

12827

THE
HOMILETIC REVIEW

VOL. XXV.

FROM JANUARY TO JUNE.

1893.

EDITORS:

I. K. FUNK, D.D., AND REV. NEWELL WOOLSEY WELLS.

PUBLISHERS:

FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.,

NEW YORK:

LONDON;

18 AND 20 ASTOR PLACE.

44 FLEET STREET.

TORONTO, CANADA: 11 RICHMOND STREET, W.

Copyright, 1893, by the
FUNK & WAGNALLS CO.

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXV.—JANUARY, 1893.—No. 1.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—THE PROGRESSIVE NATURE OF REVELATION.

BY C. S. GERHARD, D.D., READING, PA.

THAT Divine revelation was progressive under the Old Testament dispensation is universally admitted. That it is also such under the New is not so generally acknowledged. In this paper we propose to limit ourselves entirely to the New Testament and to the dispensation of the Spirit. In opening the subject we will be guided by that remarkable declaration of our Saviour: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

From the standpoint of confidence, Jesus Christ withheld nothing from His disciples. Not only did favored John enjoy His esteem, but He called them all friends, and told them that whatsoever He had heard of His Father, that He made known unto them.

Nevertheless, there was a vast difference between the Master and His disciples. Many things He could not tell them, because they could not as yet bear them. Had He made these things known to them He would have been grossly misunderstood. On account of their inexperience and slowness of mind and heart, our Saviour kept to Himself many revelations which, under the circumstances, were necessarily reserved for a later period. All that could be done was to give them seed thoughts and set their minds to working. For all truth is many-sided and interrelated with other truth, and nothing is slower than the growth of ideas. Truth works its way by degrees. Mental operations are conditioned by psychological laws, which are stimulated, but have never been ignored or set aside by Divine inspiration.

To become the propagators of the new faith the apostles were obliged to apprehend and appropriate the truth as it is in Jesus, and apply it to themselves and their surroundings. This they could not do suddenly or abruptly. Many things which the evangelists record in the Gospels they

do not themselves understand. Neither is it necessary that they should, in order that they may adequately perform their task. They give us the words and acts of Jesus as they were preserved by those who heard and saw them. The Holy Ghost guided the apostles and evangelists into all the truth, as Jesus had promised, but not in such a way as to contravene the usual laws of intellectual growth and spiritual progress. In the Acts of the Apostles and in their epistles we can trace a development of Christian ideas. St. Paul's later Epistles evince a maturity of thought which his earlier letters do not possess. His views on eschatology particularly became broader and more consistent. The Holy Spirit guided him and the other New Testament writers into all the truth, but the wholeness of the truth in its manifoldness and multiplicity of relations they did not understand; neither do we, the believers of the nineteenth century, yet fully comprehend it.

Many things the apostles did not know, though they were full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and called to the special mission of founding and teaching the Church, because, so long as there is growth and development, there can be, to a finite mind, itself subject to the law of growth, no fully complete knowledge. St. Paul says of himself and his fellow-laborers: "We see through a glass darkly. We know in part and we prophesy in part." But he also adds: "That which is in part shall be done away when that which is perfect is come." By the final consummation the truth in all its wholeness will be brought out. First the blade, then the ear, and after that the full ripe corn in the ear. When the truth is full grown and ripe—that is to say, when the historic process of Christianity shall have reached its completion—then it will be possible to see face to face, and to know as also we are known.

In the mean time, the Spirit is still guiding the Church into new phases of the truth. This is the reason why the Church problems of to-day are just as fresh, interesting, and perplexing as they were in apostolic times. So long as the Holy Spirit is in the Church, and the Church a living power in the world, new and troublesome questions will arise and will also be solved, so that there will always be a large measure of truth in the easily misleading saying that the heterodoxy of to-day is the orthodoxy of to-morrow.

For three years Jesus Christ instructed His disciples. During this period they learned many things, but others they could not learn until after Jesus was glorified, the Holy Ghost poured out, the Church established, and the Gospel preached for a considerable length of time. One of these was the admission of the Gentiles, without any legal conditions, to the privileges of the Gospel, on an equality with the Jews. For ten years after our Saviour's ascension the apostles confined themselves to the Jews. During all this time they were not willing to give the Gospel to the Gentiles unless they became proselytes to Judaism. A special Divine interposition was needed to overcome Peter's prejudice. When the prayers and alms

of Cornelius came up before God as a memorial, Peter learned through a vision, which came to him while he lay in a trance on the housetop of Simon the tanner at Joppa, that he should not call any man common or unclean, and that God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him. And then, when the Holy Ghost, while he was preaching, fell on Cornelius and his household, as on the disciples in the beginning, the apostle was fully convinced that the blessings of the Christian dispensation were intended for the Gentiles as well as the Jews.

This was a new truth toward the apprehension of which the infant Church had been growing, but when it was actually enunciated and put into practice it became the source of endless trouble. It involved consequences which required the apostles to wholly reconstruct their theology. It was contrary to all their traditional beliefs and practices. It seemed to strike at the very foundation of their entire religious system. If any one thing had been clearly taught and fully settled, it was that God's people should keep themselves strictly and entirely aloof from the Gentiles. And yet now Simon Peter had received a Gentile into fellowship with the disciples, and had actually baptized him.

So soon as the apostle came to Jerusalem he was called to account for associating and eating with the uncircumcised. But when he had rehearsed the whole matter before them, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." And so the question was settled. Was it? Not quite so fast. At Antioch it came up again in a new and aggravated form. For Paul and Barnabas not only admitted Gentiles into fellowship with the Church, but did so without requiring them to keep the law of Moses. These Gentile Christians were allowed to ignore the entire ceremonial law, and were received on simple faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. What a revolution was this! No wonder that Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with those who came down from Judea, and that it ended in the convocation of a synod at Jerusalem of the apostles and elders for the consideration of the whole question.

After the matter had been freely and thoroughly discussed at the meeting of this first synod, Peter referred to his experience with Cornelius, and concluded his address with this remarkable statement: "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." And when James, as president, gave the final decision, it was this: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." To abstain from idolatrous pollutions and from fornication were duties which they owed to God; to abstain from things strangled and from blood were duties enjoined by brotherly love. There is not a word about circumcision or the ceremonial law. The Church had gradu-

ally risen up to the great truth that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

Of this far-reaching saying St. Paul is the author; and although its truth was evidently at times perceived by the other apostles, he alone consistently held to it. At Antioch, where he withstood Peter to the face, the latter at first fellowshiped with uncircumcised believers; but afterward, when certain men came down from James, he withdrew and separated himself, and with the rest, including even Barnabas, again took the position that although Gentile Christians were not required to keep the Mosaic law, Jewish Christians were still bound as before. How significant that it was Stephen, a Hellenistic Jew, and Saul of Tarsus, whose lives had both been influenced by a broader culture than that of Palestinian Jews, who first recognized, as a necessary principle of the Gospel, its freeness and breadth. Evidently God, in His all-wise providence, had directly prepared these men for the work, into which it seems only those could so early enter who were not bound by the narrowness which held captive Palestinian Jewish life and theology.

As the apostles were able to bear them, the great truths of the Gospel were made known to them: such as the universality of redemption through the blood of Christ, the relation of grace to the law, salvation open to all believers without any legal conditions, the exalted character of the person of Christ, and the glory which awaits those who trust in Him. These truths kept on growing, expanding, and asserting themselves, until Judaism, having become completely undermined, tottered and fell. Was its overthrow a loss or a gain? Though exceedingly painful to thousands of Jewish Christians, its demolition was the necessary condition of the progress of the Church. It is always thus. The narrow, the provisional, the immature must give way to make room for the broader, truer, deeper, and more advanced. When the Jewish economy passed away, that which was of permanent value in it did not perish, but was taken up and appropriated by Christianity. The moral law was not abrogated, nor the prophets undervalued, nor the psalms set aside, nor the history of the Hebrew nation ignored. All these have been apprehended more and more in their true relation to Jesus Christ.

Revelation was progressive under the Old Testament dispensation, and it is also such under the New. We are to-day learning Divine truths which former ages did not know. Jesus Christ has opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers, and to every age He reveals new truth through the Spirit. But if we take this position, do we not disparage the New Testament Scriptures? No. On the contrary, we establish them. To the apostles was granted a special fulness of the Spirit to enable them to properly preserve and transmit to us the words and acts of Christ, and to grasp in germinal form the truth as it is in Jesus, and thus to lay the foundation upon which the superstructure of the Church has been erected. By founding the Church and giving us the New Testament Scriptures,

esus Christ, through the apostles, planted the seed which has since developed into the historic tree of Christianity.

A tree, although controlled by the life of the seed, is vastly more than a seed. To say that the tree is contained in the seed is only a half truth. It is just as true to say that a tree is the product of the soil, the atmosphere, light, and heat. A living germ and a proper environment are both necessary to produce a tree. The Christian Church can never transcend the life of the seed from which it has sprung, nor outgrow the inspired Scriptures of the New Testament; but the truth which was germinally grasped and uttered by the apostles has been growing for nineteen centuries, adapting itself to all the varying conditions which a constantly changing environment has brought forward, but has not yet been unfolded in all its length and breadth and depth and height.

The conflict of the early Church with Ebionitism and Gnosticism, with Apollinarianism and Eutychianism, furnished the occasion which enabled her to come to a proper apprehension of the true nature of the person of Christ and of the Godhead; the struggle of Athanasius with Arius and nearly all Christendom of the equality of Christ with the Father, and the discussion of Augustine with Pelagius of the true nature of sin and grace. During these early centuries were formulated also the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, which embody the great objective facts of revelation, to a consciousness of which the Church had gradually come.

For more than a thousand years, to the Reformation of the sixteenth century, Roman thought and organization dominated Christendom. But when the Germanic nations, so long under the tutelage of Latin Christianity, reached their majority, drawing new inspiration from the Bible, their religious life began to overflow the corrupt, unnatural, and narrow limitations set by the Roman Church, and gave proper recognition and emphasis to the importance of justification by faith and the supremacy of sacred Scripture.

The Reformation churches did not form a new creed. They adhered to the old creed and gave it special honor. But they studied the Scriptures, and drew up confessions and catechisms for the instruction of the people. These confessions and catechisms contain an explanation of the doctrines and duties of our holy religion as understood by those who wrote them. Their apprehension was a great advance on that of the Roman Church.

Has the Protestant Church made any progress since that time? There certainly has been change, and we believe progress too; for while the great facts of revelation, as set forth in the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, are always the same, men's views in regard to them are not stationary. No two men think alike. Much less can a former generation do the thinking of a later generation.

The Reformed Church believes in the unchanging creed of all the Christian ages; but as the Reformers, in explaining the creed, stated Christian truth under a new aspect, because in their thinking they had outgrown the

theology of the Middle Ages, so has the Church of to-day outgrown the theology of the sixteenth century. No one believes in Luther's catechism, in the Westminster Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Heidelberg Catechism in the same sense in which the authors of these formulas believed in them. Slowly and imperceptibly the change has been wrought, but it has come. Forces have been at work which have completely undermined some of the theological tenets of the Reformation, and at present we are in a transition period from the influence of which none of us can escape. Calvinism has lost its grip on the thinking of the age. The leaders of thought no longer believe in a limited atonement, but have come to realize that there is a wideness in God's mercy like the wideness of the sea. Reprobation and preterition are no longer tenable. The forensic or juridical theory of the atonement, the verbal inspiration of sacred Scripture, the Divine right of any one form of Church government, the creation of the world as the result of a succession of Divine fiats, can no longer be maintained.

On the contrary, not the elimination, as is often asserted, but the naturalness of the supernatural, and the importance of the study of the Bible as literature, in order that we may properly appreciate the Divine inspiration which lives and breathes within its sacred pages, are profoundly recognized and strongly emphasized. The immanence of God in the world of nature and of humanity; the unique position of Jesus Christ, the source, the inspiration, and the goal of all true religion and spiritual life, of whom, and by whom, and for whom are all things and all men; the far-reaching significance of the ethical element in the consideration of all the questions which have to do with the personal history as well as the final destiny of the individual and of the race, and lastly the pressing claims of the unsolved but fascinating problems of the entire field of eschatology, are crowding in upon us with ever-growing impatience. So-called "creed revision," whether in actual process of execution or not, in public church assemblies, is going forward irresistibly in our minds. We cannot put ourselves into the position of those who framed the confessional standards to which we subscribe. We live in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and the question is whether we will open or shut our eyes to the truths which Jesus Christ is making known. The world moves. Traditionalists cannot stop it. Great minds, big with new ideas, like Christopher Columbus, will not rest until they have discovered a passage-way to unexplored fields of truth, vast in extent and possessed of boundless wealth.

Of course we must remember that all recently discovered truth is surrounded by dross, and lies close to error. Modern Christian scholarship, in studying the Bible as literature, and in breaking the chains which bound it to the dead orthodoxy of the past, has no doubt made mistakes. If it has demonstrated, as it claims to have done, that the Bible is not inerrant, it has also, at the same time, most conclusively proven that it too is not,

by any means, inerrant. Nevertheless, it has certainly given us a practically new Book, which we recognize as most wonderfully human, being beset by the same limitations that control the writings of all honest but uninspired authors, and yet, at the same time, still more wonderfully Divine because saturated with the moral and spiritual truths revealed by the Holy Ghost; filled with the mind and heart and life of God; inspired in a special sense; the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice.

Our blessed Saviour, however, speaks to this age not only through biblical learning. He also challenges our attention through marvellous discoveries in the domain of science. He is the truth and the inspiration of the truth in all departments of knowledge. And just this is the greatest word which He is uttering at the present time—namely, the position which He, in His own person, occupies as the life and the light of the world. Slowly, very slowly, but surely, theology, science, and philosophy are beginning to recognize the Christological principle as fundamental to every other. At the present time the evolutionary hypothesis dominates all scientific thought. It is the category of the age; and no thinking man can place himself outside it, or limit the scope of its operation. And what has come to be the prevailing tendency of the theory of evolution? A few years ago it was supposed to be of necessity wholly atheistic. This conception of its trend is now largely given up.

Herbert Spencer, for instance, tells us that there is needed a revised ideal of life; that to be a successful warrior was the highest ideal among all ancient peoples; that in modern civilized society the duty to work has taken the place of the duty to fight, and that he thinks this will not survive, but that when there is fully recognized the truth that moral beauty is higher than intellectual power, such beauty, culminating in the desire to be loved for the sake of moral worth, will be the characteristic variation in the coming man that will survive. Well may we ask, Where, then, shall this ideal be found except in Jesus Christ, who is the realization in past history of the highest ideals of the future?

“Watch,” says a recent writer, “the outlines of the face which the unflinching hand of modern thought, guided by a belief in the theory of evolution, and working according to the methods of Darwinism, is inevitably though unconsciously drawing. Watch it as it limns the salient features. It is the face of the man who best serves his fellow-men. Watch it! Whose is that face emerging from the canvas? What but the very face of the one Man who, above all other men, ‘gave His life a ransom for many’? What but the face of Jesus Christ? Literally and truly the face of Jesus Christ! The outlines are only broadly given as yet. Many details are to be worked in; but yet the Son of Man is there. To fill in that outline, in all its marvellous beauty and force, we turn to our Bibles. But the one fits with the other, so far as they touch upon common points with absolute accuracy.”

Again, the philosophy which awakens the quickest response among the

profoundest scholars of the age is that which makes the Christ idea fundamental in its thinking. The coming system of thought in New England, imported from older centres of learning, is plainly Christological.

The same thing is pre-eminently true of theology. From all sides comes testimony, bearing witness to the great fact that the problems of the age, pressing in upon the Church, demolishing traditional beliefs, opening questions that had long been settled, and producing a feeling of uncertainty in many minds, can be answered only by recognizing the person of Christ as the centre from which all theological investigations must proceed, as well as the goal to which they must tend.

Surely the Lord Jesus is saying many things to us which former ages were not able to bear. May He give us strength to meet all that is before us, in humble reliance upon His grace, with fearless courage, unswerving faith and abiding confidence.

But however much we may receive and learn in this world, how much more will He not tell us, when the night is past and the day breaks, when we shall know Him as also we are known, when we shall see Him as He is, and shall dwell forever with the Lord in that city which hath foundations, whose Maker and Builder is God !

II.—THE PASTOR IN RELATION TO THE BENEFICENCE OF THE CHURCH.

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

It may be taken as an axiom that the relation of the pastor to the beneficence of the Church is a vital relation. The benevolence and beneficence of a congregation are never likely to attain to a normal development, apart from the personal influence of the pastor or minister. This is so obvious that it needs no proof. The statement of the position carries with it its own demonstration, and all that we essay to do in this article is to illustrate and apply this principle. For brevity's sake we shall divide this paper under four heads : the pastor as a teacher, a leader, a pleader, and an exemplar.

I. First, as a *teacher*. The pulpit is a great educator or trainer. Sometimes under its influence a congregation enjoys a sort of university education. The teaching of the pulpit comes with authority ; and specially, if it be a faithful reflection of the sentiments of the Word of God, it comes with the authority of the Holy Scriptures and of the inspiring Spirit. The duty and the privilege of systematic beneficence should be among the foremost of the topics treated in the pulpit. The minister of Christ should not be afraid of repetition. The word "in-cul-cation" embodies no little of the ethics of etymology. *In-cul-x*, to tread in with the heel. It implies the constant going over and over of the same path, and fixing the impres-

sion of truth by the frequency and the emphasis of repetition, which Sydney Smith remarked was, for all purposes of oratorical persuasion, the only figure of speech that is worth a farthing. The teachings of the Scripture on the subject of beneficence, however they may be resisted by carnality and selfishness, nevertheless carry conviction, for they appeal to the normal instincts of the human soul. Men may indulge themselves in all manner of selfish, extravagant, careless, and godless expenditure, but there is something which tells every man from within that this is not only wronging God and wronging man, but wronging himself. The foundation of all beneficence is the doctrine of divine stewardship, which, briefly stated, means that we possess nothing which is absolutely our own, that every good gift is God's gift, and is to be used in recognition of the Giver; that property is something held in trust, and that, as trustees, we are bound to expend what we have for the supreme profit of others and the honor and glory of the original and inalienable Owner. Upon this foundation of divine stewardship the minister of Christ must press the privilege as well as duty of systematic beneficence. This is the antidote and corrective of that selfishness which is perhaps the root of all other sins and the most dangerous foe even of human happiness itself. Balzac, in his "Peau de Chagrin," makes use of an old fable which has never lost its pertinency. He represents a young man as becoming the possessor of a magic skin, the peculiarity of which is that, while it bestows on its possessor the power to gratify every wish or whim, with every such gratification the skin itself shrinks in all its dimensions. The owner makes every effort to find the cause of such shrinkage, invoking the aid of physician, physicist, chemist, and student of natural history; but it is all in vain. He draws round the skin a red line. That same day he indulges in a longing for some object of gratification. The next morning there is between the red line and the skin a little interval, close to which it was traced, and so always inevitably as he lives on, gratifying one desire or satisfying one passion after another, this fatal process of shrinkage continues. Then a mortal disease sets in which keeps pace with the shrinking skin, and so his life and his talisman together come to an end. This is but a fable to illustrate the moral atrophy of self-indulgence. Paul, in his first epistle to Timothy, the sixth chapter and the ninth verse, warns the rich, or them that will to be rich, that they fall into temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts which drown men in destruction and perdition; and he further warns them that the love of money—that is to say, greed—is the root of all evil; and that, while some covet after gain, they pierce themselves through with many sorrows. The Apostle James has, if possible, a still more pertinent word in the fifth chapter of his epistle, second and third verses. He says that the rust which hoarded gold and silver gathers is itself a witness against the miser, for rust is the proof of unused coin; and he also says that this rust acts as a canker, and eats the flesh of its possessor as it were with fire. This is very remarka-

ble language. It teaches us that the hoarding of money shall itself witness against its possessor and become a means of the torture of such possessor. Buried capital is something for which men must give account. If we knew the fact, happiness becomes impossible to him who does not make a proper use of the gifts of God. When Butler, the author of the "Analogy," went into close retirement in the little country parish of Stanhope, Queen Caroline, the consort of George IV., asked the Bishop of Blackburn if Mr. Butler were dead. "No, madame," he said, "*not dead, but buried.*" And the same thing might be said of many men who hold property. As property holders they may not be dead, but they are buried and their property with them. What a blessing would come to the Church and the world if rich men could learn to say, as Lowell used to say in college, that one "could spare the necessities but not the luxuries of life;" and that they were more willing to spare themselves the bread and like necessities, which are the support of physical life, than to forego the luxury of imparting blessing to those less favored than themselves! This instruction on the subject of beneficence must begin with children, line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little. Just as the twig is bent the tree is inclined. Those who understand botany know that if you take out from a branch a scion whose natural tendency is upward, cut off the branch and set the scion downward, all others that grow out of that branch afterward will grow downward. If we can set the scion in the branches of a young life with a Godward tendency, all the developments of the future growth will be in the same direction.

II. Secondly, as a leader. We refer here to the necessary prominence of the minister of Christ as the organizer of the beneficence of his people. In this matter Nehemiah should be his great model. The Book of Nehemiah seems to be inserted in the Old Testament canon largely as a spiritual and scriptural lesson on the development of church life. The intent study of this book will show that the four principles which regulated Nehemiah's successful activity as the restorer of the city of Jerusalem and its government were, first, thorough organization; second, division of labor; third, co-operation between all laborers, and, fourth, concentration at any assaulted point. In other words, he strove to bring every individual into the general plan of labor; to give each individual such sort and measure of labor as he or she might be able to perform; to make them all participate in a work that was one work, and to repel the adversaries of the work from any point of assault by gathering all the workers into force at the imperilled point in the wall. We know no addition possible to the wisdom of such a course, in developing the systematic activity of a church on benevolent lines. The pastor must aim at a work large enough and varied enough to adapt itself to each individual member. He wants to secure such unity of work as that all shall feel themselves to be fellow-helpers to one great end. He must seek to divide the labor so that each shall have such work as is adapted to him or to her, and he must teach all

to lay aside their particular work and concentrate their efforts in any direction where there is a special emergency or peril. A great lack in our church life is a lack of such complete organization. We knew well a prominent pastor in one of the Western cities who was perpetually urging his people to engage in beneficent activities, but who was so utterly deficient in devising and dividing labor that when approached after his own discourses by those who were ready to engage in work for Christ, he was absolutely unable to direct them in what way to bestow their activities. Fortunately the economy of all well-organized churches does not leave the pastor to do this work of organization alone. He has his eldership, or his board of deacons, or his committee men to assist him in the forming and perfecting of this mechanism of church activity, and he should associate with himself the largest number of wise, sagacious, active men and women in his congregation as the pastor's working council. They should with him develop modes of activity, and apportion work to every man, woman, and child willing to engage in it. I have found it of great personal value to me in the pastorate of Presbyterian churches to unite the trustees, elders, and deacons in such a pastor's council, and with them to mature the methods of work to be recommended to the congregation for their adoption. Such a plan has a higher value in this, that each member of such a board of councillors represents a coterie of personal friends and acquaintances in the congregation, over whom he has more or less influence, and whom he can induce personally to take part in the organized work of the congregation.

III. Third, as a pleader. We mean that the pastor who thus teaches and leads the work of his congregation must not hesitate at a persistent, constant, and bold advocacy of the duty and privilege of engaging in habitual beneficence. He must perpetually emphasize the fact that the law of all noble living is the law of unselfishness; that we must do good for the sake of doing good, and not even for the sake of its returns to us personally. We have fallen upon a day of universal patent automatic sweetmeat machines, which guarantee to return a package of sweets for every penny put in the slot, and their influence seems to be perceptible even in our church life. We have heard of a little fellow who, on putting a penny in the offertory box on Sunday, asked his mother which she thought would come out, chocolate or caramels. We shall never have well-developed beneficence in our churches until we get the sweetmeat machines out of our thought; and nothing will impress the true law of unselfishness in beneficence but a bold and constant advocacy of every form of benevolent work. The pastor must insist that the church doors shall swing open for all benevolent enterprise, and that all waters which carry healing and help to humanity shall find a channel for their stream through the house of God. He must not be afraid of the effect of such insistence and persistence. The historian Froude, for his singularly bold treatment of historic questions, has had attached to him a new word—Froud-acity. We should be

glad to see every pastor deserving of some such descriptive title in view of the courageous perseverance with which he educates his people in benevolent activity. He may seem to be a beggar, but he will lose, with all noble-minded people, no prestige on this account. A church is perverted from its purposes the moment it becomes a religious club house. Whatever purposes the church may answer as a home for disciples, as a place of worship, or even as a school, it must not be forgotten that it is primarily a rallying point in order that it may be a radiating point. A pastor who does his duty in this respect may at least compel some of his church-members to say, like the man who was asked whether he was afraid to die : " No, I am not *afraid* to die, but I am *ashamed* to die."

IV. After all, we must emphasize most of all the fourth and last consideration of this paper. The relation of the pastor to the beneficence of his church is most vital in its relation to personal character as an exemplar. Herbert Spencer says that by no political alchemy can you get golden conduct out of leaden instincts ; and I think it was Epictetus who said of some in his day that while their vessels were silver and golden their principles and practices were the commonest sort of earthenware. If the pastor himself is constantly nearing the divine perihelion, his very face will shine with the beauty of the reflected light, and his contact with his people will be somewhat like the contact of Burke even with complete strangers. It used to be said of him, so great and extraordinary was his mind and so remarkable his whole character, that no subject came under discussion which he could not treat in so masterly and technical a manner as to induce such as heard him to imagine that he had dedicated a considerable portion of his life to the consideration of that particular subject. If he was not the most accomplished orator, he was, at any rate, the most eloquent man of his day, and, perhaps, second to none in any age. No person of sense could meet him under a gateway to avoid a shower who did not go away convinced that he had met the first man in England, whoever he might be.

The pastor must show himself a *man*. That is the first condition of influence as a minister of Christ. It behooves him to take heed to his doctrine and to his deportment, but, *above* all, to take heed to *himself*. A man who is radically greedy and stingy and selfish can never for a long time influence a congregation in the lines of beneficent activity. There is a contagion about self-denial, and there is an infection in selfishness likewise. It is not necessary that a pastor should announce his gifts. He may not let his left hand know what his right hand does, but there is an atmosphere which accompanies a radically generous and unselfish soul that reveals itself, like the fragrance of a flower, by invisible but still sensible methods ; and a man in the pulpit who not only advocates giving, but gives ; not only preaches, but practises benevolence ; not only inculcates beneficent activity, but himself illustrates it, is the man who, though it may take time, will develop a generation of liberal souls ; and the outcome

of such a man's ministry is sure to be a people who give, give habitually, and give from the very love of giving, and who regard beneficence as the inevitable outcome of all true and consecrated living.

III.—THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GERMANY.

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH.D., COLUMBUS, O.

THE leadership of Germany in the progressive theological thought of our day and date is recognized on all sides. The beginnings of nearly all new departures in this department, both good and bad, spring from the soil of the Fatherland. It is really only Holland which evinces a tendency toward independence in new lines of theological and biblical thought other than those which originate in Germany. And there, too, where Dutch methods and ideals have given the first impetus toward new developments in theological thought, the Germans have gradually supplanted the Dutch. This is notably the case in England, where the influence of Kuenen was originally a prime factor in starting that new movement which is so characteristic of the progressive thought of the English theological world. French scholars, such as Havet and Vernes, have indeed been going their own way, particularly in pulling down the date of the prophetic writings of the Old Covenant to the second century before Christ; but these erratic idiosyncrasies are really only extreme applications of the methods of German radicalism. Renan, indeed, acknowledged no man his master; but in historical and theological research he plays only a *rôle* as a rhetorician and none as a scholar. America readily joins others in accepting Germany as a protagonist wherever theology is acknowledged as a progressive and not as merely a reproductive science. So strongly do German ideas and ideals prevail in the younger generation of American theologians, chiefly through the scores who sit at the feet of the savants at the famous universities of the Fatherland, and through the study of Germany's prolific and solid theological literature, that attention has frequently been called to the dangers of "Teutolatry" in this connection.

This prominence of the Germans in the theological ups and downs of the age is by no means an accidental affair. It is the result of causes that are clearly discernible. The ideals of German scholarship and research are exceedingly high and exalted. It is the search for truth from the best of sources for the sake of the truth alone, and without subjective prejudgments on the part of the investigator. Theoretically, at any rate, the German scholar disregards the isms and standpoints of former generations or of special schools of thought. In fact, the recognition of scholarship in the researches of a student is conditioned by the evolution of new truths or the correction of old error. A compiler or a reproducer of even the best thoughts of others is not entitled to the rank of scholarship. The

literary canons and ideals suggest and favor new departures and new results. That in the nature of the case sensationalistic features and methods cannot be absent under these conditions is self-evident. Many a new theory or hypothesis is promulgated with the claim that they are the results of a scientific management of accepted data and facts, while in reality they are only bold attempts to catch the public eye and ear by a brilliant guess. Theology reflects these characteristics of German thought in general all the more, because there theology is in close contact, touch, and tone with scientific research as such. The fact that the theological faculty is one department of the *universitas litterarum* is typical and representative. Theology is regarded as a science not primarily in the service of the Church or the doctrines of the Church, but dedicated and devoted to the search of truth irrespective of all other considerations. Theological science is chiefly or exclusively a knowledge. That it is a *habitus practicus*, demanding on the part of the student not only a head but also a believing heart, as was taught by the theologians of other generations, is now no longer accepted. The idea of a personal devotion to the cause of the Church no longer enters into the definition of a theologian. Theology as a science stands in close connection with scientific methods in other departments too, especially the philosophical. For this reason those new movements in German theological thought which cut deepest, nearly all are at bottom based upon metaphysical and philosophical differences. It is acknowledged on all hands that the Baur-Tübingen school of neological New Testament critics was under the spell of the Hegelian system, and reconstructed the origins of Christianity from the standpoint of this school. The new theology of modern Germany—that of the Ritschl school—is based upon an adaptation of the Kantian system of philosophy and ethics. The great debatable ground between it and the conservative school are not primarily prominent Christian doctrines, but the philosophical and metaphysical basis of theological thought and its certainty. The destructive Old Testament school of the Reuss-Wellhausen clan in its premises and conclusions is an exponent of the naturalistic philosophy of the day. It reconstructs the Old Testament covenant and its history to harmonize them to the “religion of the era of Darwin,” to use a word of the lamented Professor Delitzsch.

With these facts before us, it can be readily understood why there is not a single school of theological thinkers in Germany representing in its entirety the systems of earlier Protestant theology. While the conservative men, who are strong in faith and are evangelical to the core, are a powerful factor and force in the development of theological science in Germany, there are none who are content merely to reproduce the teachings of the fathers. The conservative and confessional school too has been strongly influenced by the critical and philosophical discussions of the last decades. This is particularly noticeable in the critical questions which affect the Scriptures. Characteristic of our age is the fact that the Scrip-

tures are now being studied for the first time as a literature ; as the composition of human authors, too, and not merely of the Holy Spirit. This new point of view has brought into great prominence features and phases of the Biblical books which the great theologians of earlier days largely disregarded. If they put the stress upon the divine side of the Scriptures, the tendency and trend now is to emphasize the human. In doing this German conservative theology is willing to make concessions which the conservative men of the English-speaking theological world are not willing to make. While clinging firmly to the Scriptures as a Revelation, and the history of a Revelation, they see in the Scriptures, as a human book, imperfections that are necessarily found in all the works of man. In both the critical questions affecting the books of the Bible and in the burning Inspiration question conservative theology in Germany yields what to conservative scholars elsewhere seems dangerous. Since the death of Professor Bachmann, of Rostock, there has not been in connection with the universities of Germany a single Protestant teacher who does not reject the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and accept the analysis into documents as a settled fact and result of a century of scrutinizing detail researches. The exilic date of Isaiah xl.-xvi. is generally accepted, as also the Maccabean date of Daniel and many of the Psalms. These views are reproduced and defended in scores of books emanating from the pens of the most positive men. The recent discussions of the Inspiration question have brought these tendencies to the forefront again. It appears that there is not a single confessional theological university teacher in all Germany who maintains the absolute inerrancy of the sacred Scriptures. The verbal inspiration theory finds few friends there. It is accepted on all sides that the critical discussions of the day have brought forth data and facts in the Scriptures which clash with such a theory of absolute inerrancy. Probably the most positive man in this direction is Professor Nösgen, of Rostock. While there are still some men who, like Professor Zöckler, of Greifswald, reject the current proposition that the Scriptures only *contain* the Word of God, and still adhere to the old view that the Scriptures *are* the Word of God, yet errors and inaccuracies in externals, in history, geography, chronology, and the like, are accepted and acknowledged. Not, indeed, in this sense that the existence of such weaknesses in the written word in any way, shape, or form interferes with the Bible or its character as the trustworthy revelation of the Divine plan of salvation, but rather that the acknowledgment of these weaknesses frees apologetics of the impossible task of defending the Scriptures as an absolutely errorless book, which it does not claim to be. The certainty of the Divine character of the scriptural revelation is based upon the subjective conviction made by the Word upon the believer. An idea akin to the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* of the Reformation and post-Reformation period is made the standard and measure of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Unfortunately, however, the weakness of this purely subjective method ap-

appears everywhere, and the exact demarcation line between the divinely certain and the humanly uncertain is nowhere drawn with precision. It is a singular phenomenon that this Inspiration controversy has been so prominent just in conservative circles. Some few years ago the addresses of the Dorpat professors, Mühlau and Volek, provoked the antagonism of the conservative rank and file of the German Protestant Church by their free utterances. Recently a standard-bearer of confessional theology, Professor Dieckhoff, of Rostock, the most positive theological faculty in all Germany, has written a work on this subject, in which he aims to show that the doctrine of absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures is not the teaching of the best representative theologians of the Church, but only a part and portion of the great theological systems of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He examines in detail especially the standpoints of an Augustin and a Luther, maintaining that they had practically, though not *ex professo*, admitted the possibility of inaccuracies in the accidentals of the Scriptures as a book and books. The names of the Reformers and of the early confessional writings of the Protestant Church can easily be used and abused by both sides of the controversy. The fact of the matter is that they took only a practical view of the Scriptures as the revealed Word of God; the critical literary problems did not exist for them. Both sides, accordingly, appeal to Luther and other heroes of that ago, and seeming corroborations of both views can be found in their writings. It is well known that a Luther spoke slightly of the Epistle of James, claiming that, in comparison with other New Testament writings, it was a real "straw" epistle; yet he did so, not from any critical distrust of its authenticity, but merely because it did not "urge Christ"—*i. e.*, bring out prominently salvation by faith in Christ alone, which, according to his standard, was the *sine qua non* of a Biblical book. It is true the confessions of the Lutheran Church do not have a paragraph on the subject of inspiration; but the conclusion drawn from this by Professor Franck, of Erlangen, and others, that this was done intentionally in order to leave this matter an open question for future generations, is certainly without warrant. Practically the Scriptures from one end to the other are for the Reformer and early Reformation writings the truly divine book of revelation, reliable and trustworthy in each point and particular. A formal definition of verbal or real inspiration was not needed at that time, and, therefore, was not given.

This, however, does not imply that the old landmarks of verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures, as also the traditional views on critical questions, find no defenders in the conservative ranks of the Church of Germany. They do, but generally and, in fact, altogether among the pastors and ordinary clergy. It is a noteworthy fact that the opposition to these innovations is coming from the Church itself, who see in the official teachers and their ways a dangerous departure. The most pronounced defender of this absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures is Pastor Wilhelm

Kölling, who has written two extensive works on the subject within the last three years. Pastor Rohnert has written in the same spirit. The best defence of this Mosaic origin of the Book of Genesis is from the pen of Pastor Neumann, and of the Book of Deuteronomy from the pen of Pastor Zahn, of Stuttgart ; the bulk of the conservative writers, however, see in these new departures no danger to the Church or to Christian doctrines. The late Professor Delitzsch was a singular instance of the manner in which concession in the literary matters of the Scriptures can be united in a German mind and heart with an unswerving faith in them as divinely given truth. His standpoint was often a psychological enigma. On literary points purely there was a difference of degree rather than of kind between Delitzsch and Wellhausen ; but when it came to a judgment of the revealed character and contents of the Scripture, they differed *toto cælo*. As Delitzsch himself stated in one of his pamphlets, there exists between the schools in this regard a deep and impassable " chasm." It is the chasm that exists between barren deism and a living, theistic conception of God ; between naturalism and the faith in divinity and miracles. This characteristic distinction must never be lost sight of in passing judgment on the seemingly illogical position of German conservative theology. Spite of the concessions made to literary and historical criticism, the German confessional school is thoroughly evangelical. They do not recognize in their concessions the dangers which others do, and see in these concessions only the tribute which fairness must pay to truth.

The antipodes of the confessionals and conservatives are the adherents of the Ritschl school. This clan numbers among its members some of the brightest minds in German theology, such as Harnack and Kaftan, of Berlin, the latter the successor of Dorner, the former occupying the chair of Neander ; Hermann, of Marburg ; Schultz, of Göttingen ; Stade and Kattenbusch, of Giessen ; Schürer, of Kiel ; Gottschick, of Tübingen, and others. In fact, it is represented in nearly all the Protestant faculties in Germany. It is decidedly a school of enthusiastic young men. Professor Ritschl, who died only about two years ago in Göttingen, succeeded in what had been achieved by only two other men in the present century—by Schleiermacher in the early decades and Von Hofmann in the middle decades—namely, in organizing a theological school of his own. His is decidedly *the* new theology of Germany, and its methods and manners are the leading debatable grounds in scientific theology. Like all German theological controversies, this is one about fundamentals. In that country it is scarcely possible to arouse a wide theological discussion on a particular doctrine of the Christian system, as was done by the Andover probation theory, or the predestination troubles in the Lutheran Church of America. The acceptance of a common basis for such an argument are wanting in Germany. There such debates always go to the roots of the entire Christian body of doctrines. This too is the case here. The Ritschl school excludes from theological science all metaphysics and mysticism, which

practically, as a rule, implies all supernatural elements. Not what Christian truths *are*, but what they are worth to us is the measure of their reality. It is *Werturtheile*, not *Seinsurtheile*. At basis the system is seemingly a kind of an agnosticism, and practically it is an ethics separated from religious grounds. The school there really empties the fundamental doctrines of Christianity of their positive character and contents and of their objective existence and reality. Luthardt, of Leipzig, one of the strongest opponents of Ritschl, correctly says that the leading characteristic of the system is the "*Entwerthung*" of the Christian system—*i.e.*, it robs the Christian doctrines of their value by robbing them of their objective reality and basis. The system, however, is in touch and tone with the naturalistic spirit of the age and in fact, its roots strike down deeply into this soil. Hence its popularity.

Naturally there are mediating schools between these two extremes of German theological thought. The best known and most influential are found chiefly at the Prussian universities as the exponent of that union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches which was effected by Friedrich Wilhelm III. in 1817. Among these we can mention such noble names as Tholuck, Dorner, Christlieb, B. Weiss, and others. To what degree the positive evangelical element and to what degree the neological prevails in the systems of the representatives of these schools depends entirely upon their standpoints. There is no formal expression or official declaration of these mediating schools. The same is true of the other radical school, which has its headquarters at Jena and Heidelberg, and which in methods but not generally in results differs with the Ritschl school. Thus Harnack maintains the thesis that Greek philosophy exercised not merely a formative, but also a creative and material influence on the construction of early Christian doctrine. Pfeleiderer, of Berlin, practically teaches the same; yet the latter is one of the sharpest antagonists of the philosophical premises of the Ritschl school.

Naturally all of these schools have their organs. The *Allgemeine Luthertische Kirchenzeitung*, of Leipzig, edited by Professor Luthardt, is the best popular exponent of the conservatives, while the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, of Munich, is their learned organ; the *Christliche Welt*, of Leipzig, preaches in a forcible manner the tenets of the Ritschl school, mainly to an educated laity, while the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* is its theological journal. A positive mild organ of conservatism is the Berlin *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, edited by Professor Zöckler, while the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, of Berlin, represents the radical type of theological thinking. Other journals of less prominence and representing all the kaleidoscopic aspects of German theological thought exist in large numbers.

IV.—CLERICAL CELIBACY : ITS EXTENT, RESTRICTIONS,
AND EXCEPTIONS.

BY REV. C. C. STARBUCK, ANDOVER, MASS.

THE three great divisions of Christendom, it is known, have three different standards of use as to the marriage of the clergy. Roman Catholicism forbids it; the Greek Church, with the lesser Eastern churches, allows it before, but forbids it, or, at least, holds it incompatible with continuing functions, after ordination to the diaconate, and forbids a man living in marriage to be ordained bishop; Protestantism in every branch allows clergymen of every grade "to marry at their discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

The prohibition of marriage to the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church is not, however, absolute. The incumbents of the four minor orders—ostiarus, lector, exorcist, and acolyte—are not required to live single. These orders, indeed, are merely survivals of functions that were once active in the Church. Exorcism, so far as it is now practised, is virtually absorbed in the priesthood; the functions of ostiarus and acolyte are now competent to laymen; and that of lector, or Scripture reader to the people, is extinct in the public offices of the Church, and, so far as it does subsist, is exercised by the higher orders. Clerics in minor orders, however, on marrying are required to surrender any benefices which they may hold, although they continue to enjoy clerical immunities.

The sub-diaconate is now held in the Latin Church to be a major order, though it is regarded as being probably non-sacramental. It was once included among the minor orders, but for some seven centuries it has been added to the other three holy orders, and with them now involves the obligation of leading a clerical life, and of abstaining from marriage. Yet, as being non-sacramental, it admits with comparative ease of obtaining a dispensation for marriage, on condition, however, of demitting all clerical functions and surrendering all benefices.

The obligation of celibacy, therefore, hardly rests in its full weight except upon the three fundamental orders of deacon, presbyter, and bishop—especially on the last two, as being the two grades of the priesthood. The diaconate, which, though next to the priesthood, has no properly sacerdotal attributes, is a good deal more open to the hope of dispensation than either presbyter or bishop. Reginald Pole, though a cardinal in rank, would never go beyond deacon in order until the marriage of his cousin, Mary Tudor, precluded all hope of his being invited to share her throne.

To presbyters a dispensation of this tenor, apart from high reasons of public policy, is scarcely ever granted. Ordination to the priesthood, for prince or peasant, in almost every case closes the door of marriage—that is, of any such marriage as the Church will own as valid. As to bishops, it is disputed whether the solitary one who, on becoming King of Aragon (or next heir to the throne), was permitted to marry for the sake of con-

tinuing the line, had been already consecrated or not. Some contend (on rather dubious evidence) that he was as yet, though a bishop in rank, only a priest in order. At all events, there appears to have been no certain later instance of the ecclesiastically authorized marriage of a consecrated bishop. Pius VII., it is true, consented to secularize Talleyrand, once Bishop of Autun, but would never recognize his marriage. John Casimir, King of Poland, who married his sister-in-law, Queen Mary Gonzaga, was, indeed, a cardinal and a Jesuit, but probably only under simple vows and in minor orders. Caesar Borgia held some bishoprics, but had not gone higher in order than deacon.

In the various Eastern rites affiliated with Rome the clergy are commonly permitted to follow the Eastern discipline—namely, to marry before ordination to the sub-diaconate (perhaps in the East the diaconate*), and to continue in marriage as priests, but not to marry subsequently. If in the West a married man wishes to be ordained to holy orders (the lowest of which is sub-deacon), intending to go on to the priesthood, this can only be granted if his wife has taken a vow (I think a solemn vow) of continence, and, unless advanced in life, has entered a convent. He cannot be made a bishop unless she enters an order of strict vows. In such cases the two are held, of course, to be still, as to the sacramental relation, man and wife. Their obligation of living apart is viewed as resting on the vows which both have assumed by mutual consent. If a man, deceiving his wife on the one hand, and the bishop on the other, obtains holy orders surreptitiously, he loses marital rights, but remains bound by full marital obligations. The compromise proposed to Catherine of Aragon, that she should enter into “lax religion” in order to give her husband the liberty of marrying again, is utterly abhorrent to Roman doctrine as now determined. This teaches that mutually admitted vows may authorize a sacramentally wedded husband and wife to remain permanently apart, but that the conjugal relation itself, if the parties have lived together, is absolutely indissoluble except by death.

In the Coptic Church young children are sometimes ordained priests. Rome has decided that such, on coming of age, may lawfully marry and live as laymen unless they freely elect the sacerdotal life.

It is held, therefore, that without a dispensation, granted with increasing difficulty for each ascending grade of holy orders, the ordination of a grown man to the sub-diaconate, as involving the obligation of a solemn vow, renders a subsequent marriage not merely ecclesiastically punishable, but absolutely null and void. In other words, it is not merely an impediment, but a diriment impediment. *Impedimenta impedientia* render a marriage ecclesiastically censurable, but leave it obligatory. *Impedimenta dirimentia* are held to destroy its validity from the beginning, although many diriment impediments allow of a subsequent validation of marriage, while others, again, are held to be intrinsically irremovable.

* The authorities are a little hazy as to minute particulars of the Eastern discipline.

The obligation of abstaining from marriage in the case of men and women bound by monastic vows rests on quite another basis—namely, their *explicit* declaration given in their monastic profession. This is entirely distinct from ordination, of which women, indeed, are held intrinsically incapable. In all monastic orders it is now required that at least the first three years following the noviciate shall be spent under simple vows. Among female orders in this country, except for the Ladies of the Visitation, solemn vows are hardly permitted, except by special papal authority in individual cases. To the Jesuits it is granted that even a simple vow shall be a diriment impediment, invalidating a subsequent marriage, although all simple vows of Jesuits are dissolved by dismissal from the society (which the general can order at any time), and in such an event do not require a papal dispensation. In all other orders, male and female, a simple vow of chastity is only an impedient impediment, involving, if undispensed, a liability to heavy censures in the event of a subsequent marriage, but leaving this marriage sacramental and obligatory, and, if the parties have lived together, indissoluble even by the Pope. Whether, however, the parties do not involve themselves in added censures by living together without special allowance is a question variously answered, according to various circumstances, but with a prevailing inclination to set the duties of the married state, especially where there are children, above the obligation of a simple vow. Of course if a male regular or religious, whether monk, friar, regular clerk, or what not, has been ordained to the sub-diaconate, the solemn vow involved in this is held to invalidate a subsequent marriage, even though his monastic profession may have been made under simple vows. A Sister of Charity may marry almost when she pleases, as her engagements hardly rise to the stringency of even simple vows, and, moreover, only bind from year to year.

It may be asked on what the authority of the Church to grant dispensations from impediments to marriage, impedient or diriment, is supposed to rest. It is held to rest on her authority to establish these impediments. From impediments resting on the settled will of God, as expressed in the immutable *jus divinum* revealed in the Scriptures, or in the immutable *jus naturale* revealed in the universal reason and conscience, it is held that the Church cannot possibly dispense. A parent and child, it is held, cannot, under any possible authority, contract a valid marriage. Nor are any marriages whatever between ascendants and descendants, or between brothers and sisters, of the whole or half blood, ever permitted to continue, even when contracted among barbarians before conversion to Christianity. If, therefore, the marriages of clergymen were held to be immutably forbidden by Christ or by the apostles through revelation from Christ, it would be allowed that no ecclesiastical permission could validate them. But few, probably none, now suppose this ; and, indeed, such an opinion, as Bellarmine remarks, is contradicted by the whole history and practice of the Church. It is true, he whimsically interprets *σώφρονα*,

continentem, in 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Titus i. 8, as implying the obligation to a celibate life, but he allows that the apostle here only acts in the exercise of a "godly discretion," using the power of the keys, which, unlike the gift of inspiration, is supposed to have descended to the episcopate, and in its fulness to the Pope. Accordingly, says Bellarmine, as not Christ through the apostles, but the Church in the apostles, has forbidden the marriage of clergymen, so the Church, which has inherited from the apostles not, indeed, the gift of revelation, but the plenary power of the keys, can, at her absolute discretion, relax the prohibition, either temporarily or permanently, either partially or completely. She can, he would say, remit the obligation of celibacy to the clergy in certain regions, or to certain classes, or certain orders, or abrogate it altogether; she can either permit marriage before any one of the eight ascending possible ordinations of ostiarius, lector, exorcist, acolyte, sub-deacon, deacon, priest, bishop, or she can permit it both before and after any or all. She can either confine the permission to those who demit, or extend it to those who continue their functions. She can, at her option, forbid or allow a clergyman to marry more than once.

Of course, since the Church has doctrinally pronounced virginity higher than marriage, no Roman Catholic divine conceives it practically possible that she will ever permit unrestricted clerical marriage. At the very least he must suppose that she will always, under all ordinary circumstances, insist on the celibacy of bishops. Yet as the marriage of secular clergymen—that is, of clergymen unbound by monastic vows—is not supposed to be forbidden by the *jus divinum*, and is certainly not forbidden by the *jus naturale*, the Church undoubtedly claims the abstract power to permit even the marriage of diocesan bishops. Practically, it is true, so complete a change of policy would hardly be consistent with the continued identity of the Roman Catholic Church. But almost any relaxation of the law of clerical celibacy short of the marriage of bishops can be conceived as yielded to the pressure of circumstances, if not as brought about by some possible, however improbable, internal development.

Even in our own country there are some married Roman Catholic priests of several Eastern rites. This privilege, however, gives such scandal to Roman Catholics in general that it will doubtless be ultimately withdrawn. Married priests, however, sometimes visit this country, and are regarded by the Catholic laity with a wondering interest, and perhaps by some of the clergy with a mild envy. Even the strictness of the famous monastery of Port Royal, extolled alike by friends and enemies, did not prevent the pious nuns and recluses from being much interested when a married Armenian priest celebrated mass in their church, and was served in the mass by his own son. Nature does not seem to have found it displeasing to have had a moment's breathing pause from incessant restraint, under the full sanction of the Church.

Of course even a plenary repeal of the obligation of celibacy for the

clergy would leave the whole of that numerous class of clergymen who are bound by monastic vows still restrained from marriage. They would, however, then be restrained, not as priests, but as persons under a conventual rule, which binds indifferently all who promise obedience to it, whether men or women, clergymen or laymen. Permission for a nun to marry, or for a monk, even though he were unordained, after having taken a *solemn* vow of chastity, would be difficult, probably almost impossible to obtain. Indeed, it does not seem to have been yet settled as a definitive doctrine that the Church has power to dispense from *solemn* vows. The writer has been assured by a well-instructed Franciscan that this thesis, though strongly supported by the Jesuits, is more than doubtful. Those who hold this view would meet the objection that the popes seem sometimes to assume this authority in the name of the Church by reminding us that it is competent for the Pope to act on a presumption of validity, so long as no adverse *ex cathedra* decision has been given, leaving those who have solicited the relaxation to avail themselves of it at their proper risk. The mere theory on which the Pope acts does not bind a Catholic conscience to explicit approval, so long as it has not been finally established as an article of faith. Practically, however, I suppose that the point may be regarded as settled in the sense of the Jesuits—namely, that a dispensation even from a *solemn* vow is valid, if given for a weighty cause. As it does not appear that any one calls in question the validity of a papal dispensation for the marriage of secular clergymen, this seems to imply that the mere passive acquiescence, on being ordained, in a requirement imposed by the Church, is tacitly conceded to be of a less stringent order of obligation than the explicit and active emission of the same promise in a monastic profession.

One instance of a general papal dispensation for priests to marry (of which that granted to married English priests in Mary's reign is another) is found in the permission given by Pius VII. that all those French priests who in the confusions of the great revolution had taken opportunity to marry, and who afterward sought reconciliation with the Church, should be acknowledged as *validly* married. Of course it was held by the Pope that up to the time of his dispensation these clergymen had been living in an unchaste relation, although he consented that all these marriages should be "healed," and apparently that they should receive "a healing in the root," *sanatio in radice*—i.e., that they should be treated, ecclesiastically and civilly, as to all their effects, as if they had been valid from the first. These married priests in France did not return to the exercise of their functions, but, like other clergymen married by dispensation, continued to enjoy clerical immunities.

There is a very common persuasion that Pope Gregory VII. introduced a new principle into the legislation of the Church in requiring universal celibacy for those in holy orders, or at least first gave distinct form and wider prevalence to obscure tendencies and local enactments subsisting

previously. This, however, appears too strong a statement. Hildebrand seems to have introduced a decisively new epoch of policy, but not a revolution in doctrine. From the earliest ages of the Church a free election to live unwedded was held in honor; and though Peter and the Lord's brethren and most of the apostles lived in marriage, yet a large proportion of the early missionaries were both too much absorbed in their work and too much imperilled in it to think of entangling themselves in family cares. The presbyters and bishops of the churches appear, by the evident implications of the Ignatian letters, to have been mostly married men, as it is plain from the pastoral epistles that the settled superintendents of the churches in the apostolic age were expected to be. But asceticism came in so irresistibly, being implied in the whole spirit of the age within and without the Christian pale, of which even the wild Antinomianism of some Gnostic sects was only a regurgitant eddy, and the clergy were so soon comparatively invested with the mystic dignity of the sacerdotal character, that long before the age of Nicaea the tendency to regard the marriage of presbyters with dislike and the marriage of bishops with horror had become, to say the least, very strong. Yet here the Greek Church, which has always looked more kindly on common life, took a turn, and under the very influence of ascetics and confessors like Paphnutius, who regarded the common clergy with a benevolent superiority, as unapt to the difficult heights which they themselves had climbed, adopted that interpretation of St. Paul's words which makes it imperative on presbyters to be married, but forbids them to marry when once ordained, at least if they would remain in their active functions. A Russian ordination in this century of a young university professor is noticed by Dean Stanley as being the first exception in the East from time immemorial to the rule that a presbyter must be already married when ordained. Even monasteries largely obtain their necessary supply of priests from parish clergymen (called in Russia popes) who, having lost their wives, are always required to resign their parishes, and can therefore only maintain their clerical standing by entering a monastery, where they are distinguished as *hieromonachi* from the *monachi* or simple monks. Thus, while in the West, at least since the time of Innocent III., the sub-diaconate is necessary for full conventual rights, in the East, as of old, the great body of the monks are laymen. As the bishops must be unmarried, and as the parish priests are married, the bishops are naturally provided from among the monks.

In the Latin Church things took a different course. The homely and humble simplicity of the Greek pastor found little like it in the West. As the late Dr. Osgood has remarked, after attending mass in Geneva according to both the Latin and the Greek rite, the Greek priest, although the theory of his function and the ceremonies of his worship do not differ fundamentally from those of the Western Church (which recognizes the full validity of his ministrations), yet shows in all his ways that he is the brother of his people, while the Roman priest shows with equal distinctness

that he is their lord. He was, therefore, more likely from the beginning to stand aloof from the interests and relations of ordinary life. Indeed, it has been declared by Professor Burgess, of Columbia Law School, that the spirit of the regenerated and purified Roman aristocracy early took large possession of the Latin episcopate, and in this form courageously renewed its unending opposition to the democratic despotism of the empire. We know, in fact, that the great and good Pope who fashioned Catholic Christianity into the form which carried it victoriously through the Middle Ages, Gregory the Great, was of the illustrious Anician house.

The West was, therefore, prepared for a far more unbending assertion of clerical celibacy than the East. Nor in the Occident were the monastic and the ordinary clerical life so far apart as in the Orient. On the one hand, Benedictinism (also the offspring of piety and organizing power as developed in a Roman patrician) showed the wisdom of Rome in a milder and more practical tone than that of Eastern asceticism, and, on the other hand, the canonical life favored by St. Augustine and other great bishops formed a transition whereby monastic influences found it easier to leaven the whole sacerdotal body. Rome, following her usual disposition to seek a mean, was milder toward monks than the East, and sterner toward priests. It is, therefore, perhaps rather a matter of surprise that clerical marriage was grudgingly tolerated as the prevailing practice for a thousand years, at least in many regions of the West, than that such a man as Hildebrand, in such a crisis as the eleventh century, when the whole future of the Church seemed to turn on the question whether she could be detached from her implication in the barbaric anarchy of the feudal world, should have resolved to carry through in fact the only theory which the public conscience acknowledged. Undoubtedly the immediate effect of this heroic rebellion against nature was a great exaltation of the general conscience of the Church, which had not altogether subsided until, nearly three hundred years later, the Babylonian captivity of the Church began. Had the Church then been wise she would, by frankly conceding and sanctioning the marriage of the secular clergy, have saved it from the scandal of taking up as concubinage that which she could not prevent, but which, by obstinately insisting on the elder theory, she could and did permanently demoralize. Irish chastity was not the possession of every land. But the Gregorian policy in this regard seems to have been prepared for by the whole history of the Latin Church. Should she show herself, under the profoundly different conditions of the modern world, capable of a more pliable and more scriptural policy, she will show thereby that the Tridentine reaction has not been final or fatal—nay, that it may have been a providential barrier against too precipitate an abandonment of the mediæval traditions by the universal West. We may still hope, with Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock, that Rome and the churches which call her their mother and instructress may yet leave Hildebrand and his harshness behind, as having done their work, and may draw something better out of

the fulness of Christ, so that, in Dr. Hitchcock's words, the last days of this vast sisterhood of churches may be its best days. We are not obliged to give over this hope so long as a final crash has not sounded its death-knell.

The little Church of Utrecht, which, though owning but seven thousand adherents, is venerable as inheritor of the rights of the ancient Catholic hierarchy of Holland, and is also, by her generous hospitality, indissolubly connected with the illustrious memories of Port Royal, still maintains the general Roman Catholic discipline of requiring the observance of celibacy on the part of all her clergy, from sub-deacons up. The little flock, surrounded by scornful and watchful Ultramontaniam, has maintained this discipline above suspicion of reproach. Whether the Old Catholicism of Germany and Switzerland, to which Utrecht has communicated her episcopal succession, is a broadening or a dwindling movement, is not yet definitively ascertained. Be that as it may, it has departed, as to the marriage of the clergy, from the rule of Rome and of Utrecht, which latter at first threatened to break off communion with it, but has finally declared that "this difference of discipline shall not be permitted to interrupt brotherly unity." The Old Catholics (of whom there are a few hundred in this country) do not, as the *Examiner* has inadvertently stated, follow the Oriental discipline, which allows marriage before ordination, but forbids it after. Ordained and officiating priests among them are allowed to marry on obtaining consent of the bishop and his council. We take this opportunity to remark that neither in Europe nor in America has this movement any ambition of proselytizing among Protestants. Its main hope (not a brilliant one at present) is of waiting until some new assumption of Roman despotism shall perhaps detach permanently from Rome those masses of German Catholicism which in 1870 cracked ominously, but after awhile settled back into an apparent acceptance of completed action.

The catholicizing party of the Church of England cleaves into two sections. One, and, we judge, much the more numerous, is, as has been remarked in the *Independent*, "intensely Anglican," and, whether more or less averse to the memory of the English Reformers, is fully resolved to maintain many results of their work, including the free right of the clergy to marry. Another section, represented by Dr. Frederick George Lee, is frankly, fully, and servilely Roman Catholic. This party, as illustrated in him, never speaks of Roman jurisdiction but with bated breath and inward prostration, as "Authority." Many clergymen of this section, though still clinging to the forlorn hope of what they call "corporate reunion," have privately obtained in some way or other an ordination, and some of them an episcopal consecration, which Rome inclines to regard as valid, and are waiting in the hope of bringing over several thousand of the clergy and great masses of the laity to her feet. From time to time we hear rumors (probably illusory) of negotiations, according to which the reconciled

clergy, even if married, are to be continued in their functions, except that in this case they are not to be allowed to receive confessions. Were so extended a defection from the English Church in any way likely, doubtless Rome would make no difficulty of allowing large relaxations of the Western discipline in its favor until she had it well in hand, when she would take good care that the English ecclesiastical liberties were, in due time, after the example of the Bohemian ecclesiastical liberties, slowly but surely done to death.

It has been said that in the Middle Ages one or two great clergymen only missed the tiara because they were widowers with children. However this may be, the excellent Clement IV. was a widower with living daughters and sons-in-law. One mediæval pope, indeed (whose name I do not now recall), is said to have had a living wife, who, of course, had withdrawn into strict monastic seclusion before her husband's ordination, thus leaving the way canonically open for his advancement. Rome, in bestowing cardinalates and bishoprics, does not appear to allow any disparagement to rest on widowers and fathers of lawful families, although these are too few in number to occur very often in the catalogue of dignitaries. It marks how every over-rigid rule of discipline tends to harden into an observance of the letter and contempt of the spirit, that numerous popes, cardinals, bishops, abbots, and clergymen of all ranks, have been parents of children of whose birth they ought to have been much more ashamed than they were. The last instance of this kind among the popes, so far as I know, is Gregory XIII., the reformer of the calendar, who was reigning pope from 1572-85. His life as a priest, it is true, had been blameless, but he procured his unlawful son, born before his ordination, to be entered on the books of the Venetian nobility under the delicate evasion of "Signor Giacomo Buoncompagno, near relation of His Holiness." However, he allowed him no unbecoming influence or state. I am not aware that since then the papacy has been subject to any scandal of this sort, and think I can answer pretty confidently for the last century and a half as having been on this side quite free of reproach. Unhappily, remembering Antonelli, we cannot say as much for the cardinalate, nor, as respects Italy and Spain, for the episcopate. The numerous licenses given before the Reformation for priests to live in concubinage are now regarded in the Church as having been mere prelatial ungodliness. It is allowed that in France the storms of the Revolution have wrought powerfully for the moral regeneration of the Roman Catholic clergy.

To sum up briefly : In the East (taking no account of a few rare exceptions) a priest, when ordained, *must* be married, and afterward *cannot* be. Eastern churches connected with Rome mostly follow the same discipline. Bishops, taken in the East from among the monks, are never married. In the West the four minor orders are compatible with marriage, even if associated with subordinate ecclesiastical functions, but such married clerics can no longer hold church livings. The four major, or holy orders, are

incompatible with marriage unless by dispensation, which if given implies withdrawal from active functions. Dispensations, except in some extraordinary conjuncture, are hardly given to priests, while it is disputed whether there is a single authentic instance of one given to a consecrated bishop. The few cardinals who have been allowed to marry appear not to have been higher in order than deacon, and while living in marriage were of course required to withdraw from the consistory and to lay aside the insignia of the cardinalate.

Monastic obligation of men or women, laymen or clergymen, to a single life rests on a special vow, which, if simple, can easily be dispensed, but if solemn can hardly be dispensed at all. The authority of the Church to abrogate entirely the precept of clerical celibacy cannot well be questioned, since no command of Christ to the Church or to the apostles is adducible for it, and a command of the apostles, even when deduced from a strained interpretation, is not supposed to rest on revelation from Christ, and therefore is not regarded as immutable. Nevertheless, as every Roman Catholic is bound to acknowledge as of faith that virginity is higher than marriage, no one can doubt that from this point of view the Church is bound to insist on an unmarried priesthood, unless she is convinced that by permitting their marriage she is choosing the least of two evils in avoiding incontinence or dangerous discontent.

SERMONIC SECTION.

THE MYSTERIES OF GRACE.

By HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D.
[PRESBYTERIAN], GREENOCK, SCOTLAND.

I am instructed.—Phil. iv. 12.

THE Greek word (*memuēmai*) translated "I am instructed" in the text is a picture word. It implies not an ordinary, but a special kind of instruction—an initiation into the secret things of religion. It opens up a wide vista of thought, and brings before our imaginations one of the most remarkable institutions of the ancient world. It was the invariable custom of the Apostle Paul to make use of the things with which the persons whom he addressed were most familiar, in order to remove their prejudices and to illustrate and bring home to their understandings and hearts the spiritual truths which he wanted them to know. To the Jews he put his language in the mould of the types and

sacrifices of the Old Testament dispensation; and to the Gentiles he compared the Christian life to the games of the amphitheatre, the ceremonies of their temples, and the customs of their common life. He acted in this characteristic manner when he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians. When he came first to Philippi he met there one of the hierodules or priestesses belonging to the oracle of Dionysius, which was situated in a lonely recess among the neighboring mountains of the Hæmus. This woman, who possessed the Pythoness spirit, was hired by the citizens as a fortune-teller among the strangers who frequented the market of the place from time to time; and the practice of her art brought no small gain to the town. She was converted by the apostle to the Christian faith; and this most interesting circumstance struck the appropriate key-note of the ministry of the Gospel in Europe, and seems to have given

Paul an opportunity of explaining the truths of the Gospel in the light of the old pagan religion of the place.

Among the Greeks there were mysteries—that is, secret rites or ceremonies connected with their religion, to which only certain favored persons were admitted. The chief of these were held in the city of Eleusis, eleven miles distant from Athens, and were therefore called the Eleusinian Mysteries. They were the oldest and most sacred in Greece, and were celebrated without interruption for more than a thousand years, from the earliest historical period down to the end of the fourth century of the Christian era. Every year at the beginning of August a grand procession, composed of thousands of the citizens, set out with hymns and dances along the beautiful road called the Sacred Way, which led to the Temple of Ceres at Eleusis, the largest and most splendid temple in the world at the time. This temple, situated on a rocky hill, was surrounded by high walls and shut out from the observation of the people. For six days the festival was observed with great pomp; the last two days being chiefly occupied with the mystic rites which gave the institution its name and fame. Persons of both sexes and all ages were initiated at this solemnity; and this was regarded not only as a privilege, but as a duty, the neglect of which was looked upon as a heinous crime; for one of the accusations against Socrates, which led to his condemnation to death, was that he neglected the Eleusinian Mysteries; and it was the charge of having profaned them which caused the exile of Alcibiades, the greatest of the Athenian generals. The candidates, who must be persons of pure morals and members of the commonwealth, prepared themselves for the mysteries during a whole year by various symbolical rites, the design of which was to withdraw their attention from business and pleasure, to create a placid and hallowed frame of mind, and to stimulate their curiosity regarding the revelations that

were to be made to them. The ceremony of admission was performed at night; the neophytes, crowned with myrtle, first washed their hands at the threshold with holy water, and were then blindfolded and led to the innermost part of the sanctuary, a vast enclosure called the Hall of Initiation, where the bandage was removed, and they were permitted to behold and know the secrets of the place. What these mysteries consisted of we do not fully understand. From the fact that they were called *initia*, we may suppose that they commemorated the beginnings of civilization, when agriculture and law and the various arts of social life were first taught to savage men. Perhaps the first mysteries celebrated only a rude harvest home, to express the gratitude of men to Ceres for her bounties; but in later years they became more recondite, and represented the doctrines of science and philosophy so far as they were known at the time, and their chief design seems to have been by sensible signs and symbols to produce a deep conviction of one great law underlying the whole system of things,—to teach the true nature of the gods, the immortality of the soul, and a future state of rewards and punishments. There can be no doubt that these mysteries exercised a great influence on the spirit of the nation, and tended to preserve the reverence for sacred things. Those who were initiated into their secret doctrines enjoyed special privileges and immunities; they were under the peculiar protection of the gods, and they alone were certain of the joys of immortality; and it was forbidden on pain of death and divine vengeance for a stranger to be present at the mysteries without having undergone the rite of initiation, and for the initiated to divulge what they had learned in the inmost recesses of the temple to the general public.

The Apostle Paul must have known about these Eleusinian Mysteries, having been instructed in classic as well as in Hebrew lore; and therefore, when

writing to his converts in Greece, he was fond of alluding to them as graphic images of the truths of the Gospel. He often spoke of "the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world." He spoke of the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews as a mystery, of the relation between Christ and the Church under the symbol of marriage as a mystery, of the resurrection from the dead as a mystery, of the prevalence of sin as the mystery of iniquity, and of the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience; and he sums up the whole subject in these splendid words, "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." It was therefore a favorite image with him. As the Greeks had their mysteries, so had the Kingdom of heaven, which he brought near to them by his preaching—the highest of all mysteries, kept hid from the foundation of the world, which concerned the highest welfare of men for time and for eternity, and for which the candidates had to prepare, not by a long and elaborate course of outward ceremonies, but by a total change of nature and life; and unlike the heathen mysteries, the Christian mysteries, the deep things of God, the unsearchable riches of Christ Jesus, the love that passeth knowledge, were made known to every one, and revealed to the humblest capacity; for to the poor was the Gospel preached, and the things that were hid from the wise and prudent were revealed unto babes.

You thus see the full force of the apostle's meaning when he says to the Philippian converts, "I am instructed." It is as if he had said, In the neighborhood of your own city of Philippi is the shrine of the nature-god you once worshipped in your heathen ignorance, before you were converted. No one can get admission to the secret rites that are performed in that sanctuary, or be in-

structed in the secret doctrines that are taught there, unless he is initiated, goes through a great many arduous ceremonies and preparations for a whole year; but when he is initiated, the solemn things of the pagan oracle are made known to him. In like manner I have been initiated into the mysteries of Divine grace. I have been admitted into the holy of holies of God's plans and purposes in regard to the salvation of the world; and these I now reveal to you that you may have fellowship with me in this Divine knowledge, and rejoice with me in the sacred peace and contentment which it imparts. I want you to be instructed or initiated in these mysteries along with me. I want you to be hierophants of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, as I am.

And was not Paul prepared in a wonderful way for this initiation into the mysteries of grace? We may say of his training at the feet of Gamaliel, the wisest and most liberal-minded of all the Jewish Rabbis, whose teaching approximated more closely to that of our blessed Lord than any other rabbinical teaching of the time, that it was a special preparation for the Gospel; and even of that dreadful, frenzied period, to which he often looked back in after years with shame and sorrowful repentance, when in the blinded zeal of a fanatical Pharisee he persecuted the Christians and pursued them to prison and to death, we can affirm that it was a Divine guidance of him to the day-spring from on high through the darkest hour of the night. That long ride from Jerusalem to Damascus, with its lonely heart-searchings and perplexed musings on the strange death of Stephen, and the still stranger things which the apostles of the new faith proclaimed, through the scenes associated with the ministry of Him who was the wonder and the mystery of His day, was like a long avenue of approach to the sanctuary where the truth was to be revealed to him from heaven. What an initiation that was when the Lord Jesus, in person, appeared to him as he was about

to reach his cruel destination, in a glory that made the noonday effulgence of the sun pale in comparison, and showed him what great things he had to do and suffer for his Divine Master's sake! Blinded by the brightness, with eyes bandaged, as it were, for three days, during which he neither ate nor drank, he was led into the inmost sanctuary of grace; and there Ananias, a devout man according to the law, the link between the old and the new faith, who had himself made the significant transition, opened his blind eyes, and disclosed to him the mysteries of godliness which changed his whole nature and life. What a preparation for his great work were those three mysterious years of solitude which he spent in Arabia before he began his public ministry! Nothing is told us of this period, but we are free to conclude that he who stood on the threshold of the new covenant was anxious to visit the birthplace of the old. There at the foot of Sinai, the ancient mountain of the law, he found the Hall of Initiation, where he was taught the breadth as well as the depth of the riches of God's wisdom, and acquired that thorough knowledge of the relation between the law and the Gospel, between the old dispensation of types and shadows, and the new dispensation of living realities, which he made it the business of his after life to expound in the clearest and most impressive manner.

Never was there any candidate for the Eleusinian Mysteries who went through such careful and elaborate and trying preparations for his initiation as the Apostle Paul for his initiation into the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; and therefore no one was more entitled to say than he, "I am instructed." He knew the secret of the universe, the nature of the Heart that inspired and of the arm that controlled all its operations. He had the key to all the creeds and to all the perplexities of this unintelligible world. We know not what effect the disclosure of the secret of the Eleusinian Mysteries had

upon the initiated. It was probably only a barren knowledge which produced no influence at all upon their daily life, a mere theory or philosophy of the universe which had no practical value; and yet, judging from the awful sanctions with which it was hedged round, and from the terrible penalties connected with the revealing of it, the secret must have been some very solemn one, the knowledge of which may have weighed heavily upon their spirits, and taken all the joyance out of life. There is a tradition of the early Christian Church which says that when Lazarus was restored to life he never smiled again; his personal experience of the secret of death having made life a burden of sadness to him, owing to the thought that he should have to go through it all again. It is said of a noble old Scottish house, that when the heir succeeds to the title and estates he is told an hereditary family secret; and that secret is of such a terrible nature, that when once he comprehends its full import, he is never the same again and all the scions of this noble house have passed through life with a dark cloud over them; and so, too, it is in life usually. In childhood we are unconsciously happy; but a time comes in later years when our eyes are opened, and the secret of the race is revealed to us, and we are overwhelmed with the awful trouble of the world; and though we may sometimes have happy hours in which we forget the secret, life is changed from that hour. We know that we are to die, that we can get only a very limited amount of enjoyment and success out of life, and that we must of necessity go through a certain amount of sorrow and suffering. We are perplexed with the mysteries of life, so that our feet well-nigh slip; and we feel, indeed, that he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

But such was not the effect upon Paul of his initiation into the mysteries of grace. So far from being depressed and dissatisfied with his lot, he was more than ever contented with it. It

was no awful heart-crushing, life-blighting secret that was made known to him. It was, indeed, the fear of God that was the beginning of his wisdom ; but that fear had no torment in it. It was filial fear, the fear of God as his Father who had revealed Himself to him in Christ Jesus as his reconciled and faithful Friend ; and that fear cast out all slavish fear, so that he could come to Him at all times with confidence, and trust Him in all his experiences. He feared God and knew no other fear. So long as the old geocentric idea prevailed which made the earth the centre of the universe, with the sun and stars revolving around it, everything was in confusion ; there were mysteries which could not be explained on that theory ; and difficulties which could not be solved ; but when the heliocentric idea dawned upon the minds of astronomers, which made the sun the centre of the solar system, round which the earth and the planets revolved, then what was before inexplicable was made clear as daylight ; everything fell into its proper place and order, and every difficulty and mystery vanished ; and so the Apostle Paul got into the true relations of things. He found out that God was the centre, not an impersonal force, but a God of love, who had shown His love by sending His own Son into our sinful world and into our perishing nature, that all its old things might be made new. The atonement of Christ was the heart of the system of things. The Cross of Christ was the key that explained all the mysteries of the world. Taking his position at the foot of the Cross he saw the gain of loss, the joy of sacrifice, the blessedness of poverty. Through all the mysteries of sin and pain he saw the working of a Father's good and perfect will ; and with that perception came peace and patience. He had abandoned a career of worldly ambition which once held high promise for him, and became an outcast, persecuted and despised ; but the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ had taught him that all outward losses and sufferings

were proofs of a Saviour's love, and part of a holy discipline by which he was being prepared for the inheritance of the saints in light. Having got possession of the highest good, he was not cast down if he did not possess temporal good things at the same time. Delivered from the greatest evil, the evil of sin, he felt all the burdens light in comparison. Sin was the only thing really adverse to his well being ; and that adversity taken away, all other things that seemed adverse would work together for his good. He knew that all his times were in the wise and loving hands of One who, having bestowed upon him His unspeakable gift, would bestow upon him all inferior necessary blessings, and withhold from him all unnecessary trials. Come weal or come woe, it would be all for the best. His whole life was a plan of God, and therefore nothing of all that God designed for him would fail. No unexpected incident could defeat His purpose ; no hostile force disconcert His design. Being thus instructed, having this secret of the Lord, he knew how to be abased and to be uplifted, how to be full and to be hungry, how to abound and to suffer need. His experience had taught him a Divine patience, and he had learned in whatsoever state he was therein to be content. He dwelt habitually in that higher sphere where it has been said motion begins, but which is itself a profound calm.

It is very pathetic to think that Paul was a prisoner in Rome when he wrote the words of the text. It was not in the inside of a temple, but in the inside of a prison that he realized the full benefit of the initiation of which he spoke. Hitherto he had supported himself by his handicraft. It was a toilsome, poorly paid work at the best ; and he often knew what it was to be in want of work and even in actual want of food, while he spent his strength and his soul upon those who manifested little gratitude in return ; and the time when he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians from Rome he was in special

straits. Things had gone very hard with him ; but he was too proud to tell his converts and friends of a need which they should never have allowed to exist. And the very depth of his gratitude to the Philippian converts for the timely aid they sent showed how great were his necessities ; and yet he could say of that time of sore privation that he had learned the secret of peace. He had been initiated into the mystery of the purpose and design of all his trials and afflictions, and therefore he could bear them patiently.

There was another notable prisoner in Rome at the same time with the Apostle Paul, no less than the famous British General Caractacus, who, after having been defeated in a great battle in Wales, was carried captive to the imperial city to glorify the triumph of the conqueror, and had his life spared and was kept in honorable custody for many years. According to the voice of tradition the two great heroes, each of whom had fought a good fight, had met, and under Paul's teaching Caractacus became a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ. If this tradition be true, and there is a great deal of verisimilitude about it, that was the first native of the British islands who was initiated by Paul into the mysteries of the Gospel. And if Caractacus had by native dignity of character learned to bear his misfortunes bravely, we may be sure that, instructed by Paul in the Christian faith, he would be a nobler and happier man as the captive of Claudius than he had been as the commander-in-chief of the native armies of Britain. Vast changes have taken place since then. A little one has become a thousand, and a small one a great nation. The first-fruits have been followed by a glorious harvest. Britain has for fifteen hundred years been Christian. Millions have been initiated into the mysteries of the Christian religion, and have learned the secret of Paul.

How about you who are the heirs of all these ages of Christian faith ? Are you still among the number of the unin-

itiated, to whom the mysteries of godliness are mysteries, indeed, in which you have no share, and regarding which you have no experimental knowledge ? Esau was called a profane person, though he lived a perfectly good and moral life. For the literal meaning of the word *profane* is, one who is outside the fane or temple, one who is not admitted into the inner shrine, and allowed to take part in its privileges and ceremonies. Are you in this sense profane persons, even while members of churches, living outside of your spiritual privileges and blessings, even while apparently enjoying them ? The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper were called holy mysteries by the early Christian Church, because only the initiated could partake of them with spiritual profit ; and are these ordinances mysteries to you still, because only man and not the Lord Jesus Himself has initiated you into them, opened the door only to the outward enjoyment, and not to the inward spiritual enjoyment of them ? If so, your sin is inexcusable in a land of Gospel light and liberty, where the mysteries of salvation are made so plain that a child can understand them, and the qualifications for them so easy that every one may acquire them. How foolish to live wofully ignorant of truths that would make you wise unto salvation, that would dignify and bless your whole life ! How foolish to refuse to possess the secret of a quiet life, which has been the great quest of man from the fall until now—the question of questions in all religions and philosophies ! Many of you, I know, are longing for the solution of this secret if you only knew how. Are you prepared to pay the cost, to count, like Paul, all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus your Lord ?

You have all heard of the old-world fable of the Sphinx. This monster, half a woman and half a lion, devastated the land of Thebes. Seated on a rock close to the town, she put to every one that passed by a riddle ; and if they were able to solve it they were promised the

sovereignty of the land, but if they failed they were cast from the rock on which the Sphinx stood into a deep abyss. Life is a sphinx that proposes a riddle to every one of you—"What must I do to be saved?"—upon which the most momentous issues depend. If you can answer it, then you pass into eternal life; if you fail, then you pass into eternal death. If you can solve it, as Paul solved it to the Philippian jailer, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ and was saved and his whole house, then all the mysteries of life will be cleared up for you; you will have the power to overcome all its evils; you will be made not a slave to, but a king over all your circumstances. The love of God in Christ will draw a magic circle around you within which you will enjoy the perfect peace of the mind that is stayed upon God.

Those who were initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries were forbidden on pain of death to disclose them. Members of Freemason and of other secret societies are sworn to the utmost secrecy with regard to what takes place in their assemblies; but it is not so with those who are initiated in the mysteries of grace. They are commanded to publish them everywhere, so that every one may be made partakers with them of like precious faith. These mysteries are not esoteric mysteries for the select few; they are for all, for all need them as they need the vital air, and the vital light of heaven, and the vital food of earth. Christ says to every one that has ears to hear and hearts to understand, "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." And if you are instructed yourselves in these mysteries, you cannot but wish to instruct all whom you can influence. You can speak, not from conjecture or opinion, but from experience. And this will give confidence and earnestness to your appeals. You do not ask persons to be made acquainted with barren theories and futile philosophies; you ask them to know the true wisdom and the divine salvation; and from your

own enjoyment of that wisdom and salvation you can say, "Blessed is the man that trusteth in God."

OFFENCE IN ONE POINT, GUILT OF ALL.

BY REV. FOREST F. EMERSON [CONGREGATIONAL], NEWPORT, R. I.

For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point is guilty of all.—James ii. 10.

THERE are many passages of Scripture which at first sight appear somewhat harsh and unjust. It may be that the translation into our language does not give the exact thought in the author's mind, or it may be that we look at such passages without considering the context. No man ever spoke or wrote but you might find some sentences or expressions here and there in his discourse which, taken alone, and without allowing the general tenor of the thought to throw light upon them, would convict him of absurdity or false statement. And so there are certain sentences of Scripture which at first sight and before they are thoroughly understood seem to be harsh and unjust. The text has been considered as one of them: "Whosoever offends in one point is guilty of all."

Now, the exposition of Scripture which sets out with the understanding that a statement is true, should show, if possible, in what sense it is true. There is a sense in which the text is not true. Of course James does not mean that he who offends in one point offends in every other point. He does not mean that if a man is cruel, he is therefore guilty of being dishonest; that if he is avaricious above measure, he is therefore guilty of murder; or that if a man steals, he is guilty of all the other sins prohibited in the Decalogue.

But in certain senses and with proper explanations, this text will be found to be a correct and truthful statement of principles.

1. In the first place, we find it true

when we consider THE UNITY OF THE WILL, from which a single sin proceeds. He that offends in one point is guilty of all because he puts his individual will into it. The whole man moves toward it, determines upon it, goes out in its final commission. We cherish the same spirit in one offence that we should if we were proceeding to violate all the commandments. If I betray a garrison to the enemy of my country, I assume the same attitude and will and purpose that I should were I betraying all the garrisons of the country, and destroying the whole government. A man can show as much hate toward his neighbor in one act as in twenty acts. One act is full of himself: twenty cannot be more than full.

A man, then, in one transgression against the law of God is guilty of all, because the whole man is engaged in it. It is the outcome and exponent of his character. If I have sinned, it is I who have done the deed. I put into it my will, my purpose, my affections. My whole soul was as much engaged in it as if I had contemplated violation against the whole moral law in all its items. It is the whole man rising up and moving forward to the commission of evil.

There are many illustrations of this principle. If I walk down the street, I need not walk north, south, east, and west to prove my ability to walk; I need walk in but one direction. If you have lost a child, and understand what grief is, it does not follow that I must lose a child in order to understand grief. I may lose some other dear friend. If I have all my soul can hold of sorrow, I know the meaning of grief. I need not love with a strong and fervent attachment every person I may meet in order to understand the length and depth and height of human affection. If I love one person thus I know all of love, for my whole being is swayed by it. In loving once, my whole soul loves.

So in wrongdoing. Man in one act is guilty in the sense that the whole man is engaged in it, and thereby shows

for the time being what is the character, will, and purpose of that man toward God's law. James did not mean, then, that if a man sins in one point he actually commits every other transgression; but he meant, I think, that in one offence a man would manifest the same kind of spirit that he would show in committing every other. In other words, one transgression is enough to reveal the character of the man.

2. Again we find the text to be true when we consider THE UNITY OF THE LAW toward which an act of disobedience is directed. If a man offends in one point, he is guilty of all, because he offends against the whole law, considered as one body of truth.

The law is one thing, not many things. It is the expression of the will and nature of God; of the purpose and wish of God as regards human conduct. We are not to consider the law as broken up into fragments, a rule here and a rule there; the law is the mind and will of God. For purposes of convenience human governments specify different kinds of trespass and transgression; but the essential thing about a criminal is that he is a transgressor against government. So the law of God has been expressed more or less imperfectly through human language as different and separate enactments, and for purposes of convenience we speak of this enactment of God's law, or that item of it. But the essential thing about such an enactment is, that it is one feature or item only of the expressed will of God.

James, then, saw the law as one thing—as a unit. It is a unit, one body of truth, of which one part is as sacred as any other part. It is a unit because it all proceeded from the same being, and is all actuated by the same spirit of benevolence and love.

If a man offends in one point, then, he offends against the law as a whole. Quoting in the next verse the points of the Decalogue, James says: "He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. He is the same

God ; now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." In other words, the same Being is the author of both laws. These laws, then, when so considered, are one law. The law is a unit. The same God enacted every part of it. It makes no difference on which side a man attacks it. If he attacks it, he attacks it ; and if he only takes one of the outposts, one of the least outstanding enactments, he is guilty of an assault on the citadel.

Does it make any difference where the murderer's knife touched me ? Whether in the face, or on the arm, or over the heart ? He may say that he only touched one part. Yes, but it was I whom he attacked ; he only touched one part, but he was guilty of injuring the whole body, for it was the whole body that received the shock and felt the pain.

Does it make any difference where Prussia strikes in her war on France ? Whether at Strasburg, or Metz, or Fontainebleau, or Epernay ? She might say, "Oh, I have only taken one or two cities." Yes, but France is a unit, and her government is one body ; so that wherever Germany strikes, whether a petty village, or a railroad, or a fort, or a city, she means to strike death to the heart of France.

So is the law of God one body, containing the outspoken will and nature of the Lord. If you treat it with violence at any point you strike a blow at the whole government, the very throne itself of God. The law of God is a perfect sphere, and if you mar or disfigure it at all, you mar and disfigure it as a whole, and strike a blow at its whole symmetry and beauty.

We all understand this unity of government. If a master makes rules for his pupils, and a pupil offends purposefully against the least of them, he opposes his teacher. If my father has certain rules for my guidance, I need not break them all in order to array myself in opposition to him, for on the very least of them I may confront and oppose his au-

thority ; and in disobeying one rule of the house I dispute my father's just right to enforce the remainder.

So with the law of God ; if I offend in one point I oppose myself to the whole law of God, for the honor of God is just as much bound up in one law as in another, and I do violence to the spirit of moral law in its entirety, and put in a plea and claim that I have a right to question the justice and righteousness of all the remainder. It is the man in his entire nature against God in His entire nature.

3. Again, we find the text to be a correct statement on account of THE UNITY OF THE MORAL NATURE upon which the violation of law recoils, and which it injures. If we offend in one point only, we are guilty of injuring our moral nature taken as a whole. A man injures himself, if at all, in all his manhood, and his whole nature feels it. We never speak of injuring a part of a man's moral nature ; we say he has injured his moral nature, and we mean his whole moral nature. We mean that one offence injures the whole man and makes him weak and diseased all through and through. Do you imagine that a man can sin in certain directions and remain wholly sound in certain others ? Do you imagine that a man's moral nature is divided into compartments and sections, so that his passions may run riot in one section while he remains pure and upright in all the rest ?

It is not so ; the moral nature is a unit ; and a letting down of restraint in any part of it, an indulgence in any direction, predisposes men to go astray in other directions. Conscience is one single thing ; the power of self-control is one ; and if you weaken either of them you weaken them both ; and when you do this they are likely to break down in almost any direction. Men are not equally tempted in all directions, it is true, but if indulgence in one wrong thing has made them weak, the whole nature is weak, so that wherever temptation presses upon them they are

more likely to fall. If a man's conscience is made blunt and indelicate in one direction, it has lost keenness in every direction. In whatever direction a man indulges his evil propensities, he injures his moral sensibilities; he is weaker and lower and worse all through and through; if he is made worse at any one point, then rest assured he is injured at every point—the whole man is injured.

Here is a man who has blunted and injured his moral sense by yielding to the appetite for drink. He is ready for a great many other sins besides that of intemperance. He is cruel to his children and to his wife; he is growing in a lawless and criminal disposition; he neglects his business; he is ready, in many cases, for any deed of theft or cruelty. The sense of right and the power of self-control which in other men rise up to prevent such things, have become so weakened by yielding to the passion for drink that they do not do the work that God and nature intended. The love of intoxicants has trampled on them so long that now every temptation is liable to master them.

The point of interest in such an illustration is not simply that the man gets intoxicated and so loses self-control, but that his moral strength is weakened all round by his yielding to one temptation, in repeated violations of the moral sense. He is liable to break down in other temptations. So that when a man presses on in some line of wrongdoing, and does violence to his sense of right, overstepping the limits set by his own judgment, he is a weaker man for it; not only weaker at that point, but weaker at every point.

We know how it is with our bodies; once injure the constitution, and we don't know how we shall fail, we must fail. Expose men to great heat and cold, to hard, unremitting labor, with loss of sleep, with coarse, hard fare, and the body must break down. It may be the lungs, it may be the heart, it may be the brain; no matter, the constitu-

tion once weakened, the body must fail.

And so the downward course of a man in immorality is often so rapid that it takes people by surprise, and yet it is not strange when we consider the law of tendency. Watch the course of some young man. Only petty falsehood to start with, then the taking of small sums of money from his employer, then perhaps it is forgery, then the company of the dissolute, and so on to the State prison. These are easy and natural steps. A man who is false in little things is in danger of becoming wrong at heart in great things. One deliberate sin must leave its poison in the moral nature. It may not always appear in open sin, as I have just described, because men are restrained in various ways; but as men often carry hidden diseases to the grave—diseases that have never made their appearance—so men may carry a diseased moral nature that does not outwardly show its true character in outbreking sin. Sometimes in temptation and opportunity it comes to the surface, sometimes not; sometimes a community is startled by some sudden and unexpected deed of dishonesty which is the result of a long-continued and private process of moral degeneration; sometimes it does not appear in outbreking sin; but every loss of the feeling of uprightness and rectitude, every indulgence in sin, every infringement on the sense of right, every resistance to the authority of conscience changes the whole attitude of the man toward holiness, and corrupts his entire disposition.

If Lake Ontario were held in place by an embankment, the people of the surrounding country would look to that breakwater as their only safety, and so long as that should hold firmly in its place they would feel secure. Now you need not dig clear down through that embankment in order to let away the water; you have only to take a spade and remove a handful of loose gravel on the top and let through a tiny rivulet, and soon the stream which you

could stop with your five fingers becomes a thundering torrent; the pressure of miles and miles of water behind rapidly wears away, every minute and every second, deeper and deeper, this careless work of a moment, until in one mighty volume the lake empties itself upon the surrounding country.

So a man need not commit murder or some great sin in order to destroy the delicateness of moral feeling and blunt all the nice perceptions of conscience; he need not tear away clear to the foundations all the barriers that God has erected in the soul against evil; he need not commit every sin in order to be a thoroughly sinful man; all he has to do is to violate conscience here and there; lose self-control here a little, there a little; carry on a secret commerce with evil; be crooked and false and perverse in little matters; be untrue with others and with himself; that is all he need to do. Why? Because one deliberate sin injures a man's moral manhood all through and through; little sins injure a man's moral nature and corrupt him in will and intent; poison the moral disposition; soil the fineness of conscience, and when you have once done that, whether in great things or small, you open the way for the whole troop of evil thoughts and purposes to pour through the breach and flood the whole heart and soul of man. While James, therefore, does not mean that in one offence a man is guilty of every other sin in particular, he does mean to say, I think, that by one sin the whole moral nature has sustained an injury, so that the man can never be the man he was before.

4. Lastly, the text is true on account of THE UNITY OF A MAN'S RECORD BEFORE GOD. He that offends in the commission of one sin injures, beyond any remedy that he can provide, his whole record before God. So that the page of a man's record can no more save him, even if there is but one stain upon it, than it could if it were all covered over with the stains of sin.

Let us illustrate this record before God by our record before men.

We understand how it is with our reputation before men. If we observe every requirement necessary to keep our reputation clean and sound, yet offend against the opinion of others in one single thing, it injures our whole reputation, does it not? You are not required to do everything that can possibly injure your moral reputation or your business record in order to injure it; one disreputable act is enough. If we offend in one thing only which injures our reputation, then our whole reputation is injured. To-morrow you forge a note; it is only one act, but it ruins your business name. You never hear people talk about a part of a man's reputation for moral character. A man's record is a unit, one whole thing, and if he injures it in any part he injures it as a whole, and the whole of it with good conduct or bad rises or falls together. A man's record or reputation in the world has a wonderful sphericity and unity. It hangs together. It is a rounded completeness. Reputation is like the body; if the foot suffers the man suffers; if the brain reels the man is dizzy; if a tooth aches it is the man that says he suffers pain; so there is such unity in a man's reputation that any blight that touches any part of it falls like a shadow across it all. Every good thing the man has ever done, every good quality he possesses, is overclouded by that one shadow that follows him wherever he goes. If a man offends against his reputation in one point then he offends against his whole reputation.

A man asks me for a sheet of nice white paper on which to write a note of invitation. I give him a sheet. He says, "That won't do." "Why not?" I ask, "Why," he says, "don't you see that crooked line that somebody has drawn across it with a pen?" And is he not right? Should I think of telling him that only a part of the sheet is injured? That it is injured only along the line where the pen has traced its

inky way across the page? That the page is perfectly white and nice below the line, perfectly nice and white above the line? No, you need not cover a sheet of paper with ink in order to spoil its cleanliness and whiteness. That which injures a part injures the whole. With that one black line the purity of the whole is defaced and destroyed. The sheet of note-paper as a sheet is spoiled. It is the way we all talk. If you should take a hammer and chisel, and walk up to a marble bust, and chip a piece of marble out of one of the cheeks, or splinter off one of the eyebrows, the sculptor would not say that you injured a part of the face, he would tell you that you had ruined the statue. It is so with our reputation. When we injure a part of it, that one stain spoils the beauty of the whole, and that one feature disfigured destroys the symmetry of the figure.

Suppose a man otherwise highly distinguished for virtue and uprightness and religion should be convicted of petty thieving; you may sum up his other virtues if you please; you may say that this man's reputation is good as to the matter of elasticity, also as to the matter of fair dealing in business transactions, also in the matter of manslaughter—he never killed anybody; he never committed adultery; he never used profane language; he never broke the Sabbath—you may say all this, but it is of no use, and you know it is not. Indeed, this is not the way in which men would talk of such a case. They would not talk about a part of the man's reputation for goodness; they would not see it in parts at all; as a whole they would see it, and as a whole they would say that an everlasting blight had fallen upon it, and they would say that that splendid reputation for moral integrity was soiled and tarnished beyond possible redemption.

Now, in some such way as our reputation stands before men does our moral record stand before God. He looks at it, not in parts, but as a whole; so that, if we sin at all, our whole record as a record

is defiled. This is His reason for saying that by the works of the law shall no man be justified; for if we are to be justified by the works of the law, if we are to become acceptable to Him on account of the record we have made, then we must have a perfectly clean record, a record absolutely without spot or stain. But where is the man who has such a record? Where is the man who, in word, thought, or deed, never stained the clean page of life?

I am not now, of course, taking into account the mercy of God; I know it is great. He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust; He has offered His salvation to help us in our infirmities; but I am speaking of the utter impossibility of a man's being saved on his moral record and his upright life; for if he should keep the whole law except one point, by that one offence he would be *just as far from being saved on his record* as the man who has covered it all over with the scrawls of sin. For, in order to be justified by the works of the law, these works must be absolutely without sin, and perfect in stainless holiness from first to last.

A teacher offers a prize to her writing scholars. She will give a prize to every pupil who does not blot the book from first to last. At the close of the term two little girls come up with their books to judgment. One has twenty blots to a page, the other has one blot only on the corner of one page. Now, the teacher may commend this girl for her neatness, her care, her patience, but she can no more give her the prize than she can the other. She has written better, been more careful and neat and patient, but the prize no more belongs to her than it does to the other, for the prize is for those who have no stains whatever. So must we carry our record up to judgment; if we are to be saved on our life's record, we must have a record without a blot. So that we are all of us, friends, equally far from gaining the prize. We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God.

There may be degrees in goodness—and God takes account of them, doubtless—but we all stand alike in this; we can never enter heaven on our record. Every one who thus hopes is debtor to do the whole law; and not one of us has kept it, not one of us is holy. There is none good, no, not one. Thus, though James may not mean that if a man offends in one point he therefore offends in every point; he does mean, I think, that one offence stains our record as a whole before God.

Let us now look for a moment at the ground we have gone over. If we offend in one point we are guilty of all.

First, because of *the unity of the will from which the sin goes out*; the whole man is engaged in it.

Second, on account of *the unity of the law against which the sin proceeds*; it is the law taken as a whole that is violated.

Third, on account of *the unity of the moral nature upon which sin recoils*; it is the whole moral nature that is injured.

Fourth, on account of *the unity of a man's record which the stain of sin despoils*; it is the whole record that is tarnished.

Where, then, is there place for boasting? It is excluded. One cluster picked from a vine is sufficient to prove the nature of the vine; so one sin teaches what human nature is, and teaches us also how this and every other just consideration of God's law and our relation to it forces us to look for our only help to the great atonement made for men in Christ Jesus our Lord. Under the law and in the law there is no loophole of retreat. How shall we be justified? Our salvation is all of grace, all of grace. It never can be a matter of debt. God certainly owes us nothing.

Vain, then, are all the lofty claims of the moralist; vain the assertions of self-righteousness; vain the arrogant assumptions of culture and philosophy which permeate our literature and mark the thought of the age in which we live.

Men need Christ. Men must have a Saviour.

Where is our hope, then, but in that blessed text of John: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Righteous." Here is the beauty, the sweetness, the power of the Gospel of Christ. You have sinned; the whole man against the law; your nature injured; your record ruined. But Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost.

The best men who ever lived have died trusting wholly to Him. They have died crying, "It is all of grace, all of grace." The best and holiest of men have declared that they could not pass the ordeal of the law, and have trusted their case to Him; and I have made this plain statement of the case to-night, not to make any one discouraged, not to paint a gloomy and despondent picture, but just to make the merits and glory of our Saviour the more conspicuous.

Let us flee, then, to Him who will save to the uttermost all who come unto God by Him. Having offended in one point—nay, but have we not offended in many, many points?—if we have offended in one point only, our need is as great, at least, as that of him who came to Jesus, having kept all the items of the Decalogue, and who went away sorrowful because he found that he was still an offender. Come to Christ, then, and "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."

FIRST PRINCIPLES.

BY REV. EDGAR G. MURPHY [PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL], LAREDO, TEX.

The first principles of the oracles of God.

—Heb. v. 12.

THIS is Bible Sunday,* that day of our Christian year set apart for attention to prayers, thoughts, beliefs about

* Preached on the Second Sunday in Advent.

the Bible. I have written what it is my duty to say, because I do not care to be subject to the suspicion either of extravagance or understatement, because the intentional custom of this day is instruction, because for this time at least I care a great deal more for what we think, for what we remember, than for what we feel. It could not be otherwise. The Bible is first of all the speaking of mind to mind. The symbol through which the heart lays hold on the truth of revelation is an intellectual symbol—the written Word standing for thought; the Divine meaning and the prophet's power unknown, and to you unknowable, until it is ministered to you through the concrete book, our human language, and your own mind. You may have a heart for truth, for the truth of this book of God, but this truth cannot come to you until you know the letters of its alphabet, until you know the symbols of its spirit, until you know the language of its mind.

The Bible, I say, is the speaking of mind to mind. It is said—not for the words, or the phrase, but for the principle which they imply—that the Bible first of all is literature; that therefore we should give to this Scripture an intellectual reverence which is its due, as, through minds and hands of men, God's writing to us all. An intellectual reverence. Of emotional reverence we have enough that is dishonor and not honor. The world is filled with interpreters of this book who have no other qualification for position and pretence than that they have good hearts and understand the English tongue. It is not enough. When men speak in terms of thought, they must think; when men speak in terms of knowledge, they must know. We would not accept the appreciation, the interpretation of a speech by Mr. Gladstone given us by an illiterate pulpiteer, yet how often do we let such a man minister to us in the meaning of God, in the interpretation of matters of fact and philosophy in the record divine! I am far from denying the mystical value, the devotional use

of God's Book. The best heart, the purest, truest soul, is best authority as to God's presence, God's power in a passage, in a chapter, in a prophet. That is a matter of touch, of contact, of atmosphere; but the best heart is not the qualification for the settlement of the dates of books, for the settlement of what the intellectual form of truth—that is to say, doctrine—is or is not. The purest soul may know nothing of history, nothing of literature or literary forms, nothing of principles governmental or administrative. We accede the right of the individual to go to the Bible for spiritual power, for life, and the presence of God. We deny his right to go to the Bible as such for theology in any of its departments—history, eschatology, church polity, ecclesiastical law. The ignorant man may go to the Bible for religion, because religion is a life; he may not go there for theology, because theology is a science. The sweet fragrance of gathered flowers may bring to your heart life and cheer and the sense of health, but when you make these the ground of a botanical judgment as to kind and class, the botanist will tell you that you have trespassed upon a field from which, in the nature of the case, you should be excluded. I say, then, that as the botanist is authority on botanical matters, so the theologian is authority upon matters theological.

Let it be distinctly understood that it is not intended to limit the theologians to the clergy. Mr. Gladstone is not a clergyman; the late Judge Black was not a clergyman; Mr. Hutton, of the London *Spectator*, is not a clergyman, but these men rank to-day as the theologians, because they have studied, because they know, and therefore have the right to teach. I wish to ask you who are forming opinions about Christian truth, whether for it or against it, to learn something of its vehicle, to understand its symbolism, to love through your highest self of mind and reason its Book and its God. Am I asking you to be professionally erudite, am I asking

too much of men and women as we find them? Not at all. I am asking simply for such knowledge as may justify in some measure *your* opinions as to matters of fact and theory. Such opinions the American mind insists upon having in the wildest exuberance of ramification and degree; opinions about heaven, opinions about hell, opinions about baptism and the holy communion, opinions about the Prayer-Book, opinions about what Sunday is and about what Sunday is not, opinions about prophecies and opinions about miracles. As to what is spiritually good in the Bible you are always a judge, simply because God and conscience are in your heart, simply because you are a man; but that you know goodness when you see it is by no means a proof that you are a good judge of the questions of law, miracle, literature, and government brought to us in the pages of this Scripture. For such questions you must not only have a full heart, you must have a full head. And *are* you showing an intellectual reverence for the truth of God when you presume to settle such things by an off-hand appeal to a small section of some half-remembered text? I think not. I do not know why a man, ignorant of simplest history and commonest exegesis, should set up his opinions about the questions of heaven and hell, the questions of baptismal regeneration and eucharistic presence against the careful judgment of the trained scholar, the historical student, the theological mind. It is a presumption which would not be tolerated in any other field of literary or scientific investigation.

Let us remember further that just as our Scripture is not a book of magic, easily applied, for the settlement of moral truth, so it is with the intellectual truths of Christ and of God. The end in things moral is not primarily to furnish a text to meet easily and precisely each detail of human conduct, but to form character; not to regulate an act, but to make a man; to form within the soul the sinew of courage

and the fine high life of truth, making immorality unnatural and at last impossible. The ethical purpose of Scripture is not primarily the moral law, but the moral man, the character and the countenance of purity, wrought inward through the impress of the story of God's mighty heroes, through the reiterated coloring of scene and sympathy divine, through the play and power of light and righteousness brought to you and to me through example, law, and the Book's spirit. It is not, first of all, the *law* of God; it is the *man* of God. It is for this the books were written, the Lord has come, and the Church has taught. It is the apostle's reason, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God that the *man* of God may be perfect."

And what is true of matters moral is true also of doctrinal matters. If the primary ethical purpose of Scripture is not the moral law, but the moral man, it is equally true that the primary doctrinal purpose of Scripture is not belief, but the believer, not creeds, but the *man* of creeds. It is not the primary purpose of God's Book to teach doctrine as such. If I thought it were, I should consider this Bible a lamentable failure. There are to-day some three hundred Christian sects, each appealing to the same Book for the settlement, the vindication of its peculiar tenets. If the primary purpose of the Book is to teach doctrine, is not this failure—one book and three hundred systems? I think that you will agree with me that it is. Thank God, we have not a book with ready-made statements of ready-made truths for every intellectual emergency of the Christian disciple. Just as the easy recourse to precise direction means the vitiation of fibre in the moral man, so does the easy use of truths precisely stated vitiate the faith of the man of mind and intellect. I am glad there is scope for moral character, that there is scope for the development of an intellectual character toward God. It is to this intellectual character, to this faith-mind that the Bible directs itself; not the formation of belief, but

the making of the believer. First of all the end which is personal, the soul and the spirit of the disciple life—a prophet, a saint, an apostle—this is the meaning of the books. See the Christ's method as He works with men. Is it dogma, first, that is the end of His seeking? Is it doctrine, is it the *form* and the *language* of truth that He exacts? What are His questions? "Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, and I say also unto thee that thou art Peter (*πέτρος*), and upon this (*πέτρα*) rock-man I will build My church." The believing *character*, the *rock-man*, the *man* of faith, here is the starting-point of the idea and of the institution. This, through the long worry and the long work of training and direction, is what the Lord seeks; it is here He begins, it is upon this He builds; and the foundation stones of the New Jerusalem are the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. As it is with Peter, so it is through all the years and through all that incomparable finding with which Jesus lays hold of the world's heart. He asks little of doctrines in themselves, of dogmas, of statements, sentences, and creeds. It is the character and the man He seeks, it is for this He works—the man and the character from which right dogma, right doctrine, and true creed come logically and necessarily. For do not imagine that dogma and creed are foreign to His purpose, unimportant in His view. They are there all the more deeply and essentially because they are not the things of immediate seeking; they are there always, inevitably there. Do you think He does not know when the cleansed leper falls in adoration at His feet, when the disciples fall worshipping before Him, that these minds would translate devotion into dogma, sweet trust and adoration into theory and creed, a bodily posture into a mental posture? He *seeks* the man to ask, Dost thou *believe* on the Son of

God? The man's answer is adoration. It is not his wisdom, or the true ring of creed, or the firm tone of orthodox decree—the man's answer is *himself*. What sweet grace of joy in the words that fall, now here, now there, to those who trust, whom He has blessed—"Thy *faith* hath saved thee." "I have not found in Israel a *faith* so great." "Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see." It is too much to say that these poor hearts had correct theoretical notions as to the place and right of Jesus as the Lord.

It is not for the child in the first hour to translate the senses of right and wrong into ethical formulæ, to give form and statement to the dumb movings of moral life, to classify and name each motive as it comes and goes in the depth and dark of the child-mind and the child heart. Day by day it comes, always the conquering of the unintelligible and the unknown; always a shadowy region of cloud, and black, and unmastered light, to be won to intelligent uses for the man's world of character and service. The great forces at last are known, the great sources at last are found, the finding has lent greater strength, has made fibre, and given truer, clearer set to character and toil. So it is in the history of God's child of earth—the Church of Christ. In the background of her consciousness there is the figure of a form of light in the dark of her first years, to which she gave her earliest self with loyalty and heroism; a native calm assurance of His right and truth. It is a clearer figure with each year of growth, with each century of labor, trust, and thought, the dumb heart finding voice, the thought finding word and creed, in the fine high enterprise of truth for God's sake, for the sake of men. What is the experience of our race through the ages is the experience, dear friends, of each single life to-day.

When God gave His light to the world, I am glad His ministry to truth was first the garden and then botany—nature under forms of mind; first mo-

rality and then ethics—morality under forms of mind; first the Lord and the God of Thomas, then the Creed of Nice; Jesus first and then Christ the Eternal Son. Do not fall back upon the shallow talk, the easy sneer about what you are pleased to call the “magic” of congresses and councils. Oh, do you not see it is more than that? It means *character* to faith in heart, in mind; man having the trust of truth, the Divine Spirit in the world; not merely an incarnation in the ministry of three single years, but God with man in all depths of love, in the toil and the agony of mind for light and for truth. If you know the story of those years of conflict, the long battle, the bitter feud, the death-grip of man with man, the endured work and poverty, the sorrows of exile and betrayal, you will know, dear friends, the meaning of the Christian preacher when he tells you that the Christ and His creed, the Saviour and His truth were both born to power and rule from the travail of a cross. The truth came no easier than its Lord. So it came to the world, and so truth has ever come.

The man Moses in the cloud and the fire of the mount read to his children, as they gathered before Sinai, the Ten Commandments of the Lord's writing. They were the translation into terms of conquering truth; the translation of experience into *law*. Forty years of defeat and wrong and of triumph divine had written them in the italics of struggle upon the fleshly table of their hearts.

And the revelation of law is the story of the revelation of *life*. In vain will you look for a clear doctrine of immortality before the reign of David. At last the mind of Jew and proselyte gathered into thought and word the moral postulate of all their hopes, the one truth in which all had lived and wrought and ruled. I am quite sure that the fact of immortality had a large place in the *lives* of Moses, Job, and Elijah, but I am equally sure that in thought, in doctrine, and in system its place was **insignificant**.

And the revelation of love has had the same history as the revelation of law and of life. Because, mark you, the revelation of the Bible is the revelation of persons (last, of a Person) to persons, of mind to mind; a revelation of facts and not of intellectual forms; a revelation of substance and not of mental symbols. Moses is more important than the law, Abraham is the father of circumcision, the prophet is ever greater than his prophecy, David is more important than his kingdom. It is the *men* of old that the Bible puts before us; the men of law, then, moulding the men of law with them, with us to-day; the men of life and love there moulding men of life and love here; Elijah and à Kempis; *Christus et Christiani*—the moral man and then the truths of morals, the immortal man and then the truths of immortality; the Christ-man and then the truths of Christ. Morality and ethics, purity and eschatology, religion and theology. The substance first, and then the science and the symbol.

And just as the working, the settling of moral character is through moral trial and moral victory, so the faith-mind, the mind toward God, the character of belief is stronger, better, surer, in and through the shaping and moulding of the mind's labor. *The end is the moral character, the intellectual character of God's child in the things of God.*

I have said, then, that there are two reasons why we should not use the Bible as an *easy* book, as a book for easily-made creeds and ready-made opinions on matters religious. In the first place, the average man does not know enough about the Bible. In the second place, the Bible was not meant for it. The average believer is not the man, and the Bible is not the book for such results. Such a method is to dishonor the Bible and to degrade character, the character for goodness and the character for truth.

Begin with the task and the proof of the Book's first design, and the rest will come. Charles Lamb, sitting in a com-

pany of English gentlemen, is asked, "What should we do if Lyeurgus and Solon, Caesar and Jesus Christ should enter the room?" "You see, gentlemen," answered Lamb, with the quaint stutter that was his when stirred by emotion, "you see, if Caesar, Lyeurgus, Solon, if they came in, we should all rise; if *He* came in, we should kneel." Oh, learn to feel like that more and more with each day, with each hour! Read this blessed Book for that. Let its sweet, strong words build that picture within you, in heart and mind—the gracious Lord whom you adore. If you do not know the philosophy of His deity and the metaphysics of His presence, the fact is there, and the rest, if you will believe me, shall come at last. First the true believer, then the true belief. Read the Bible, I say, for that, for Him; for the story, the beauty, the meaning, the power of your Lord Christ. Remember, I beseech you, that *He* is the beginning and the ending—all is for Him from the first, all to Him at the last—God in human life; His love, its dignity and worth. If you have that, all the rest will come easy to you; no longer a petty worry about some miracle of an ancient book, no querulous question of the rectitude of a patriarch here, of a prophet there. Oh, how small all this will seem when you have once grasped this thought: that our hope, our light, and our life to-day are not bound up with the critical issues of a manuscript or a document, but are settled upon the history and presence of a Life that is the Lord of all worlds, of each star and sun, and of each human destiny. If rationalistic criticism has taught us one thing more than another, it is the first truth and the last truth of our old faith and of our faith to-day, that Christianity is devotion not to a book, but to a Person.

That was the religion, and it was thus that it came to triumph, and thus it must be to-day; the triumph of the personal Christ and of the personal Christian. Christianity does not stand or fall with the success or failure of its

books. Millions, millions of souls, before paper was made or books were printed, lived the life the Lord has given and died in the Christian's hope; but Christianity *does* stand or fall with the success or failure of what Christianity really pretends to be—a higher life there in Him, a higher life to-day in you and in me for the world's service and the glory of its God.

FULL OF JOY AND OF THE HOLY GHOST.

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

The eunuch went on his way rejoicing.
—Acts viii. 39.

The disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost.—Acts xiii. 52.

THERE is a striking resemblance between the condition of the eunuch deprived of his teacher and of these raw disciples, in Pisidian Antioch, bereft of theirs. Both were very recent converts; both had the scantiest knowledge; both were left utterly alone. One might have forgiven the Ethiopian statesman if, as he contemplated his plunge into the darkness of his own country, where there was not a single Christian soul but himself, he had looked with some lingering regrets after his vanished teacher. But no sentiment of that sort fills his mind. "He went on his way rejoicing." The explanation which is supplied in reference to the Christians of Antioch, who stretched out no hands to retain Paul and Barnabas, and scarcely seemed to miss them, but "were filled with joy," may avail for the eunuch's experience too. They were full of the Spirit of God, and that enabled them to do without teachers, and more than made up for all losses.

Now this phrase, "full of the Holy Ghost," is not an uncommon one in the Acts of the Apostles; and the writer is fond of connecting with it other blessings and graces, of which it is declared to be the cause. So, for instance, we read that the deacons who were to be

chosen were to be "men full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom;" and of Stephen we read that "he was full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." In like manner, the explanation of my text traces the joy of these solitary Christian souls to the abiding and complete possession of that Divine Spirit.

This state of being "filled with the Holy Ghost" is not regarded by the writer of the Acts of the Apostles as necessarily carrying with it the power of working miracle, or any other supernatural endowment, nor is it confined to the aristocracy of the Church, but it belongs to all. And if any Christian man is not thus completely possessed by the Divine Spirit, the Source of new life, and the very Soul of his soul, the fault lies wholly at his own door.

The two texts that I have put together, regarded in the light of the circumstances of the persons to whom they refer, seems to me to suggest to us two or three very large and blessed thoughts of what is available and possible for, and therefore the duty, of every Christian thus being "filled with the Spirit of God." So filled, we shall have an all-sufficient Teacher for all our ignorance; a Companion for all our solitude; a fountain of joy in all our sorrow. And the stories before us may help to illustrate these three things.

I.—First, then, note here, the all-sufficient Teacher for our ignorance.

Think, for instance, of that Ethiopian statesman. An hour or two before he had said, "How can I understand except some man guide me?" And now he is going away into the darkness, without a single external help of any kind, knowing only the little that he had gathered from Philip, in the course of a short conversation in the chariot. He had not a line of the New Testament. There were no Gospels in his day. He had nothing but a scroll of the prophet Isaiah in the way of outward help, but he went away with a glad heart, quite sure that he would be taught all he needed to know.

And these other people at Antioch,

just dragged out of the filth and darkness of heathenism, with no teaching beyond the rudimentary instruction of the two apostles for a few days—they, too, were left by their teachers without a fear, and felt themselves alone without a tremor, because the teachers "commended them to God, and to the Word of His grace," and the taught felt that they had a Divine instructor dwelling in their hearts.

The same thing has been experienced over and over again in the history of the Church. How often we have heard of some poor man that came to a Christian teacher in a heathen land, and picked up the one thought that God had sent His Son to love him and die for him; and carried that away in his heart into some solitary corner, and there, all alone and untaught of men, found that this one truth blossomed out into all manner of Divine wisdom according to his need.

There was once a great mission from one of our English denominations in the island of Madagascar. It was smitten by persecution. Long years passed, during which not a soul went there from any Christian land. When at last communication was restored, what was found? A flourishing church. Who had taught it? God's Spirit.

Ah, brethren, we trust far too little to the educating and enlightening power of God's grace in the hearts of men who have no other teacher. And if Christian people more really believed the promise of their Master, which said, "He will guide you into all truth," they would be more likely to realize the promise, and be all taught of God. I would that I could rouse you Christian people to the real belief in that saying of Scripture, "Ye have an unction of the Holy One, and ye need not that any man teach you."

Only remember, the instrument of that Divine Teacher is the Word of God. And if we, as Christians, neglect our Bibles, we shall not get the teaching of the Spirit of God. And remember, too, that that teaching is grant-

ed to us on plainly defined conditions. There must be a desire for it. Oh, what an enormous and tragical number are there of so-called Christians who have no conception that there is anything more for them to learn than the initial truth, the acceptance of which saved their souls—viz., that Jesus Christ died on the cross for them. It is quite true that in one sense there is no more to learn. It is also true that it will take eternity for us to learn all that is in that one word. A clown in the fields sees as many stars as an astronomer, but it takes a lifetime of patient gazing and of hard study in order to arrive at some notion of the laws that move the shining orbs, and of their mighty magnitudes and distances. And so with the simple truth, that a half idiot and an almost babe, may take to heart, and find life in—viz., the sacrifice of the Son of God for the world's sins, there lie depths that will task the largest faculties, and will reward and bless the most protracted and patient search. If you do not desire a deeper, fuller, more vital, and more comprehensive knowledge of the treasures of wisdom that are laid up in that "simple Gospel," you cannot expect that you will be taught what you do not want to know; or that the Spirit of God will force instruction upon an unwilling heart. You must desire it, and you must use the instrument. Read your Bibles, ponder your Bibles, become masters of them.

And there must be patient waiting and solitary meditation. They tell us that it is possible to overdo the manuring of a farm, and to put so much nourishment and stimulus upon the land as to spoil it. There are a great many Christians who have got so much of men's thinking, so many books, so many treatises, so many sermons, carted and shovelled on to their souls, that the productivity of their souls is ruined. And in this day of so many voices speaking of religion, precious as some of them may be, and helpful as the ministrations of the word is, from a

brother's lips, if rightly used, there is sore need that Christian men should be pointed away from all human teachers, from a Philip and a Paul and a Barnabas, from an evangelist and an apostle, and should be relegated to the one great Teacher whose voice speaketh in secret, and makes us wise unto salvation. Depend upon it, the eunuch was in as good a place for profiting by the teaching of the Spirit of God in lonely Abyssinia, and amid the secularities of the court of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, as if he had been sitting in the middle of the church at Jerusalem and listening to the teaching of the apostles. Let us take the lesson, and whosoever scholars we may be, let us enrol ourselves in the school of the Master, and learn from that Spirit who will guide us into all truth.

II.—Now, note, secondly, the Companion in all our solitude.

Think of the loneliness of this man on the Gaza road, or of that handful of sheep in the midst of wolves in Antioch. And yet they were not alone. "Full of the Holy Ghost," they were conscious of a Divine presence. And so it may be, dear brethren, with us all. We are all condemned to live alone, however many may be the troops of friends round us. Every human soul, after all love and companionship, lives isolated. There is only One who can pass the awful boundary of personality which hedges off every man from every other. Love comes to the gate, and sends its sweet influences within, but still there is a film of distance between. There is only one Being that can pass within and mingle—in no metaphor, but in fullest reality—His being with my being, so that, in a very deep and blessed sense, we may be one. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit"—two, in so far that there remains the sweet consciousness of giving and receiving; one, in so far that a mightier smelting power than that of love is in operation to fuse the believing spirit with the Spirit of the living God.

Let no man say that that is mystical

and wants verifying. Trust Christ and you will have it verified. It is not mysticism, it is the very heart of the Gospel. And so we need never be alone if we have this Companion.

Besides the natural, necessary solitude in which every human soul lives there are some of us, no doubt, on whom God, by His providence, has laid the burden of a very lonely life. God's purpose in making us solitary is to join Himself to us. He sent His prophet away into the dreadful desert of Sinai, that there, amid its wild peaks and blasted, dreary loneliness, he might see the great sight and hear the Divine voice. "I will bring her into the desert and will speak to her heart." Oh, brother, if your hand has been untwined from a dear one—if you look along the long stretch of life, and see no prospect of other companion—learn the lesson and the privilege of your solitude, and take God into it to keep you company. Left alone, nestle close to Him.

Beside the natural and the providential solitudes there is yet another. We must make a solitude for ourselves if we would have God speaking to us and keeping us company. Solitude is the mother-country of the strong. To be much alone is the condition of sanity and nobleness of life. I know, of course, that domestic arrangements and imperative duties make it all but impossible for many of us to realize to any large extent the outward solitude which is so calming and bracing and every way desirable. But, for all that, brother, and making all needful allowance, and gladly remembering that God will come to people in a crowd, if His providence has fixed them there, let us not forget that there must be a Mount of Olives in the life of every follower of Jesus Christ. We cannot afford to neglect what He had to attend to, who the more He was busy in the temple the more went out to the mountain-top, and continued there all night in prayer to God. His commandment to us is still, "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place and rest awhile." Confer-

ences and meetings and congresses and crowds have their function, no doubt; perhaps we could do with fewer of them, but, at all events, no man's religion will be deep and strong unless he has learned to go into the secret place of the Most High, and shut his doors about him, and there receive the fulness of that Spirit.

III.—Lastly, notice the joy in all the sorrow.

"Full of joy and of the Holy Ghost," says the latter of the two texts. That collocation is familiar to the student of the New Testament. You will remember the apostle's great enumeration of the fruits of the Spirit, "Love, joy, peace." And, in another place, still more relevant to our present purpose, he speaks to the members of one of his churches, and tells them that they had "received the word in much affliction with joy of the Holy Ghost." So then, whoever has this Divine Guest dwelling in his heart, may possess, and will possess, a joy as complete as is its possession of him.

I need not remind you how that Divine Spirit, that enters into our souls by faith, brings to us the consciousness of forgiveness and of sonship, nor how it fits the needs of every part of our nature, and brings all our being into harmony with itself, with circumstances, and with God; and how, therefore, the man who thus is truly "good," is "satisfied from himself," because himself is not himself only, but himself with the Holy Spirit dwelling in him; how such a man needs not to go to the brackish ponds of earthly and outward satisfaction, but has a never-failing fountain within, springing up, with joyous inherent energy, up, and up, and up into life everlasting.

But I may remind you that not only does this Divine Spirit in us make provision for joy, but that, with such an indwelling Guest, there is the possibility of the co-existence of joy and sorrow. It is no paradox that the Apostle gave forth when he said, "Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing." Even in the midst

of the snow and cold and darkness of Arctic regions the explorers build houses for themselves of the very blocks of ice, and within are warmth and light and comfort and vitality, while around is a dreary waste. There may be two currents in the great ocean, the cold one from the pole may set and threaten to chill and freeze all life out, but from the equator there will be a warm one which will more than counterbalance the inrush of the cold. And so it is possible for us, even when things about us are dark and gloomy, and flesh and natural sensibilities all proclaim to us the necessity of sadness—it is possible for us to be aware of a central blessedness, not boisterous, but so grave and calm that the world cannot discriminate between it and sadness, which yet its possessors know to be blessedness unmingled. Left alone, we may have a Companion: in our ignorance we may be enlightened; and in the murkiest night of our sorrow we may have, burning cheerily within our hearts, a light unquenchable.

But remember that this joy from the Spirit is a commandment. I am sure that Christians do not sufficiently lay to heart that gladness is their duty, and that sorrow unrelieved by it is cowardice and sin. We have no business to be thus sorrowful. There are no unmingled, and there are no irrevocable, causes for sorrow in the lives of any men who can say, "God is my Father; Christ is my Brother; the Spirit of God dwells in my heart." "Therefore, rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, rejoice."

But remember the conditions. If you and I have that Divine Spirit within us we shall be enlightened, however ignorant; companioned, however solitary; joyful, however ringed about with sorrow. If we have not, the converse will be true; we shall grope in the darkness however we conceit ourselves to know; we shall have a central sorrow however we may have a delusive, superficial joy, "the end of which is heaviness," and we shall be alone, how-

ever we may seem to be companied by troops of friends. If we have faith in Christ we shall have the Spirit of Christ. If, like the people in one of my texts, we can say truly that we are disciples, "we shall be filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost." He that is full of faith is full of God's Spirit.

THE LIGHTED LAMP.

By REV. G. JAMES JONES, PH.D.,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path.—Ps. cxix. 105.

THE world has seen many curious and ingenious contrivances for illuminating purposes. Some of them were crude, imperfect, and unsatisfactory. But the almost omnipotent mind of man kept on experimenting and devising till the wonderful and brilliant luminaries of to-day were produced. What were once mere conceptions in the human mind have become trophies of past victories and prophecies of future possibilities. The pupils in the infant departments of our public schools of to-day may live to see lamps hung in space, connected with the dynamos of the skies, distributing a flood of soft white light simultaneously over a whole continent in response to a gentle touch of a button, and thereby turning darkness to day. But the source of all light is referred to incandescence, and its propagation to exceedingly fine and minute vibrations in a medium or ether which, on reaching the retina of the eye, produce vision. The light itself and the undulation are unseen; and science is more certain of the result—vision—than of the source. But what is it that sees? Can it be a physical mechanism? Impossible. A moral, living, responsible being must stand behind that beautifully constructed organ, one who is still capable to receive visions and to see when the physical instrument is removed.

Material vision at best is only a humble symbol of the higher vision of the

spiritual man. It is the immortal soul that sees. The source of its light is the gracious Spirit of the great Creator of all mingling or uniting with the spirit of man. The result is spiritual vision. As the union becomes more complete the vision becomes more clear. The medium of propagation may be the audible voice of a friend, or the speechless spectre of affliction, or the regretful reflections of the memory. But pre-eminent as a medium of spiritual enlightenment is the Holy Bible. The incandescence of God's love undulates through its pages, and, on reaching the heart of man, produces not only a pleasing sensation, but also an illumination of such glorious intensity that the soul perceives with inerring distinctness its own superior nature, its relation to man and to God, to time and eternity, to the atonement of Christ for the remission of sin, to faith as its anchor of safety in the time of storm, to the certain ultimate victory of the redeemed over every foe, with the triumphant entry to the realms of pure and eternal light amid the joyous shouts of angel hosts saying: "Welcome, mighty victor, to the joy of thy Lord, to whom be praise, dominion, and power, and glory, henceforth and forevermore. Welcome; enter; welcome." The Bible is the best gift of God to man. That is why the psalmist said: "Thy Word is a lamp to my feet and light unto my path." Let me dwell on a few pertinent facts concerning this extraordinary and wonderful book.

I. It is a Book unsurpassed in the power of its truth.

No smelting of the dross from the gold necessary, for there is no dross. It is all pure gold. It is the most sacred and impressive of all books—the educator of the young, the guide of manhood, the strength of old age. As a stream of cold, crystal water is to the thirsty traveller in a dry land is God's Word to him who believes it. By it he is refreshed, strengthened, encouraged to meet trials, temptations, duties that confront him almost at every step in the

Christian life. Its sweet, calm spirit fills him with joy, and he is not moved. In life it speaks of death; but death only to the dead. In death it speaks of life, and opens to the divine vision of the believer the indescribable glories of immortality, with the eternal grandeur of the city whose walls are jasper, whose streets are gold, and whose light is the "Lamb that was slain." In the *Dublin Review* of June, 1853, a learned Roman Catholic convert from Protestantism speaks of this book as follows: "The words of the Bible live in the ear like a music that can never be forgotten—like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments; and all that has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good speak to him forever out of his English Bible." Of no other book in all the realm of literature could one tenth as much be truly said. It is the Book of books. To influence men to right thinking, living, being, to fashion, and strengthen, and sustain character it has more power than all other books combined. Those who live in harmony with its teaching are the best people in the world. Much is said sometimes about the best class. There is such a class. It is made up of men and women moved and actuated by Bible truths. Character is not a compound of fine cloth, feathers, and powders, or of certain ethical achievements, but of right principles, motives, and actions. Genius demands admiration; character secures respect. Genius cannot always be trusted unless acted upon and guided by godly fear. The Bible concerns itself with the building of characters of such intrinsic value and

worth as will stand the storms of life and the trials of the judgment day. Man's greatness is commensurate with the degree of his spiritual development. "Bigness is not greatness." A very small man may live in a very large and a very elaborately decorated house, and an individual may be clothed in royal robes, wear a crown, wield a sceptre on a throne in the realm of thought, as did Bacon, and yet be so devoid of all essentials of true manhood as to betray the best friend with Judas, and merit and receive the contempt of the good forever. The world measures by bulk; God measures by principles. The world by external display; God by the degree the soul assimilates spiritual truth, which in turn changes the very essentials of its being, and it becomes a "new creature in Jesus Christ." Through the power of the truth—Bible truth—the human is to become divine, and the face of the earth like unto that of heaven. Wonderful is the power of this marvellous book.

II. *It is a Book sadly neglected.*

Realizing the present condition of the masses, the extent and power of evil agencies, the power of Bible truths in the transformation of character and the reformation of bad men, and its capability to dry up all the mighty streams of corruption, it is indeed a wonder that every one claiming to be a patriot, a lover of his country and people, does not cry aloud and shout for a universal and a thorough study of it among the people. Collectively and individually we are weak or strong, foolish or wise, corrupt or righteous in the degree Bible principles sway and control our thoughts and deeds. It is barely possible that your zeal for your country has caused you to wink at some evils or underestimate the power of corruption that threatens its prosperity. Distress, woe, want, with extravagance, avarice, debauchery daily precipitate old men and women, young men and maidens into crime, damnation and death. As long as these facts remain, threatening calamities hang over us, whether we realize

their significance or not. The peril of the earth lies in the fires smouldering at her core. The winds in fury may beat upon her from without, the rains may descend, the thunders may roar, the lightnings may flash, yet she will remain steadfast in her orbit. The danger is in the fire burning at her heart, which every now and then makes continents to quake, rocks to crumble, and threatens to burst open the sides of the planet.* The danger is within herself. Our nation is safe from any foreign foe. No power from without can disturb her tranquillity, but there are elements within consuming her very life. We are in danger, and this danger arises from the want of Bible knowledge among the people. No better condition of things political, social, religious, ever existed than among the Pilgrim Fathers of early colonial times. The Bible was their "Book of books," their counsellor and daily companion. Their numerical and physical strength was not very great when they landed on Plymouth Rock, but their faith in God and the Bible was great. Indeed, that faith is what made it possible for them to cast themselves on the bosom of the trackless Atlantic, and to seek a home among the red savages of America, where they could worship God with hearts sincere. From the point of view of some of the high-sounding critics of to-day some of their notions as to its teachings were crude and unwarranted, but they founded a nation on that blessed Book. Inspired by its truths they faced the most formidable oppression and crushed it. From that small band of people, united in love and faith, trusting in God and the Bible, has sprung the mighty American nation, the cradle of liberty, the asylum of the oppressed, the mother of inventions, the home of genius, the pride of the nineteenth century. Here men of genius and industry, of noble principles and towering aspirations have always been welcomed with open arms, but with

* See Dr. Cynddylan Jones on Matthew.

these entered paupers, criminals, assassins—the scum and stench of older countries—the ignorant, degraded, drunken, whose presence make possible outbreaks of hellish passions that would shake the very foundations of our institutions, our boast and strength. No people are more happy in their educational advantages than we are; but no amount of secular education can make up for the want of Bible knowledge among the people. Scientific intelligence is good only when supplemented by Bible intelligence. Indeed, true science is the handmaid of true religion. On the west of England dwells a little people, not pre-eminent in secular knowledge, but remarkably and confessedly so in scriptural knowledge. The nineteenth century presents no people superior in social purity and stalwart Christianity. The most important piece of furniture in their homes is a Welsh Bible. Their literature is very extensive and elaborate, covering all branches of useful knowledge, and the language has never been prostituted to the use of infidelity. There is not an infidel book in it. The Bible is the national textbook. In its pages do these people learn “how to get along in the world,” and their highest ideal of life “worth the living” is a life in conformity with its teachings. In recent years several of their jails have been found empty, and their district court a thing of leisure. It is estimated that over three quarters of a million of these people now inhabit these glorious United States; and you have never heard of a Welsh voter or a Welsh party clamoring for political preferment, and seeking it by means of the infernal saloon and the cursed grog-shop. The majority of our brewers, saloon-keepers, and Sabbath desecrators hail from the realms of boasted intellectual superiority and higher criticism. The descendants of the ancient Britons love their Bibles at home, consequently on removing to America it is natural and easy for them to assimilate with the American nation, become a part of it, and to lose their own

identity in it. The Sabbath-school is a national institution in Wales, and the Bible in its entirety the national textbook. Whole chapters are committed to memory and recited in concert or responsively, and the minister in charge catechises them in the whole chapter verse by verse. A Sabbath, sometimes a week day, is given to such exercises once in two or three months. The Sabbath-school is not an infant school with them, but a Bible school for all grades and ages. Children are born into it, and born again in it, and enter glory from it.

These words may seem strong, but they are not stronger than the truth they convey. My purpose in using them is not so much to show what the people do for the Bible as what the Bible does for the people. They are more loyal to English laws than the English themselves—not because they have any special love for the English or think the laws always just, but because they believe in the Bible and in a just God who in the fulness of time will reward the righteous and punish the doers of iniquity. Understand me, I am not undervaluing the excellent services rendered by Americans to the advancement of Bible truths. More is expected of you than of any other people. With the good and the great the heathen of all nations are cast on your shores in tremendous numbers every year, and they prove a source of great danger to the very people that give them asylum. You must fill their mouths with bread and their souls with the bread of life. The Bible must be put in their hands and in their hearts. With the increase of this heterogeneous class of emigrants there is a growing disrespect for and hatred of the Bible, and intrigue and licentiousness build their castle in the very heart, and send their influence of evil to every fibre of the body politic. In their implications they overshadow all else. No question connected with the civilization, the commercial interests, the religious advancement of the people can be examined and investigat-

ed that these evils are not encountered. They are present everywhere. We meet them at every point. They challenge the civil laws and silence the voice of the Gospel. The riots in Pittsburg in 1877, in Cincinnati in 1884, in the Hocking Valley in 1885, in Chicago in 1886, in the coke regions of Pennsylvania in 1891, in Homestead in 1892 sounded the tocsin of alarm. Passions waxed hot, the cannons of hell thundered, devastation leaped from their smoky mouths, fire consumed property, the blue face of the sky blushed in crimson, and the earth quenched her thirst with human blood. Crimes are committed under the very eye of the law; men deliberately murder whole families for the small sum paid for their bodies at the dissecting-room of a medical college; \$900,000 are annually spent for the liquid that kindles the fires of hell in the human heart—twice as much as the cost of bread for the whole nation; sixteen times as much as is spent for the promulgation of Christianity and Bible knowledge. Who is safe under the shades of night in any of our large cities, or even in our smaller towns or country hamlets? This is the land of the free and the home of the brave—the “Home, sweet home” of the poet; but it is a “sweet home” only as long as an open Bible is read, studied, and understood. Banish the Bible and anarchy is triumphant. An infidel may not be a professed anarchist, but an anarchist is always a professed infidel; and an anarchist in his bitterest extreme is only an infidel drawn out and developed to his highest—rather lowest—capacities. The difference between infidelity and anarchy is not in quality, but in quantity; not in principle, but in the degree that that same principle is developed in two individual men. Anarchy finds its germs in infidelity; infidelity finds its culmination in anarchy. Infidelity manufactures the weapons, while anarchy hurls the deadly darts and plunges humanity in woe, fire, and blood. Society is sadly out of joint. No instrument of less power than the

omnipotent Word of God can rectify the mischief. Social science, ethical question, and the like are all good as playthings for philosophers, but for a thorough renovation of the social classes and the readjustment of individual rights the open Bible sanctified of God alone is sufficient. In Chicago, the great central commercial metropolis of the land, anarchy has assumed such tremendous proportions that it has become a balance of power in political circles. Only by the united efforts of the best citizens has political supremacy been snatched from its claws. Should the law-making power fall into the hands of those who maintain that the law is a curse, and the preserving of peace and order to those who constantly seek to destroy peace and order, then the proud city would sink out of sight. The anarchists are anarchist because the incandescence of God's love has not touched their hearts and opened their eyes to better and higher things. The medium of undulation (?) is the Bible, and they know it not. Their fragmentary scientific intelligence is their curse and the nation's curse. Call any one of them to a court of justice and he will protect himself from a charge of perjury by refusing to take an oath on the plea that he does not believe in God. Can you trust property, personal rights, life, and all that is dear to us to such persons? No. For truthfulness, justice, integrity you must look to them who believe the Bible and live according to its precepts. Such are the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Of them are justice and righteousness honored. A little maid of only nine years of age was at one time called as a witness in court. The counsel for the defence objected to her on the ground that she did not understand the nature of an oath. The judge said: “Let us see.” He kindly called her to him and tenderly asked if she had ever sworn. Thinking that he meant taking the name of the Lord in vain, she withdrew from him with a shudder. The good judge saw his mistake. Again he

called her to him and asked if she knew what the Word of God was. Her eyes brightened as she meekly said: "Yes, sir." "What will become of you if you do not tell the truth?" "Jesus will be grieved at me." "Did any one tell you anything about how you should testify in this court?" "Yes, sir; mamma talked to me about it last night, read and explained the Ten Commandments, and prayed that I might be guided in telling the truth regardless of what may become of me." "Are you determined to do that?" said the judge, while a tear glistened in his eye and his lips quivered with emotion. "Yes, sir," said the child with a voice and a manner that showed her devotion to the truth. Said the judge: "God bless you, my child, you have a good mother. Were I on trial for my life, and innocent of the charge against me, I would pray God for such a witness." Turning to the counsellor he said: "She knows what she is about; let her testimony be taken." S. H. Hammond, formerly editor of the *Albany State Journal*, who was an eye-witness at that court, and who gave the facts to the world, said: "Falsehood and perjury had preceded her testimony. The prisoner had entrenched himself in lies till he deemed himself impregnable. Witnesses had falsified facts in his favor, and villainy had manufactured for him a sham defence. But before her testimony falsehood was scattered like chaff. The little child for whom a mother had prayed for strength to be given her to speak the truth as it was before God, broke the cunning devices of matured villainy to pieces like a potter's vessel. The strength her mother prayed for was given her, and the sublime and terrible simplicity—terrible, I mean, to the prisoner and his associates—with which she spoke was like a revelation from God Himself." Contrast her testimony with the testimony of him who claims that he does not believe in God. We sadly need men of her stamp—men imbued with Bible truths on the bench, at the bar, on the witness-stand

in the courts of to-day. They alone are capable to administer justice. The safety and perpetuity of the republic depend on such men. The glory of the nation, the safety of life, the protection of home, the future possibilities of the race of man, unite their tender and pathetic appeals that this Book of books shall not be neglected.

III. *It is also a Book greatly and shamefully abused.*

In this age of keen, intelligent, and searching investigations of the truths or the errors at the bottom of creeds, systems, dogmas and standards, it is very important that we make ourselves very familiar with the Bible itself, lest happily we build on insecure foundations. There are no standards of equal importance with the Bible. Should we discover that any author perverts willingly or inadvertently any truth or dogma of the Bible, we cannot give him the respect or attention that he may claim. Some dogmatists may consider themselves called upon to support what they term "standards," but as intelligent and conscientious Christians we must stand committed to the notion that the Bible alone is infallible in matters of faith and conduct. Cheerfully, thankfully, enthusiastically do we welcome every suggestion from every source that will enable us to understand better and clearer what God says to us in the Bible. With profound reverence and humbleness do we bow to Luther and Calvin, Wesley and Whitefield, Hodge and Beecher, Patton and Briggs. We easily recognize and cheerfully acknowledge their superior ability, but we cannot regard them as on equality with Paul, Peter, and James, and their associates. When we speak of standards we refer to the inspired writers of the Bible. It is not necessary that we know what Luther or Calvin, Wesley or Whitefield, Beecher or Briggs may have said, but it is of prime importance that we know and understand what Paul and John and James have said regarding man's duty and obligation in the face of God's love revealed in Jesus

Christ. Whatever of brilliancy of intellect or thoroughness of learning possessed by the higher critics of the Bible of to-day, or of the piety and keen consciences of the dogmatists of the past, they have not the same claim upon us as the men specially called and pre-eminently fitted for the transmission of God's thoughts to human speech. That Calvin and Beecher, Luther and Wesley, and other equally eminent men were inspired, we doubt not, but for a purpose other than that for which the writers of the Bible were inspired. Blackstone was inspired to write his commentaries on the laws of England, but not in the sense that Moses was inspired as the oracle of the living God to deliver the Decalogue to Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai, which is both the foundation and culmination of all moral and civil laws. Blackstone became a standard because he recognized Moses as superior to himself, and attempted to build on the foundation laid by him. Had he undervalued Moses and undertook to substitute his own notions, he would not have found his way to the majority of the colleges and universities of the nineteenth century, but with others would have been buried in oblivion long ago. Ingersoll is a standard of nothing but of ridicule. The Bible is misused when dogmatists and critics utilize its truths in substantiation of some fancy notions and pet theories of their own, and insist on what ought to be from their point of view instead of what is from God's point of view. The Bible in its individual entity as a revelation of God's love, to the end that men may be saved from sin in this life and be prepared to enter the joys of the life to come, is often lost sight of by them, and sometimes denied. Extremists on either side do much to arrest the progress of truth. We welcome all dogmas if they are God's dogmas, and hail with gladness all criticisms that are truly honest, candid, discriminate, scholarly, and given in the fear and in the love of God. Unless they are so we have no need for them. For those men who as-

sume to know the mind and will of God better than Himself, and count all as fools and idiots who venture to judge for themselves and dissent from their views, we have but very little respect. The Bible is more than a dogmatic statement of religious truth: it is also the infallible illuminator of that truth. It inspires the thoughtful and prayerful reader with hopes and aspirations that lift him up on the wings of faith to realms above all doubt and fear, where he holds communion with God as friend with friend. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Let us familiarize ourselves with the truths of the Bible. They are given for the instruction and encouragement and redemption of all men in all conditions of life, and it is reasonable to suppose that common humanity is possessed of intelligence sufficient under God's blessing to understand and appreciate them. What our very critical age needs is a greater number of humble and honest learners, and fewer theorists and so-called critics. The Bible is a lamp and a light to all in all conditions of life, and it should not be abused.

IV. *It inspires all believers to Christian activity and consecration.*

The inactivity, indifference, coldness, formality that are so often seen and felt are evidences that the Bible is not read and studied and prayed over to the degree that is commensurate with the demands and privileges of the age. Ignorance in Bible truths is a barrier against the progress of Christ's kingdom in the world and against the progress of individual Christians in the kingdom. The Bible is a universe of thoughts, and each thought a world gleaming in the sunshine of God's revelation. It is our duty and privilege to place ourselves so as to receive that flood of light as it comes from the heart of God in the grandeur and glory of its prismatic colors. No dogma can serve its highest purpose to man till that dogma is the experience of his own soul. When the power of the truth is felt in the heart, the power of the man

is felt in the community. The man whose knowledge of Bible truths is imperfect must of necessity lead an imperfect Christian life. I have read somewhere a little story like this: During a great storm at sea a glass was blown from a window of a lighthouse. There was no time to put in a new glass, and something had to cover the space or the light would go out. So a piece of tin was substituted. The lamp burned brightly. It shed its lustre to the right and to the left, but no light penetrated through the tin. It threw a black shadow over a great part of the ocean, and that shadow became wider and wider the farther it reached out to sea, till it lost itself in darkness. Vessels were struggling for life in that shadow, and because of it were wrecked. So I regard the Christian who has but an imperfect knowledge of the Bible. He may give out great light in some directions. He may give liberally for the support of the Gospel; he may pray long and loud; he may be present in all meetings, but there is something in his character that represents the tin in the lighthouse, which casts a shadow on the world, and souls are lost because of it. Unless men know the truths of the Bible they cannot be very expeditious in leading souls to Christ. Why is Mr. Moody such a mighty instrument in the salvation of men? He is not a learned man according to the common acceptation of that term. No, but he is learned in the Bible. He is well acquainted with its truths. He handles these with ease, and hurls them against the strongholds of sin. He brings the sinner to feel that there is an all-sufficient Redeemer from all sin in Jesus Christ, and with his wonderful way of using Bible truths and precepts he assists that poor trembling sinner to give his hand and place it in the omnipotent hand of Christ to be led by Him through life. "But," you say, "every man cannot be a Moody." True; but every man can have his Bible, and can read it over again and again and again till its truths will have become a part of him-

self. Then he can use it according to the ability God has given him. By so doing he will fortify himself in the truths of the Gospel, and carry conviction and salvation to the hearts of his friends. The most insignificant man in the community, with the truths of the Bible burning in his soul, can do mighty things in the tearing down of the strongholds of sin, and the building up of the kingdom of Christ. Let us make the most of the Bible. It is the best gift of God to man.

AGENTS IN EVIL ACCURSED.

By REV. J. F. MIXON, D.D. [M. E. SOUTH], ELBERTON, GA.

And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.—Gen. iii. 14.

THESE words bring us face to face with a question which has been a puzzle of the ages. Human thought has been kept busy, and speculation, on tireless wing, has sought to compass the mighty problem as to the *how* and by what special agency the *fall* of the first human pair was brought about. Every field of probable and improbable conjecture has been upturned by the ploughshare of patient investigation, with a view to the solution of the problem.

A wide harvest, the fruit of earnest toiling speculatists, waves in beauty all about us; but little if any of it has been or can be converted into life-giving food for immortal souls—souls ever craving yet never satisfied. Whether the agent of Satan, in the work of man's moral overthrow, was some being of seraphic beauty or a veritable serpent of the reptile species remains, and will doubtless ever remain, a mystery, like the "mystery of godliness," too deep for human solution. Still it is natural, and, as I think, in no sense improper to speculate along this and kindred lines

of inquiry. I do—we all do so to a greater or less extent. We all have our opinions—have a right to them. As for myself, I do not believe that the agent of the devil in the consummation of this first of earth's tragedies was a member of the baboon family. I do not believe it belonged to any one of the serpent races, unless, indeed, the curse accompanying or following upon the heels of the diabolical act wrought a hideous transformation in the nature and aspect of its original being. In fact, I have doubted—still doubt—whether serpents, as we now style the whole reptile species, are specimens of primeval creation. I feel sure in the light of Bible teaching, as I understand it, that there are creatures innumerable now upon earth that are the spawn of SIN. A part of the primal curse was that the earth should “bring forth thorns and thistles,” which is suggestive of the inference that these plants were not in existence as the result of an original act of creation. If so in the vegetable, why not also true in the animal kingdom?

It is claimed and stoutly maintained by some—I do not accept the theory—that there was no rain prior to the deluge, therefore no rainbow. It is held that after the waters were dried up and Noah and his family were come out of the ark, God made a covenant with him and “set His bow in the clouds” as a pledge of fulfilment. So God, upon the consummation of man's overthrow, and in view of the Divine purpose to redeem him, may have created, or permitted to come into being, the loathsome, crawling, deadly reptile, the sight of which might prove a perpetual reminder to man of the sly, insidious, subtle, devilish character of the great serpent, the arch-foe of God and man. There are objections, I know, to this as well as to all other purely speculative views, and I do not, therefore, attach any special importance to them; because we are told that there are countries, or portions of countries, where serpents are not found; and we know

that there are other reptile tribes equally abhorrent to mankind.

Why, then, it may be asked, these speculations at all? I simply reply, They start and exercise the powers of inquiry, broaden fields of thought, and thus do good—answer a wise purpose—although for heart change and life betterment they may profit little.

But there are questions for consideration more important than these. They are involved in the text, are at issue before us to-day. When one has had a serious fall and is in pain in consequence thereof, there are more important questions calling for his consideration than the name or physical form of the agent which caused his fall. Can he rise up again? How? Through what means? Is there a remedy for his hurt? are to him far more important subjects of inquiry. These he should consider as of first importance, and seek to solve them, always remembering that “Secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but the things which are revealed belong unto us and our children forever, that we may do all the words of the law.”

Now there are some lessons along this line taught in the text which every one of us would do well to consider. And,

I. Agents in evil shall not escape punishment.

The blow may be suspended, the day of vengeance may tarry, but the penalty of sin *must* be met and suffered sooner or later. True in the case presented in the text; true in every case. This agent, whatever it may have been, as the emissary and tool of the arch-tempter, felt the lightning stroke of God's avenging judgment. And the world is not left to the speculation of vain philosophies to discover the reason. God gives it in the text. It is plain and simple. There need be, there *can* be, no mistake about it. “Because thou hast done this” (become a partner in this deed of guilt) “thou art cursed.”

“Why cursed?” you ask, saying, by way of extenuation, and in bar of judgment, “It was but an inferior being, in

the power and under the control of some malignant though far superior order of intelligence." And suppose I should ask you, "How do you know this?" Could you tell me? "Cursed!" Why cursed? Because an agent in a deed of evil. Sin affects and curses everything which comes in contact with it—at least everything in league with it. For aught you or I know, it may be that, as Adam was the representative—the embodied manhood of the whole human race in the finer elements of the material and the spiritual—so this "accursed" creature, whatever it may have been, sustained a sort of federal headship to the whole brute creation—all in the lower realms of being, whether beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes of the sea, or creeping things. You do not know. I do not know. But we all do know that through *sin* and because of it "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now." We know and feel the fact, although we may stand dumb in the presence of the mystery which veils the agencies and processes which led to the "curse." We know and feel enough to force home upon mind and heart the conviction, the fact that every agent of Satan is a partaker of Satan's punishment.

The human body suffers. Why? Because it is an agent of the depraved nature within. Look at that manly form steeped in the foul odors of loathsome disease; see the body of the debauchee, all spotted with the leprosy of sin; behold the man bloated and scorched by fires hissing hot from the cups of debauch, his eyes bleared, his limbs quaking in the throes of delirium. Behold and shudder at the soul-harrowing sight. "Does that poor, innocent body suffer?" you ask. Stand silent, while signals of distress from his every feature voice the answer. Are you sorry for the "poor drunkard"? Well, let me ask, did you help to make him such? Did you, by your influence or example, spread the net before him? Did you, by your voice or vote, open

the gates of temptation and invite him to enter? If so, repent, for sooner or later, in the light of the text, the curse will come.

What has the body done that it should suffer so? Done nothing of itself; for of itself it can nothing do. But it is and has been what the serpent was—the agent of a fearful, misdirecting power from within or without. The body, self-moved, never goes amid scenes of debauch or to halls of sinful revelry. The nature within says "Go," and going, it incurs its share of the curse involved in the sinful act. In this view, no doubt, Paul exhorts: "Neither yield your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." The soul sinning, and making the body its agent and instrument, both together are involved in the curse and condemnation. Hence Christ forewarns men: "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." So intense is God's abhorrence of sin that He ordained that the ox which gored a man should suffer the death penalty. And His special wrath, hottest displeasure, will be visited upon those who, like Jeroboam, made Israel to sin, who seduce others to become partakers with themselves in deeds of evil. Hell's fires will flame more fiercely for some than for others, because not only the fuel of their own sins will kindle about them, but that of the sins of others whom they, as the busy agents of the devil, have led on down to destruction. Better, far better, for these instigators to evil had a millstone been hanged about their necks and they drowned in the depths of the sea. "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed."

II. *The serpent was cursed above others.* "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." And the reason *why* is given—given in the first verse of the chapter from which the text is taken. Because it was "more subtle

than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." It had more wisdom, richer endowments—at least on some lines—than others. Thus we are taught that God curses not only for the wrongdoing, but in proportion to the light and knowledge, in opposition to which and in spite of which the wrongdoing is committed. The curse was not inflicted because of the superior knowledge—for God had bestowed this—but because it was employed and abused in the accomplishment of base and unlawful purposes.

This creature, whatever it may have been, was a shrewd, cunning, and, we may suppose, willing accessory of Satan in his diabolical conspiracy against the well being of man, and therefore brought down the curse of God upon itself, and by proxy upon the whole brute creation. This conclusion seems justified by the words of our God with reference to the transaction: "Because thou"—the most subtle of all the beasts—"hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field." Here the punishment inflicted, both in character and degree, was in harmony with the nature and reason of things, and according to all the movements of the Divine economy. "For that servant which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." "Think ye that the Galileans, whose blood Pilate mingled with his sacrifices, or the eighteen upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, were sinners above all Galileans? I tell you, nay; but except ye"—you who have had greater light and superior advantages—"repent, ye shall likewise perish." God curses according to talents bestowed and opportunities enjoyed, but neglected and abused. Responsibility is in exact proportion to gifts and capabilities conferred. Would that all men were filled with a burning consciousness of this grand fundamental truth. Wisdom—power

to conceive and to execute—is a fearful bestowment, because it brings with it fearful responsibility; opens the way to higher heights of blessedness or deeper depths of wretchedness and despair. "Be ye wise as serpents." Wisdom, high mental endowments, large acquired stores of knowledge, widen spheres of influence for either good or evil, and must, therefore, in the reason and nature of things, reap richer rewards or fiercer maledictions, according to the direction in which these powers are left to expend their forces. A man of masterful mind, of marvellous native or acquired gifts, wields a sceptre of magical influence; power to kill or make alive, to lift to heavenly heights or sink to hell's lowest depths. As the reward is richer in the one case, so the curse is deeper and more dire in the other. Proof of the fact grows out of the very nature and constitution of things, to say nothing of any apparent overruling superhuman agency. Thus a delicate, high-toned mental organism is more sensitive to the touch of either pain or pleasure than is a man of duller brain or coarser material fibre. The lyre of the poet, under the inspired touch of genius, gives forth sweetest music or wails in tones of plaintive sorrow; but the man of shallow, untutored brain sees and feels nothing at which to either rejoice or weep, nothing which brings him into sympathy with either the poet's joy or sorrow. Therefore, unless the wisdom of the serpent is joined in loving wedlock with the innocency of the dove, it is better to be a fool than wise, as the world accounts wisdom.

Dr. Henry, the great commentator, says: "Unsanctified subtlety often proves a great curse to a man; and the more crafty men are to do evil the more mischief they do, and, consequently, they shall receive greater damnation. Subtle tempters are the most accursed creatures under the sun." Are these strong deliverances true? According to the tenor of Scripture and the teaching of the text they are. Then terrible must be the judgment and hot

the displeasure of God against those who employ intellect, wealth, social position, and the seductive arts of fashionable life to beguile weaker companions into the indulgence of sinful pleasures under the serpent's specious plea that such are the gateways to respectability and the circles of good society. Respectability! Good society! How long till mankind will learn that

"Virtue alone gives nobility to blood"?

The serpent crawls upon Brussels carpets, and his snaky scales flash like diamonds in the brilliant lights which bathe the thoughtless revellers in bewitching splendor. The curse, the curse, the slime of the curse, is found in the serpent's trail! Put on robes of splendor; plant gardens of odorous flowers upon brow and bosom; pour forth costly wines into golden goblets; "eat, drink, and be merry." So whispers the asp of hell, who often basks and suns himself amid all this painted glory. Oh, day of judgment! when masks will fall off, when disguises will be torn open, and not even fig leaves shall be found with which to hide the world's nakedness! In that tremendous day where will deceivers stand—those who have employed time and talents in weaving webs of sceptical and godless philosophy with which to entrap and destroy the unwary? Where will such be found? Can they stand at all? "Evil men and seducers," "deceiving and being deceived," how can they escape the curse of the Almighty—escape the "damnation of hell"? The Bible being true, they cannot escape. These, with all others, who either by precept or example "pervert the Gospel of Christ," shall be accursed eternally from God; and the curse, like the curse upon the serpent, shall be measured out according to their capacity and deeds of evil, whether of omission or commission.

III. *The degradation, the abjectness of the curse.*

The text sets this forth also: "Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt

thou eat all the days of thy life." The greater the elevation, the more crushing the fall. Adam fell from the sunlit heights of the Divine peace and favor into the starless night of spiritual death. Satan fell from a high rank among the hierarchies of heaven down to this little globe. And it is thought that a part of his punishment was to be shut up as to his operations in evil to this single sphere. If so, what a check to an ambition which aspired to nothing short of the thrones and dominions of God Himself! What a fall! "Upon thy belly shalt thou go." Thou shalt crawl through the narrow boundaries of this little ball, licking the dust till the cup of thine iniquity shall be full, and hell's chambers shall be prepared for thy eternal prison house! Again it is supposed that his conquest over man, in the persons of Adam and Eve, shut off from the devil the last ray of hope as to future reinstatement into the favor of offended Jehovah. As if God had said: "Thou hast made a final, hopeless plunge. Now hear thy doom: Dust thou shalt eat all the days of thy life. Thou lovest the dust, the low, the grovelling, the base; now feed, feed forever upon that for which you ever hunger, but which shall never satisfy."

This may seem like imagination, mere speculation; and so it is in part; but how it harmonizes with the teachings of the Word! See that hideous creature as it moves with sinuous folds prone upon the earth. Whether it belongs to the seed of the accursed agent in the tragedy of Eden I know not—the world knows not—but humanity accepts it as a fitting representative of the arch-tempter and of those whose souls grovel in the dust endeavoring, though vainly, to satisfy their immortal longings with the baubles of a dreaming day. The Bible is full of declarations and illustrations to the point. The multitudes whose "god is their belly," "who live after the flesh," "who mind earthly things," what do they but "lick the dust like a serpent, and pant after the dust of the earth"?

KNOWING AND BELIEVING.

BY REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS, B.A.
[CONGREGATIONALIST], LONDON, ENG.

I know whom I have believed.—2 Tim.
i. 12.

THAT is a suggestive utterance of our Lord when, in describing the great Forerunner, He asks, "What went ye out for to see; a reed shaken with the wind?" The question carried with it its own answer. No man of such a type ever did move the hearts of men as John had roused his generation. *The man who is a force in the world must have force in himself.* Without clearness of thought and strength of conviction there can never be that glow of enthusiasm or that fulness of sympathy without which there is no widespread and enduring influence. The world is not likely to receive a Divine message unless the messenger delivers it out of the fulness of his own faith.

In this we have the real secret of Paul's wonderful power as a preacher. What oratorical gifts he may have possessed we know not. His enemies seem to have described him as "in speech contemptible," but there are facts which suggest that this was the malignant caricature of faction. The man who could arrest the attention of scoffing philosophers on Mars' Hill, on the one hand, and move the rude idolaters of Lycaonia that they were ready to worship him as a god on the other, must have had gifts of reasoning and eloquence. But it was not in them that he found his power. Its secret is told here. With no uncertain, faltering, hesitating tone did he address himself to the people. He had received a Gospel—a Gospel which admitted no rival, a Gospel in which was the full revelation of God's love to the world. Woe, therefore, was unto him if he preached it not.

And as with his public declarations, so, also, with his private experiences. Christ lived in him, spoke through him, inflamed his zeal, fired his courage. There was nothing impossible to him

so long as Christ strengthened him. It is not in occasional outbursts of zeal and devotion, more or less frequent, that we trace that surrender of his whole nature to Christ, which is characteristic of him. It is wrought into the very texture of his soul, so that whatever the conditions under which he is, the subject on which he speaks, the experience he records, it is manifest that for him to live is Christ. If his human heart ever whispered to him suggestions of another kind, if he was tempted to think of what he might have won as the pampered favorite of the Jewish hierarchy, and what he was as the apostle of a sect everywhere spoken against, prematurely worn out and waiting a martyr's death, if doubt sometimes whispered to him who had reposed his hope in Christ that he was of all men most to be pitied, and if all the circumstances of his lot seemed to confirm the suggestion, if its cruel thought were echoed from the prison walls as in mocking tones of demoniac laughter, the answer was still the same. Calm, confident, undoubting it comes: "I know whom I have believed."

The nature of Christian trust. I say *Christian* trust, not merely Paul's trust, because the belief or trust here spoken of is one that is common to all Christians. The faith which Paul exercised is possible to all who seek this gift from God, and the force and joy which Paul realized through it are reached only by those who have the faith.

The point which strikes us most here is the personal character of this trust, "I know whom." How marked the difference between this and "I know what I have believed!" No one had more carefully thought out his creed or was more prepared to defend it. Paul was a theologian. The enemies of the faith are very fond of taunting him on this ground. At least we may admit that there is no writer of the New Testament who has discussed the great doctrines of the Gospel in a more careful and exhaustive manner. He is the last, therefore, who would undervalue the

importance of sound teaching. But sound teaching is, after all, only the means to an end. He knew how false conceptions as to the Divine government and man's relations to it might hinder the approach of a soul to Christ; how a vain confidence in the law of Moses might be a hindrance to faith in Jesus; how impossible it was for a man to have a full and simple trust in Christ so long as he had not sounded the depths of sinfulness in his own heart; how certain he would ever yield himself up to Christ until he had learned the full story of that Infinite Love in which Christ gave up Himself for the salvation of men. Therefore he did not fail continually to insist upon these truths—truths which, when welded together and adjusted in their proper relations to each other, become a system of theology.

A right conception of Christ Jesus the Lord, His person, His work, His place in the Divine economy, is of importance, but it is quite possible to have this theological correctness and to be without the true knowledge of Christ. There may be orthodox opinions which have not the slightest influence on the heart—are no more to him who holds them than correct views as to the laws of science. Theology may be studied as a science, and the heart left as much outside the sphere of its influence as is the case with the student who inquires into the age of the world or discusses the theory of evolution. Theologians or so-called theologians of this type are not unknown. They are familiar with theories and expert in argument. They can trace the history of particular heresies and exhibit the actual dangers with which they are fraught. Their reason is logical, and they have satisfied themselves that they are infallibly right; but hardness of temper, the severity of judgment, the unsympathetic coldness which show that their own soul has never been touched by the constraining power of that love, whose grand achievements and glorious messages they map out with so much precision and coolness in their endeavor to have

a complete system, remind us of the Pharisee in his most repulsive aspects.

But is there not some danger that in the condemnation of men of this temper it may be forgotten that there are theologians of another order, stern enough in their maintenance of what they regard as orthodoxy, and yet broad and generous in their personal sympathies, even with those whom they esteem in error? And is it not possible, also, that in the indulgence of the antagonism to theologians we may at times lose sight of the real value of theology? Our creed about Christ may be very simple, but yet we must have some idea of Him whom we trust and love, and of the reason why we trust.

The assurance which the trust gives.
The language of the text is very strong and far-reaching. "I am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him until that day." This is no mere piece of rhetoric—one of those fervid declarations of loyalty and love in which an intense and ardent spirit might indulge without expecting that every one of its phrases would be subject to severe analysis. Rather is it an avowal of the ruling principle of Paul's life, the certain ground of Paul's hope. To the Christ in whom he believed he had committed his entire being. If Christ failed him he had nothing left. Christ, then, was to him a reality, and the persuasion that He could and would do all that he hoped or asked for from him was simply invincible. If it could have been shaken it must have yielded before them. Years of trial, suffering, hard toil, cruel persecution, had passed since first he heard the voice that called him, and after the experience of it all his persuasion was firmer that it was a heavenly vision which he had obeyed, and that nothing could separate him from the love of God in Christ Jesus which had then been revealed to him. He had been taught to know Him, and in that knowledge, fed by constant fellowship, had grown up this blessed as-

surance that having Christ he had everything.

The conditions under which our spiritual life is developed and strengthened are the same as those under which Paul attained this heroic grandeur of Christian confidence. With us as with him, the foundation is faith in Christ, not faith in a religion, or a Church which bears His name, not faith in any creed which professes to embody, and which possibly does embody, the Scriptural teachings about Christ, but faith in Christ. Men may sneer at it--are pretty sure to sneer at it; but to us, as to Paul, it must be the foundation of true and holy character, the source of all power, the one condition of all spiritual blessedness. "I know whom I have believed."

The knowledge of Christ which this faith gives is eminently practical, and at the same time full of encouragement and strength. It makes the heart to glow with enthusiasm, but in that enthusiasm there is nothing of idle sentiment. It is the enthusiasm which keeps before the soul the loftiest ideals, nerves it for a daring which the world would pronounce foolhardy, sustains it amid delays and difficulties which might well crush out its life, fires it with a zeal which only becomes the more intense because of apparent failures and defeats. To know Christ is to have a guide to whom all questions of duty are ever referred, and in obedience to whose will our life is shaped; is to be full of a passionate desire to please Him and to do His will, which operates as the master force in the formation of character; is to have a mighty power within constraining to goodness, helping us to conquer all selfishness, and bringing the very thoughts of the heart into captivity; is to rejoice in the assured rest of the soul upon Him who is able to keep what we have committed to Him.

No doubt all this implies a large measure of trust in Him. A weak faith cannot have this knowledge, and weakness of faith is, alas! only too common. Men take up a profession of Christian-

ity without clearly perceiving what it means. Whatever our ideal, it is pretty certain that many will fall below it. What I complain of is that with numbers the ideal is so imperfect. Too often we meet with those who seem to regard a Christian life as little more than the cultivation of morality as morality is practised by those who would preserve a reputation for respectability. To them this talk of knowledge of Christ is unreal and dreamy. It is hard for them to believe it sincere, or if they admit this in a few cases they regard it as a special experience of eminent saints—a select body to which they do not belong, and, if the true inwardness of their hearts was laid bare, do not desire to belong. There could be no more fallacious idea than this—that in the Church of Christ there is a spiritual aristocracy, a select company of the "religious," holding a position altogether apart from the multitude, who may be content with a much more limited range of experience and enjoyment. Alas! it is sufficiently acceptable to a class who would resent the denial to them of the Christian name, who maintain the outward observance of Christian institutions, who, it may be, will even sit down at the Lord's table, but to whom this personal knowledge of Christ is as a sealed book which they are unable to open. They want faith, and possibly they deceive themselves into the idea that this faith has ceased to be an essential of Christian life. In the unsettlement of opinion on many subjects there seems to have grown up in many minds an idea that there is nothing very certain, and that the old conception of life by faith in the Son of God has passed away. Never was it more necessary to reiterate and emphasize the truth that in this knowledge of Christ alone is eternal life. Men may be poor theologians and yet be devout Christians, but they cannot in any right sense be Christians unless they know whom they have believed.

"I know whom I have believed."

Yes, may one say, I know Him, but I am often perplexed by questions on which divines differ, and sometimes wonder which is right. It may be my thoughts about Him are often wrong, as I am sure they are always far below the understanding of His greatness and glory, but I know Him, for my soul felt its need of a Saviour, and He revealed Himself to me. I felt the burden of sin, but when I came to the cross and heard His gracious voice, it was taken away forever. My best, happiest, most joyous hours are those in which I am conscious of His presence. I can conquer temptation, as He strengthens me. Troubles and afflictions are light when He is near me. Nay, I can realize what is meant by the joy that is unspeakable and full of glory when I can live in humble communion with Him. And the joy no man takes from me. No Church has given it; it is not dependent on the soundness of my creed or of any creed. It comes solely from this personal knowledge of Christ. How I got it first, whence it came, I do not stop to inquire; it is sufficient that I have it, and can never lose it, because I know whom I have believed.

STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

THE works of nature are unsatisfying to the artist soul. There is something wanting. Both metre and rhyme are commonly absent. Indeed, the conception with which the whole grand scheme was begun seems to us to be false, or far-fetched. The continents are not square as perfect taste would suggest, the islands lying between are not oblong, the rivers are crooked and not straight, and the seas are not uniform in depth and width. Walk where we may there is nothing beautiful as our innate conceptions of beauty; nothing so sweet as our capacity to enjoy sweetness; nothing so symmetrical as the art ideal which our fancy has builded; nothing so sublime as the colors and clouds and castles of the faculty which denotes these forms to consciousness. Nature's harmony is a minus quality, as may be readily seen in its groupings of contrasted subjects, as light and dark; bitter and sweet; food and poison; flowers and thorns; beauty and deformity; life and death, etc. The works of nature are glorious in perspective, and never fail to give the effect of vastness or that somewhat indefinite quality that we term sublimity, but it loses incalculably when we substitute analysis for synthesis. It is but too true that distance lends enchantment to the subject. It is fair indeed to look upon it in looking we can dispense with the critical faculty. It is an orchestral melody with a line left out; a beautiful

poem whose rhythm is interrupted by columns of star dots; a lovely painting with no clouds above its mountains and no blending of gold and amethyst in its sunset.—*Beard*. (Psalm. cxix. 96.)

MANY Christians are much agitated about the storms which rock the church and the tempests which from time to time beat upon her. They think the ship is going down. They forget that Christ is still in the ship. The disciples might have known that the ship could not go down with Christ in it. Knowing what He was they might have known that He could not come to so meaningless an end. And so may we, knowing that Christ is in the church, be sure that it cannot go down. Our panic is a shame to our faith and an insult to Him. Cæsar at the crisis of his fortunes, being in a storm on the sea, said to his frightened boatmen: "Fear not; you carry Cæsar and all his fortunes." So Jesus says to us: "Fear not; you carry Christ and His kingdom." Let us not be afraid of the storms of science and criticism which seem at times to be against the church; they will only blow the church onward in its course. The Roman general spoke presumptuously, for he was human, and his fortunes might have foundered, and they did. But if we believe that Jesus is divine we know that His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. How glad these disciples would have been if their faith had defied the storm and Jesus had wakened, as He would have, in time to save and praise their trust in Him. May we at last hear not the question, "Where is your faith?" but His gratified commendation of a faith like the centuries, so great as to excite even the wonder of the Master.—*Sprecher*. (Luke viii. 22-25.)

BRETHREN, we must acknowledge that to every man there belongs a certain area in which the thoughts shall have the power to move unrestrained, ample room for the working out of every problem, full, unmolested play of that element we call the personal equation, which is another name for individuality. Liberty! liberty of thought, liberty of investigation, liberty to follow the dictates of the conscience, whether in politics, science or religion, or any other realm of truth, excepting only that we do not trespass upon the liberty of others. Yes, friends, we must come patiently to learn to give wide latitude for the honest differences of opinion, even in sacred things. We claim that around every question, especially around every great question of life and death, and of duty, there is a wide strip of debatable territory. Yes, and just beyond it lies a vast terra incognita which beckons the discoverer to investigate it; unknown fields, for the mines of truth have not yet been fully explored. Now, what shall we do with this debatable territory? Shall we fight over it, make it an awful battle-field of strife? Shall we fence it in and forbid any one to enter it and fly over it the flag of peace and liberty? Protestants we all are here this morning; but what is Protestantism pure and simple? Is it not the protest against the interference in any way of any human power, whether of priest or church council or the Pope of Rome with the God-given liberty of the conscience to act out its convictions of truth and duty?—*Curtis*. (Matt. vii. 1.)

POETRY, philosophy, may see God in the light, but who will find Him for us in the dark? Sin is a fact before us; sorrow is a fact we all have to face; death is a prospect we all have to meet. We must find God in the cloud or we are lost. We do find Him in the cloud at Calvary. There sit was at its worst; sorrow as its saddest, and death ever present. There also, was God bearing our sins, sharing our sorrows, bearing our death. It is not strange that the darkest hour should touch the heart sooner than the brightest day. When the Lord descends to us in a cloud He does more for us than when he shines from afar. There is the sinner's hope. There was a great longing in Moses to see the face of God.

The answer was the coming of God to Moses in a cloud. Don't be afraid of any cloud that will bring the Lord nearer to you.

I confess that by searching you cannot find God out. There are cloud gates that must be passed before you see the glory of the Lord. Don't be afraid of the cloud hovering around you. Before the Lord comes you are afraid of it, but afterward you will have passed out of darkness into light and joy. The words of love spoken in the cloud are better than the rambles in the sunshine. Do you think Moses was less a leader for this personal experience?—*Gibson*. (Ex. xxxiv. 5.)

THE Czar of Russia, when he was crowned, took up his sceptre in the name of Jesus Christ, acknowledging that he ruled only as a subordinate under Jesus Christ. The Emperor of Russia proudly acknowledges his subserviency to this mighty Conqueror. Thiers, late President of the French republic, did the same. The Queen of England has been through all her reign a professionally devoted servant of this victorious person. The subtle face of this conqueror is seen penetrating all the spheres of modern life. His aggressive warfare on the old heathen homes transformed the home until the modern home, where woman is queen and where children are cradled and cultured in love, rises in its beauty and glory. He has transformed governments until to-day, instead of the people being the servants of the kings and the presidents, they are the servants of the people. He has transformed the educational institutions until to-day the poorest and obscurest child has the opportunity of the highest and most finished education. He has transformed commerce until the principles of equity and honesty and fairness are those only which the leaders in the commercial world can adopt, if they wish to hold their supremacy. This conqueror has subdued the world's stony heart and transformed it into a heart of flesh; and to-day imbeciles, lunatics, paupers, unfortunates, the sick and maimed have grand, palatial homes reared for their benefit, to which they can go and there find warmth and care and protection. Such things as charitable institutions would have been laughed to scorn by the world before Jesus Christ came. Christ silenced the scornful laughter, conquered the selfishness of the human breast and then commanded the rich and the strong to build up magnificent homes for the unfortunate classes. And so throughout Christendom we have these noble edifices to-day.—*MacLaurin*. (Rev. vi. 2.)

THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. Patriotism and Partisanship in Politics. "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee."—Psalm cxxii. 6. R. S. McArthur, D.D., New York.
2. The End of the World. "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first," etc.—1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. Joseph A. Seiss, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
3. Christianity and Legislation. "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."—Heb. viii. 10. Henry M. King, D.D., Providence, R. I.
4. Self-Searching. "Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way ever-

lasting."—Psalm cxxxix. 23, 24. Rev. Myron W. Reed, Denver, Col.

5. The Divine Providence in the Sixteenth-Century Movements. "And God said, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it. . . . And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed."—Gen. i. 28 and iii. 15. T. W. Eaton, D.D., Pittsburg, Pa.
6. The Weakness of Protestantism. "For the preaching of the cross is, to them that perish, foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God."—1 Cor. i. 23. Rev. Wayland D. Ball, Baltimore, Md.
7. The Tested Word. "The word of the Lord is tried."—Psalm xviii. 30. C. P. Masden, D.D., Indianapolis, Ind.
8. Clubs and Club-Life. "Let brotherly love continue."—Heb. xiii. 1. Rev. W. W. Wilson, Chicago, Ill.
9. The Duty of the American Voter. "Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."—Matt. xxii. 21. Rev. W. F. Richardson, Denver, Col.
10. Christian Charity and Liberty. "Judge not, that ye be not judged."—Matt. vii. 1. Henry M. Curtis, D.D., Cincinnati, O.
11. The Blessings of a Good Life. "Among whom ye shine as lights in the world."—Phil. ii. 15. M. L. Haines, D.D., Indianapolis, Ind.
12. Arbitration in Labor Conflicts. "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God."—Heb. vi. 1. H. W. Thomas, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
13. How to Make Life Worth Living. "Leaving us an example, that we should follow His steps."—1 Pet. ii. 21. Moses D. Hoge, D.D., Richmond, Va.
14. The Growth of Civil Liberty. "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth," etc.—Isa. xi. 12, 13. Thomas Parry, D.D., New York.
15. The Protestants of 1492. "But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."—Matt. xv. 9. Henry T. McClelland, D.D., Pittsburg, Pa.

Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. An Exemplary Church. ("We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, before our God and Father; knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God."—1 Thess. i. 2-4.)
2. A Consecrated Rich Man. ("And Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver and in gold."—Gen. xiii. 2.)
3. The Persistency of Ambition. ("They therefore, when they were come together, asked him, saying, Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"—Acts i. 6.)

4. **The Destiny of the Church.** ("Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and to the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."—Eph. iv. 13.)
5. **The Source, the Measure and the End of Christian Power.** ("Strengthened with all power, according to the might of His glory, unto all patience and long-suffering with joy."—Col. i. 11.)
6. **The Certainty of Compensation in the Lord's Service.** ("Knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance; ye serve the Lord Christ."—Col. iii. 24.)
7. **The Glamour of Gold.** ("And it came to pass, when he saw the earring and bracelets on his sister's hands, . . . he said, Come in, thou blessed of the Lord; wherefore standest thou without?"—Gen. xxiv. 30, 31.)
8. **National Vainglory.** ("Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked."—Ex. xxii. 16.)
9. **A Mother's Sin and its Consequences.** ("And his mother said unto him, Upon me be the curse, my son. . . . Arise, flee thou to Laban, my brother, to Haran; and tarry with him a few days, until thy brother's fury turn again. . . . This twenty years have I been with thee."—Gen. xxvii. 13, 43, 44; xxxi. 38.)
10. **The Walk of the Many.** ("For many walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is perdition, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame."—Phil. iii. 18, 19.)
11. **A Nation's Irresistible Ally.** ("Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand; for God is with us."—Isa. viii. 10.)
12. **The Advocate of the Oppressed.** ("What mean ye, that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor?"—Isa. iii. 15.)
13. **A Worthy Ambition.** ("We exhort you, brethren, that ye abound more and more, and that ye study [margin, be ambitious; to be quiet, and to do your own business] and to work with your hands."—1 Thess. iv. 10, 11.)

HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

A Word to the Troubled.

Let not your heart be troubled.—John xiv. 1-3.

THESE three verses contain the three great truths of Christianity—God, Christ, and immortality. Here is the perfect antidote for all troubled souls.

1. Ye believe in God. This may be read like the second clause, imperatively: Believe in God. Undoubtedly God the Father is here referred to. The first great truth is the Divine Fatherhood. Our first class of troubles proceed from anxious thoughts about to-morrow and even to-day: the body and its wants present and prospective. For all such anxieties the remedy is a belief in the Fatherhood of God, His love and care for His children—prayer and Providence.

2. Believe also in Me: or, ye believe also in Me. Here Christ the Son and Saviour of men is brought to the troubled soul, for He is the antidote to a second class of anxieties—viz., those which concern the soul itself. All the problems of sin—its penalty,

power, and presence—seek in vain a solution without Him. Memory, conscience, and reason are the foes of the sinner. Evil habit, a corrupt nature, a past of transgression, an anticipation of judgment—all these are the natural Nemesis of sin; and to antidote these troubles Christ is revealed, the Redeemer from every curse brought by sin—our Justifier, Sanctifier, and perfect Saviour.

3. "In my Father's house," etc. A third class of troubles found in connection with the future life—in fact, whether there be a future *life* or not. Christ "brought life and immortality to light." The Father's house is the universe; and Christ taught us that we are now in the lower and inferior rooms. Death to the believer is simply ascending the stairs to the upper and palatial rooms that look out upon eternal prospects, etc. Thus the revelation of God answers to our instinctive longing after immortality. When Shelley's body was burned near Leighorn, it is said that his heart was found in the ashes entire. And this consciousness and craving for

immortality survives all the attempts of men to consume it.

In these three truths all troubles of men meet their perfect solution and solace. God the Father loves and cares for His children. Christ the Son redeems us from the penalty, power, and presence of sin; and a future life and an eternal home compensate all the sorrows of our present life and balance up all its inequalities.

To resume :

The existence of God implies (1) a Creator; (2) a Provider, or Father; (3) a Ruler, or Sovereign.

This answers problems: 1. Of the material universe and its marks of design. 2. Of human history and the harmony of all events with a Divine purpose. 3. Of a final judgment, when all wrongs are righted.

The faith in Jesus as Messiah implies (1) an incarnation of God; (2) an atonement for sin; (3) a mediation between God and man.

This answers: 1. The need of a revelation of God's nature. 2. Salvation from sin. 3. Prayer and assurance of answer.

The doctrine of immortality implies (1) the unity of the whole universe; (2) the dignity of all being; (3) the indestructibility and continuity of all life.

This answers our questions as to: 1. The reality of heaven. 2. The nature of death as a transition. 3. The reunion of souls.

Prophecy.

DAVID BARON, the converted Jew, says prophecy is a stream that narrows down more and more until we come to DAVID. "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots" (Isa. xi. 1). Not a branch, but a little twig, insignificant to human eyes. "He shall be called" not a Nazarene, but a "Nazarite," and from an insignificant place, not even mentioned in the list of towns in Joshua. In verse 10 root is a different word. Compare Isa. liii. 2—

"a root out of dry ground." The first advent; the root which shall stand as an ensign for the people, that is the second advent. (Compare Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.) As Son of David, Christ was the link between the Old and New Testaments. Malachi's prophecy of Christ's coming ends the Old Testament; Matthew's gospel takes up the thread; it is God's last appeal to the Jews, written in Hebrew originally, and issued before the destruction of the city. This is therefore the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, Messiah, Son of David, Son of Abraham. Mary was undoubtedly, like Joseph, of Davidic line. See Luke i. 30-32, "His father David." Enemies surrounded Christ; and had His lineage not been clearly Davidic, He would have been challenged on this ground. His descent from Joseph was taken for granted before His resurrection, not after, when His miraculous conception was declared. In the Talmud it is conceded that Jesus was of David's family. A discussion is found in the Talmud: "He was of the family—the regal family of David" is the reason given why Jesus was leniently dealt with. Eusebius says that the general impression was that Messiah was to arise, and that Domitian caused search to be made, and the only members of the Davidic family found were of Mary's family.

Prophecy, Mr. Baron adds, contains many hints of Messiah's supernatural character and miraculous birth: Micah v. 2, Bethlehem the fruitful. Isa. vii. 14, "A virgin shall conceive." There is no place where this term is used of a married woman; it is the strongest word to hint a supernatural birth. Joel i. 8—here the very word is used that is claimed as the proper word. In Jer. xxxi. 22 a weak woman is represented as compassing a mighty man—the original words are of peculiar force. Compare Isa. ix., where Messiah is represented as "wonderful" all through, beginning, life, and ending.

Note farther particulars. He was to be a man of sorrows. Sold for thirty

pieces of silver (Zech. xi. 13); to give His back to the smiters (Isa. l. 6); it pleased the Lord to bruise Him (Isa. liii. 10). The word bruise means pulverize—grind to dust. "If thou shalt make his soul a trespass offering." Lamb was only offered sacrifice; blood must be shed, death must be vicarious. He was "cut off, but not for Himself"—*i.e.*, prematurely and violently, in the midst of his days. And the manner of His death was a non-Jewish mode: Ps. xxii., "They pierced my hands and my feet;" Zech. xii. 10, "So the soldiers brake not His legs, for a bone of Him was not to be broken; but they pierced His side." And we know, says John, that the "*record is true.*"

The above will give some conception of the remarkable unfolding of Scripture truth under Mr. Baron's teaching. We have never heard Old Testament truth so marvellously and discriminatingly unfolded.

AGAIN we commend to every reader of the HOMILETIC Bernard's "History of the Development of Doctrine in the New Testament"—one of the Bampton Lecture course—as on the whole the most suggestive book on the New Testament within our knowledge. We know no more perfect and exhaustive reply to the assaults of modern criticism, nor any more complete corrective to the loose notions of inspiration. It is, moreover, a splendid example of pure, un-sullied, masterly English; not an unnecessary word or phrase mars the faultless style. It would be a blessing to every minister of Christ and student of theology.

A Missionary Sermon: God's Destination of His People.

For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation to the ends of the earth.—Acts xiii. 47.

Application of scriptural truth may be wider than the legitimate interpreta-

tion. This passage in the prophecy of Isaiah (xlix. 6) is undoubtedly dispensational, and is to be interpreted of the future of Israel. But the Apostle Paul here justifies a wider application of these words to the whole mission of the Church of God to the nations.

The dominant idea of the passage is a Divine destiny for the body of believers. Christ puts it in the Sermon on the Mount with singular brevity and beauty: "Ye are the light of the world," so hath the Lord commanded, "Let your light shine;" "I have set thee to be a light of the nations," etc.

1. This text suggests first the implied truth that the *condition of the nations* without God's Church is one of *spiritual darkness*. This is, in fact, the prevailing figure or form of representation, especially in the Old Testament. "Darkness covers the land and gross darkness the people." It is night *vs.* light—midnight waiting for the dawn. The figures of Scripture are plain and need no explanation; they are illustrations which illustrate—*i.e.*, throw light upon the subject of which they treat.

Darkness suggests to us the absence of light, heat, and life. It is associated with gloom, chill, death, as naturally as the sunshine is associated with light, warmth, and life. Gross darkness at once conveys to us the idea of the reign of ignorance and superstition—error in men's conceptions of God and of all spiritual things.

How is it wherever the Gospel has not gone? There is one unbroken gloom; if the midnight is broken it is owing to the indirect, reflected rays which have struggled through the gloom from remote ages, fragmentary, broken beams of the original revelation made to man in Eden, or the later unveiling of truth on Sinai or at Jerusalem. Men have never been wholly shut out from each other; and as sunlight finds its way through tiny crevices or thick clouds, and relieves darkness which it does not illumine, so truth comes through the crevices of tradition or penetrates even the thick clouds of

idolatry and iniquity and modifies the otherwise deep midnight.

It still remains true that in proportion as men have been shut in to heathenism the midnight gloom has been unbroken. No height of civilization has assured knowledge of the true God. Paul found even at Athens, the centre and shrine of wisdom and philosophy and art, the altar to the unknown god. And from these heights we go down to the deepest and darkest depths of paganism, where the very idea of God, of the soul, of the future life seems to have been obscured and almost obliterated; and all the way down this awful descent we find the reign of spiritual ignorance and superstition to be absolute and despotic.

On the coast of Malabar, in Canara alone are 4041 temples to evil spirits, besides 3682 to other gods. Here, in the very heart of the East Indies, men worship *demons* as deities. Evil spirits have for centuries been held in homage by all classes of Hindus except Brahmins. Even the lowest caste—that of slaves—have been believed to have power to let loose the evil demons upon men, and exorcists have been employed with noisy native drums, charms, and incantations, to drive out the evil spirit. Here is a whole community living in terror of demons, and demons let loose by slaves, and only bound again by the charms of a conjurer.

We go down to the fetich worshippers of Africa, and we find among these most degraded tribes almost precisely similar superstitions. Evil spirits are the terror of the sable sons of Africa. Any plague or pestilence among men or cattle, any blight upon crops, any drought upon streams, calamity of any form, must be attributed to this source. Somebody is possessed—witchcraft is at work. The medicine man is called in. Some innocent party is tainted with suspicion; the *casca* draught must be taken; if it acts as an emetic, the party is innocent; if as a cathartic, he is guilty and must be drowned or burned; and as the medicine man knows that

the poison will act as an emetic or a cathartic according to the strength of the draught, human life is absolutely in his hands and at his mercy. Any man or woman whom it is desired to put out of the way may thus be sacrificed to the jealousy or malice or hate of any designing foe.

Where the Gospel has not gone no knowledge of the true God exists. There may be idols, as among pagans, or none, as among Mohammedans—one god or many, but there is no *true* God. Human passions are incarnated in deity and worshipped. In the court of Jove every lust, every evil attribute of man was lifted to the level of deity and seated on a divine throne. Labor is esteemed drudgery and crowded upon slaves, or woman is made a slave or a beast of burden. Marriage becomes concubinage if not worse. Children are held as of no value, and especially girls; infanticide consequently prevails. Caste divides man from man, etc. Human life is recklessly taken.

II. The text suggests the corresponding truth, that God makes this moral darkness *dependent on disciples for illumination*. God might have employed other means to enlighten ignorance and banish the death shade, but He has not chosen so to do. Preaching the Gospel is a *witness*, and hence implies that the preacher is a saved soul. Angels have not been sinners, and so cannot be redeemed saints or witnesses of Christ's power to save. Hence God's plans for a world's salvation wait for His Church, and cannot reach accomplishment without her co-operation. The selfishness that stays at home and leaves a world to the death shade defeats itself, for that candlestick risks removal that does not send its rays abroad. On the other hand, the endeavor to let our light shine world-wide is sure of blessing, for it is a fulfilling of the Divine destiny of believers.

The text is emphatic; it ascribes to the Church a ministry not only of illumination, but of salvation, and that to the ends of the earth.

III. *The method by which this mission is to be accomplished* is suggested by the figure. Light relieves and removes darkness by simply being planted in the midst of it. The Church has only to shine and to erect her light where darkness reigns; at first her light, however scattered, will relieve the midnight; then, as churches multiply, like lamps set at shorter intervals, they will more and more drive darkness away. We need a *plan* of missions coextensive with the globe. Concentration might make light *intenser* where light is focalized; but we need the widest *diffusion* to relieve darkness we cannot remove; then to multiply mission stations, churches and schools, and so shorten the intervals and multiply the light bearers. This is God's way, and it cannot be improved by man. Everything is to be subordinate to evangelization, and that is to be absolutely world-wide. Let us at once set up God's candlestick in every dark place, and leave to Him who holds the stars in His hands to make the light all-reaching and powerful.

Principles of Giving.—We may find seven principles laid down in Scripture:

1. The willing mind.
2. The covenant with God as the basis (Ps. 1).
3. The altar sanctifying the gift.

4. Giving as unto the Lord—not men.
5. Self-denial as the measure of gifts.
6. Stewardship—all inalienably the Lord's.
7. Prayer and privilege.

ON October 29th, 1892, the *Etruria*, in the midst of a terrible storm that swept the Atlantic from Spain to Greenland, was passing a sailing vessel which was laboring amid the waves. The ship sent up signals asking for her longitude, as she had lost her reckoning and was nearing the Irish coast. As the *Etruria* had just taken her noonday observation, the captain at once ran up signals acquainting the sailing vessel with her exact position. What an illustration of the need of souls that are swept by storms and nearing the rocks and yet have lost their reckoning! And how blessed are those who, having taken their observation, can with certainty answer the vital questions which concern imperilled voyagers!

"ELOQUENCE," said Theremin, "is a virtue." Yes, there must be a man behind the speech. The true orator is the man who has something to say. The mere declaimer is the man who has to say something. What a vast gulf between them!

THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

BY WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

JAN. 1-7.—SOME DEFENDING THINGS TO ENTER THE NEW YEAR WITH.—*Moreover I said unto the king, If it please the king, let letters be given me to the governors beyond the river, that they may convey me over until I come into Judah.*—Neh. ii. 7.

"The king" is Artaxerxes Longimanus, monarch of Persia, son of the great Xerxes of Grecian story, reigning now over the vast Persian Empire about the year 444 B.C.

The "letters" Nehemiah asks of the

king are what now in the far East would be called a firman, a Persian word meaning an order authenticated by the Sultan's own cipher or monogram. Such firman carries with it a particular authority. It is especially assisting and defending as a passport, for it enjoins upon all subordinate authorities, governors of provinces, chiefs of cities, etc., the granting the traveller bearing such firman special protection and all possible help in his journeyings.

"Beyond the river, . . . until I come

into Judah," means that wide, unsettled, and in many places barren stretch of country lying something like four hundred miles beyond the river Euphrates, and reaching to Judea in the Holy Land. It was then, as now, a region crowded with danger. It was not thickly peopled. There were in it great wastes of desert. It was threatening with marauding Bedouin tribes. It was precisely the region where the traveller would most need such authoritative letters authenticated by the sign manual of the great king. Such letters would mean for him water, food, safety from attack, defence from robbery.

This was the occasion of the asking by Nehemiah of such letters from the great king. Something like one hundred and forty years before the great Eastern conqueror, Nebuchadnezzar, had captured Jerusalem, destroyed the wonderful temple which Solomon had built, overthrown the walls of the city, burned its gates, and carried the Jewish people into captivity and to Babylon.

About seventy years thereafter, Cyrus, the Persian king, and conqueror of Babylon, by special decree permitted as many of the captive Jews as should desire to go back to Jerusalem and rebuild their temple. About fifty thousand of them availed themselves of this permission, and returned to Palestine under the leadership of Zerubbabel.

But there were all sorts of difficulties in the way of these returning exiles. Not much was done in the way of the rebuilding of the temple and the ruined city, and the position of the colonists became most desperate.

At length, after another interval of nearly eighty years, another returning colony of captive Jews set out for Jerusalem under the leadership of Ezra. But Ezra also met difficulty. Oppositions of various kinds arose, and sad news of defeat, disorder, and of the still unrisen temple walls and of the still dismantled city came back to the Jews in Babylon.

Nehemiah was a descendant of these captive Hebrews, royal cup-bearer to

this King Artaxerxes, now seated on the throne. He tells us about what just now stirred his heart (Neh. i. 1-4). For what happened about three months after see Neh. ii. 1-6. Now that Nehemiah may make his journey safely and be favored in it he asks of the king this firman—these assisting and defending letters.

Wise man, this Nehemiah. He will brave danger, he will undertake difficult duty, but he will do it shielded from danger as much as possible. There is no bravado about this Nehemiah.

Well, do you not see the parallel? Before us stretches the journey of a new year of nearly four hundred days. What it holds for us you cannot tell any more than Nehemiah, standing there in the Shushan palace and looking off toward Judah, could tell everything the difficult journey might hold for him. But just as Nehemiah could not tell precisely what and how much of danger and of difficulty his journey might hold, but was sure it held somewhat of them in patches of arid desert, in prowling Bedouin banditti; so while you cannot tell precisely what the journey through the New Year holds for you, you are certain that it holds somewhat and somewhere for you things like these—work, trial, temptation, death possibly.

The question is, What defending things, similar to Nehemiah's letters, may we carry with ourselves into and through the journey of the New Year?

The first defending thing is the *historic Christ* as the revelation of the *truth for life*. If we would live rightly we must closely follow His great example.

A second defending is the *indwelling Christ* as the *force* for life. "Where does Jesus live?" asked a missionary once in a mission school. "Please, sir, he lives in our alley now," said a little boy who had found the Saviour. Christ is not simply for heavenly glory in the distance. He is also for our streets, alleys, homes, hearts. Dwelling in these, He is the force for life.

A third defending thing is *prayer* as

the *help* for life. One of Mr. Lincoln's closest personal friends tells this about him: To the remark that he might be sure that in all his cares he was remembered by those who prayed as no man had ever before been remembered, he said, "I have been told so, and I have been a good deal helped by just that thought." Then he solemnly and slowly added: "I should be the most presumptuous blockhead upon this footstool if I for a moment thought that I could discharge the duties which have come upon me in this place without the aid and enlightenment of One who is stronger and wiser than all others." As prayer was help for Mr. Lincoln for his great duties, it is help for every one of us.

The fourth defending thing is the *Bible* as the *guide-book* for life. Said the late Dr. Wayland, President of Brown University, holding in his hand a well-worn Greek Testament, "This book teaches me how to manage a college." That book is direction in any way of life.

The fifth defending thing is a *real resolve* toward an accepted Christ and a high and holy life. Nehemiah was decided toward the journey and the duty. So should we be decided toward Christ, and live for Him. Entering the new year with such defending things, it surely cannot fail to be a happy one.

JAN. 8-14.—BUILDING.—1 Kings. vi. 37, 38.

Within late years there have been discovered in Jerusalem, in the neighborhood of the temple area, vast subterranean quarries. One, describing a visit to these underground quarries, says: "But the most interesting portion was the extreme end of the last chamber. Here were blocks of stone but half quarried, and still attached by one side to the rock. The work of quarrying was apparently effected by a pick-axe with a broad, chisel-shaped end. The stone was extremely soft and pliable, nearly white, and easily worked, but,

like the stone of Malta and Paris, hardening by exposure. The marks of the cutting instruments were as plain and as well defined as if the workman had just ceased from his labor. The mouth of the quarry is but a little below the level of the platform on which the temple stood, making the transportation of the immense blocks of stone a comparatively easy task. The heaps of clippings which lie about show that the stone was dressed on the *spot*, which accords with the account of the building of the temple. And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither, so that there was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building."

And so, silently, because in the first place hiddenly, the majestic temple reared itself.

And in this fact of the silent rearing of the temple, because the stones of it were hiddenly quarried and hiddenly dressed in the places underground and below the area on which the finished temple stood—in this fact there is signal illustration of a great principle of life. There is a hidden, withdrawn realm in every one of us, where life is getting itself chiefly shaped.

"Not e'en the truest heart, and next our own,
Knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh."

"Do noble things, not dream them all day long." urges and sings Charles Kingsley; and it is a good music and a right urging. Yet it is still true that no one can do noble things except he first dream them. There was a voyage to the new world in the thought of Columbus before he left Spain, or there could have been no voyage by ship. There was the boat propelled by steam in the thought of Robert Fulton before the actual boat could go puffing up the Hudson, drawing in its wake the vast retinue of later steam navigation. There must be the hidden dreaming before the doing can be possible.

Think of some of these withdrawn and hidden quarries, where the stones

are chiefly shaped, which get builded into the external temple of our lives.

(a) There is the hidden quarry of the *imagination*. There is the imagination ethical, "that form of imaginative activity in which the end is to realize the ideal of character and conduct." Every man has some ideal for life and conduct which he builds first in his imagination. Nothing is so controlling as this ideal. What the external temple of his life may be is determined in great measure by the ideal for life and conduct he fashions for himself in the withdrawn and hidden quarries of his imagination. Precisely and every time and in all places are the words of the Scripture true; as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he. The outward and seen temple of a man's life must be as is that unseen and hidden ideal which the man quarries for himself there in his imagination. If that be high and pure and noble, the life will be; if that be low and mean and touched with lustful taint, greedy with covetousness and hard with selfishness, you cannot in the long run get any other sort of life out of such quarries of imagination. We are to attend to our deeds truly, but more sedulously are we to attend to the imaginations whence deeds spring.

(b) There is the hidden quarry of the *affections*. What a man deepest loves, that, in the long run, the man in the outward temple of his life must surely be. No man can steadily live better than he loves.

(c) There is the hidden quarry of the *will*. What, away from the sight of everybody, back here within the man's most solitary and separate self the man really chooses; stones according to that prevailing choice must be the sort of stones which will go to rear the courses of the outward temple of his life.

The main work for the temple of life is hidden work, carried on back in the chambers of one's secret imaginings, lovings, willings.

Some temple of a life every one of us must rear. How much in these interior

and beginning processes of the building of the temple do we need the cleansing of Christ's forgiveness, the strength of Christ's indwelling, the upward drawing of Christ's love. Significant that question of the apostle, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of the Holy Ghost?" If the Holy Spirit dwell in us we shall surely build a right and noble temple of a life. This is a good question for a beginning year: How and what am I building?

JAN. 15-21.—GRIEVING THE SPIRIT.
—Eph. iv. 30.

Do not think that you can comprehend God. Your little child cannot comprehend you. If it could it would no longer be a little child. When I was a little child my father was a young lawyer in a Western city, struggling to make the ends meet. I used to wonder why he was so constantly at his office—every morning, noon, night, not even taking a Saturday holiday, as the school-children did. And dimly I remember how I used to speculate about it and say to my little self, "If I were father I would not be tied down so to an office; I would go shooting the wild pigeons," which in those days in the spring and fall used to fly in countless companies through the sky. I could not understand the problem of subsistence, the unrelaxing toil which must always minister to professional success, as father did. I was only a little child. If then I could have understood what father did, I had not been a little child.

So do not think that you can comprehend God; if you could you would be God, and that you can never be.

God is infinite, without bounds. God is bounded neither by time, for He is eternal; nor by space, for He is omnipresent; nor by any obstacle whatever, for He is omnipotent; nor by any ignorance whatever, for He is omniscient; nor by any sin whatever, for He is holy. And you are finite—that is, bounded.

So do not think that you can *ever* comprehend God. There will be questions to ask in heaven.

So there must to the finite be always mystery in the infinite.

Only attach the right idea to mystery. A mystery is not an absurdity. An absurdity is that which to conception is self-contradictory—for example, to try to suppose that that certain portion of space which is filled by a solid substance is not filled with it is an absurdity, is contradictory to conception. But to suppose that there may be methods in the Divine existence beyond the grasp of our intelligence is not an absurdity.

A mystery is not an enigma. An enigma is something which for the time puzzles the ingenuity, but which we are sure is capable of some solution.

But a mystery is that which, though partially intelligible in some of its manifestations, nevertheless, as to its interior meaning, sweeps perpetually beyond the highest ranges of a human intelligence. I may understand that a mystery is—I cannot understand what it is. For example, the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery, and must ever remain a mystery. I may understand that the Trinity is by the revelation of it to me in the Scripture, and also by the revelation of the truth of it which comes to me from my Christian experience. I may understand that it is, but I cannot understand what it is.

If anything is true, it is true that the doctrine of the Trinity is revealed in the Scripture. And this doctrine of the Trinity—of the three substances or persons in the one Divine essence—is not a doctrine metaphysically valueless, which belongs to the rubbish of dusty theologies, but is a doctrine vital. It is a doctrine necessary to my thought of God. God the Father is the Infinite One; God the Son is He through whom the Infinite One passes into objectivity; God the Holy Spirit is He through whom Deity comes into spiritual relation with myself.

The doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine underlying the whole revelation of redemption. God the Father is the source of redemption. God the Son is the instrument of redemption. God the Holy Spirit is the applier of redemption.

The office of the Holy Spirit is to hold Christianity in the living present, to make the crucifixion, resurrection, ascension of the past the crucifixion, resurrection, ascension of the present; by the power of these verities to work in men to-day supernatural change, life, culture.

And when you get in your conception this vast applying work of the Holy Spirit, as when sunlight floods the mountains, you begin to see the significances of the great direction of our Scripture that we grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.

1. Why should we not grieve the Holy Spirit of God?

(a) Because the Holy Spirit convicts of sin. Nothing is more important for us than that we should be convinced of sin. Sin is spiritual insensibility, and also sin is doom.

(b) Because the Holy Spirit renews. By His power He changes what have been so well called our imminent preferences. He causes us to begin to love what God loves and to hate what God hates.

(c) Because the Holy Spirit illumines. He makes the Scriptures real and radiant to us.

(d) Because the Holy Spirit sanctifies. The whole process by which man, naturally depraved, comes at last into perfect likeness with the Lord Jesus, is carried on by the Holy Spirit.

(e) Because the Holy Spirit leads. Let us not yield the truth that still for us there are guiding impressions, the touch of the Holy Spirit on our hearts.

(f) Because the Holy Spirit comforts. Think of the comfort of the Holy Ghost (Acts ix. 31).

(g) Because the Holy Spirit dwells in us. God is not in heaven only. He is

in our hearts in the person of the Holy Spirit, if we will have it so.

Behold how utterly we are dependent upon the Holy Spirit. Therefore we should not grieve Him.

2. Consider *how* we may grieve the Holy Spirit. The chapter in which our Scripture stands is full of suggestion. Read thoughtfully verses 25-29. We grieve the Holy Spirit.]

(a) By refusing absolute truthfulness (v. 25).

(b) By allowing ourselves in anger (v. 26).

(c) By allowing ourselves under the dominion of the evil one (v. 27).

(d) By a want of complete integrity (v. 28).

(e) By a want of carefulness as to clean speech (v. 29).

EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

Exegetical Notes on Eph. ii. 1-7.

By REV. A. WELCH, GLASGOW, SCOT.

You also who are dead to your trespasses and sins ; wherein aforesaid ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience : among whom we also all once lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind ; and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest—God, I say, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, did us also, who are dead to our trespasses, quicken together with Christ (by grace have ye been saved), raise up together, and make sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches of His grace, in His kindness toward us, in Christ Jesus.—Revised Version (revised).

I. THE writer of this paper believes that the revisers of 1881 have, in common with their predecessors of 1611, failed to exhibit a perfectly accurate representation of the apostle's meaning in this part of his epistle. This belief induces him to attempt to put before his readers what he thinks Paul actually wished to say. His exposition, if found to be satisfactory, must be his apology for differing from a body of men so learned and eminent as the revisers. If his exposition prove unsatisfactory, he

is aware that he exposes himself to the charge of presumption. He puts forward his views with some confidence, but not, he trusts, without due modesty. He accepts the Greek text adopted by the revisers.

The first thing necessary is to indicate in a few words the connection between the words under consideration and the preceding chapter. In the first chapter the apostle speaks of "the strength of God's might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places," etc. In the words before us, he points out the parallel between what God has done for Christ and what he has done for his readers, himself, and all believers.

Were our revisers justified in inserting in the first verse the words *did He quicken?* This appears to be not only unnecessary, but tends to obscure the construction of the apostle's words and confuse the sense. The expression is borrowed ostensibly from the fifth verse, and is intended, apparently, to represent the meaning of *συνεζωοποιήσατε*. This verb, as all allow, governs *ὑμᾶς*. But so also do *συνήγαγε* and *συνεκάλυψε*. Why should the one verb be brought into the first verse to eke out the construction, and not the others? The course adopted by the revisers in this matter, therefore, seems unwarrantable. They dislocate the apostle's words for a purpose which our translation shows to

be wholly unnecessary. They follow the example of the revisers of 1611, but that is no justification. It seems, too, a most unscholarly and extraordinary thing to borrow an explanatory phrase from a verse so far forward. Had they acted in a precisely opposite way, and borrowed from a verse as far away back, we could have better understood their conduct. This would have been intelligible. But, further, why do they use the emphatic form *did quicken* in the first verse and the ordinary form *quicken* in the fifth verse? There can surely be no warrant for this variation except some supposed necessity, which does not appear on the surface. But a still stronger objection to the course which the revisers have adopted remains to be stated. Not only should they have brought up all the three verbs which govern *ἐμᾶς*, if they thought it necessary to bring up any at all, but they ought to have added the words *together with Christ*. The sense of the apostle requires this addition. The words *did quicken*, besides, do not express the full meaning of *συνεζωποῖησε*. The *συν*- is left without any English equivalent. How such an oversight should have occurred passes comprehension!

Our main objection to the revisers' version of this passage is to the rendering of the words *ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις*. These words they translate as if the particle *ἐν* occurred before *τοῖς παραπτώμασι*. And, in common with the revisers of 1611, they regard the clause as a description of men in their unconverted state. This view, we may say, is universally adopted. To assail it seems like an attempt to lead a forlorn hope. The revisers of 1881 make a very slight modification of the rendering of their predecessors of 1611. Instead of *dead in*, they translate *dead through*; but this change does not materially affect the sense. And both sets of revisers take *ὄντας* as an imperfect. The participle *ὄν* seldom occurs in this sense, and therefore there is a strong presumption against its being so translated in this

case. There are, we think, unanswerable objections against the clause in question being taken as a description of unconverted men and translated as the revisers have done. 1. This view makes dead men walk. "When ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein aforetime ye walked." It is not enough to say that this is a paradox. We have no right to ascribe to any writer an inconsistent idea like this without necessity. Our translation shows that there is no such necessity. The idea is grotesque and inconceivable, and ought not to be ascribed to the clear-minded Paul. We say with confidence, such an idea is not warranted here, nor in any other part of the New Testament. *Walking in sin* and *living in sin* are Pauline ideas as applicable to unconverted men, but not *dead in sin* or *through sin*. The apostle is not here so much writing rhetorically as giving a description in what, with him, are technical terms. To what spiritual condition his description applies we shall see by and by, but it cannot be to unconverted men. 2. This view destroys man's responsibility. A dead man is incapable of either thought or action. Extreme Calvinism makes men entirely passive in conversion, and some take pleasure in quoting this passage in support of such a position; but the whole teaching of the New Testament is opposed to such an idea. The whole Bible appeals to our reason and conscience, and tells us that our condemnation or salvation will turn entirely upon our rejection or reception of the truth. If men are dead *in* sins, or *through* sins, they are, *ipso facto*, incapable of obeying the Gospel, and are no longer accountable beings. According to the view which the revisers take of the clause, the words mean totally subjected to sin, as a corpse is to the power of death, and as incapable of rising from it as that is of being restored to life. The Christian intelligence of the present day will not accept such a view. 3. The expression "dead in" or "through transgressions and sins" would, proper-

ly, apply, not to unconverted men, but to lost souls. As reported in John viii. 21, our Lord said to the Jews on one occasion, "I go away, and ye shall seek Me, and shall die in your sins"—*καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανέσθε*. Should any one try to escape from the application of this passage to the case in hand by saying that *ἁμαρτία* is in the singular, whereas in the passage before us the plural is used, we have to observe that, in the twenty-fourth verse of the same chapter, the word occurs in the plural, as if the Lord, foreseeing the possibility of such an objection, wished to obviate it: "I said, therefore, unto you, that ye shall die in your sins; for except ye believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins"—*ἀποθανέσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*. Now, observe that these Jews whom our Lord was addressing were unconverted men. They refused to believe that He was the great promised Messiah. They were in their sins—*living in them, walking in them*, but not *dead in or through them*. They would not be in that state till they had died in unbelief. It is plain, therefore, that our Lord's words are not in harmony with the view which the revisers have adopted. Our Lord teaches us to regard the expression *dead in or through sins* as applicable to lost souls only. It does not need to be said that no one understands the apostle, in the passage under consideration, to be referring to men in that state. He classes himself with those whom he describes; and he was a believer, rejoicing in the consciousness that his sins were pardoned.

But to this argument, founded upon our Lord's words, it may be objected that perhaps our Lord and Paul use the same words in different senses—that is to say, while our Lord might use the words which we have quoted from John's gospel as applicable to lost souls, our apostle might use them in the sense adopted by the revisers. To show that this is not so, let us take a passage in which Paul uses the preposition *ἐν*—1 Cor. xv. 17, "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in

your sins"—*ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*. "Then they also which have fallen asleep in Christ have perished"—*ἀπώλοντο*. Here the idea is precisely the same as our Lord's. Pardon is dependent upon the truth of the Gospel. That, again, is dependent upon the resurrection of Christ. If the resurrection of Christ be not a fact, then no one of those to whom Paul was writing was pardoned. They were still in their sins; and those who had died, believing the Gospel to be true, had died in their sins—that is, unforgiven, and exposed to the wrath of God. They were lost souls—*νεκροὶ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις*. The word *ἀπώλοντο* is even stronger than *νεκροὶ*; but undoubtedly it applies to the state of lost souls. Since, therefore, the words under consideration cannot apply to unconverted men, and since it is impossible to take them as referring to lost souls, there seems no alternative but to translate them as we have done—"who are dead to your trespasses and sins."

Being constrained, for the reasons we have given, to translate verse one as we have done, for the same reasons we are compelled to take that verse as Paul's technical description of one side of the believer's life. All who have undergone the great spiritual change are *dead to sin*, and *alive to God* and to *righteousness*. This is a form of phraseology in which Paul delights. He does not mean by it that the believer does not sin. He speaks theoretically, ideally. He means that the believer ought to have as little to do with sin as a dead man has with the affairs of life. He speaks in the same way of being *dead to the law*, and *dead from the rudiments of the world*. This death in Paul's mind is logically and theoretically bound up in the death of Christ. He says (2 Tim. ii. 11), "If we died with Him;" and in Col. iii. 3, "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God." And as the death referred to is bound up in Christ's death, so are all the active graces and privileges of the Christian bound up in the life and honor now enjoyed by

Christ in glory. Hence all the verbs in this passage referring to the Christian's position are compounded with *συν*-, and have their meaning completed by the explanatory words *τῷ Χριστῷ*.

The apostle dwells at some length on the believer's mystical death to sin in Rom. vi. In v. 2 he says, "We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein?" In v. 11, drawing a parallel between Christ's being alive and the believer's spiritual life, he says, "Even so, reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus." Then, as a commentary on the meaning which he attaches to the mystical death of which he has been speaking, and as indicating that he does not consider his Roman readers as per-

fect, he exhorts them in the following manner (vs. 12-14): "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof; neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves unto God as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under law, but under grace." The same idea as that which Paul expresses in the passages which we have quoted is found also in 1 Pet. ii. 24: "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead unto sins, might live unto righteousness."

(To be concluded.)

SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

What the Workingman May Ask of the Minister.

BY REV. JOHN P. COYLE, NORTH ADAMS, MASS.

REASONABLE workingmen ask that the minister sympathize with certain higher aims, and assist them in the solution of certain problems. They do not ask for indiscriminate sympathy or support. They are aware that as a body they drink a good deal and fail of the wiser economics, and they have no faith in proffered sympathy which ignores this fact. But they are conscious of some worthy ambitions for themselves and their families. Social recognition in the shape of invitations to afternoon teas and the like is not one of these. They see enough of the so-called upper classes of society to know that their own social intercourse is more genuine and quite as elevating and enjoyable. But they are anxious to educate their children in the best manner, not to stunt them in their physical growth by early and excessive drudgery, as many of them were stunted; to keep their daughters out of slavish occupations;

to hire household help and trained nurses for their sick; to give their wives and little ones a whiff of sea or mountain air, like ministers' families, and for the same praiseworthy reasons to have bath-rooms in their houses, and as many bedrooms as the minister would want for the same size of household. And they ask him to illustrate his gospel of brotherhood by the same kind of sincere and practical sympathy with such aims as he would have in case of those born of the same parents. The sensible workingman does not begrudge the minister the honest comfort in which he lives, provided he knows that the other would be glad to see him in like comfort, and would not assent to the oft-expressed idea that the laborer's way of living is "good enough for such as he."

If a minister happens to have been so ill-born or ill-bred as to be incapable of an unaffected sympathy with the working people's better aims, he should make himself a slave (Gal. v. 13) to pastoral work until the sense of brotherhood is awakened and the evil spirit of condescension exorcised; or, if no such trans-

formation follows a fair trial of pastoral drudgery, he should quit the ministry as one who has mistaken his vocation. In this age of democracy the man who needs to condescend to get on a common footing with the wage-earner has a natural blemish which unfits him for the sacred office of the Christian ministry. Nor need he think to succeed by finding a church which wants a man of that type. There are, unfortunately, many such churches, but they ought not to have what they want. What they need is an apostolic man of the opposite stamp to convert them, or destroy them if they are past conversion. The one thing worse than a clerical snob is a church full of snobs.

To sympathize with the workingman and his better aims is not necessarily or always to side with him in his quarrels. Where the spirit of brotherhood is, there is liberty—liberty to disagree, to investigate, to instruct, to exhort, to rebuke. One has that spirit to little purpose if it does not gain him that freedom. The cheap politician may be permitted to monopolize that clap-trap sympathy which fears to offend the workingman by differing with him; and the proverbial faithlessness of the workingman toward the politician who so courts him is his own merited comment upon the sincerity of such sympathy. One may sympathize with the desire for better wages or shorter hours, and yet think that the attempt to secure these things has been made at the wrong time or in the wrong way, or that it is better for the workingman to fight his own battles without much help, and to be whipped until he has learned how to fight them. It is not always unbrotherly to leave one to hoe his own row. Let the minister so live, act, and speak that his intelligent and wakeful sympathy is not doubted, and he will seldom be asked to take any more part in the workingman's struggles than his own best judgment dictates.

Moreover, unless he would degenerate into a demagogue, the minister must be in sympathetic relations with the em-

ployer as well as the employé. The one, like the other, has his besetting temptations; the lust for power being as alluring and deceptive as the appetite for drink or sensual pleasure. While frequently afflicted with that peculiar limitation of vision which the possession or management of money tends to produce—the gold blindness—yet the employer is also a brother man, with rightful claims and real needs, and often deep hunger for sympathy; and he is seldom the pitiless wretch depicted in labor harangues, where he is identified with the ruthlessness of the industrial system. He feels, as the employé cannot, the pressure of competition, and if he be, as he usually is, a manager of other people's money, he knows the unreasonableness and heartlessness of absenteeism and anonymous stockholderism. Equally with the employé he is the victim of the system, and equally entitled to benefit of clergy.

In times of actual conflict between employer and employé the minister's duty—with occasional exceptions—is that of a not inactive non-combatant. The temper of the combatants is sometimes so bad that they will tolerate the interference of no one who is not a partisan, in which case they had best be left to polish one another down. Sometimes, on the other hand, the issue is so plain that honest neutrality is impossible. Usually, however, there are two sides, and one who is not an expert may suspend judgment; and the minister who is a mutual friend and who is well enough known so that his neutrality is not attributed to cowardice is well situated to play the part of conciliator. He may fail, for not all disputes can be so settled; but if his heart is right and he keeps his head no harm will come of the attempt. On the other hand, he is illy fitted for the part of arbitrator, which, although requiring more technical knowledge, is a lower function than that of conciliator. While the conciliator must not, the arbitrator must finally take sides, and will rarely be forgiven by the beaten party, or, such is human

nature, escape being despised by the victor. It is noticeable that a person is seldom thought competent to arbitrate twice between the same parties. Jesus refused to arbitrate because it would interfere with higher offices, which same higher offices pertain to the minister.

Moreover, an arbitrated conflict is never so well settled as one terminated by conciliation, and the latter method only fails of being employed much more frequently than it is because of the timidity of those who might step in and bring it about. For it is a remarkable fact, betraying the crudeness of our industrial organism, that more than half the disputes between employer and employé are caused not by irreconcilable difference of opinion about wages, but by mere ill manners and infirmities of temper on one side or both. Something of the old antagonism between classes remains; the wage-earner being suspicious and sensitive and self-assertive, like a recently emancipated slave who is not sure of his standing, and the employer having something of the "master's" aversion to dickerings with "underlings." This relic of the spirit of chattel slavery and peonage contributes to give to the "haggling" in the labor market an ugly tone, different from that in the goods market. It is this which leads the employer to feel that his gifts to the public, his libraries and hospitals and such like, should go to atone for despotism in dealing with his help; while the help, with, it must be confessed, a truer apprehension of the meaning of brotherhood, ask for justice before patronage, and are perhaps a little too critical of the benefactions of the rich, many of whom, especially of those most ready to give, have honestly earned their surplus. The clearing away of this cause of irritation between employer and employé is largely the mission of the minister of Christ, living, preaching, and applying in detail the doctrine of true brotherhood.

But the wages problem is not solely one of temper and sentiment. The workingman is convinced that the in-

dustrial problem has in it somewhere a legislative problem which it will be his duty as a voter to deal with some day; and that underlying all this is a moral problem which must be defined and cleared up before it will be safe to attempt legislation. So certain is he that the existing property system does not conform to the fundamental moralities, and so mute or obscure are the professional oracles upon the subject, that he is tempted to doubt whether any moral sanction at all underlies property. Nor is he alone in this suspicion. Property-holders themselves, and many professional and other educated men, are ill at ease. The course of events is tending to bring the institution of property to the bar of an emancipated but very poorly educated moral sense to plead for its right to exist, and the end is unforeseen. Most persons cling to the faith that somehow or other at some one or more points in the history of the determination of legal property rights true moral sanctions went in. But history as a whole has been shamelessly immoral, and it is plain to be seen that legal sanctions, originally coinciding with moral sanctions, have continued to hold after changing conditions have withdrawn the moral sanctions or brought the two into conflict; that circumstances have given birth to new moral demands which have never received the legal support they should have had; that moral wrongs have, either gradually and imperceptibly, or by acts of despotism and spoliation, gained legal support, until it becomes a fair question to what extent the legal institution of property holding and distribution corresponds with moral right. The suspicion lurks in many minds that the simply non-moral conservatism of the legal profession, the undue respect for bare technicalities, the stupidity and servility which royal prerogative and hereditary aristocracy have often placed upon the English bench to make precedents for American courts, the meddling of powerful interests and class legislation (as, for example, in the out-

lawry of trades-unions for centuries, and the fixing of wages by courts of employers) have evolved a legal property system which is morally a no-system, an anarchism.

When lockouts or strikes accompanied with turbulence occur, the spectre of anarchy passes before the public mind not merely because of fear of the lawlessness of the populace, but because of an unquiet sense of the moral lawlessness of property itself. It has often been remarked that nothing is so anarchic as unreasoning and uninformed conservatism resting upon vested self-interest; that the centre of danger is about Fifth Avenue rather than Avenue A. It is suspected that what is called "the conservative property interest" is only static anarchy, like that of the slave-owner interest thirty-five years ago, which a spark may transform into dynamic anarchy. The probably unfounded accusation that the incendiarism in connection with a recent railway strike was a ruse of the railway authorities found hospitality in the public mind, because the men who represent those authorities are otherwise engaged in gigantic and successful schemes of plunder within the forms of law. It is not reassuring to have had to fall back so frequently within the past year upon the appeal of "respect for law." That appeal may be made once too often. The maxim that law is sacred holds only so long as the presumption lasts that law, even though defective, is, on the whole, entitled to respect. That presumption is strong, and should not and will not in this country be lightly put aside; but when it breaks down the opposite maxim comes at once into force, that "revolution is sacred." We are a law-abiding people, but we glory in such incidents in our history as the "Boston tea party." There is in our national pantheon a shrine to the goddess of revolution. And it is just as well to remember that no revolutionists are so dangerous as they who have first overdone the virtue of law abidingness.

When any institution has to be main-

tained solely upon the plea of "respect for law," or when it has to appeal away from its own sanctity to "the sanctity of life," which it has somehow, in the form of a hired watchman or otherwise, thrust as a hostage between itself and its enemies, the time has come when public safety demands a rigid inquiry into the foundations of that institution. That time has come for property. "Who will show us," say the workingmen, "that property law sustains property rights and not property wrongs? We deprecate as much as any of you the violation of property law. But we are half disposed to deprecate it because such violation is folly rather than because it is crime, because 'the ballot is better than the bullet,' as the peace-making leaders ominously told the rioters at Homestead. We will not violate your law, but we do not respect it, and one of these days we shall have come to an agreement among ourselves, and then we will go into the halls of legislation and make short work of your system."

While the suspicion that the property system is illy adjusted to moral requirements is not confined to the wage-earners, its effect differs with them because they feel themselves to be the sufferers by reason of maladjustment. Other classes, even if they do not regard themselves as beneficiaries of injustice, are better content to let well enough alone than to take the risks of readjustment, and so they would rather not have the solution of this question precipitated in their day. The minister is between the two fires. One set of people, although they suspect something is wrong, or even because of it, would hush it up and persuade him that his duty is not to look into these things, but to preach the "simple Gospel." Another set maintain that they would be simple indeed if they could be put off with an alleged "Gospel" which contributed nothing to the solution of this problem.

Moreover, the workingman is getting particular as to whether what purports

to be a contribution really amounts to anything. He is irritated rather than satisfied with the very common preaching that "the golden rule is the solution of the labor problem." This may be true or it may be abominable cant, and it sounds to him like the latter. It means, "Wait till the millennium," which is no great improvement upon "Wait till you get to heaven," for which it is offered as a less insulting substitute. Coming from a body of men already suspected of being apologists for the privileged classes, it sounds like the same old, time-disgraced doctrine of non-resistance which has always been the bulwark of vested wrongs. Count Tolstoi or the old-fashioned Quakers may preach non-resistance and be respected, at least, if not heeded. The ordinary Christian minister of the Church militant fortunately, or unfortunately, may as well not attempt it. The workingman wants the millennium; but he is not, and ought not to be, disposed to wait for it. He is about to bestir himself to try to bring it in, so far as this can be done by education, organization, and legislation. Something at least ought to be able to be done in that way; for it would be to discredit all that has been won in the way of freedom and self-government to deny that institutions inherited from ages of tyranny and misrule might be improved upon by a free people possessing the suffrage.

They are withheld from immediate action by inability as yet to agree upon practical measures, which inability grows out of the consciousness on the part of the more intelligent and sensible that they are facing a problem of immense difficulty which they are poorly equipped to meet, and concerning which demagogues and doctrinaires are alike to be distrusted. And these are the men who turn to the Christian minister and ask of him not partisanship or political leadership, but moral light. When the time has come for partisan campaigns they will raise up their own leaders. Mere questions of public policy

they expect to be able to answer. But underlying all these they are persuaded are moral issues which have become obscured, and they justly think that it is the duty of the minister as of no one else to probe these issues without fear or favor, and to bring out into clear light what now is only dimly seen or guessed at.

They ask this service of him because he is, on the whole, probably the most highly educated man in the community, educated at small cost to himself on the basis of endowments, which, rightly or wrongly, the property law permits as a tax on the community. He is supported by the community in comparative comfort, with large freedom in the use of his time and the choice of his methods of work, a non-producer, from the materialistic point of view, who owes the community service in this very thing by virtue of his relation to it as a pensioner. Moreover, the minister professes to be a preacher of justice as well as of temperance and of a judgment to come, and as he seldom shirks his duty of lecturing men on the last two topics, he should not neglect the first. He is certified to by the ecclesiastical authorities as competent to interpret and apply to living issues—else there is no meaning in a "living ministry"—the Decalogue, including the eighth commandment. Mere reiteration of the words or of certain partial or obsolete applications will only darken counsel. If that commandment covers any unquestionable duties or inalienable rights, any sanctities, it is the business of the minister not only to assert them, but to make them so clear that the moral sense cannot mistake them. Is there a sacred property right? Wherein and wherefore the sanctity? It is the Christian minister who is to answer these questions to the conscience of this age; and he can do it by no perfunctory reassertation, in solemn tones, of ancient formulas, but only by a strong and intelligent grasping together of eternal truth with the living facts of to-day.

By this is meant that the minister is

to be no mere lecturer on ethics. No greater error is prevalent than that the minister who undertakes to deal with the property question must take leave of his office as a preacher of the Gospel or a theologian. On the contrary, it may be affirmed, and it will not be denied, at least by the profounder sense of the working people, that the mere science of ethics never quite reaches the element of sanctity. Only the touch of religion can impart the fragrance of sanctity to the moral law. The minister must meet this question as a thoroughly trained scientific moralist, but none the less as a herald of Christ—as a theologian. The writer has no hesitation—except that which is caused by the certainty of being miserably misunderstood by friend and critic alike—in asserting that only the scientific and the orthodox theologian has an adequate formula for the solution of the industrial enigma. Whatever contributions are made by those who are not at home in the conceptions of such a theology, however valuable, must, in the nature of the case, be partial. By all means let us have professors of sociology in

our theological schools; but let them be men who are fitted to fill the chairs of systematic theology. Other things being equal, the trained and orthodox theologian is the man to clear up the moral issues of this question and to revise the ethics of property-holding for the use of the men who are preparing to revise its laws. Of course other things never are equal; so that it does not follow that this work will actually be done by those who worship the Triune God and hold to and proclaim this and the other “doctrines of grace;” for the Spirit may have to find or force channels outside those specially prepared for it. But the workingmen, even those who are alienated from the churches and ministry, instinctively feel that the saving truth they need in that peaceful revolution they are determined upon is to be found in those conceptions of God and of man, and of their inter-relations, which the orthodox ministry professes to preach. And it is for this reason that they turn so reproachfully upon that ministry when it fails to shed forth the light they crave.

MISCELLANEOUS SECTION

Ministers and Money.

BY REV. R. T. CROSS, MINNEAPOLIS,
MINN.

It is not the ministry of money that we are to consider, but the money of the ministry, the relation which ministers of the Gospel sustain to the mammon of unrighteousness, the almighty dollar, the god of this world.

That the subject is an important and practical one appears from the fact that many ministers have lost their influence, in whole or in part, by the financial mismanagement either of their own private affairs or of the affairs of the church, college, or other public enterprise with which they were connected. Every minister has to wrestle with the ques-

tion of finance, and some ministers are thrown by it. When one of them is thrown it attracts attention and is blazoned abroad. Its influence is far worse than when a layman is thrown by the same antagonist.

Ministers as a class are not deficient in financial good sense. As a class they are strictly honest; most of them are economical; while a great many of them are good financiers, even in matters of large public interest. Not nearly so many of them as of merchants fail in financial undertakings according to the number of each engaged in such matters. Most of them economized closely to get an education, and are economizing still more closely to support a family and educate children on a

small salary. In the West most ministers pass through a church-building experience, perhaps through several, and frequently have the entire financial burden to carry. One minister of our acquaintance has built sixteen churches, besides starting an academy in a drought-stricken region, and carrying its financial burden for years. Such a man may justly feel indignant when he hears ministers spoken of as knowing nothing of business matters. The finances of many rich and prosperous colleges and of many benevolent societies are managed wholly or in part by ministers.

But occasional exceptions are very marked, and for the sake of the cause which they represent ministers cannot be too careful about financial matters. Hence these suggestions :

1. Ministers make a great mistake when they are not careful to consult the church, to get its authority for doing certain things. One minister wanted to build a new church. He drew up a novel plan, explained it to the church at a prayer-meeting, and then before the church had approved the plan or even approved the idea of building, he began to call for subscriptions. Of course the thing fell flat, and so did one section of that minister's influence.

A minister thought it would be a good idea to have a piano as well as an organ in the Sunday-school. He ordered it without consulting anybody, and the Sunday-school had to work hard for a long time to pay for it.

It is often the case that in some convention or large gathering an effort is made to raise money for some good object, and ministers often pledge their churches for certain sums. Sometimes they pledge weak and struggling churches for certain sums to be paid annually for several years. They have no right to make such pledges unless they are ready, without grumbling, to pay the pledges themselves in case the churches see fit to disavow them, which of course they have a right to do. If

such pledges are made they should be conditioned on the church's approval.

Nor should the minister make any pledge for himself the payment of which is going to require economy and sacrifice, without first consulting his wife. It is easier to pledge than to pay. It was charitably said of a certain minister whose financial shortcomings were notorious, that when he found a widow without any fuel, he would order a ton of coal sent to her, and then not trouble himself about seeing it paid for. The widow probably had a better idea of his generosity than the coal-dealer did. His thought for the widow was commendable ; his lack of thought for the coal-dealer was scandalous. To the extent to which they are interested let church, wife, and coal-dealer be consulted beforehand.

2. Ministers are apt to get their finances into a terribly tangled condition and bring disgrace upon the cause they represent when they fail to keep a strict and clear account, in black and white, of all receipts and expenditures, of all bargains, contracts, and settlements. Sometimes they have made only a verbal contract for a house or church, and then received money and paid it out without keeping any account, and have wondered why so many bills came in, and why some were larger than they expected. One minister ran his church hopelessly in debt in that way. He was strongly suspected of pocketing much of the money himself. Whether guilty or not, he deserved the suspicion. In all such things a minister should be, like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. He can be so only by keeping a strict account. Unscrupulous men will take advantage of him if he does not. He will perhaps receive unpleasant duns for debts that he has forgotten. Even if honest in the sight of God, he may not be in the sight of men.

3. It is exceedingly unfortunate when a minister has not a keen sense of the difference between *meum* and *tuum*. We do not mean the obtaining of things by vulgar theft or fraud, but the using

for himself or his family of money or credit that belongs to the church or to some benevolent cause, under the specious plea that it is only borrowed, or that, as he is the Lord's servant, he can rightly use it for himself. A man is treading on very dangerous ground when he persuades himself that it is right to buy bread for his hungry children with another man's money which he holds in trust. Lawyers have a sharp code about any of their number who use for themselves money collected for a client. They have to have such a code, or all confidence in them as a class would disappear. The State also makes it a crime. Let ministers be very careful how they "borrow" benevolent contributions.

A certain minister whose salary was in arrears borrowed money at the bank, and got one of his trustees, a hard-working man, to sign the note with him. He went away and never paid the note, and his influence in that community was utterly destroyed. It was a specious plea by which he justified his conduct—viz., that the church owed him as much as he had borrowed, and that that trustee ought to go to work and raise it. The church was poor, and the trustee lost the money. But his loss of money was small compared with that minister's loss of influence, reputation, and character.

It is never best for a man to fix his own salary, decide what his own expenses shall be, and then pay himself out of funds collected for benevolence. Such a course blends *meum* and *tuum* in hopeless confusion. The colored minister from the South who sustained himself and family for years by begging money in the North to build a church for his people has white ministerial brethren of the same stamp.

4. Ministers often injure their influence by carelessly running in debt, and staying there, when no necessity like sickness makes it necessary. Randolph once jumped to his feet and exclaimed: "Mr. Speaker, I have found the philosopher's stone; it is, 'Pay as you go.'"

Greeley said: "Hunger, cold, rags, hard work, contempt, suspicion, unjust reproach are disagreeable, and debt is infinitely worse than them all." Spurgeon said that he strove to keep three things out of his house—dirt, debt, and the devil. "He left a lot of debts behind him when he went away," is the record concerning some ministers. It means that he left behind him no influence.

It is strange how reckless some ministers are. They see a thing; they want it; they straightway buy it, promising to pay for it some time—perhaps in monthly instalments. They lack good judgment and sound sense. They cannot say no to agents, and so they subscribe for books which they do not need. They run in debt for a piano, a typewriter, a horse, a gun, or luxuries in the way of food, clothing, and furniture which most of their people cannot afford. One minister complained that he could not live on his salary, but he said awhile after that he was taking three daily papers. Some foolishly contracted debts are paid after many days; some are generously forgiven or prudently discounted, and some are paid by subscription after the minister has gone. Debt-contracting ministers may do some good—they ought to do a great deal to offset the harm they do.

A minister who was scrupulously careful about all his financial obligations said that he often lay awake nights and thought about his finances. It may not be best to lie awake on purpose for that, but if one is troubled with insomnia he might easily occupy his mind with worse subjects of thought.

If a minister is in debt, let him be very careful to pay promptly. Let him look up his creditors, and not wait for them to look him up. Let him keep his credit at A No. 1. When one minister left his field it was said of him that his name on a note was not worth one cent. Another minister, while building a home missionary church in the West, was accommodated at a careful bank with a large sum of money on no secu-

rity but his own autograph. Thank God, there are many of the latter kind to one of the former!

5. A covetous spirit is an ugly blot on a minister's character. He who has a tendency in that direction should beware of it; he should fight it and crucify it by generous giving. Let him give a Bible reading on covetousness, even though his hearers do mentally apply it to himself. The miserly spirit he should hold in abhorrence. He should not make a fuss over a penny, and should be very careful about allowing mistakes in his own favor to go unnoticed and uncorrected. The writer has been offered too much change much more frequently than too little, and he has come to the conclusion that it has sometimes been done purposely to try him. There is no credit in correcting mistakes that are in your favor, but there is great discredit in not correcting them.

The minister should not haggle and beat dealers down. He should be careful about dunning for small debts members of his church who have done him great favors. He should not be too eager for discounts and free passes. He need not always decline them, but it is not always best to ask for them. A prominent minister told the writer for how small a sum—less than a dollar—he had taken a vacation trip. He dead-headed his way everywhere. He got one dinner at a railway eating house at half price by showing his half-fare railroad permit, and asking if that did not include meals.

The minister should not be over-eager or particular about his salary. He should utterly despise that attitude which encourages people to talk about one, three, or five-thousand-dollar men. One minister labored successfully in five fields, and he never knew, when going to any of those fields, what his salary was to be. Another one nearly always went to a smaller salary when making a change—not because he had to do so, but because he saw a chance to do more good. In some cases, how-

ever, the salary was raised after awhile. Such cases ought not to be rare among the servants of Jesus Christ.

Ministers receive many financial favors. Why should they not bestow some? And why should not a minister do his share in the church to which he and his family belong? What if he *is* getting a smaller salary than he might have had if he had followed some other calling? He has a salary, at any rate, and it is tolerably sure, which is more than many who help pay the salary can say. It may not be best for him to pay toward his own salary, but he can pay toward church expenses and for church repairs and building. And he can give more, perhaps, than many of his people for missionary objects and for the poor. As a rule, ministers ought to give a tithe of their income to benevolence. They will be better off financially in the end if they do so. Yet in the majority of churches in our land the benevolent contributions of the entire church and Sunday-school are less than one tenth of the pastor's salary.

How can a minister preach eloquently about missions and set forth the Bible rule for giving, and then give little or nothing himself, while he sees poor men and servant-girls denying themselves to give after they have also given for his salary? According to his ability the minister should be the most generous giver in the church—an example to the saints in that as in other things. How would it do to let the laymen give examples of the best and meanest ministers they have known?

6. When a minister in ordinary circumstances has given in benevolence one tenth of his income he may then with good conscience lay by something for old age, for sickness, for his family, so that he may not be a burden to his friends or to the church. He should at least keep his life insured. His sleep will be sweeter and probably his life will be longer if he knows that sudden death will not leave his family in poverty. If he has a home or a piece of land, it need not injure his usefulness. The

poor minister who returned to the donor a piece of land that had been presented him because, while he owned it, he could not enjoy singing his old favorite, "Not a foot of land on earth do I own," might, on the same principle, have given away his family, if he had one. Land ownership is one of the natural and desirable experiences of human life, which ministers have the right to enjoy, provided they do not let it interfere with their work.

One compensation that many ministers have received for hard work and small salaries in the great West has been the opportunity they have had of getting homes when lots and farms were cheap. This opportunity, wisely improved, has practically been a Western relief society for aged ministers. Not all, however, have been equally fortunate, and there is great need of relief from the churches for some aged ministers.

If a minister by proper economy, not miserliness, does lay by something for the future, the thriftless, debt-incurring minister, who spends his whole salary and more too, is not the one to accuse him of being worldly minded. Such charges will come with better grace from the brother who has generously, if not wisely, given away all his surplus funds. But he will probably not make them.

Let the minister, however, use great care in investing any little money that he has laid by, for the sake both of the money and of his influence. He should beware of the speculative spirit. Many a minister has lost his little all by being too eager for a high rate of interest, or for quick returns from some mining company. As a rule, it is not best for him to invest his surplus in the place where he is preaching, unless he does it to get a home and is tolerably sure that he will remain there for some years. He would better consult some conservative financier in whom he has perfect confidence.

If by some fortunate investment, or by inheritance, or by marrying a rich

wife, a minister comes into the possession or control of a large amount of money, let him so use it as not only not to disgrace or discredit the Gospel ministry, but to ennoble and exalt it in the eyes of men. Let him practise when rich what he preached when poor. He then gave princely advice to the rich; now let him give princely gifts to the Lord and to the Lord's poor. God will bless him if he does; may God pity him if he does not. His giving should be on no ordinary scale. For him to give only one tenth would not be giving as the Lord had prospered him.

7. Ordinarily it is not best for ministers to engage in outside work in order to lay up money, though they may do it—as Paul made tents (as a tent-maker, not a tent merchant)—in order to supplement an utterly inadequate salary. Some ministers are so full of energy and resources that they can run a large church, edit a paper, lecture, write books, and do other things that bring in money. But most of us find the care of a medium-sized church all that we can attend to. The minister who has built sixteen churches and an academy says that he has to have an outside business upon which to let off superfluous steam, and for a change of activity when his head will not let him study. So he runs a large nursery—*outdoors*, not indoors. Most of us can use up our surplus steam on our work or in sawing wood. We will not blame that brother, nor need we imitate him.

In the mining camps of the Rocky Mountains more than one home missionary has largely lost his influence by giving way to the prospecting fever. The eager desire "to strike it rich" is not compatible with an eager desire for souls. The grandest home missionary superintendent* that ever trod the Rocky Mountains, whose soul went up suddenly to glory one night while crossing the range in a snow-storm, was once walking between two mining camps

* Rev. J. W. Pickett, killed in November, 1879, by the overturning of a stage-coach near Leadville, Col.

and mission fields in the Black Hills. He picked up a piece of rock that looked as though it might contain rich mineral. He began to build air castles and to speculate on the probability of finding a rich mine; but suddenly he checked himself. "This is not my business," said he, and then he flung the rock as far away as he could, and went on about his Master's business.

There is something in such an attitude that is noble and Christ-like. It appeals to men. It commands the respect of rough and wicked men. Such ministers will not be forsaken, nor will their seed lack bread. Let the minister in all wise and scriptural ways provide for his own; but let him beware of covetousness as of the very Evil One himself.

PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

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

Not a Legitimate Inference.

I HAVE been much interested in your presentation of some glaring evils in the October issue, especially that which seems to be so prevalent as to be rightly designated "The Crowning Sin of the Age"—murder before birth. I fully agree with your expressions of condemnation for such practices, but wish to call attention to that which, as it appears to me, is not a legitimate inference. The mere fact that in the State of Massachusetts there are some 82,000 families with only one child in each proves nothing to the point, unless the writer assumes that the fact is infallible evidence of such a crime. This is too sweeping, and a base insinuation. There is but one child in my family, though I have been married fifteen years. Doubtless there are many other parents who have only one child, and, indeed, no children, that are equally innocent and free from any wrong.

Many reasons might be given for this, but it is not necessary to do so here. In my opinion, it is largely due, not to a dislike of children nor to an unwillingness to endure hardships, but to a broader and a more just spirit than was formerly entertained—that the wife has some *rights* which a true husband ought to respect; and also the profound conviction of many parents—or, if you please, many married people—

that *quality* is always better than *quantity*.
VIRTUE.

"Preparation for Pulpit Prayer."

SUCH is the title of an interesting and helpful article in Vol. XVII., No. 3, of the HOMILETIC REVIEW, which caught the writer's eye while hastily glancing over a pile of back numbers.

The subject is one of vast importance, though it is to be feared that by many ministers the importance of such preparation is underestimated. In addition to the hints contained in the article referred to, the writer is constrained to offer one other that is suggested by his own experience.

Whoever studies carefully the *Scripture lesson* which he intends to read before the sermon will find in it many things which might properly be introduced into what is commonly known as "the long prayer." Of course one does not want to *pray* the sermon over before preaching it, though he should pray over it in the secret closet of prayer. But since the text of the sermon is usually selected from the portion of Scripture read, and since it is closely related to the context, if ideas are taken from the context to be used in the prayer, the devotional use of these helps to *prepare the minds* of the congregation for the message so soon to follow. And

more than this, the practice tends to give freshness and variety to one's style and helps to cultivate the gifts of offering *scriptural* prayer, even though the exact phraseology of the inspired writers be not quoted. The writer has more than once heard it said of a certain preacher renowned for being a good sermonizer, that when he began his long prayer one accustomed to listening to him could easily repeat in advance almost every sentence. Such charges as that ought to be few in churches in which the Prayer-Book is not used; and if the above suggestion is observed, one will scarcely be liable to that charge. It is a responsible thing to lead the devotions of a congregation; and one can well afford to seek that aid that may be enjoyed by an assimilation of the thoughts of God as contained in the Scripture lesson, and by a prayerful application of these to the hearts and lives of man.

A. R.

"The Lost Savor of Salt."

THE words of Jesus regarding the savor properties of salt is ample evidence of His knowledge of the combination in that condiment that is far in advance of the science of the times in which He lived.

Common salt is composed of chlorine and sodium, hence its proper name is chloride of sodium. The savor property is the chlorine, which element was not discovered until 1774.

Chlorine and sodium have a very strong affinity for each other, and do not separate naturally, hence only *actual knowledge* of the chemical combination could have given expression to such passages as Matt. v. 13, Mark ix. 50, and Luke xiv. 34.

Sodium, though abundant in nature, is not found in plants or cereals, and is of no use whatever as a fertilizer, hence "it is neither fit for the land nor yet for the dunghill," as the Saviour said, as no trace of it could be found in the products of the farm, though the ground was covered with it; it is only fit "to

be cast out and trodden under foot of men." Of itself sodium is poisonous. Chlorine (the savor of the salt) is that substance that gives the peculiar pungency as well as preserving power to such articles as mustard, horse-radish, pepper, cloves, spice, etc., all of which, on account of this property, are used for preserving various articles of food and giving them at the same time an agreeable flavor.

Now, carrying these facts over to the spiritual comparison, as was the intention of this lesson, we can readily see that if Christians are the "salt of the earth," the unregenerate represent the sodium, poisonous, only fit to be "cast out" and "trodden under foot of men," and the "savor" which regenerates or makes this change must be that which comes from Jesus and produces this change in the unregenerate. The Christian is the "salt of the earth," and if he loses this "saltiness," this keeping quality, he is "good for nothing." "Ye are the salt of the earth." To keep sin from spoiling it, to keep it sweet, "have salt (your soul united to Christ) within yourselves," otherwise you will be "cast out." Remember salt is *to use*; a ton of salt would not keep a pound of meat from spoiling *if not in contact with it*.

W. T. ALAN.

City or Country.

BEING a young pastor myself, I can understand "A. T. R.'s" perplexity as expressed in the HOMILETIC for November. My advice would be to settle in the country. I shall ever be thankful that my first pastorate was in a country village, where for four years and a half I had abundant opportunity to read. I exhausted the local library, which was an excellent one. I sent one hundred miles and borrowed books from the college library; I got books from every accessible quarter. Now, in my second pastorate—a town charge—I have to steal time to do any reading, and I could not have held my own for the past six years but for the diligent read-

ing of the first years of my ministry. Let "A. T. R." spend the first four or five years where he can have time and opportunity for quiet and study, and he will be thankful for it the remainder of his days.

P. K. DAYFOOT.

STRATHROY, ONT.

Another.

As one who has had experience in a city and in the country as a pastor, my advice to "A. T. R." is, accept the country call.

Whether it is generally understood or not that a man does well in submitting himself to the sacrifices of a country pastorate in his early ministry, I am convinced, on general principles, that such a pastorate is most preferable.

Unless a preacher has a very big church, and has become recognized as a very big preacher, so that he has no or very little visiting to do, and little work of any kind except preaching; for a young man the work of a city church is such that he has little or no time for study, and as much opportunity for preparation for what he may deem his life work. A country charge gives him a maximum of opportunity; and should he hold one for eight years after graduation he not only has the satisfaction of doing a good work as he goes along, but the additional one of equipping himself physically, mentally, and spiritually for more exacting service in the future.

CLARIS YEUEL.

How Regain Expended Nerve Force.

EVERY preacher soon learns from his own personal experience the value of good health. Many of us are constantly hampered by a lack of physical strength. I have found the work in the study does not tax my strength as much as pastoral visiting and the Sunday services.

My parish is in a manufacturing community. Much of the pastoral work must be done in the evening, when the employes are at home.

But I find myself nearly disqualified for evening work. Two or three calls will exhaust me.

At evening services my brain is apt to be confused; I feel weary and depressed. Sometimes when I have made the most careful preparation, I find it difficult to speak with any ease or comfort.

I have a friend in the ministry who is affected just the opposite from me. He has suffered from ill health for years. The preparation of sermons taxes him severely—far more than it does me. But his Sunday work does not exhaust him near as much; and Sunday evening he is in a state of mental exhilaration in which he can do his best work.

Now, can some of the brethren affected the same as I am inform me, through the columns of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW*, in what ways, or by the use of what means, they have been helped? Any helpful suggestions will be greatly appreciated.

P.

EDITORIAL SECTION.

LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

Immigration.

Having determined . . . the bounds of their habitations.—Acts xvii. 26.

THE annual report of W. D. Owen, Superintendent of Immigration, just received, shows that during the year ending June 30th, 1892, 579,663 immigrants

arrived in this country, of whom 2801 came in violation of law and were sent back to their respective homes, 1763 of this number being contract laborers, the remaining 1038 coming under the head of "undesirable." These figures will have added significance if the nationality of the immigrants be kept in mind.

For the years 1877 and 1878, respectively, up to October 1st, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Russia, and Poland together furnished 12 per cent of a total of 130,502 and 8½ per cent of a total of 153,207. But in 1891, up to the same date, these countries sent the enormous aggregate of 41 per cent of a total of 595,251, and in 1892 40 per cent of a total of 493,276. The tendency of the representatives of these countries coming to us is to mass themselves in certain well defined colonies within our great cities, preserve their Old World customs and fashions, even in the matter of food and clothing, resist Americanization, and resent all attempts at their betterment as an infringement of or an assault upon their liberties.

The current year will undoubtedly see a large diminution in the above figures, since the prohibitive measures that have been adopted with reference to steerage passengers coming from cholera-infected ports must effect such a result. At the same time the number of those allowed to enter will be sufficiently large to constitute a factor of menacing proportions, sufficiently so to warrant the thoughtful consideration of all who have at heart the welfare of our country and its various interests, material, physical, intellectual, moral, social, political. We call it a menace because it is a recognized fact that the increase in the quantity of immigration has been attended with a corresponding decrease in quality. The great majority of those who come to us are utterly without any intelligent sympathy with our institutions and without any visible means of support, many of them acquainted with those forms of labor alone whose ranks are already more than full, and who are, therefore, destined to become dependents on public charity or candidates for public support in our penal institutions. The increasing difficulty with which our laboring classes find employment, the growing corruption in the political world, ministered to by the conscienceless venality of those who flock to our shores from abroad, the

growing evils attendant upon our tenement system, all are warnings to us as a nation that something of a radical nature must be done, and done quickly, if we would ward off the impending danger.

In an address before the Patria Club of New York City, Charles Emory Smith, recently our minister to Russia, stated that while in that country he was constrained to remonstrate with the authorities there against countenancing or encouraging the deportation to our own land of those who were so "unfitted to our conditions and our institutions," and that, in reply, he was told that the movement was purely popular; that the people "had come to regard America as an El Dorado where to touch the soil was to become rich;" that this conviction was the result of representations made to them by those who professed to know whereof they affirmed. It cannot be questioned that the rapacity of the great trans-Atlantic steamship companies has had much to do with present conditions. For purely selfish purposes their agents have gone everywhere heralding their misrepresentations, fostering discontent, and increasing the sum of subsequent miseries. Mr. Smith went on to say:

Last winter for a time the impression gained ground abroad that the United States would no longer give free and unchallenged admission to this vast volume of immigrants, but would exercise its right of discrimination, and turn back those who were obnoxious to its rules and its interests. That was a portent for Europe. Germany took prompt action. She issued a decree closing her frontier against inroads from Russia and Poland. Her logic was conclusive. The United States will not receive the immigrants, but will send them back to Bremen and Hamburg, whence they sail. Russia will not permit them to return. Thus they will be caught and caged in Germany, and Germany's only safety is not to let them in at the beginning. But, as a matter of fact, the United States did receive them. We did not put up the bars on this side, and so Germany let down the bars on the other side. England takes care of her self; Germany takes care of herself; and it is left only for the United States

to stand with open arms for everybody of every sort that chooses or is assisted to come.

In view of these facts the question that confronts us is, What practical measures should be adopted for checking the evils that already are manifesting themselves? The nation, through its legislators, has already answered in one direction; whether wisely or unwisely remains to be seen. Regardless of treaties, careless of its pledged word, in our own opinion most sinfully, it has said to the Chinese: "No further immigration will be tolerated." With the same indifference to right that has characterized it in its treatment of the Indian, it has struck its first blow at the least menacing evil. Its action is by no means a tribute to its moral courage. Regarded from a national and not a local view-point, it is not to be denied that the Chinaman is a thousandfold more desirable immigrant than is many a European. The results of Oriental immigration, whether estimated morally or economically, have not been nearly so disastrous as have been those of a large proportion of our Irish, Italian, or Russian immigration. This fact is coming to be realized more and more generally, and the question now being agitated, and to be agitated more and more until properly solved, is, Shall immigration be restricted or totally prohibited for a definite period? If restricted, to what extent? If prohibited, for how long? Already certain restrictions are enforced with more or less thoroughness. In an address that followed that of Mr. Smith, already quoted, Senator Chandler stated:

The present laws are directed against the admission of persons afflicted with disease, idiots, lunatics, criminals, polygamists, people who come under contract to work here, and people who are liable to become public charges, under which designation assisted immigrants are also included. Now, these laws are fairly well enforced. It has been proposed to add anarchists and socialists to the prohibited classes, but it is not so easy to pick out a socialist or an anarchist as it is to pick out a lunatic, and, again, the

terms anarchist and socialist are hard to define. There is now pending a law in Congress which provides for two things that would tend to check immigration. It provides, first, that steamship companies shall stop advertising this country as an El Dorado, and that they shall cease all their efforts to get steerage passengers and to swell the emigration by advertising in any way, except by the simple notices that their ships are about to sail, rates, etc. Now, this law can be easily enforced here in many ways—by sending back immigrants without mercy, by fining the agents of the lines here, and by taking proceedings against the ships. The other provision of the submitted law is that the steamships shall bring with them full manifests, showing just what passengers they have, their qualifications, etc.

These are all steps in the right direction. Still the question confronts us whether, in view of the congested condition of the labor market, certain property qualifications should not be demanded; and whether, in view of the limitations of our educational system, certain educational qualifications should not also be demanded. It is our conviction that both of these should have due consideration in estimating the desirability of any immigrant to our shores. We would also favor still more repressive restrictions. We would exclude remorselessly all who are known to be addicted to the intemperate use of intoxicants or opiates, and all who are unwilling to make oath and give bonds that they will not engage in the business of manufacturing or selling either of these. When it is remembered how large a proportion of those engaged in this business are of foreign birth or of foreign descent, and also remember the intimacy of the relationship between this business and the misery and poverty and crime that afflict us, the reasonableness of such a restriction will be evident. We would make a violation of this agreement sufficient reason for a compulsory and permanent return of the violator to the land whence he came.

The Christian Church in America, at least the Protestant branch of that Church, as well as the entire body of patriotic citizens, has no insignificant

interest in the adjustment of this problem. In the memorial presented last year to the Propaganda by Herr Cahensly, the Austro-Hungarian representative at the Vatican, whose name has added a new word to the English vocabulary—Cahenslyism—the following words occur, disclosing in a most suggestive way one of the dangers, the greater because insidious, arising from the laxity of our present laws upon this subject. Alluding to the question of emigration, the writer said :

This question affects the interests of the countries from which emigration takes place. Through their immigrants, the nations are acquiring in the great republic an influence and importance of which they will one day be able to make great profit.

Here is a covert allusion to ecclesiastical and political interests which may well be regarded with no light appre-

hension—a suggestion of a process of honeycombing, and the substitution of foreignism for patriotism, the inevitable end of which must be disaster, if not ruin. It is therefore well to anticipate the future with precaution. The infant Cahenslyism, though wounded, is not dead. The spirit within the infant's body is that of a giant. Back of the proposition to give to our immigrant population bishops of their own races is the purpose that has actuated Rome through all the centuries, the purpose of intellectual and spiritual enslavement, the outcome of which is political enslavement. Romanism and liberty stand in antithetical relations to each other. Restriction of immigration in the directions indicated by us would be the deadliest blow to all ambitious purposes of foreign intervention in our national affairs. May that blow fall soon !

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Right of Private Judgment.

THE exciting events that have been occurring recently in one of the largest and most influential of our Protestant denominations, in connection with the trials of two prominent professors in two widely separated institutions, cannot but lead to the inquiry on the part of those within and without the Church, Where does religious liberty begin and where end ? How far has any body of men the right to impose their interpretation of the original interpretation of a given constitution upon one who subscribes thereto ? The question is not, What shall be done with the man who declares himself out of sympathy with the standards of his denomination ? but, How much liberty shall be accorded the man who avows his devotion to those standards ? Present indications seem to favor the view that religious liberty consists in such freedom as Simon Peter had when bound to two soldiers, the scope of his liberty being the

length of his bonds, and the length of his guards. The question is one which we would like to see calmly yet critically discussed, How far is the right of private judgment to be limited by the decisions of meagre majorities in church courts ? Does liberty in the interpretation of the Scriptures or of given standards consist in submission to the imposed restraint of any man or number of men, between whom and one's self the only difference is that of a varying opinion with reference to the meaning of documents whose sentiments all together profess to accept with a like devotion ?

We deprecate trials for heresy where the views in question do not involve essentials of faith or fundamental moral principles, but merely questions of a more or less speculative character, hypotheses as to the meaning of imperfectly revealed truths. We believe that the resultant evils far outweigh all the good that may be accomplished in pro-

tecting "the faith once delivered to the saints." In the early Church the apostles were content with the exercise of the rebuking function when there arose what they regarded as a departure from the truth in non-essentials. Paul did not convene a Church court at Antioch for the purpose of trying Peter on the ground of dissent or dissimulation. He recognized the good work of Simon as the apostle to the Jews, however true it might be that he was not to be depended on in his relations to Gentiles. A trial of this sort never yet was free from most deplorable developments. Invariably does the world find occasion for the taunt that is as old as the Church, "Behold, how these Christians love one another!" Invariably does casuistry find full scope for its exercise, and the truth suffer at the hands of those who would serve her. The disagreeable is very apt to be the outcome of the disagreement. In a sermon preached to his own people on the first Sunday of December, a sermon of admirable spirit as well as of conspicuous ability, Dr. Virgin, pastor of Pilgrim Church, told of the benefits coming from heresy trials, such as the publicity given by them to Christian truth; the tendency to make statements of truth more simple and lucid; the manifestation of the readiness and even eagerness of men to defend the truth; the discipline afforded in the matter of self-control; and the disclosure of the vastness of the scope of Christian teaching. The points are all well made; but over against these are others which seem to us of still greater force, the interrupted ministrations of the Gospel and of the dispensation of its comforts, engendered bitteresses, divisions in the body of Christ consequent upon ecclesiastical decisions, the wider publicity given to the very views regarded as pernicious, the emphasizing of divergencies of view up to the point of misstatement, and the subsequent and consequent arraignment of the Church by the world for an illiberality that has tended to broaden the distance between the two. While

we by no means look with complacency upon the views which may be called peculiar to the eminent professor recently on trial in this city, we are none the less inclined to deprecate the course adopted with reference to him, and to believe that some other would have been more in the interest of unity and of peace, as well as more in accord with the right of private judgment, whose defence is the boast of Protestantism.

Ministers and Municipal Cleanliness.

THE action of the ministers of Pittsburg in securing official assistance in driving out from the city those whose livelihood was dependent upon their fostering of the social evil, will have no criticism from any fair-minded men, whether within or without the ranks of the ministry. It is well that there are men who have sufficient regard for law to see to it that, so long as it remains on the pages of the statute books, it shall be enforced; and that men who are paid by the public for the enforcement of law shall not regard their offices as sinecures, or draw salaries for their fidelity in shielding violators of law. It were well if the payment of salaries were conditioned upon the faithful execution of duty. Official conscientiousness in these days seems to be closely allied to financial considerations. Whether this may be accomplished or not, no minister, whatever the cost to himself, should be unwilling to take his stand publicly and boldly, as a citizen determined upon seeing the vindication of the majesty of the law.

It is because, in his effort to secure this result, one of the leading pastors of the metropolis has consented to lay aside all considerations of personal comfort, to brave the antagonism of officials whose only reason for offence is the consciousness of their infidelity in the execution of the duties which they are employed to do, to risk the assaults of violators of law, and to evoke the censure of those who should bid him God-speed, that we say we would that the

number of men whose public spirit and readiness of sacrifice are equal to those shown by Dr. Parkhurst might be indefinitely multiplied. The work in which he is engaged is surely as worthy of him as was the scourging of the traders in the temple worthy of Him who came not to condemn, but to save. Sympathy with the fallen need not degenerate into vapid sentimentality. It may exist in its full tenderness even when justice is in process of execution; and the obligation of preaching the Gospel does not put any man above the responsibility of playing the part of a citizen well. If any class of citizens is interested supremely in seeing laws that conserve the moral life of the people enforced, it is the ministry. In this, as in all other respects, the preacher should be an example to his fellows, not sending them where he is unwilling to lead them, but saying, Come, as well as, Go.

Certainly it is time that those who are in the public employ as the protectors of life and of property, and the enforcers of law, should be taught the lesson that they cannot connive at crime of any character; that they cannot choose for themselves what laws shall be enforced and what suffered to become dead-letter. It does not lie with them to say, Hide, when the people, through the law, say, Suppress. They have no right to do aught but put down lawlessness of whatever kind. It should be no longer true of us that, as the great dramatist through the lips of the Duke of Vienna said of that city, we see

"corruption boil and bubble
Till it o'errun the stew; laws for all faults;
But faults so countenanced, that the strong
statutes
Stand like the forfeits in a barber's shop,
As much in mock as mark."

It is his uncompromising determination to see to it that officers of the law do their duty in this respect, that has brought down their wrath upon the head of Dr. Parkhurst. May it be that, as the lawless oppose him, the lovers of law shall uphold and encourage him in his arduous and thankless work!

America's Vice-Pope.

THE deputation of Monsignor Satolli, an Italian representative of the Holy See, to hear and decide without appeal, all controversies that may arise in the official circles of the Romish Church in the United States, is an event of considerable interest to the religious world. Clothed with supreme powers, his judgment being final in all disputed matters, he may well be called, virtually, the Pope of America. The choice of an Italian for this post of honor reflects rather seriously upon the intelligence of the American and Irish representatives of the official orders in the Church. It remains to be seen whether Monsignor Satolli will be able to overcome the natural feeling of envy which his appointment will arouse, or perform the difficult duties of his office without exciting such antagonisms as may result in the disrupting of the Church along national lines.

BLUE MONDAY.

We are not surprised that our well-known contemporary, the *New York Tribune*, considering recent political developments, should be slightly off its base. But we are grieved to see how disastrous has been the result of its ex-

perience. It seems clear that not only have its powers of vision become obscure as far as concerns the results of the Prohibition movement, but that even the most familiar experiences of life are become to it confused and in-

capable of identification. To cite a single illustration. In a recent issue, we find an item headed "Mrs. D— Dies at a Funeral," and proceeding to read, ascertain that "Mrs. D—" died suddenly while attending the wedding of Miss E. M— and Mr. H. W. P—. We are constrained to believe either that the *Tribune* editor has not recovered from the effects of the jar received November 8th, or that his marital experience has been of such a character that he is unable to distinguish between it and a burial. Under either circumstance he has our sympathy, though not the fellow-feeling that comes from a corresponding experience.

Ecclesiastical Canines.

SOME years since I was attending a church in B— R—, N. J., the pastor of which was the owner of a little black-and-tan. It was his custom to lock the little fellow up before service, letting him out on his return from church. On the Sunday in question he had taken this precaution as usual. It was communion Sunday, and the service was of more than ordinary solemnity. Just as the pastor was reading the Scriptures, to his chagrin and vexation the terrier made his appearance, and running up the middle aisle of the church toward the table whereon the elements were arranged, began to make such a commotion that the attention of the congregation was diverted. After waiting a moment to see whether any of the officials would remove the intruder, the pastor, turning down the corner of the page to the passage at which he had left off his reading, descended from the pulpit, took up the dog, and solemnly ejected him. Then, returning, he proceeded to read the Scriptures again, when to his own confusion and the unspeakable amusement of his people his very first utterance was, "Without are dogs!"

WHILE writing of dogs, I am reminded that one Sunday morning a

huge mastiff found his way into the church of my first pastorate about the time the offering was made. Whether he regarded the plate as suggestive of dinner or the official who carried it as one who would bear watching, I never have been able to ascertain; but with great dignity he walked behind that deacon up and down the long aisle until his duty was done, when, without waiting for the closing services, he took his departure, either disgusted with his failure to secure his "crumb" or satisfied with the integrity of the official for that day.

The Best Parishioner.

OUR best parishioner by extra labor in spare moments secures a conveyance to take his large family to church four miles every Sabbath day. He is no "fair-weather Christian." He and his give systematically out of their penury, often surpassing the gifts of rich neighbors. He works in a shop from morn till night, but has strength left to visit and pray with the sick and distressed. His liberality in poverty is remarkable. Home and family cared for, but many personal self-denials made for Christ's sake. Twice his pastor has commanded him to return his purse to his pocket, having already given more than his share to some specific object. The sum total falling below our expectations, he would quietly supplement it, though at a sacrifice. This remarkable spirit of genuine self-denial in many respects, which he makes year after year of his own comforts until the coat is threadbare, places our parishioner among the exceptional characters of modern days. The community bless this sainted brother, for he has helped many a toiler on life's journey and brought sunshine to many a home shadowed by death. He can sing, and he sings for Christ. He has learned to speak in public, and he speaks for Christ. He votes for Him and lives for Him, and a household of godly children is his monument. F.