

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

THE CANADIAN Methodist Review.

[NEW SERIES.]

VOL. VI.]

MARCH-APRIL, 1894.

[No. 2.

WERE THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST PENAL?

II.

III. JUSTICE MUST BE DONE.

“JUSTICE is that which renders to everyone his due,” taken as a definition, must be understood to include what is due from the agent to himself as well as to others. It is the principle which creates moral obligation, and is expressed in the words “ought” and “ought not.” Under Divine government, permission of moral evil reflects on the supreme rule of God, unless it have its corresponding natural evil, by which justice, not obtaining its due end in righteous obedience, takes it in punishment of the wrong-doing. If it obtained it in neither way, that would be its failure, and the victory of its opposite, injustice. Had God imposed precepts on all His moral creatures, without penalties for disobedience, that would have let sin loose upon creation with impunity, giving license to injustice, involving defeat of justice. The problem concerning the existence of evil would have been much harder than it is, but for the principle that sooner or later, in one way or another, wrong-doing entails proportionate punishment, so that justice, if not satisfied by obedience to its precepts, insists on being satisfied by punishment of the wrong. Thus, Divine justice

must invariably and universally obtain its ends against the sin that would frustrate it. As God cannot tolerate any such dishonor to His justice, that is, to himself, the principle stands firm that sin cannot go unpunished. Consequently the punishment due to man's sin cannot be omitted by virtue of something other than punishment, such as the alleged non-penal sufferings of Christ. Whether it fall on the actual sinner or some substitute, it must fall on some party liable to bear it.

We must distinguish between the ends of justice and those of benevolence. The chief end of benevolence, the happiness of others, may or may not be attained, without derogation from the excellent quality of the benevolence. The benevolence of Paul and of his Lord longed for the blessedness of all men; that less was accomplished was no defect or failure in the benevolence. But justice cannot aim at, or be content with less than victory over sin. The justice administered by men often does fall short of its ends through unwillingness or inability to execute justice; but that cannot occur in the administration of the Almighty and Holy One.

Exceptions to the principle laid down are only apparent, *e. g.*, many a villain seems to escape the just punishment of his villainy; but the final reckoning is to come, when he shall receive according to his deeds. A Christian man is enjoined to forgive, and not to extort all that is due to him; but that does not free the offender from responsibility to the tribunal at which all will be judged "in righteousness." The punishment due to those who believe in Christ, with the exception of a small fraction of penal suffering, never overtakes them; but that is because Christ took on himself their obligation. Nor can it be shown that any sin remains permanently unpunished.

God, as perfect ruler, owes it to himself to punish sin; and if some sin, all. In maintaining His honor, He cannot permit His justice to fail of its proper end, and so be lowered. Such defeasance could not be compensated for by any achievements of benevolence. To punish sin is due from God to himself in order to preserve the absolute integrity of His justice. It follows that the non-penal theory, which supposes the far

greater part of the punishment due to sinners who believe in Christ to go forever unpunished, is rightly judged unsound.*

That the justice of the Almighty can allow its decrees to be frustrated by non-execution, does not agree with the fact that, under the Old Testament economy, and not less under the New, "every word . . . was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." (Heb. ii. 2, 3.) The words of Anselm quoted by Dr. Jackson (p. 248) seem adverse to the theory of the latter. "It is necessary, therefore, that either the honor taken away be repaid, or punishment follow; otherwise either God will be unjust to himself, or He will be powerless to secure either alternative—a thing it is wicked even to imagine." This implies that, in justice, God owes it to himself to prevent the dishonor or injustice which sin would do Him; and this He does by insisting on repayment, or the punishment of the sinner.

If justice were only a mode of benevolence, its requirements could be set aside whenever they stood in the way of benevolent ends. But if justice or righteousness is an attribute of God, co-essential and co-ordinate with benevolence and other prime attributes, it must have its *own* proper ends, as distinct from those of benevolence as the one attribute is distinct from the other; though the ends of both may be attained harmoniously under the counsel of Divine wisdom, as they are in the scheme of redemption. In fact, while benevolence may be still benevolence without securing all the happiness in others to which it tends, justice in Divine government, because it is justice, must accomplish its proper ends, that is, it cannot but be enforced.† Not to be carried to that extent would be none the less a failure of justice, though it were promoted by benevolence. Justice may "regulate" the operation of benevolence, as when, because justice demanded the punishment of

* This difference does not imply that men may be benevolent to each other or not without breach of duty. It may be often the duty of one to act benevolently to others, not because they deserve it, or because he owes it to them; but because he owes it to God. Then it is an act justly due to God, and benevolent to men. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is our duty to God.

† As Arminius says: "It is necessary that the mercy of God should stop at some point, being circumscribed by the limits of His justice and equity, according to the prescript of His wisdom." (Watts, Vol. II., p. 163.)

sin, redeeming love provided a propitiation to meet the necessity. It is said punishment is deterrent of wrong-doing. (Limborch, I., p. 367.) Much more than that; it is necessary to the integrity of the Divine government, when the law is disobeyed, its action is a requisite vindication of the Lawgiver.

Accordingly, in saying sin "ought to be punished," we intend, not as Dr. Miley suggests (Atonement in Christ, p. 148; Jackson, p. 234), that the sinner "deserves to be punished," while in fact he may go partly or wholly unpunished; but that the justice of God, expressed in His law, requires it, and will fail of its proper end if the sin be not punished. We mean not only that sin's punishment is right, but that its non-punishment would be wrong to God himself as righteous Lord. We mean it ought to be punished as when, declaring a criminal ought to be punished, our idea is that the judicial authority is required by the principle of justice as well as by public utility, to punish him. God is guardian, not only of public order and interests, but of His own honor, and owes it to himself not to allow His righteous purpose to be cut off and defeated. With Him, to punish sin is to vindicate His righteousness; not to punish it is to let sin be so far victorious. This necessity is quite apart from the question of the *form* in which, and the *persons* on whom, the punishment may fall.

Limborch gives five arguments for thinking it is not "absolutely essential" that God should punish sin (Vol. I., p. 90). 1st. "There is mercy with God." *Answer*: In Bible soteriology, mercy saves the sinner by first satisfying the justice which cannot allow sin to go unpunished. How does this argument agree with the same author's statement that Christ, by His sacrifice, "appeased the wrath of God"? (p. 295). 2nd. Men can so pass by punishment, if it do not affect the interests of others. *Answer*: No man stands in the same position as God, in relation to the administration of penal laws. This is one of many fallacious analogies set up between human and Divine government. 3rd. Absolute necessity to punish sin would be "absurd." *Answer*: How is it absurd? It is only an absolute necessity in case of sin. It is then absolute because the essential justice of God is so. The very nature of perfect

justice makes it so. 4th. Psalm ciii.: "He hath not dealt with us after our sins," etc. *Answer*: The reason of that is, not that sin can go unpunished, but that our Mediator bore its curse, and thus opened the way of mercy to men. 5th. Were God bound to punish a sinner for every offence, He could not bring him to repentance. *Answer*: The penal theory does not require such punishment, since the Mediator has borne the penalty of our offences. The assumption running through these five arguments is, that it was impossible for Christ to bear our punishment.

Limborch affirms that the exertions of Divine justice are "free," like those of mercy (p. 91). That is exactly what they are not. Is justice free to break a promise? Or, if Limborch means that it is only free in one direction, namely, to forego its due or not, I ask, is it free to let God be insulted and robbed of His honor by His creatures with impunity? If all His moral subjects were to disobey and defy His authority, would He be free to choose that no punishment should be inflicted? or could He be induced to punish it only for the subsequent good of the offenders, and not from any necessity of justice to himself, or regard for the proper and necessary ends of justice? *

* Dr. James Martineau, while suggesting an utterly inadequate ground and a mistaken import of Divine forgiveness, has clearly grasped a great truth—that sin cannot go unpunished—which the non-penalists have let slip. "If anywhere in this universe it were discovered that the law of cause and effect did not universally hold, that the conditions under which physical phenomena occurred were not steady, that the supposed connections of events were broken, and the signs of their coming, which were noted on one day, could not serve for another; this would be the death-blow to human science—a proclamation that creation had run wild—that nature, relapsing into chaos, was knowable no more. Not less true is it, that if, anywhere upon the track of time, one sin were found to have escaped its menaced punishment, if the rule were seen to waver and relent, which joins suffering to the faithless will as its inseparable shadow, if ever He who sets the poor with princes, were to set the wicked with the saints; this would be the death-blow to all moral faith—a declaration that the foundations of life were crumbling beneath our feet—a premonition of universal dissolution. As reason cannot move without presuming on the uniformity of nature, so must conscience rely on the unchangeableness of law, and can worship only a God pledged never to treat those who have been guilty like those who have not. ("Hours of Thought," pp. 108, 109.) With respect to the perpetrated volition He has irrevocably committed himself: His word has gone forth, which binds together guilt and pain, and it cannot return unto Him void. Not one consequence which He has annexed to wrong-doing will fail to appear with relentless punctuality: no miracle will interpose to conduct away the lightning of retribution. Within that realm of law and nature, He is inexorable, and has put the freedom of pity quite away" (p. 112).

IV. A MORE REAL SATISFACTION TO JUSTICE.

If I rightly understand the non-penal theory, it considers that the sufferings of Christ stand related to violation of law, not as punishment but as its substitute, satisfying justice in its stead. They were not the natural effect, but superadded to render to justice, at least, an equivalent to the punishment of the actual sinner, that so he might be free from the penalty he deserved, the consequence being, in case he complied with the conditions, that the punishment due would fall neither on himself, nor on Christ, his substitute. Thus the justice was satisfied in a way that left the sin of men unpunished, excepting a small part suffered by them before their experience of salvation. Instead of them receiving the suffering they deserved, Christ endured some *other* suffering; that is, the law when disobeyed, was not enforced; the ordained penalty when due, was not inflicted; but in lieu thereof, the non-penal suffering of our Lord was brought in to demonstrate God's essential righteousness, His hatred of sin, and the integrity of His moral government.

Now, if such suffering can serve as a substitute for the punishment of sin, it must have fitness and adequacy to answer the same ends. One of those ends is to satisfy the requirements of justice as expressed in the law, so that sin shall not defeat its claim; another is to deal equitably as between different moral subjects; and a third is to manifest the glory of God's righteousness. But such suffering answers none of these ends: not the *first*, because the ordained and merited penalty of the law is ignored; nor the *second*, for in some subjects, as the fallen angels, the penalty is enforced, and in others as believing men, it is not; nor the *third*, for notwithstanding the non-penal suffering of the innocent, the damage to the certainty of law, and consequently to the integrity of justice in the Divine government, is manifest. The assertion that penalty has no end but to deter from sin rests on the erroneous idea that justice is only a mode of benevolence. The idea is refuted by the fact that justice is an original, co-ordinate attribute, having its own peculiar ends which must be accomplished.

Despite Dr. Jackson's disclaimer that he does "not regard

these momentous events (sufferings of Christ), as mere spectacular displays, much less as fictions, but as glorious facts on which depend our own welfare and that of the world," (p. 363) it is difficult to see, on his theory, what more these "events" were than a spectacular atonement, seeking to uphold the justice of the Divine government by a display, or dramatic declaration, in virtue of which punishment may be remitted. If a sovereign judge, instead of punishing his criminal subjects, publicly exhibited his mental distress and horror at their crimes, inflicting torture other than the appointed penalty on himself, would that have any tendency to vindicate the law, or to prove the justice of his government, or afford any ground on which to forgive their evil deeds? How much less would a similar method avail in the Divine government. A human government may, from weakness, or from expediency, fail to execute a merited punishment; but in either case, it is a defect and defeasance of justice, and shows the government is imperfect, either in the making or in the administration of its laws. No such imperfection can belong to Divine government.

Assuming their success as a display, what was there in the "events" but a revelation, or confirmation of *truth*, which was communicable by other means? How could that atone for sin? But would those "events," on the non-penal theory, really avail to *show* the justice of the moral Ruler, or of His government? The appointed penalty, in the case of believers, is not enforced; but some other sufferings, having no penal character, are endured; and this is the proof of the certainty of law and the firmness of justice in government! One finds it easier to think such a course of procedure more suited to demonstrate the laxity of government and the deficiency of justice. The "events" are said to furnish "impressive views of the evil of sin, or of the majesty of the law" (p. 359). Is it not rather a view of failure in these respects? However that may be, "impressive views" of anything can have no fitness or efficacy to satisfy the necessities of justice. We are told the non-penal suffering of Christ "stamps sin as an abominable thing," and "exhibits the inviolability of the Divine law." Would it not do the very opposite? Those are effects of Christ's penal suffering in our stead.

To illustrate the stability of governmental justice by the object-lesson of the incarnate Son of God suffering something which the violated law did not require, does not render the display efficacious for the just remission of the law's penalty. How can remission of sin "depend" on such "facts"? What inherent or even adventitious fitness have they to expiate sin, and warrant the omission of its due punishment? That on which a thing "depends" must be congruous in kind and adequate in degree to uphold the thing depending. But no such relation between those "events" and the remission of punishment is apparent. How were the "events" suitable to be either the natural cause of, or moral reason for, setting aside the punishment for which the law justly called? How could they be a just compensation for breach of law, or a sufficient defence of its non-execution? To satisfy the justice whose law was violated, the "events" ought to correspond in nature and value to that instead of which they stand, namely, the just punishment of sin. But they do not so correspond; they are expressly denied to have the penal character which belonged to the sufferings for which they were substituted. No amount of demonstration of God's purpose to maintain righteousness would be sufficient to render the remission of the appointed and incurred penalty just, or to assure the moral creation of the untarnished honor and unchanging stability of Divine government.

The non-penal sufferings of Christ could contain no judicial element, and, therefore, were inappropriate to satisfy any judicial claim. They would leave the claim unsatisfied. Full punishment of the offender would have done all that justice necessitated; but the sufferings said to have been endured in its stead, not being penal, could not satisfy penal demands. The non-penal theory dislocates the sufferings of Christ from the problem of how to justify the sinner *justly*, and places itself, despite its protests to the contrary, in the rank of the various theories which reduce the expiatory efficacy to a manifestation or illustration of certain truths.

On the other hand, if, in the sufferings of Christ, there was the penalty of man's sin, it demonstrated that God in His mercy

saved man in a way which met all the irresistible claims of righteousness against the actual offender. It carried out the sanctions of law, so displaying both love and justice, and rendering it possible for God to forgive because the justice of His law was satisfied. (Rom. iii. 25, 26.)

It is said, in reply, that there was no need to satisfy *retributive* justice, but only rectoral or governmental. I answer, retributive is an essential element of governmental justice, for it is distinctly an act of administrative government. Rectoral justice vanishes if its laws are disobeyed with impunity. The failure of either is the failure of all. Moreover, retributive, *i.e.*, in this case, punitive, justice is precisely that which *must* be satisfied; for it is at that point of government where justice is opposed by sin with a view to frustrate it, and where it needs firm maintenance if the whole government is not to be discredited. But, on the non-penal theory, sin goes unpunished.

There is justice as an essential *attribute*, sometimes called righteousness, and, again, holiness. There is justice in the *legislation* of Divine government, ordaining just laws. There is justice in the *administration* or carrying out of the laws. Failure, fault or defect in any one of these is the same in the government to which they all belong, and, consequently, in God himself. But to decree that sin shall be punished, and then to let it go unpunished, would be such failure. And because that is impossible, any theory which involves it is inadmissible. Thus rectoral, as well as retributive, justice would fare badly on the non-penal theory.

This aspect of the case is entirely changed, and these insuperable difficulties are avoided when we clearly understand that the sufferings of the Divine-human Christ were imposed and accepted as punishment due to transgression—the demand of the moral law, and therefore of the moral Lawgiver. No stroke is inflicted, no burden imposed, no humiliation experienced beyond the demerit of sin and the necessity of justice. The overwhelming grief, pain, horror and death came with the justifying warrant of sovereign law. No natural evil was endured but such as was righteously called for through perpetration of moral evil. The suffering of Christ being penal, had

the same quality as that for which it was substituted; and it "demonstrated" the righteousness of God by showing how its claims were met. As the Divine-human Christ took our judicial obligation, His sufferings were of such worth as to render full satisfaction to justice and to set free the streams of pardoning mercy. The difference between the two theories is that between morally necessary and unnecessary suffering in the vicarious Redeemer. The one which makes it unnecessary has neither a just defence nor a *raison d'être*; the other, by satisfying justice, opened the way for a loving God to multiply pardons.

As already intimated, our position is not affected by the fact that the individual wrong-doer often receives at the hands of the moral Governor, less punishment than is due to his sins, or that often his personal sins appear to go unpunished. He may escape much because his penalty was borne by his Divine substitute; in which case the claim of the law is fulfilled. By laying the guilt of man on Christ, God established a sufficient ground of forgiveness for all men, on which Divine love has free play in pouring blessing on the guilty race.

V. SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST INDISPENSABLE.

If God could forgive sin on the ground of such an exhibition of justice as that of the non-penal theory, it is difficult to see how the ground was *indispensable*. Whatever use the demonstration might have in impressing the creature, it could have none in satisfying the justice of the Creator; and there was no other which it was so necessary to satisfy. Minus that form of expressing His abhorrence of sin and regard for justice, He could still have displayed the same facts in some other way, by words or deeds. There being no moral affinity or necessary connection between the exhibition and the remissibility of punishment, no inherent fitness in the one to affect the other, the public assertion of Divine justice was not absolutely necessary to the forgiveness. For aught that appears, if sin could be forgiven with such a display, it might have been forgiven without it.

By depriving the sufferings of Christ of their penal character, our friends approach too near the *acceptilatio* theory, which drew away some of the Remonstrants from the true *rationale* of the Atonement, inasmuch as it recognizes no inherent or necessary fitness in the sufferings of Christ to expiate sin, except that God appointed and accepted them for that purpose. If that were the only virtue or fitness, God might have appointed and accepted some other ground of forgiveness with equal success. And inasmuch as that view resolves the efficiency into the Divine will, for aught we know the same will might have dispensed with all suffering in the method of recovery. If the Divine will could appoint and accept some undeserved suffering not identical with that for which it was to be a substitute, why might it not have substituted something else than suffering, or nothing at all, with equal success? If there was no necessity for Christ to bear our punishment, what necessity was there for His bearing non-penal suffering that was not ours?

In the Scripture view, the sufferings of Christ were inherently efficacious and indispensable to the remission of guilt and punishment. "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name." (Luke xxiv. 26-46; John xii. 24; Acts xvii. 3.) "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission." (Heb. ix. 22.) That something more than Divine appointment and acceptance was necessary to the efficacy of what was done—some inherent fitness—is illustrated by the failure of the appointed and accepted sacrifices in the Mosaic economy to take away sin. In Christ were combined the elements which were necessary to real efficacy. He was human because He had to fill the place of the human; His suffering was penal because that was the kind from which He had to free us; He suffered our punishment of His own free choice; or His suffering had been unjust; He was divine that His vicarious punishment might have a value sufficient to satisfy justice "for the sins of the whole world," and create a basis on which sin could be forgiven without infringement of justice.

VI. SUFFERINGS UNJUST IF NOT PENAL.

It stands to reason that if a personal God creates a subject in personal relations with himself, He thereby confers upon him rights as well as obligations towards himself. The "faithful Creator" is a "just God and a Saviour," which implies that He recognizes the distinction between justice and injustice to the creature. If not, we must cease to assert that unconditional reprobation would be unjust.

Suppose God created a rational, sentient, moral being, and for some reason or other subjected him to suffering extreme and for millions of ages, but not deserved by any demerit in the sufferer, or in any other person, would it be just to the creature who was compelled to endure it? Would the creature not have reason to complain of receiving from his Maker evil that was not due, that is, of being treated unjustly? No advantage accruing thereby to another creature could make the treatment just. Nor would it be made just if the suffering were for a much shorter time. In that case the ethical wrong would differ only in degree. Nor would it be made just by its causing some advantage to the sufferer as compensation; for a deed of justice, or even of benevolence, in one instance cannot rectify a deed of injustice in another. The latter would remain an injustice, however disposed the sufferer might be to condone it in consideration of the counterbalancing favor. A father might flog and otherwise torture his innocent son at one time, and, at another, load him with undeserved gifts and benefits; but the latter would not make the former treatment just. A powerful magnate might take his neighbor's field by force without right, and, at a later period, give him a field of twice the value, but that would not make the robbery just, or extinguish the right of the latter to complain. Nor would the infliction of non-penal suffering in the case supposed be justified by any advantage accruing to others, for to the sufferer it would still be the same injustice—a dealing out to him more of evil, or less of good than was due to him. On this last supposition the injustice would be accentuated by inequity which conferred undeserved advantage on one by

inflicting undeserved disadvantage on another. The ethical relations subsisting between God and a personal creature require that His infliction of evil have an ethical justification. But where can it be found, if the evil inflicted be not the retribution of any person's wrong-doing, and so not judicially or ethically due?

Nor, again, would the injustice be removed by the consent of the subject, after the suffering was decreed; for then the infliction would be determined independently of his consent; and his consent would still be to endure an injustice, that is, to have laid upon him evil that was not due; in other words, evil from which he was entitled to be exempt. Whatever his reason for consenting, it would not remove the quality of injustice from the treatment he received; it would only show his willingness to submit to an infliction not due to any one's demerit.

All these fatal consequences are avoided by supposing that the evil was laid upon him because it was judicially demanded, if not by his own sin, by that of some party so connected with him as to render the infliction on him not unjust. The close relation of the suffering to ethical demerit is an element of the case necessary to its justification. Minus that element, what could justify the misery and death under which God has placed mankind? No theodicy is satisfactory which leaves out the consideration that all men fell into guilt by Adam's sin; that he, their father, head and representative involved them in the penalty of his transgression; (Rom. v.) that consequently they are "by *nature* the children of wrath"; (Eph. ii. 3) which implies an inherited condemnation (from which, however, they are delivered by Christ). But the wrath of God is His will to punish; therefore, they are all liable to punishment. If sin entered into the world, and death by sin, it was the sin of the "one man"; and, in that sin, "all have sinned"; and their death is the ordained penalty of that sin. "By the trespass of the one the many died." That death was not mere suffering, but the act of the condemning judge, carrying out the sanction of His law. "For the judgment came by one to condemnation," "came unto all men to condemnation," "through the

trespass," "through the one man's disobedience the many were made," not sufferers merely, but "*sinners*," under "condemnation." (Rom. v.) Thus the sufferings and death imposed upon mankind, viewed as the penalty of sin, are just; and on no other ground justifiable. The beheading of the Baptist was a wicked murder because it had no such justification. If, as Limborch and his school assert, it was unjust for suffering to be laid as punishment on those who individually did not commit the sin, how much more unjust would it be to impose the same terrible pain and death on the same individuals, if it were not in the least required as the penalty of violated law!

It avails not to reply that much of human suffering is *chastisement* or discipline, for the good of the sufferers. For, in addition to the fact that much of it cannot be so explained, the suffering is punishment *first*, a great deal of which Divine mercy and wisdom utilise as chastisement. Misfortunes, pains, sorrows, decay, infirmity, and death, brought in as the penal result of sin, are made, under the hand of our Heavenly Father, as discipline, to promote our moral improvement. "Our God turned the curse into a blessing." (Neh. xiii. 2.) The Babylonian captivity was punishment of the chosen people for their sins; yet God turned it into a beneficent discipline to bring them back to His service. (Neh. ix.) The forty years of suffering in the wilderness was punishment of sin; yet God made it a chastening discipline to Israel. (Num. xiv. 33; xxxii. 13; Ps. xcv.; Deut. viii.) He brought evil on David in punishment of his adultery and murder; but the same evil was also made the means of his chastisement and restoration. (2 Sam. xii. 11.) The privations of Job, and of the man born blind, were not the punishment of their individual misconduct; but of the race-sin: and yet their sufferings could easily form part of their moral discipline, as well as of instruction to many others.

In like manner all the sufferings and death endured by mankind may be rightly viewed as punishment of sin, committed either by various individuals, or by Adam as head of the race. In no other way can the natural evils under which the world groans be so well reconciled with the absolutely perfect justice

of the Supreme Moral Ruler. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth," often with "grievous" suffering; but He finds it in the natural evil which first came upon man as punishment.*

The problem of pain is by no means solved by showing that suffering is made a means of good. That would "lean too much" towards the optimism which makes evil necessary to good. Even then evil remains evil. *In se* suffering is always evil, and never good. To affirm that evil, whether natural or moral, is necessary to good reduces the Author of our being to straits and limitations inconsistent with absolute perfection; implying a fate stronger than God; not only an imperfect creation, but an imperfect Creator.

Should it be held that the evil is not necessary, but made subservient to the good, the question must arise, how does the existence of evil, so world-wide and continuous, accord with the perfect wisdom of God, seeing it is not necessary? Could He not devise means less dreadful for the attainment of good? Still, does it accord with His perfect justice to bring in such evil upon myriads of sensitive, moral creatures, without its being due to wrong-doing, and with no justification except that the end justifies the means. The problem is not how good may come out of evil under Divine government; but how natural evil, not required as punishment, can come within the range of that government, and on so vast a scale. One would think the only ethical ground on which the Moral Ruler could justly impose it, either by direct intervention, or indirectly by means of natural causation, is, that it was necessitated by justice as the penal counterpart of moral misconduct—the faithful administration of moral law. No relief is obtained by supposing the suffering is the non-penal effect, or result of sin; for that deprives the fact of its ethical defence. This solution leaves the mystery of pain as dark as ever, and cuts away the only basis on which the righteousness of the infliction can be maintained.

Moreover, between the sin of Adam, which was a moral act, and the physical sufferings and death of all his posterity, no

*Consequently my "double *reductio ad absurdum*" ("Substitution," p. 104) which Dr. Jackson declares (p. 236) to be destroyed, remains intact

causative relation is perceptible. There is no fitness in the one to cause the other, and whether God caused the effect through the operations of nature or by immediate action, the infliction was His own all the same. One shrinks with something like "horror," from the idea of a God who wills and enforces all our agony and death, while it was not demanded by the ethical relations of the Divine government. Or, if there was a *natural* necessity for such suffering, without which God could not bestow goodness of character and condition, one shrinks from the idea of a God so limited by the forces of natural evil.

I venture to believe a far more rational solution of natural evil is that which traces it, as punishment, to the commission of sin, partly in private persons, and still more in Adam, the representative of all men, and sees much of it, through the great propitiation, transformed by Divine wisdom and goodness, into chastisement or wholesome discipline. This view avoids the intolerable notion that God puts on men immense suffering not required by justice; and it lays the onus of responsibility on man's wrong-doing.

Similar considerations apply to the sufferings of Christ. If they were not the desert and punishment of sin committed either by himself or by any other party, and so were not ethically due either to Him or to those for whom He died, its infliction on Him by the Divine hand has no complete vindication in righteousness; especially in view of the extent to which He suffered.

The case of our Lord, however, differs from that of the fallen world, in that He voluntarily identified himself with humanity, and in it freely suffered and died instead of others, in order to deliver them from punishment. But that amazing stroke is not fully justified by the willingness of the victim, if, as we have seen, it was neither fit nor adequate for the end, namely, to render remission of punishment just, and was therefore unnecessary. For then the suffering of Christ neither justified God's forgiveness of sin, nor was itself justified. Surely the imposition of great natural evil on a moral being, by a Moral Ruler, requires a sufficient moral reason for its defence. Such defence is not found in the mere consent of the sufferer. If a

father subjected his innocent son to unheard of imprisonment, disgrace and pain, not merited by anybody's misconduct, nor effectual, or necessary to any worthy end, the consent of the son would not suffice to make the treatment right. Had Naboth, for the sake of peace, or from any other benevolent motive, consented to Ahab's taking of his vineyard, that would not have rendered the deprivation just; especially if the act were not in fulfilment of a just requirement, nor adapted or indispensable to the end Naboth desired. If, as the non-penal theory implies, the sufferings of Christ were not necessitated by any demands of retributive justice, nor merited by any transgression; and if, as I have shown, they were neither sufficient nor indispensable to the end—remission of obligation to punishment—their infliction lacks justification. To aim at a good end might make the action benevolent, but not just. On the other hand, if, in addition to the willing consent of the sufferer, the suffering was a necessity of justice as punishment of sin, and rendered punishment of those for whom He was the substitute justly remissible, the justification of putting Him to grief is complete.

VII. BETTER DISPLAY OF LOVE.

The penal theory affords a better manifestation than the non-penal, not only of justice and wisdom, but of Divine *love*. According to the former the Son of God stooped to a far deeper humiliation than mere suffering, in order to redeem our race, when He humbled himself to bear our curse. So great was His love that, in order to deliver us, He shrank not from coming under our dreadful obligation to endure the sentence of criminals against supreme and rightful authority. Surely in that lower depth of humiliation for us there was evinced a far greater depth of redeeming love than there could have been in non-penal suffering. This truth is too obvious to need enlargement.

(To be continued.)

Didsbury, Eng.

M. RANGLES.

HISTORY OF DOGMA.

By the history of dogma I understand the history of the doctrines of the Church. These doctrines are such as are contained in the Thirty-nine Articles, and include, indeed, every statement of faith which is declared by the Church of Rome to be a doctrine. Of these doctrines I may mention the following as being of special significance from an historical point of view, viz., the doctrines concerning Jesus Christ, concerning sin, justification, authority, sacraments; indeed, every doctrine is historically interesting.

In the natural course of events, many years would pass over in the Christian Church before there would arise any need for a dogmatic statement of the faith of the Church. And when the need of such statement did arise, the subjects would come under discussion in the order in which circumstances would call them forth, some doctrines receiving a formal statement in the earlier years of Christianity, some in later years, and some, perhaps, not yet discovered, or not yet decided upon.

For the sake of clearness the history of dogma has been divided into several parts. I mention the first four divisions as being the most interesting to us, viz.: The Apologetic period, closing about the year 250 A.D.; the Polemic period, extending from 250 A.D. to 750 A.D.; the Scholastic period, extending from 750 to 1500; the Reformation period, covering the sixteenth century.

There was no formal statement of doctrine, such as we now possess, during the first one hundred and fifty years of Christianity. The faith of the Church was, doubtless, in essential matters, much the same as it is with us, though with limitations. For no such system of dogmatic theology as we possess could possibly have existed during the first centuries of the Christian era. The materials, out of which we form our theology, existed only in part in those early days. The harmony which exists between the Old and the New Testament was not so well understood then as it is now. That knowledge was the growth of

years, while the Apostolic Epistles were not accorded the place in sacred literature which they now hold. The Church's faith was more confined to the historic Christ, and from that it broadened out to what it now is.

During the first century and a half, the Church defended itself against its accusers, and in this time we have the writings of the apologists.

When differences of view began to be entertained by individuals and by congregations throughout the world, the necessity was created for some definite standard of doctrine for all the Church. And out of such differences of view arose the discussions and the councils, which engaged the greatest talents of men, and extended over centuries of time. Origen, who died in the middle of the third century, is the father of systematic theology.

The question of authority for a rule of faith would naturally come up among the first of all questions. And this question was practically settled in the early part of the fourth century. This authority consisted of the Holy Scriptures of tradition and of the Church. Tradition at first meant the Apostles, then the third and fourth generations of Christians, then Origen and his disciples, then Athanasius and the Fathers of the fourth century, then the first seven councils. And by the time we reach the Scholastic period, viz., 750 A.D., everything is considered fixed and settled, and future doctrines can be formulated only upon interpretations of the past councils, and the Church of Rome stands for that position to-day.

The person of Jesus Christ came under discussion in the third century, and for the space of about four hundred years was prominent in individual interest, and in provincial and œcumenical councils. The agitation included such questions as the divinity of Christ, the humanity of Christ, the duality of the will of Christ, the real presence of a divine being, or only the appearance of a divine being, and covers the whole ground of incarnation and redemption. Historians arrange this discussion under such heads as the following: The Trinitarian Controversy, the Originistic Controversy, the Appollinaristic Controversy, the Nestorian Controversy, the Monophysitic

Controversy, the Monothelete Controversy. It is evident from the endless discussion of this subject in those ages, that the Church realized Jesus Christ to be the centre around which all doctrines revolve. And in this respect our ancestors resemble us. For what is the centre of theology to-day but Jesus Christ?

The doctrines concerning the sacraments, penance, purgatory, indulgences had their origin in the views entertained upon the way of salvation. We can hardly realize how unscriptural were the views upon this matter, even before the time of Augustine. And all the period that intervenes between the time of Constantine until the time of the dawning of the Reformation seems to have been one of ever-increasing error, until, in the heart of the Middle Ages, there was darkness that might be felt. I shall not endeavor to trace further the development of any doctrine, as that might prove tedious to you, and as I think I can put my time to better use.

Let us transport ourselves in imagination to the beginning of the fourth century. Let us make a tour of inspection to all the churches of the world. We shall go to Jerusalem, the stronghold of Judaism; to Alexandria, the university of Hellenic culture; to Rome, the seat of imperial dominion. And wherever we go, what shall we find? We shall find, not Christian nations, but heathen nations, or in Palestine a bigotry more impregnable than heathenism. And what shall we find in the churches? Shall we find an open Bible and a simple apostolic faith? We shall find the Bible and some of the apostolic faith, and we shall find Plato. We shall find Hellenistic philosophy and Greco-religious philosophy, and the cultus of ancient religious worship. These we shall find in the churches incorporated into Christianity.

“The claim of the Church that the dogmas are simply the exposition of the Christian revelation, because deduced from the Holy Scriptures, is not confirmed by historical investigation. On the contrary, it becomes clear that dogmatic Christianity in its conception and in its construction was the work of the Hellenic spirit upon the Gospel soil. The intellectual medium by which, in early times, men sought to make

the Gospel comprehensible, and to establish it securely, became inseparably blended with the content of the same."

It is no wonder that such a combination was formed. The apologists prepared the way by the endeavor to commend Christianity to the world as a doctrine agreeable to reason and to the highest religious faith of the world. Besides, the influence of the religious philosophies of the time was very great. The products of Platonism, even at the inception of Christianity, were an intellectual achievement of the highest kind. It was a conclusion worthy of the four hundred years which had been devoted by the finest minds in all antiquity to the solution of moral and religious problems. And Christianity put all other religions to the proof, and in this test Neo-Platonism, which appeared about the year 250 A.D., was the gathered product of all the wisdom of the ages, and contested its claim to be the world's religion with the last energies of a man who contends for his life.

It is not much wonder if Christianity was seduced by this powerful enchantress, the last-born child of mighty wisdom. And seduced she was. Her pure and limpid stream flowed concurrent with the turbid waters of heathenism, and mingling their elements together, they bred disease and spread contagion throughout the universal Church. I quote the words of a living historian when I say that, "taking one's stand at the end of the third century, one cannot avoid the impression that ecclesiastical Christianity at that time was threatened with complete secularization, and with external and internal dissolution. And the power which, as matters then stood, was alone able to support energetically the distinctive character of the religion, viz., theology, came very near dissolving it, and handing it over to the world."

It is worth while, then, to remember that the theological discussion out of which our dogmatic statements of religion have been evolved, were not discussions of theology after the same manner as we are accustomed to use the term theology. It was a discussion of natural religion and of revealed religion, of the Bible and of the school men, of Christianity and of heathenism, of Plato and of Paul, all in one. And our doctrines, in the

manner in which they have come to us, are to be looked upon, not so much as systematic statements of divine revelation taken simply from the Holy Scriptures, as the invaluable product of tons of ore smelted and refined to the precious metal—not so much as buckets from a majestic river, as crystal jugs from filtered streams.

“The Church in its organization, its constitution and its government, appropriated, piece for piece, the great apparatus of the earthly Roman empire.” “And with the philosophy of that age the Gospel allied itself, and the stages of the ecclesiastical History of Dogma, during the first five centuries, correspond to the stages of the Hellenistic philosophy of religion within the same period.” “The four stages of the development of dogma correspond to the progressive, religious and philosophical development of paganism during the same time.”

I have said enough about the history of doctrine, about its origin, its associations and its development to bring out to notice the fact that since the world began, nothing has been more complicated and involved in the process of its development than theology has been. The pathway of more than half a millennium of years is strewn with the pages of forensic debate upon some question of religion. You cannot mention the names of the great writers and leaders of the Christian Church without bringing before your mind the historic cities of the three ancient continents of Europe, Asia and Africa. And you cannot examine the origin of the later dogmas concerning government and penances—no, nor even the earlier ones concerning Christ and salvation, without finding proof that pride and ambition, that love of money and love of power had taken an active part in the determining of these questions. Divines struggled with divines, emperors plotted against emperors, bishops compromised with kings, and kings compromised with bishops. The leaders of one statement of doctrine stood with their supporters on one side, the leaders of a divergent or contradictory statement of doctrine stood on the other side with their supporters, and these two companies bore down upon each other like two battalions in battle. And the

man who, with his party, is victorious to-day, yesterday was routed and put to flight. Those were the days of heresies and of excommunications, the days when Origen was condemned by the councils, and when Athanasius had to fly for his safety.

One is amazed on receiving from such a past so pure a statement of sacred truth. One involuntarily asks how Christianity escaped being pillaged. It is a miracle that it is not naked, and wounded, and half-dead. The reason is that Christianity is divine. It is like the ark of God in the land of the Philistines, which the idolators placed upon a cart, and with oblations and offerings sent back by lowing kine to dwell among God's own people. The truth of God, like a golden thread, runs unbroken through the nineteen centuries. "The history of dogma testifies to the unity and continuity of the Christian faith in the progress of its history, in so far as it proves that certain fundamental ideas of the Gospel have never been lost, and have defied all attacks." There was a simple statement of faith in the Church at a very early period. This statement has always been held in the greatest respect. I saw it beautifully painted upon the blackboard in the Sunday School of the church where I was pastor three years ago. I have often joined in the chorus of voices with the children while they repeated these words: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen."

This simple statement has been transmitted from generation to generation, and will be handed on from father to son to endless years. It is so simple that one wonders it was ever thought worth while to put it into form. But its simplicity is its stability.

One question has arisen in my mind many times, as I have read the history of dogma. It is this: How much do we know of doctrine now? How much have we received from the theologians? The Trinity is a doctrine wholly Christian; its conception was impossible without the New Testament. What do we know about it? What do we know about Jesus Christ? Theology has given Him unparalleled attention. What do we know about atonement? This question, also, has agitated the councils. Do we know enough about God and Christ and redemption to formulate a definition that should serve for the thought of the world for a hundred years? This is what the Church has done. It has declared itself capable of casting the facts of divine revelation into moulds of such perfect form that any man would be a heretic who made a mould of his own, or used any other than their pattern. Well, I stand at the end of the nineteenth century, a man in middle life, a minister of the Gospel, an average man who lives in the spirit of his time, and I have no definition of God, of Christ, or of atonement, that I would put in the mouth of my children as the whole truth concerning them. Yes, and when I try to teach my children the meaning of baptism and of the Lord's Supper, I do it in the language of Christ and of Paul, rather than in that of Hodge and of Pope.

I do not know how much the theologians have done for us. But has it ever struck you that someone has laid us down at the gates of the Holy Scriptures. We hear the voices of the fathers, the voices of Origen and of Augustine, sounding away in the far distance. We hear the voices of John Calvin and of John Wesley growing fainter as they recede over the hills. And instead of these the Bible is speaking at our doors.

There are those who say that the truths of revelation never can be expressed in dogma. I quote the words of Lyman Abbott upon this point: "The Church has often adopted, consciously or unconsciously, the philosophy of Lord Macaulay and Dean Burgow, it has endeavored to crystallize truth into a formal and final state. For a creed is truth crystallized. But a crystal is a dead thing, and truth is a living thing. . . . The fundamental difficulty about all attempts to define truth in a creed is that truth is infinite, and, therefore

transcends all definitions. As soon as humanity understands the creeds, the creed ceases to be to humanity the whole truth, because there is truth yet beyond, not confined within the creed. The fundamental difficulty in all attempts to reduce truth to dogma, is that they are attempts to reveal truth without imparting life."

And Harnock, in speaking of the scholastic period, observes that "every science, even the most trammelled, will always find within itself an element offensive to that faith which longs for peace. It will display a freshness and joyfulness which to devotion will appear like boldness. It will never be able, even when it agrees with the Church in end and aim, to disclaim a negative tendency, because it will always rightly find that the principles of the Church in the concrete expression of life have deteriorated, and have been marred by superstition and inclination." And in the last pages of his book he says: "Everywhere it is plain that when the evangelical faith is thrust into the dogmatico-rational scheme which the Greeks, Augustine, and the scholastics created, it leads to bizarre formulas. Yes, first makes this scheme wholly un-rational. Therefore, the reformation of the future has the task of doing away with this cosmo-theistic philosophy, and of putting in its place the simple expression of faith, the true self-judgment in the light of the Gospel, and the real import of history."

My own opinion upon the matter of heresy may not be of any value, but I give it for all that. I believe that the Church should be very lenient in its judgment of those who take exception to the historic standards of faith. I think it quite probable that the world would be farther advanced in divine knowledge to-day, if in every age men had been free to express their convictions without fear of ostracism or excommunication. "Truth is mighty and will prevail." And I say, as far as possible, leave men alone in their opinions. Can we not trust the universal conscience, heart and mind of the human race? To excommunicate an honest, godly man for his convictions is like taking staves to beat a dog. It is an assumption that truth lives by interdiction, it is a broken fragment of that sceptre on which in Rome is written the word infallible. In this connection I may quote again from the author which I last mentioned :

"The semblance of the *semper idem* must ever be kept up, since the Church . . . surely possesses everything fixed and final. The theology and the theologians—even the best of them—came thereby, during their lifetime and after their death, into the worst predicament. During their life they were considered innovators, and after death, when the dogma had progressed above and beyond them, they came often enough wholly into discredit, for the more precisely perfected dogma now became the standard which was applied even to the theologians of the earliest times."

I observe one fact more: The doctrines that we hold as most precious have not been discovered by scholarly research. They have been bequeathed as a heritage from spiritual life. Some one has said that all the Bible is the record of what men have lived. This is eminently true of true theology. The doctrine of God, of sin, of justification, of holiness, are the gifts to us of men who have seen God, have felt sin, have been forgiven, have been sanctified by the Spirit. "Man can be saved by good works if at all," they said, fourteen hundred years ago. Or, man must make himself worthy of God. "Man is a sinner," said Augustine, "and cannot raise himself." "Sin is an error," they said, holding by heathen philosophy. "Sin is guilt," said he, "and must be washed away." "Man must be saved by the Church," they said, four hundred years ago. "Man must be saved by faith," said Luther. "Man cannot be saved from sin until death," they said, one hundred and fifty years ago. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin now," said Wesley. We have in addition the doctrine that the Gospel is for all the world, which is not a hundred years old, as seen in modern missions. We have in addition the doctrine of humanity or Christian socialism. And judging from the past, there are other doctrines in the blessed Christ to which our eyes are yet holden, but which our children, or our children's children shall see.

The thing for us to do is to maintain our spiritual life to walk with God. And while the Holy Spirit, who is the Divine Author of revelation, abides in us, He will still be as He has even been, the Divine Interpreter of His own Word.

Toronto, Ont.

THOS. MANNING.

THE GUIDANCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

II.

THERE is, however, taught in the Word of God a separate and distinct guidance of the Spirit from that which qualified the apostles for their work. It is universal as a privilege of the household of faith, immediate and personal, by the Spirit, and embraces "the truth" in numerous phases of experimental religion and ethics. Whatever other measures of guidance there may or may not be promised, it is desirable that the function of the Spirit as a positive guide should be placed beyond any doubt.

1. The Spirit's guidance at the initiation into Christian life. (John xvi. 18.) His work as the Spirit of truth is to antagonize sin and guide men to perceive it and its consequences, and so lead them to shun and abandon it. The spirit of the world contrasts sharply with the Spirit which is of God. The Divine Spirit aims to eliminate the power of the former from the individual life and heart. With the preaching of the Gospel the Spirit co-operates to awaken and convince of sin, and by this subtle, personal reproof to lead out of a sinful life into a personal acceptance of and belief on Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. ii. 12.) Not by natural perception does a man come to see the sinfulness of sin, nor to behold "the things freely given of God." The Spirit is the clear inward guide, reproving for the one and so leading from it, and disclosing the existence and beauty of the others and guiding towards acquisition. Among the things "freely given of God" must be included all the experiences which indicate deliverance from conscious guilt, forgiveness, regeneration, peace, righteousness, adoption, access, joy in the Holy Ghost.

Only the Spirit can lead us into the knowledge of these things. "God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit" is true of the actual entrance to Christian life by every one.

2. The next step in this practical and experimental guidance by the Spirit is described in Heb. viii. 8-12.

This important passage includes a most positive declaration of guidance by the Spirit directly. It is worthy of careful examination.

Wherein is the new covenant superior to the old, or what

advantage hath the Christian over the Jew? The new is a "better covenant established upon better promises." The former covenant was not found faultless, and its failure furnished ample room for the new covenant. The law of that first covenant was "holy, just and good," yet it did not bring life, for "by the law was the knowledge of sin," and the seeker of life by that method declares "the commandment which was ordained to life I found to be unto death." "The law is spiritual, but I am carnal." "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God;" "because the carnal mind is enmity against God and is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be." "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh." The old covenant failed in measure because the carnal mind antagonized it completely—the law of the nature of the man within, resisting the law without. The new covenant provides a remedy for this difficulty in the promise, "I will put my laws into their mind and write them on their heart." Formerly the law was without, an external force pressing duties on a nature unwilling to obey. Under the new covenant the laws are to be within—a part of the man—written by the Spirit of God directly on the heart and mind. This writing of the divine laws is thus described: "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us." "Love is the fulfilling of the law," and "All the law is fulfilled in this one word, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'" "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." This Spirit-implanted love is the essence of all God's laws and is a guidance of the Spirit into the spirit of obedience—making obedience a possibility through harmonizing the inward nature of the man with the outward law.

Pope, III. 176: "Love is the fulfilling of religion as well as of law; the sum of all interior goodness; a life governed by this grace is necessarily holy; for all the faculties and energies of the being are united and hallowed by charity. It expels every opposite affection; it sanctifies and elevates every congenial desire. It regulates and keeps from affinity with sin every emotion. It rules with sovereign sway as the royal law within, the will and intention that governs the life. The whole of goodness is in the perfection of this grace. When it thus reigns within it diffuses its influence over the intellect and its judgments; the mind conducts its operations

under the authority and restraint and sure intuitions of charity, and the heart is united to God." "Love is the very strength of the Holy Ghost in the inner personality of the regenerate. It is behind the intellect and the sensibilities and the will, ruling the man who is possessor of these."

"But as touching brotherly love ye need not that I write unto you, for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another." This is the supreme guidance of the Spirit into experimental religion—that one great truth of love has been taught directly by the Spirit of God, and other teaching of that was not needed.

Wesley writes: "Another ground of these and a thousand mistakes is the not considering deeply, that love is the highest gift of God; humble, gentle, patient love. The heaven of heavens is love. There is nothing higher in religion; there is in effect nothing else; if you look for anything but mere love, you are looking wide of the mark, you are getting out of the royal way, and when you are asking others, 'Have you received this or that blessing?' if you mean anything but mere love, you mean wrong."

The fact that this "law is written on the heart" by God, does not preclude teaching on applications of the law—it warrants no claim to universal knowledge. The apostle in Thessalonians while disclaiming any need to teach the law of love, teaches personal purity and honesty, and frugality and loyalty, and unfolds other important truth in the strikingly apposite passage, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, etc." As a result of this guidance of the Spirit, and a fruit of the new covenant thereby established when the law is written on the heart and mind of God's people directly, it is said, "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest." This describes not a distant millennial condition, but one to-day—a universal phase of the new covenant. A Jew, one of the house of Israel or Judah, with the purest blood of his race in his veins, might be devoid of all experimental knowledge of God. That he was a Jew was no guarantee that he knew God. Under the new covenant every member of the new house of Israel must be spiritual, must have the "law written on his heart"—the "love of God shed abroad" within it. Now "every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God." "Know ye therefore that they which

are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham"; "for he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart in the Spirit, and not in the letter whose praise is not of men but of God." The Israel of God converted, pardoned, and personally taught by the Spirit to know God, from the least of its members to the greatest, would easily perceive that, surrounded by "neighbors" and "brothers," of like experience, it would be unnecessary to say, "know the Lord." To know the Lord, however, is not to know everything; one may know that and need still to be taught nearly everything else as to Christian conduct and truth. Possessors of eternal life still need to be taught, and the exercise of the teaching function is vital to the maintenance of the Church's life and success.

3. We come now to consider the Spirit as a guide in the department of practical Christian conduct as closely related to the Christian experience. This guidance, as portrayed in the New Testament Scriptures, will be found to deal constantly with the question of sin and holiness. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." The distinguishing characteristic of the sons of God, those who have received the adoption and have the Spirit indwelling bearing witness thereto, is that they are led of the Spirit. This experience is a continual one, and is universal to the whole of the "sons of God." Now, what is it to be "led of the Spirit?" Is it a guidance directing all the minute phases of every act and determining by divine purpose every act, trivial or otherwise, of those so led? Wesley in his concise note, thus paraphrases: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God (in all the ways of righteousness) they are the sons of God." When the Word of God speaks of our being "led by the Spirit," does it mean led away from sin and into righteousness, or does it imply a teaching as to the general apart from the moral quality of our actions? This will be found crucial.

In Rom. viii, "walking after the Spirit" is evidently synonymous with being "led by the Spirit." "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." The antithesis of "walk-

ing after the Spirit" is, "walking after the flesh." *Pope*: "The flesh is nowhere more fully described than when it is opposed to the Holy Spirit as the principle of regenerate life." The object of "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin," was "that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Those "after the flesh"—led by the flesh—"mind the things of the flesh," and so do not "fulfil the righteousness of the law." "Ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body," it is said; and, likewise, "they that are after the Spirit, do mind the things of the Spirit." "Walking after the Spirit" means rejecting the unholy promptings of the flesh.

For a fuller definition of the "things of the flesh" and the "things of the Spirit," read Gal. v. 16-23, and Eph. v. 9.

To be "led by the Spirit," or to be "after the Spirit," is to be guided by the Spirit to refuse "to fulfil the lust (desire) of the flesh" manifest or clearly known. It involves the refusal of every form of action known as sinful, and contained "in the above catalogue, which includes every form of sin against God, against the neighbor and against the self, against social, political and ecclesiastical society."—*Pope*.

Again we have the expression: "But if ye be led of the Spirit ye are not under the law." "Not under the law," whatever it be, is the equivalent of being "led of the Spirit."

Pope III. 171, says: "The Christian religion, as the perfect law of liberty, finds its perfection in the bestowment through the Holy Ghost of an internal freedom from the restraint of law which is quite consistent with subjection to external law as a directory of the life. There is nothing more characteristic of the Christian economy of ethics than that it sets up an internal rule, 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus which makes us free from the law of sin and death.' This interior rule responds to the exterior, and in a certain sense supersedes it. The external law ceases as a law of death; it has vanished with the conscience of sin removed in pardon. Nowhere does the New Testament—even when it sounds most loudly the note of liberty—proclaim that the law is abolished. 'From the law of sin and death' we are delivered, not from the law that directs to holiness and life. The political and social legislation of the old economy has passed away, but not its eternal morals."

The "led of the Spirit," harmonizing in conduct with the written law, are not "under the law" since they so act that the

law has no censure or condemnation for them. Their acts are such that "against such there is no law," and not to be "under the law" is not to have the law "against" or condemning one. "Led by the Spirit," "not under the law," are expressions which neither make void nor abolish the law, but establish it.

The Spirit is a guide from every known vice and towards every virtue, and the guidance or leadership of the Spirit in Romans and Galatians, described as given to the sons of God, is absolutely and solely one to draw from acts of sin, and impel to acts of positive virtue and spirituality. This accords with the significant statement, "In this the children of God are manifest and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God."

4. A further illustration of this guidance in experimental religion is furnished in the passage, Rom. viii. 26, 27.

Whedon says the "true reading is our infirmity; namely, our ignorant infirmity regarding prayer mentioned in next clause." The promise is not that the Spirit will guide our minds into the clear consciousness of what we ought to pray for, but that the indwelling Spirit will offer the intercession of unuttered desire direct, and "he that searcheth the hearts will know the mind of the Spirit," not through reading what has been taught to the human mind consciously, but will read it directly. In no sense is it to be understood as promising a revelation as to what we should pray for. What we ought to pray for is prayed for in spite of our ignorant infirmity—a matter largely of unconscious guidance. To build on this the inference that prayer should await the promptings and teachings of the Spirit is an utter misapplication of its intent. The Scriptures teach that conscious want or need is legitimate prompting for prayer. "Men ought always to pray and not to faint." "In everything, by prayer and supplication, let your requests be made known to God." "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them."

5. Having traced the operations of the Spirit as a guide leading away from the spirit of the world, writing upon the mind of the regenerate a new law of love through which obedience

might be attained, and traced that guidance as an absolute rejection of all the deeds of the flesh specifically known as such—in all of which cases the Spirit aims to save from what is clearly sin, and to lead into righteousness—we come now to consider the Spirit as a guide in that branch of the personal ethics of the individual life, spoken of as the ethics of the ultimate intention. How far is the Spirit a guide in acts that are neither bad nor good in themselves, but only so in the intention of the doer? In a vital sense there is a real guidance of the Spirit in every act of the regenerate man, no matter how trivial or how completely it may be of a secular character. That guidance, as promised or indicated in the Word as to be expected, was not concerning its secular or trivial relations, but its spiritual and moral ones. Pope says, "The rule of God's Spirit in the spirit of the regenerate is the administration of conscience." Conscience distinguishes the moral quality of things or right from wrong, but concerning the other qualities of those same things it has no judgments. Now "in the moral domain the man is as his intention is, as his love is, as his conscience is." If the Spirit guide the intention, the love, the conscience, the man will in the highest sense be "led of the Spirit," and the manhood be assured, as not wanting in the elements for the formation of which the Spirit has been given.

The Spirit maintains the ultimate intention of the regenerate to "exercise himself to have always a conscience void of offence." "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

Pope: "Where the uppermost thought is that every action may be so ordered as not to bring dishonor upon the author of the Gospel. The reference here is to comparatively insignificant things. Thus every thought and every word and every action must, in Christian ethics, aim to honor God, and so Christians live to the glory of God. The entire renunciation, or rather forgetfulness, of self as the end of our actions; its utter extinction as the final intention of anything we think or speak or do, is altogether the glory of the Christian system. By the Scriptural terms, 'single eye,' or 'simplicity and godly sincerity,' purity of intention and singleness of aim are signified. 'Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.'"

Personal aims and motives are thrust out as unworthy, and the end and aim of all is recognition of the Supreme Ruler.

Pope declares: "Self-resignation to the guidance of the Spirit is the secret of all the virtues which belong to the process of the internal transformation. This grace is peculiarly Christian, and is known by many names. As the Spirit is Teacher and Guide, it is subjection to His will both passive and active. As He is a friend, it is the sympathy with His design and yielding to it: 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.' 'Quench not the Spirit.' While this last may refer to the restraint sometimes put upon His extraordinary influence, the former refers to the soul's habitual reverence and awe in the consciousness of an internal Divine Monitor. The general rule of universal duty is, 'If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.' The interior rule of the Holy Ghost is the new secret of Christian ethics."

6. The enumeration of these elements of Divine guidance has not exhausted all the phases of it, although the supreme emphasis and purpose of the experience come out in these manifestations of it, viz., to secure salvation from sin, and holiness of conduct, as the result of a holy purpose. The Spirit will lead us to keep us from consciously sinning in all our affairs. This guidance will necessarily affect our temporal affairs and relations and the results that grow out of them; so that, in a sense, as the spiritual and material interests are often conjoined, the spiritual guidance will be likewise guidance in material interests, so as to enhance the value of the other and secure the ends sought therein. Certain material results follow positively on that spiritual service into which the Spirit leads. "Godliness is profitable unto all things having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come." "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." "All things work together for good to them that love God."

There is, beyond all question, a promise of general direction in all our material affairs closely correlated to the definite guidance of the Spirit on the lines of probity of conduct. This promise of a general paternal superintendence working out great cumulative and ultimate results of good, though greatly full of comfort and inviting our hearts to a constant trust in God our great Father, falls far short of the definite and detailed guidance claimed.

This guidance is definite on one or two points, that the faithful shall not fall below a certain line in the supply of worldly comforts and conveniences. "Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?" They are not, however, to "suppose that gain is godliness," but accepting this guidance and supply as sufficient, "having food and raiment, are to be therewith content."

Now, in addition to all these phases of the work of the guiding Spirit, there are also cases of occasional special interference and guidance, descending at times to the most minute details, and affecting temporal concerns in a manner determined only and absolutely by God according to His own conception of need or utility. The diversities of gifts of the Spirit are not like the universal outpouring of the Spirit. In regard thereto, He is found "dividing to every man severally as He will." He alone is the judge as to the need and the wisdom of such interference and minute direction. No promise of God's Word justifies the expectation of such constant special interference for minute and detailed guidance. There are numerous instances of such guidance coming quite unexpectedly to the Apostles. They never dreamed of constantly claiming that such should be given them. Peter, under that special guidance, detects the falsehood of Ananias, and introduces church discipline; Philip, by special guidance, joins himself to the Eunuch's chariot; Peter is specially appointed to preach the Gospel to Cornelius and receive him into the church; Barnabas and Saul are set apart for missionary work—a special guidance; in the execution of that work the Spirit forbade them to preach the word in Asia, and suffered them not to go into Bithynia, while he directed them to follow the entreaty, "Come over and help us," from the man of Macedonia; all of which disclosed the possibility of such minute guidance, but was not a fulfilment of any promise leading them to expect such guidance when it came, nor did they generalize from these exceptional instances of interference and expect the Spirit to guide them in all the details of their ministerial life and work. These various phases of accepted guidance of the Spirit exhaust the promises of God, and no

promise is found but is completely met without resorting to the extreme theory.

III.—EXTRAVAGANT CLAIMS TO GUIDANCE.

That it may not be alleged we misinterpret the theory, we quote from the authoritative deliverances on the subject, in order that it may be seen we put up no man of straw to knock down.

“Hence our contention is both from the clear, unmistakable teaching of Holy Writ and the ample corroboration of personal experience, that the work of the Holy Spirit, as guide into all truth, extends to every matter, whether great or small, that touches human life. And what man, we ask, can sit in judgment on any matter and pronounce with oracular certainty as to whether it is great or small, or, for that matter, as to whether it is sacred or secular in its character.” “Hence he is a most reckless thinker who will admit the possible benefit to man from conscious Divine guidance in the so-called momentous incidents of life, but hesitates not to rule it out as unnecessary in matters of apparently trivial importance.” “Now when this consciousness of the Spirit’s indwelling is a practical reality, and not a mere creed or aspiration, the believer must of necessity do all things in the vivid sense of the supervision of the Spirit. Hence, to walk in perfect agreement, all that is done must be agreed to or sanctioned by the guest Divine, or else there is, perforce, immediate estrangement.”

“At the present day, the Holy Spirit retains supreme right to come between the professed followers of Christ, and all rules and regulations concerning prayer, Scripture study, or any other religious observances, and he who questions his claim in this matter cannot walk in the Spirit.”

“It is, then, the privilege of any child of God to learn from the Spirit direct just what to wear and what not.”

“It follows that he who is led of the Spirit into all truth secures all possible benefits for his body. For the simple fact that the Holy Spirit undertakes to guide into all truth him who yields unreservedly to his leadership must mean such knowledge imparted to him concerning the care of the body, that when reduced to practice the result will be eminently satisfactory in all respects. To particularize, he who is ‘led of the Spirit’ will not walk in darkness—that is, doubtfulness concerning eating, or drinking or raiment, concerning labor or rest, or concerning health or sickness.”

“Selecting any one individual, if from this moment he accepts and walks in the Spirit, there shall be no incident in his life which will not fully harmonize with the promises of Christ, his life will be the best possible in these respects, God being judge. To particularize, he shall always be in the right part of the world, shall have the best surroundings, and that health of body which is the best for him and all concerned, and of no

other person or persons than those who so walk in the Spirit can this be true."

"He who walks in the Spirit, in full-orbed guidance, has the abiding consciousness, amidst all life's perplexing changes, that he walks worthy of God unto all pleasing, and hence does not walk in the darkness of uncertainty concerning any matter, however great or trivial."

According to these statements, and numerous incidents given by this author to illustrate them, the Holy Spirit will always direct the seeker of guidance what street to take, what and where to buy everything, the business man how to conduct all the minute details of his commercial life, the housewife in all the minute details of her culinary operations, what ingredients to put into her cakes, the time and place to do everything, the pastor when to visit and when to stay at home, everybody when to go to a meeting, when not to go, when to read the Bible, pray, etc., and when not to have anything to do with them.

"Indeed," he says, "Christ implied in his teachings a minuteness of guidance which exhausts language to express."

IV. This doctrine is highly objectionable, on the following grounds:

1. That in opposition to the accepted creed of Protestantism, it makes the Bible insufficient as a rule of faith and practice. Constantly in this teaching the Bible and the Spirit are antagonized, to the great depreciation of the former. The leading advocate writes, "Can it ever happen that a Christian will be led of the Spirit to discard times and seasons for prayer or Bible reading, or for definite periods of time? Certainly, if it should be best for all concerned, not otherwise." This teaching declares the Spirit empowered to revoke the whole Bible for definite periods of time, and that his teachings to the individual man are of equal authority with those of the Bible—that these supplementary teachings are as vital and authoritative in reference to salvation, even when referring to trifles, as anything in the Bible.

No. V. of the Articles of Religion of our Church declares: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved

thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." But as already noted, to fail to obey *any* of the supposed supplementary teachings of the Spirit—not in the Bible—even in regard to paring one's finger nails, would produce "immediate estrangement," and "he who questions his claim in this matter cannot walk in the Spirit"; therefore he must walk after the flesh, and so must die and be lost, even if he lived in absolute harmony with the written Word in its loftiest spiritual claims.

On the other hand, those who neither know nor care for the things contained in that Word "which is able to make wise unto salvation," so long as they accept the teachings of the Spirit, whether revoking or contravening the express teachings of the Word written, will please God, and be saved. Antinomian recklessness could go no farther than to assert this, as is done in the following words: "The Spirit requires a man to follow his guidance with reckless faith, even when he guides contrary to our notions of Bible teachings, or even of what is reasonable."

This theory which makes "the truth" embrace everything in a human life, and refers it to all kinds of truth, material, scientific, political, commercial, makes "the truth" an undetermined quantity. No one, at any point, can ever say truly, with so much unknown truth ahead, that he knows "the truth." But the Scriptures contain "the truth" always referred to therein as a definite fixed and settled quantity, so that those who do not come to positive views thereon, receive apostolic condemnation as "ever-learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." This doctrine places its votaries alongside Romanism, in the claim that the revelation of the truth is not sufficient, and was not complete with the completion of the canon of Scriptures. Each must supplement, the one by the Holy Ghost residing in the Church, and teaching the truth ever more fully through tradition and edicts of Councils and Popes; the other by the authoritative voice of the Spirit in the individual. In each case the sufficiency of the Bible is attacked and repudiated, as an adequate guide to personal salvation.

2. It is objectionable because it makes God the Holy Spirit responsible for every act of the Spirit-led man; Under that guidance all he does is of God. Now either he makes no mistakes or else he is fallible like other mortals. Some of the holders of this tenet declare that their lives are not free from erroneous judgments and mistakes of various kinds; but that God the Spirit leads them to make the mistakes. In other words the Guide they trust to save them from making mistakes like other men, through *defective judgment or knowledge* betrays their confidence and *misleads* them.

This teaching claims superiority over all other theories as to entire sanctification. The chief asserter of this declares in regard to the accepted holiness creeds, "No representative individual of all this holiness movement exists, who guarantees holy, righteous living as the outcome of their teaching." But this theory, thus repudiating the "perfection of love" as the acme of definite experience, sets up the new standard as a means to secure "perfection of living." The ordinary godly judgment frequently erring through these mistakes of intellect, the man often fails to live a perfect life. All this is, however, to be corrected by the guidance of the Spirit. But if the Spirit instead of leading the man to "perfect living," *misleads* him into mistake, what becomes of the superiority of the doctrine? The man himself could make such mistake as would mar the perfectness of his life yet be without moral guilt in his intention. The Spirit could not lead into such mistake without becoming the author of the moral wrong or sin, and hence you have a conclusion that we are asked in this theory to commit ourselves to a malign leadership. The theory of the admissibility of mistake is manifestly illogical and untenable.

The only other conclusion is that the teaching involves infallibility as the result of the Spirit's guidance. "They say nothing but what He gives them to speak. They do nothing but what He prompts them to do. Therefore if anything in their lives seems to others to be error, those who think so are mistaken, and all is right and good and correct in the little and the great." The other hypothesis laid all the blunders and absurdities and weaknesses that were manifest, on God as the

sole person responsible. This latter, with the brow and face of brass and the eyes of a mole in the noontide of Christian enlightenment, says there are no mistakes. No more tremendous mistake could be made than to make such an assertion—the profession is its own refutation.

The infallibility claimed is, however, most unique. It is alleged to be very harmless, for “the doctrine of the guidance of the Spirit for every individual takes away the responsibility of one dictating to another; for if the truth is fully recognized that every one must be taught directly of God, then no one will demand the acceptance of his views of truth as necessarily true for another.” Every man is thus to be infallible for himself alone, within his own life. No one has a right to say he makes mistakes, and he has no right to attempt any interference with any other to correct what he may deem erroneous. Each Spirit-led man is through this individual infallibility independent of all other human teaching and interference, and the unity and mutual interdependence of the members of the body of Christ—the Church—are so far things of the past that we can each blot out of our New Testament the statement, “The eye cannot say to the hand I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.”

This theory of infallibility involves the abrogation of all true, fixed standards and tests of morality. Under this process right may be wrong and wrong right; good may be evil and evil good; and no one has any right to interfere. Such a doctrine, if it once prevailed, would usher in not alone the eclipse of faith, but the eclipse of all morals as well, and bring back spiritual, if not material, chaos.

In attempting vindication of this extravagant claim, we are reminded that John declares to the whole Church: “But ye have an unction from the Holy One and ye know all things; I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it and that no lie is of the truth.” “These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him.”

The real significance of the passage is somewhat-obscure. The revised New Testament in margin says, "Some very ancient authorities read 'And ye all know.'" Dr. Adam Clarke gives strong and cogent reasons for thinking it should read "Ye know or discern all men," which interpretation he claims is confirmed by the reference to "those deceiving or misleading you," and in the same sense would he understand "the same anointing teacheth you of (not all things) but all men." Against the false and pretentiously positive teachers of Gnosticism the Apostle pronounces these solemn warnings. Such power of discernment would seem to be predicated of the whole spiritual Church in the expression, "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that *if it were possible* they shall deceive the very elec.." According to 1 John iv. 1-6, the test by which to discern the spirit of truth and that of error is very simple—the acceptance or rejection of apostolic teaching. Such teaching received, would be confirmed by the anointing Spirit and be an abiding knowledge thus taught spiritually.

Wesley says: "With regard to the Holy Scriptures themselves, as careful as they are to avoid it, the best of men are liable to mistake, and do mistake day by day, especially with respect to those parts thereof which less immediately relate to practice. Hence even the children of God are not agreed as to the interpretation of many places in Holy Writ. Nor is their difference of opinion any proof that they are not the children of God on either side; but it is a proof that we are no more to expect any living man to be infallible than to be omniscient. If it be objected to what has been observed under this and the preceding head, that St. John, speaking to his brethren in the faith says: 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One and know all things,' the answer is plain, 'Ye know all things that are needful for your souls' health.' That the Apostle never designed to extend this farther; that he could not speak in an absolute sense, is clear from hence; that otherwise he would describe the disciple as 'above his Master,' seeing Christ himself, as man knew not all things: 'Of that hour, saith he, 'knoweth no man, no, not the Son, but the Father only.' It is clear, secondly, from the Apostle's own words that follow: 'These things have I written unto you concerning them that deceive you,' as well as from his frequently repeated caution, 'Let no man deceive you,' which had been altogether needless, had not those very persons who had that unction from the Holy One been liable not only to ignorance, but to mistake also.'

"Ye know all things necessary for your preservation from these seducers

and for your eternal salvation. Ye need not that any should teach you save as that anointing teacheth you ; but this does not exclude our need of being taught by them who partake of the same anointing, of all things which it is necessary for you to know."

On 1 Cor. ii. 15 Wesley comments : " He that hath the Spirit discerneth all the things of God whereof we have been speaking, yet He himself is discerned by no man—no natural man. They neither understand what He is nor what He says." The Revised Version in the margin would have "examineth" and "examined" substituted for "judgeth," indicating the spirit of inquiry rather than the assertion of knowledge acquired.

On the contrary, this theory of infallibility, and its conception that the perfection of living through perfect knowledge is the ideal of religion, meets a flat contradiction in Paul's statements : " Knowledge puffeth up ; charity buildeth up." " And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know," for even this richly endowed Apostle has to say, " For we know in part and we prophesy in part." " For now we see through a glass darkly ; but then face to face ; now I know in part ; but then shall I know even as also I am known."

3. The theory is objectionable because it despises many noble faculties and powers God-given and continually sustained by God for the purpose of guiding us within their sphere. Their proper use and cultivation are valuable in the development of character, and life, and manhood. Many of these are adequate guides in natural things. I thirst. Do I need the Spirit to tell to drink ? That thirst is God's natural guide to me. I hunger. Must I wait the special guidance before I partake of the food to which I have already a guide ? It rains. My eye observes a shelter. Must I wait in the rain till the Spirit guides me to the shelter or follow the simple observation of my eye—the natural guide—and go in out of the wet ? The eye, the ear, the taste, smell, pain, pleasure, intellect, embracing memory, reason, perception, are all God-given guides—not into spiritual realms, but in the natural. By the smell I may detect foul exhalation that warns me of danger of disease—it would hardly guide me safely to choose virtue from vice. But I ought to use

it in its own sphere with a devout and grateful heart for such guidance. It detects the smell of fire in the midnight.

Many other objections there are, but these must suffice, with one more merely mentioned. The theory is largely defended by a wresting of the meaning of certain general promises of protection, help and direction, and reading into them this theory.

The volume of sermons on "The Guiding Hand," by the late Rev. Dr. Stafford, contains an admirable exposition in detail of most of these passages, and points out how very objectionable many of the interpretations put upon them are. Space does not admit here of even the briefest *résumé* of this phase of the discussion.

(To be continued.)

Tilsonburg, Ont.

J. W. COOLEY.

THE CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF CHILDREN.

CHILDREN form by far the greater part of this world's population, and the greater part of the population of the better world, as it is being peopled from the inhabitants of earth. Childhood has been consecrated by the indwelling of Deity. We have often heard the story of the Divine child—of Him who was consecrated from His birth to the service of God and man. The story of this holy child has a divine and truly interesting significance. It seems to fit into all that has gone before, and into all that is to follow of that Life which is the light of men. There seems to be something uniting the birth of every child to this child of whom the prophet said, "A little child shall lead them." Children are receiving large and costly divine gifts through Him who has claimed them as His own, being found in the same nature with them, and by the strongest of ties has united them to the Father of all spirits and the God of all grace. Christ was once a little child, and the little child was never lost in the man. The purity, tenderness, simplicity, the benign feeling, fondness and sweet grace of childhood remained with him until the day in which His innocent blood was shed, and He, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. Through the sacrifice of Him whose

divine nature invested the atoning mediation with all the requisite merit, and whose human nature prepared Him to make the atonement in the very nature that had been guilty of transgression, all the requirements of our case are met, and "our children" are to-day "of the kingdom of heaven." Was there not a divine majesty of mingled indignation and tenderness in His look as He denounced, with terrible and never-to-be-forgotten emphasis, the cold-hearted selfishness and cruel pride that should offend or despise "one of these little ones?"

What did the great Teacher mean when, in a moment of profound sadness, He said, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Was He looking through the ages, and thinking of the possibilities of failure in the nation, in the Church, and in the home to catch His spirit and to fulfil His idea in the education and salvation of our children? Look at Christian England and America after centuries of Christian teaching and influence. Look at the world lying around the Christian Church, and think of the suffering and sin, and we may catch, to some extent, the import and sadness of that reflection, "Shall he find faith on the earth?" The nation has failed. The great question with the most enlightened of earth's sons has been to find some means by which the moral character of man may be restored, and the nation raised to justice, integrity and truth. What has been the result? One nation after another has failed and fallen. The Church has also largely failed; it has failed at every point save one—it has never abandoned its hope and purpose for mankind. It has blundered continually about its methods. It has used brute force in almost every possible shape to master men's consciences. It has tried to compel men by sword and chain, by rack and torture, to serve that King whose kingdom is not of this world. The home has failed. Home is the place where men often exhibit all that is false and selfish in them. In many localities, and in some states and nations, the home is only regarded as a place of convenience, and not as the dearest and most sacred spot on earth. How often the peace of home is broken, and what should be an earthly heaven is little better than an earthly hell. What

shall be done for the nation? What shall be done for the Church? What shall be done for the home? We must touch the life of society at its very spring and renew it. Had the nation understood, had the Church comprehended, had the home realized the force of the Master's words, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," and in that mind undertaken the training of "these little ones," we should not now be sighing and languishing because of our many failures, and the lack of the signs of the kingdom of heaven among men. For the future prosperity of our nation and country, for the future success of the Church universally, and for the future comfort and peace of our homes, we must give attention to the training and education of our children. There is nothing to be mentioned in the same breath with it, in the entire field of benevolent activities, for the prosperity of coming generations and the safety of the nation and country at large. Richard Baxter said, "Good laws will not reform us if reformation begin not at home." This is the cause of all our misdeeds in church and state, even the want of a holy education of children.

Let us look at the prospect. Our children are soon to guide the affairs of state. They are to make the laws for coming multitudes. They are to fill the pulpits of our land. They are to stand as medical practitioners by the bedside of our sick and dying. The entire trade and commerce of our country will soon be in their hands. If they grow up in the fear of God, it will be well for our home, our Church and our country, but if they grow up in transgression, the coming days will be full of sorrow and shame. It is a startling fact that most criminals are young. It is seldom that a grave crime, provided it be the first, is committed after the age of thirty. A careful statistician has proved that of the entire male population of England and Wales, the largest proportion of criminals is found to be between the ages of twenty and twenty-five. Five times as many crimes are committed in the five years between these limits as in the ten years between the ages of fifty and sixty. Dividing the whole population into groups of those from ten to fifteen, from fifteen to twenty, from twenty

to twenty-five, from twenty-five to thirty, from thirty to forty, from forty to fifty and from fifty to sixty, it is found that from the age of twenty the tendency to crime decreases at each successive term thirty-three per cent. in the case of men. Thus crime is committed and laws are broken by the youth of our land. One does not have to be old in Paris to be a criminal. Of the 26,000 arrested in that city three years ago, 16,000 of them were under the age of twenty. Where does disobedience to the laws of our country, disobedience to the laws of society in general, disobedience to teachers and parents begin? It begins at childhood. A child brought up in the family not to know how to obey his parents will be a bad citizen, a breaker of the laws of his country and a violater of the rights of society. The most powerful institution that abides to-day is not the regal nor the noble; it is not the monarchical government; it is not the republican government; it is not political economy in any form; it is not the Church, powerful as it is; it is the family—it is the household. The hope of the nation, the hope of the Church is in our children. What shall we do for them? How shall we save them, and thus save the nation, and give a tone of health and vigor to all our institutions? We must give more heed to their physical, intellectual and spiritual training. Here lies the secret of our prosperity as a country, and here lies the future success of the Church universally. In this work we have been very deficient during the past. We have spent very much time and hundreds of thousands of dollars in training our horses. We have devoted a large share of talent and large sums of money to agricultural purposes. Not too much. We have been bringing many emigrants in to cultivate our soil and help us become great. We have built our railways at an enormous expense. Our bridges are multiplying, and our public buildings are rapidly becoming all we can desire, at least all we can afford. But what of all this if our population be not raised in moral vigor and strength? What of all this, if we rise not in purity, virtue and truth? Where shall we begin this important work, and how shall we proceed?

Our first appeal must be to the mothers. The truest, tenderest

and most beautiful thing that this world knows is a mother's love. There is no human love like a mother's love. There is no tenderness like a mother's tenderness. The mother clings to her child with a constancy that knows no change, and with a depth and strength of affection that nothing, not even death itself, can shake or destroy. The love which the father, the brother, or the sister bears seems to be secondary and the result of habit or association. But that which never tires, that which burns early and late, that which in the bosom of the mother never decays, seems to be a part of her very being. Even God himself measures His fatherly love by a motherly standard. "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you." What more than this could He say? Now, this love of the mother needs to be purified by the Spirit of God and sanctified by faith, then it assumes its highest expression; and as well as being beautiful, it becomes holy, divine and God-like in its purpose and aim. Mothers, you love your children with an intensity that has no parallel, but you must remember this love needs to be hallowed, needs to be guided, needs to be under the direction of grace, and reason, and judgment, because your sons and daughters are very much what they are as the result of your training and discipline. When the question is asked respecting your child, What manner of child shall this be, what life will it lead, what character will it gather around itself, will the life be an upward one towards God or a downward one towards darkness? the answer that can be given is that the future of that child does not rest so much with itself as with its mother. The mother is the greatest teacher, the most powerful teacher, for good or for evil, that the child will ever have, and the scenes, experiences and lessons of childhood will never be forgotten, and their influence will be felt all along life's pathway down to the end of the journey. When clever, eccentric, gruff Dr. Johnson was fifty years of age, he wrote to his aged mother as if he were still her wayward but loving boy: "You have been the best mother, and I believe the best woman in the world. I thank you for all your indulgences to me, and beg forgiveness for all that I have done ill, and for all that I omitted to do well."

John Quincy Adams did not part with his mother until he was nearly fifty years of age, yet his cry, even then, was: "O God, could she have been spared yet a little longer. Without her the world feels to me like a solitude." Before everything else and higher than everything else, there stands out the noble and sacred duty of the mother to bring her children to Christ. The example of mothers in Christ's time must be followed to-day. I will not speak lightly of worldly comfort, or of worldly prosperity, or of worldly greatness, but to a mother they must be nothing, and less than nothing, when placed side by side with the moral training and the religious upbringing of her children. No prize, great as it may be, valuable as it may be, could atone, or in any way compensate for the error, and I may say, the sin, of not bringing them to Christ that they may receive His blessing. Consecrate your offspring to Christ. Consecrate them by prayer; let them be the children of many prayers. "I would," says an American statesman, "have turned my back on God and become an atheist were it not for one thing, and that one thing was not the Church; and it was not the Bible, but it was the thought of my child-life and the remembrance of those sacred moments when my now departed mother, taking me by the hand, knelt with me at the throne of grace and taught me to say, 'Our Father which art in heaven.'" O mother, see that your home is a Christian home, banish from it everything that would tend in any way to degrade or injure any member of the household, and take care that your home is surrounded only with that which is healthy and elevating in its tone, and moral and spiritual in its aim. Let your home be Christian in its character and surroundings, Christian in its blessings and burdens; and when you have thus given over your children to God by your prayers, you can then, in the spirit of meek faith and of quiet confidence, look to the Master for His blessing.

Next to the relation and responsibility of parents to their children, in the matter of bringing them to Christ and fitting them for future usefulness, comes the duty of the Church in this matter. The age in which we live is an age of recognized enthusiasm for the good of the coming generation. Little was done for eighteen centuries by the Christian Church for the

spiritual edification of children. That which will mark this century of Christian work in the annals of history is the development of Sunday School work, or a growing interest in the young of our times, an interest developing itself into organizations for their salvation and religious education. Until 1780, the twentieth year of the reign of George III., no Sunday Schools were instituted, and the Church took little care of her children. The Church is surely growing wiser, but not so wise and faithful that there is not left ample room for improvement. The world is not converted yet. There is still much sin and sorrow. There is a vast amount of work for the Christian Church to do, and we must not think the world will be saved by the irresistible afflatus of the Divine Spirit apart from human instrumentality, and all those forces by which man is developed and society built up in all that is excellent. It is not the design of Christianity to save a select few from the world, but to save the world itself. The field is the world, and we must cultivate it until our laws and institutions, our governments and courts, all commerce and art, and all our various industries are pervaded by the Spirit of Christ. How is this very desirable state of things to be brought about? It must be brought about by nurturing children in the essential Spirit of Christ. We have tried long enough, and tried in vain, to save the world by converting full-grown men, and unless some other plan is adopted we shall never get through with the work, we shall never accomplish the task. The Church must heed the voice of the Master. The servant must follow the direction and counsel of his Lord. We shall surely expect the world's conversion in vain if we wait till men are set in pride and selfishness. The history of the past seems to say that it is impossible to convert the adult world. No power is known to-day that can lift up the world and save the race by the conversion of men and women. Habit becomes too firmly fixed. Even the Church itself seems often cold to virtue and warm to selfishness. The world cannot be saved by leaving the work of salvation until the generations are full grown. Too late. We shall not do much until our children are kept in the kingdom of God. It is a noble thing to seek to convert the masses and

to bring them up out of the mire of sin, but it is a nobler, grander thing to get at them and influence them for good, and save them before they fall so low. It is a glorious thing to say to the poor, to the ignorant, to the abandoned, to the lost, in the name of the Master, "Come unto me." "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." But, O brethren in Christ, fellow-laborers in the Master's cause, is it not a far more glorious thing to say, in the Master's name, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." This is the Church's most important work, and she has lately discovered to some extent her responsibility in this matter. Why was the Sunday School called into existence, and why is it sustained with some amount of zeal. It was to supply the lack of home religious training. Under the providence of God, it was called into being expressly to correct this evil. The Church is now a little inclined to boast of the increased attendance upon our Sunday Schools; but it is not increased attendance alone that we want, not merely a swelling of the numerical lists. Christ said, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." We want the mass of our children to be growing stronger in the Scriptures, loving the Word of God better, and more ready to step out of the teacher's class into the pew to hear the Word preached. Among many of our young friends there is still a prevailing ignorance of the Word of God. This must not remain. There are questions of measureless interest that can only be met by a solid accumulation of Scripture treasure. We have admirable helps to the study of the Bible, volumes of illustrations and of facts, but we need to be on our guard that these things do not blind the eyes to the true purpose of Scripture and to the Scriptures themselves. The stories of Jesus are full of the richest doctrine, they also contain the marrow of all truth, and lead directly to Him. They are of themselves more poetic, fascinating and instructive than any science or history, and as easy for our children to understand as the stories and lessons in the primer. No words or lessons are better suited to the capacity of our children than the Master's words; they can always catch

some glimpse of His meaning. Then, as the days come and go, and the experiences of life enlarge, that meaning will open to them more and more. The principal thing is for the child to be drawn to Christ, and to think of Him as his best friend. We must endeavor to fix the young heart upon Christ, and lead it to realize that He is better than the best we can conceive of, the Friend of all friends. "Who is your most intimate friend, papa?" asked a young girl of her father. "My most intimate friend is God," was the answer. It is no use to pray for our children unless our lives pray. We must, first of all, have our own minds and hearts steeped in divine love, and in the truth. It is no use to use ill-timed and ill-tempered talk to children about their souls. It is worse than useless to talk harshly or tauntingly to children about religious things. We must possess the Master's spirit if we would lead others to Him. Nothing requires more tact and gentleness and loving-kindness than to converse about, or teach, or preach the things belonging to the kingdom of heaven. There must be a real connection between us and the Master, and then we must set up a real connection between the child and Christ—the connection between Christ and the child exists already. Then the child's heart will respond to His mighty love and all will be well.

There is another very important feature of our church work in connection with teaching our children to become followers of Christ, and that is the matter of Christian education. Of the various enterprises of our Church, this is second in importance to none. It would be well for our children if we could rightly appreciate the power of Christian education. Let me give you a quotation from the first published report on Sunday and day schools which was made to the home Conference (1837) over fifty years ago—a report which seems to be an embodiment of the true spirit of the work: "The land is not yet leavened with religion. Perhaps this will never be done until the various denominations of Christians zealously unite in giving to the rising generation a thoroughly religious education. What we wish for is not merely schools, but church schools, schools which, being systematically visited by the preachers, may prove doors of entrance into the Church of God; not merely education, but an education

that may begin in an infant school and end in heaven ; and which may thus subserve the high ends of Methodism, which are to fill the world with saints and heaven with glorified spirits." The ideal of our fathers in the Church was to have church schools such as could be visited by Christian men and ministers, and prove doors of entrance into the Church of God, and be the means of leading our children to Christ. A religious education, if it be under Methodist or Presbyterian, Episcopal or Baptist influence, is better than purely secular instruction, where there is no reverence taught for sacred things, and which secularism has led to so many 'freethinkers,' non-church goers and persons indifferent about religious things. It may be that common schools are necessary in order to have complete educational provision for the country. But schools under the influence and direction of a distinctively religious body or bodies, so far as they can be provided, are the best for the coming generation in the highest and truest sense of education, for they are the appropriate fruit of our church life and character. It is highly necessary that our church life should redound to the good of our country through our educational work that thus we may be fulfilling the mission of a truly national church. Here we must not forget that in this Dominion we are fast becoming in the truest sense of the word a national church, touching the very heart-strings of the nation, and that in years to come it ought to be increasingly national in its character, diffusing blessings of every kind, domestic, social, institutional, and therefore pre-eminently educational, through the families of the land. It is highly necessary that we should keep up our educational institutions, because they are fast becoming a very powerful influence in leading the rising generation to Christ. It is highly necessary that we look well to these institutions, because those who are growing up amongst us and are competent and zealous to do public work as educationalists will carry their capacity and influence with them wherever they go, and our Church must not suffer from a dearth of such men.

If we do not look well to our educational interests, we shall lose the best and cleverest of our children, for many of the schools of our land are becoming absolutely secular—no Scrip-

ture lesson is read, and not even a form of prayer used. There is a danger lest these schools should become secular in the sense of ignoring all religion. Whilst we do not find fault with our schools as far as their work is concerned, and so far as doing what they pretend to do, yet the Christian character of our common schools in many places is about gone, and we may look for the alarming consequences in the manners and character of our young people. We must guard against an irreverence for parents and teachers, for Christian men and religious things. If we are to fulfil the Master's will and do His work, our children must have a training in which the religious and Christian element holds a prominent place. We must have distinctively religious schools and colleges in the land under the direct influence and inspiration of the Christian Church, conducted under strictly Christian direction and imbued with positive Christian truth and teaching. Such are the sources from which the education of the country has been replenished with Christian influence.

Our schools and colleges under the direct influence of the Church have determined the moral and religious standard, and have given the key-note and kept up the tone of our national education. Take away our Christian schools and colleges, and instead of organized and sustained Christian influences there will be, as regards religious instruction, marked deficiency and a lack of culture and high moral tone that cannot be supplied from any other source. It would be a great misfortune for us as a Church and for us nationally to have no public schools under distinctively Christian management and teachers that have not learned in Christian colleges the happy art of religious as well as secular instruction for children. The Sunday Schools are doing a good work, but they owe a debt to our academies and colleges for teachers, which cannot be easily estimated. The best Sunday School model teachers have been trained and educated in our institutions of learning. The claims of our academies and colleges to encouragement and support in educating our children, are a sacred obligation and inheritance of duty and also of influence and opportunity which it would be sacrilege as well as cruel injustice to repudiate or neglect.

I have nothing to say just here and now as to the future educational legislation of our Church, whether founded on this or that system; but I am very anxious that our Church should look after the religious and Christian, as well as secular, education of her children—the children that have been given her as a sacred and an important charge.

Sussex, N.B.

JAMES CRISP.

ANALYTICAL STUDIES IN THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

GENESIS CONTINUED.

SECTION V.—THE BEGINNINGS OF THE NATIONS.

CHAPTER X. 1; XI. 9.

WE have here a document unique in its character, and unequal in value to ethnographical science in all the range of human literature (see for full discussion Canon Rawlinson's "Origin of Nations," or more briefly, Marcus Dods' "Genesis" in "Bible-class Hand-book Series"). It seems, like the preceding sections, to be composed of a document in the legal or priestly style, complete in itself, as will be seen by reading from Chapter x. vs. 1-7, 20-23, 31, 32, inclusive in each case. This is enlarged by additions in the more discursive style which we have ventured to call prophetic, embracing as usual notices of historical facts, and fixing attention, especially in Chapter xi., on the sinful developments of humanity.

NOTE 1. That the names are throughout tribal rather than individual. In the prophetic sections the tribal termination is used.

2. That the geographical range is limited to South-western Asia and the adjacent parts of Africa and Europe. It is the world of Hebrew history.

The document includes:

- (a) The tribes of Japhet, inhabiting the maritime regions North and West.
- (b) The Hamites inhabiting the South.
- (c) The Semites occupying the centre.
- (d) As supplements.

(1) A more particular account of the beginning of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires.

(2) A more particular enlargement of the Canaanites.

(3) A more particular enlargement of the Arabian tribes, with a reference to some remote beginning of national boundaries.

(4) An account of the divergence of language as a Divine judgment against sinful ambition.

These supplements constitute the prophetic portion of the document.

Note that there is no special supplement on Egypt. Otherwise the supplements cover the great points of national contact of the later prophetic history of Israel.

Question: Was the re-peopling of the world by the sons of Noah coextensive with the destruction of the world's population by the deluge?

SECTION VI.—THE GENEALOGY OF THE CHOSEN PEOPLE.

1. This section is constructed on the same model as Section III.

2. Section III. gives ten generations from Adam to Noah inclusive; this, ten generations from Shem to Abram inclusive. (Compare the three series of fourteen generations in Matt. i.) Note that the Septuagint varies from this uniformity, inserting an additional name.

3. In each case the genealogy is a general tracing of the line along which the purpose of God's grace moves.

4. The six sections have a marked parallelism: I. and IV. The beginning and the rebeginning of the human race under God's blessing and ordinances; II. and V. The beginning and extension of sin to the first judgment, including the expansion of the race in each case; III. and VI. Ten links along which the purpose of God's grace is carried, first, to Noah called for the salvation of the race; second, to Abram, called for the same purpose.

5. To use these genealogical links for the purpose of constructing a chronology to determine the world's age is perhaps to demand from them what they were not originally intended to give.

SECTIONS VII.—XI.—THE BEGINNING OF THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE CHOSEN PEOPLE THROUGH THE LIVES OF
TERAH, ABRAHAM, ISAAC AND JACOB.

We now reach a new point of departure in this record of the Beginnings. Thus far tradition has furnished great individual facts. Of the historic reality of these facts, we have abundant collateral proof in the principal items. But these facts are woven into a reasoned and in some cases, perhaps, idealized presentation which makes them the vehicle of fundamental, moral and religious teaching, rather than of continuous history. Now, on the other hand, tradition begins to expand into something akin to historic narrative, and as a consequence the interpretation becomes much more easy, while the religious truth is embodied and illustrated in the related facts themselves. For the authenticity of this traditional narrative, we have many remarkable attestations at the points at which it touches contemporary ancient history, especially of Egypt. This attestation becomes still more complete as we reach the Book of Exodus. This attestation is no longer the direct attestation which is furnished to the preceding sections by the great national traditions, but is rather the indirect attestation of harmony with the ancient monuments. For examples of this harmony we refer our readers to "Abraham, His Life and Times," in "Men of the Bible Series." The history of Joseph furnishes still more abundant examples of this indirect yet convincing evidence. For detailed exposition of this and the following sections of Genesis, we would also refer our readers to Marcus Dods' "Genesis," in T. L. Clark's "Bible-class Hand-book Series."

Proceeding now to the analysis of the contents of these five sections, we have the following sub-division made by the compiler of the history himself by means of the usual headings of "Generations," or Posterity, "Things born from," as follows:

VII. The generations of Terah, dealing principally with the life of Abraham. Chapters xi. 27; xxv. 11.

VIII. The generations of Ishmael, a brief table of the tribes descended from Ishmael. Chapter xxv. 12-18.

IX. The generations of Isaac, in which Jacob is the principal figure. Chapter xxv. 19; xxxv. 29.

X. The generations of Esau, a brief account of tribes and leaders descended from Esau. Chapter xxxvi. 1-43.

XI. The generations of Jacob, in which Joseph occupies the chief place. Chapter xxxvii. 1 ; 1. 6.

But a careful study of these sections seems to reveal the fact that the compiler, in preparing these sections, has combined materials from two narratives, which carry the marks of the priestly and prophetic style, as in the previous parts of the book. The analytical separation of these two narratives will give us a more perfect grasp of the contents of the book. To do this thoroughly we ask our readers to read the priestly chronicle or record through by itself continuously as follows :

*1. The generations of Terah. Chapter xi. 27.

2. The migration and death of Terah. Chapter xi. 31, 32.

3. The migration of Abram. Chapter xii. (4*b*. "And Abram was seventy-five," etc., to end of 5.)

4. Separation of Abram and Lot. Chapter xiii. 6. (11*b*. "And they separated themselves" . . . 12*a*. to "dwell in the cities of the plain.")

5. The birth of Ishmael. Chapter xvi. (1*a*. "Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children," 3, 15, 16.)

6. The institution of circumcision. Chapter xvii. This is a most important part of the priestly record laying the foundation of the Abrahamic covenant, (*a*) in promise of posterity ; (*b*) in promise of the land of Canaan ; (*c*) in the ordinance of circumcision ; (*d*) in direct promise of Isaac. This is followed (*e*) by the record of Abraham's (the name was now changed) immediate fulfilment of the covenant ordinance.

7. The destruction of the cities of the plain. Chapter xix. 29. A brief note of a well-known fact.

8. The birth of Isaac. Chapter xxi. (1*b*. "And the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken" ; 2*b*. "at the set time of which God had spoken to him," to end of v. 5.)

9. The death of Sarah and the purchase of Machpelah. Chapter xxiii. 1-20.

10. The death and burial of Abraham. Chapter xxv. 7-11.

11. The generations of Ishmael. Chapter xxv. 12-17.

*In this analysis, we follow Driver.

12. The generations of Isaac. Chapters xxv. 19, 20.
13. The marriage of Esau. Chapter xxvi. 34, 35.
14. The marriage of Jacob. Chapters xxvii. 46; xxviii. 9.
15. His two wives and their maids. Chapter xxix. 24, 29.
16. Jacob's return to Canaan. Chapters xxx. 18; xxxiii. 18.
17. The quarrel with the Shechemites over Dinah. Chapter xxxiv. 1. (2*a.* to "saw her"; 4, "Shechem spake," etc., 6, 8, 9, 13-18, 20-25, 27-29.)
18. The renewal of the covenant with Jacob. Chapter xxxv. 9-13.
19. The children of Jacob and the death and burial of Isaac. Chapter xxxv. 23-29.
20. The generations of Esau. Chapter xxxvi.
21. Settlement of Jacob in Canaan. Chapter xxxvii. 1, 2.
22. Migration of Jacob to Egypt. Chapter xlvi. 6-27.
23. His appearance before Pharaoh and his settlement in the land of Rameses. Chapter xlvii. 5—6*a.* 7-11; 27*b.* "and they had possessions therein and grew and multiplied exceedingly."
24. Jacob's adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh. Chapters xlvii. 28; xlviii. 3-7.
25. Jacob's final charge to his sons, and death. Chapter xlviii. 1*a.* "And Jacob called his sons," and 28*b.* "spake unto them and blessed them," etc.—33.
26. His burial. Chapter i. 12, 13.

We shall make no attempt to state the grounds upon which this separation of the priestly sections is based. It is based largely upon peculiarities of style, many of which appear only in the original. But it is evident that we have here a concise and formal statement of the great facts of the covenant by which the Hebrew nation was founded, with an explicit account of the Divine appointment of the covenant sign; all else is given in brief as introductory to the great work of Moses, which is to follow.

In its internal structure this priestly record seems perfectly adapted either for careful transmission from one generation of priests to another by oral teaching or for that brief monumental written record which belonged to the early ages.

But incorporated with this we have another more popular,

more picturesque, and far more expanded tradition which the analysts have called prophetic. We have already seen that in the preceding part of Genesis, where the two components are not so intimately blended as here, the prophetic element deals largely with the development of sin, the priestly with the line of the covenant. This peculiar characteristic still holds good. The sins of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph's brethren are all detailed in the prophetic supplement. We have noted also the peculiar human interest attaching to the prophetic narrative. The same continues here. We may note still further the substantial harmony of the documents. Like the evangelists, they confirm each other, while the seeming divergence is that of independent witnesses and of a faithful compiler, who does not attempt to force his materials into a rigid verbal harmony. Again, it is the prophetic documents which here again bring us into contact with historic monuments of Egypt and South-western Asia.

For these reasons we have no hesitation in rejecting at once the views of those who would deny to Genesis the claim to be trustworthy history. The very analytic theory of which they have been the main promoters will, we think, go far to disprove their assertion that we have here only myth and legend. We believe that we have here the best historic material that has been transmitted from those ancient times.

Turning now to the contents of the prophetic traditions, guided by Driver, we may divide it into three groups:

1. Traditions of Abraham and Isaac.
2. Traditions of Jacob and Esau.
3. Traditions of Joseph.

These attach themselves to Sections VII., IX. and XI. respectively.

The supplemental traditions of Abraham and Isaac, as the following:

1. The death of Haran and the marriage of Abram and Nahor. Chapter xi. 28-30.
2. An early Divine revelation and promise to Abram. Chapter xii. 1-4.
3. Notes of Abram's early sojourn in central Canaan, and his

journey to Egypt (note Abram's moral failure). Chapter xii. 6-20.

4. Notes of Abram's sojourn in Southern Canaan and increase in wealth, and of disagreement between him and Lot, resulting in separation.

5. Renewal of promise to Abram. Chapter xiii. 14-18, with reference to the iniquity of Sodom.

6. A special account of the war of four kings of the East with five kings of the valley of the Dead Sea, the conquest of that region and the neighboring tribes, and the rescue of the captives and spoils by Abram, and his tithes to Melchizedek. Chapter xiv. 1-24.

7. A special revelation to Abram and a covenant by sacrifice. Note that here the promises of the covenant are the same as in the priestly record, but the sign of the covenant is sacrifice, not circumcision, but a special sacrifice, and the promise is related to Divine judgment against the iniquity of the Amorites. Chapter xv.

8. Traditions exhibiting the moral relations of Sarah to Hagar, and God's mercy to Hagar. Chapter xvi. (1b. 2, 3, 4-14.)

9. Extended account of supernatural visitors, first, to Abraham and then to Sodom, relating to its sin and overthrow, including promise of the birth of Isaac, intercession for Sodom and Gomorrah, rescue of Lot, destruction of the godless cities, and subsequent career and sin of Lot. Chapters xviii. and xix. except v. 29.

10. Account of Abraham's sojourn in Gerar, and repetition of his moral failure as in Egypt. Chapter xx. 1-18.

11. Further particulars of the birth of Isaac and of Sarah's treatment of Hagar and Ishmael. Chapter xxi. 6-22.

12. Account of Abraham's friendly relations to Abimelech, king of the Philistines. Chapter xxi. 22-33.

12. The trial of Abraham, his offering of Isaac, and the renewal of the covenant promises. Chapter xxii. 1-19.

13. Nahor's children. Chapter xxii. 20-24.

14. Abraham's provisions for the settlement of Isaac, the journey of his steward to Mesopotamia, and the marriage of Isaac to Rebecca. Chapter xxiv. 1-67.

15. Abraham's second marriage and children. Chapter xxv. 1-6.

16. Note of the country occupied by the descendants of Ishmael extending in a belt from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea, south of Palestine. Chapter xxv. 18.

17. Traditions of the birth and youth of Jacob and Esau. Chapter xxv. 19-34.

18. Traditions of Isaac's sojourn in the land of the Philistines and his repetition of his father's moral weakness, and of his covenant with Abimelech. Chapter xxvi. 1-33.

19. Account of the deceitful means used by Jacob and Rebecca to secure the birth-right blessing, and consequent wrath of Esau and exile of Jacob. Chapter xxvii. 1-43.

20. Jacob's journey to Padan-Aram to seek a wife, his vision of God and reception of the covenant promises at Bethel. Chapter xxviii. 10-22.

21. Jacob's arrival at Haran, his meeting with Rachel, and his engagement with Laban and its results. Chapters xxix. 1; xxx. 43.

22. The separation of Jacob from Laban and his return to Canaan. Chapter xxxi. 1-55.

23. Jacob's homeward journey, his relations to Esau, his prayer, the renewal of the covenant blessing and his kindly reception by his brother. Chapters xxxii. 1; xxxiii. 17.

24. Jacob's settlement near Shechem, where he built an altar. Chapter xxxiii. 17, 19, 20.

25. Additional particulars concerning Dinah, developing the darker side of the story. Chapter xxxiv. (2b. 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 19, 26, 30, 31.)

26. Jacob's sojourn at Bethel and his purification of his household, building an altar, erecting a pillar. Chapter xxv. 1-8, 14.

27. The death of Rachel on the birth of Benjamin, the sin of Reuben. Chapter xxxv. 16-22.

28. Traditions of the boyhood of Joseph, his dreams, and his relations to his brethren, their enmity, and his captivity to Egypt. Chapter xxxvii. 2-36.

29. Traditions of moral obliquities of Judah and their consequences. Chapter xxxviii. 1-30.

30. The story of Joseph in Egypt (full of historical detail so true to the monumental records as to make its trustworthiness absolutely indisputable). Chapters xxxix. 1; xli. 45.

31. Joseph's government of Egypt (*a*) during the plenty, (*b*) during the famine. Chapter xli. 47-57.

32. The first visit of Joseph's brethren. Chapter xlii.

33. Their second visit, in which Joseph is revealed. Chapters xliii. 1; xlv. 28.

34. Various particulars of Israel's journey to Egypt. Chapter xlvi. 1-5.

35. Their settlement in the land of Goshen. Chapters xlvi. 28; xlvii. 4. 6b.

36. Subsequent rule of Joseph in Egypt. Chapter xlvii. 12-27.

37. Additional particulars of Jacob's death. Chapters xlvii. 29; xlviii. 2.

38. His blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh. Chapter xlviii. 8-22.

39. Individual blessings or predictions to the tribes of Israel. Chapter xlix. 1b., 28a.

40. Account of Joseph's mourning for and burial of his father in detail. Chapter l. 1-11.

41. Subsequent relations of Joseph to his brethren, his children, and his death. Chapter l. 14-26.

A careful and conscientious study of this analysis in detail will first of all serve to fix the contents of the book firmly in the mind of the student which is the main object desired in our analytical study.

It will further make fairly clear even to the English reader the contrast in style and subject matter which has laid the foundation of and gives probability to the analytical theory of this book.

But it will still further show us that there is nothing in this theory to militate against the historic credibility of the book. If two or more original sources there were, they not only supplement but also strongly confirm each other as independent witnesses. Even their seeming variations only prove that there has been no attempt to tamper with the original witnesses.

by forcing them into a false and mechanical uniformity. If the keepers of this witness were the schools of the prophets, on the one hand, and the order of the priests, on the other, then their relations to each other, each jealous of any deviations from the orthodox standards or from true moral ideals on the part of those who were frequently their rivals, gives increased assurance that the traditions, whether oral or written, were faithfully kept with only such enlargement or change as was justified by the progress of history.

Supposing them to be finally collected in their present form by Ezra, they form a unique and seemingly perfect introduction to the main body of law which is to follow.

For our usual suggestive questions on the detailed matter of the analysis, we refer our readers to Marcus Dods' "Genesis," where they will find also excellent notes.

Victoria University, Toronto.

N. BURWASH.

THE E. L. AND C. E. PLEDGE.

THE greatest need of our day is not more Christians, but more Christianity; not more men and women in the Church, but more *man* and *woman* in the world. Our times demand and require decided, definite, pronounced. Christians, who are acting from well-understood principles rather than from mere fitful impulse; men and women who are loyal to Christ and His Church, and give themselves unreservedly and unselfishly to the accomplishment of the Divine purpose. Anything that will conduce to this end, that will produce a clean-cut, well-defined, really positive Christian life, is desirable. Past experience has proven that covenants, vows, and oaths have been used by Christians, individually and collectively, to great advantage. The crystalizing into concrete form certain specific duties by a definite pledge greatly aids a person, or a number of persons, in the accomplishment of a determined object.

"The growing intelligence and religious needs of the young people" of every Christian Church "have created the necessity for an organization for the promotion of personal piety, intel-

lectual culture and Christian work." Such an organization should be under the direction, supervision and control of the Church with which identified. The Young People's Society, like the Sabbath School, should be an actual department in the Church, and exist for the promotion of its spiritual work. If this vital connection is to be realized, it is necessary that certain essential and fundamental principles should be definitely formulated, and all the members made to feel that the organization stands for these. As a guarantee of this living union, and a protection of the Church against possible perversion of her aims, the membership should be required to pledge themselves to the performance of certain definite duties. If the Young People's Society is to be recognized, like the Sabbath School, as a corporate part of the Church, then there should be in the former as in the latter, an assurance as to the character, work and teaching of the Society. As the doctrinal standards of the Church are safeguarded in the Sabbath School by authorized catechism definitions, so the genuineness and loyalty of the Young People's Society should be guaranteed by positive pledges formulated by the denomination with which incorporated. Nor should the pledges be mere "models" to be modified by each society, any more than the definitions of the catechisms should be models "strongly recommended for adoption." For the sake of uniformity, safety and unity in each denomination, its highest ecclesiastical court should adopt and promulgate fixed pledges for the use of all who wish to affiliate with the officially recognized Young People's Society of the Church. Pledges provided by an organization outside the denominations must of necessity be only models, "to be regarded in the light of a recommendation," but the particular Church has a definite responsibility to her young people that ought to be unequivocally performed.

The "backbone" of the Society of Christian Endeavor and of the Epworth League is the pledge. It is a solemn league and covenant by the members for the performance of clearly defined Christian duties. It is a cardinal principle in these organizations and "essential and fundamental" in their working. Membership is based upon the taking of the pledge, and

is quite distinct from signing the constitution or roll of members. The latter relates to our duties to the government of the local society as such ; but the pledge is a crystallization of the principles for which the whole "movement" stands, and commits the members to the performance of definite personal duties "for Christ and His Church."

The pledge or obligation is in some form essential and fundamental in all organizations, whether secular or religious. Not one of the many benevolent orders exists without it. It is assumed or required of every member of a Christian Church. Indeed, it is impossible to become a Christian without a consecration to God, and just as impossible to live a true Christian life without a definite devotion to His service, either of which is the taking of a pledge. A pledge is simply the outward expression of an inward promise, and in the case of our Christian Endeavor or Epworth League pledge, it is the visible manifestation of a vow that must, or ought to have been made in the heart to God. Our pledge is neither a work of supererogation nor extra-judicial to Christian duties ; it is of the nature of sacrament. The *sacramentum* was the Roman soldier's oath of allegiance. In the forming of a new legion, the ceremony was performed by collecting in an upturned shield, a few drops of blood drawn from a gash in the arm of the captain and each soldier by his own sword. Then the captain, holding the shield aloft, dipped his hand into the blood, and each soldier passing by in turn dipped in his hand with the captain's. By this "Covenant of Blood" they became a blood-brotherhood, by which their hearts and lives were as one, symbolized by the mingled blood. They thus swore fealty to each other, the captain to the soldier, and the soldiers to the captain, even to the death. By this solemn rite of blood covenanting they entered into a common life, which partook of the spirit and purpose of the commander. This is the design of the Christian sacraments, with the Old Testament idea of a covenant added, which was a conditional pledge between parties, whether the contractors were God and man, or man and man. A meal was taken, a tree planted, a gift made, a heap of stones gathered, a sacrifice offered, or a stone set up for a pillar, as a symbolic witness of

the compact binding upon both parties. In the covenants of God with man, we have the rainbow, the stars, the change of name, circumcision, etc. as tokens; in like manner, the bread and wine at the memorial-feast of the Lord's Supper is a perpetual reminder of the covenant relation between Christ and His people. Every communion service is a pledge-taking; it is the renewal of a vow upon the part of God and man; by it we not only swear allegiance to our commander, but His promise is renewed to us. Similarly, although our pledge is not a sacrament in the ecclesiastical sense, the principle of the *sacramentum* underlies it. It is a joining with God in a covenant for the performance of certain duties. It is not so much undertaking to do something *for* God as *with* God; "trusting in Him for help or strength" is the basis of our "promise." Let it be remembered that our pledge is a joint contract between God and man in which both parties are concerned, in keeping certain already assumed duties therein specified but not thereby created. It is not a mere promise to God, but an acceptance of God and His covenanted help. Our signatures and the monthly consecration meeting are memorial witnesses to this mutual pledge.

Some say that they do not believe in pledges, forgetting that the principle of pledge-making is fundamental in social, business and political life, and that the person who gives no pledge is not to be relied on. The home and society rests upon the marriage vow; all business relations are based upon the promise to pay; and the safety of the nation is in the oath of allegiance. Persons refusing to comply with these principles would be unworthy of all confidence, and should be refused the rights of citizenship. But the principle of pledge-making is not a mere human accident or convenience; it is of Divine origin. God has recognized the essential and necessary character of our pledge in the covenants, vows and oaths taken by himself, enjoined on individuals, and approved of on different occasions, and who has a right to say he does not believe in pledges to Christian duty? God approves of positive statements of duty, of definite lines of action, of the formal expression of obligation. He honors the public profession and verbal statement of

acknowledged responsibilities. He is a God of definitely announced plans and purposes. He does not deal in generalities, and never approves of it in His people. Positive purpose, definite work and earnest effort is the secret of success everywhere, and not less in Christian life.

The pledge of the Young People's Society has not called into existence one new Christian duty. Every duty therein specified originated with our becoming Christians, and is equally binding upon every professed follower of Christ, whether pledged or not. It is but the formal expression of the acknowledged obligation of every person who would become a true follower of Jesus. The Christian is never free from doing his whole duty to God and man, pledge or no pledge. The pledge is not an added responsibility, but a means of helping us to perform existing ones. It is a memoranda of accepted Christian duties, and should be regarded as sacred as business, social and other obligations. A man who disregards his word of honor, or undertakes to pay on the "feel like it" principle, would have no business standing. Some think if they have not taken a pledge, they are under no responsibility to perform the obligation thereof. The not taking of a pledge where duty is required, is the same as not keeping a pledge when taken. The obligation exists in either case, only in the latter it is expressed and admitted, and in the former unexpressed and unadmitted. Any duty is an obligation, and not to pledge ourselves to its performance no more releases us than not giving our note absolves us from the payment of a just debt.

Our pledge differs from that of all secular societies or benevolent orders, since assuming these is purely optional, and may or may not be necessary to Christian life. It raises a definite standard by formulating specific Christian duties, emphasizing existing fundamentals, and making plain certain essentials. It simply concretes that which is universal and necessary to the successful living of a true Christian life. We may get to heaven when we are dead without taking it, but shall not be able to build up such grand and noble characters, or live such useful lives as we shall by doing so. The fact is, all Christians who have impressed the community for good, and whose lives

have spread the contagion of righteousness in the world, have recognized and practised the principles enunciated by the pledge.

Marcus Dods, in commenting on the monumental stone that Jacob set up as a witness and reminder of his vow, says: "One great secret in the growth of character is the art of prolonging the quickening power of right ideas, of perpetuating just and inspiring impressions. And he who despises the aid of all external helps for the accomplishment of this object is not likely to succeed. Religion, some men say, is an inward thing; it does not consist of public worship, ordinances, etc., but it is a state of spirit. Very true—but he knows little of human nature who fancies a state of spirit can be maintained without the aid of external reminders, presentations to eye and ear of central religious truths and facts." F. W. Robertson, in the same connection, says: "Herein is the value of forms; impressions, feelings, will pass away unless we have some memorial. If we were merely spiritual beings, then we might do without forms; but we are still mixed up with matter, and unless we have a form, the spirit will die. Resolve then, like Jacob, to keep religion in mind by the use of religious rites. Church-going, the keeping of the Sabbath, are not religion; but religion hardly lives without them." So we contend that our pledge is an external form, a visible reminder which greatly aids in the growth of Christian character.

It may be necessary to observe in passing, that our pledge is not an absolute promise to perform, but an endeavor to do. Its performance is contingent upon possibilities, and its fulfilment is left as to details with the individual conscience. Principles, not forms; the spirit, not the letter, is being enforced and inculcated. Each person is required and expected to keep the pledge "according to his several ability," of which Christ is made the judge.

An analysis of the Christian Endeavor and Epworth League pledges shows that each is made up of a statement of certain specific duties to God, the Church, ourselves, the Society, and to mankind generally. While every detail is not enumerated, Christian life is touched at every point. We shall now quote and compare the different points in the Active Member's pledge of each:

Epworth League: "Taking Christ as my example and trusting in the help of the Holy Spirit, I promise that I will endeavor to learn and do my heavenly Father's will."

Christian Endeavor: "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise Him that I will strive to do whatever He would like to have me do."

These clauses form the basis of all that follows in each pledge, and are really the ground-work in every Christian life, since the will of God is the test of Christian duty. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" is the constant cry of every true Christian. His experience: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me"; and his testimony: "For me to live is for Christ to live." A vow of complete consecration to God is unconditionally required of every real Christian. It is not a matter of mere choice, but a duty that ought to be a delight. Unreserved loyalty and sworn allegiance to God's will and purpose is rightly demanded of all who profess to be subjects of His kingdom. Refusal of fealty to Him and His laws is treason against the government of Heaven. Such a vow to God is eternal. If to enter into a covenant with God be a duty, to withdraw from it without sin is an impossibility; both duty and pledge are binding forever. This clause of the pledge is a specific acknowledgment of our required service to God. It is a formal assumption of the prayer, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven," as a principle and motive of life. It puts our life in harmony with the desire and purpose of Christ. It makes visible and real what is otherwise hazy and intangible. Christianity has been largely a religion of theological dogmas, a system of abstract definitions, a matter of faith and feeling. What idea of the character of God is formed from such an intangible personality as the "Unseen Deity"? What conception of Christian life can be formed from a formal statement of: justification, regeneration, sanctification, consecration, holiness, etc.? The words of the pledge, as above quoted, present a concrete conception of God and a true idea of our Christian duty. We are made to "look up" to Him who was at once the manifestation of the character of the unseen God, and the embodiment of an ideal human life.

We are by the words of this "promise" brought into actual personal contact with the covenanted help of an all-sufficient God, and the perfect life of a real man. By it we "lift up" a perfect standard for our imitation. Paul said, "Be ye imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ"; and John declared, "We ought also to walk even as He walked." What will be the result to Christianity when we have a generation of Christians who realize that a Christian life means a life like Christ's? What will be the consequence when our young people, inspired by the spirit of this pledge, realize that they represent Christ in this world? What will be the kind of life lived when each one is fully possessed with the idea of the pledge, that he is here to do the Father's will, accomplish the Christ purpose, and be used of the Holy Spirit? This is not only the standard of Christian duty, but the ideal life that the triune God has undertaken to enable us to live.

The other clauses of the pledge are subordinate to the solemn covenant with God above set forth, and the means by which it is to be carried out. They are just such things as every Christian should do, and, it may be said, would do, without the pledge; then all the more reason for having an actual, attainable, ideal model for all who desire to be Christians. Those who observe these duties already will, by taking the pledge, inspire and encourage those who do not. And those who at first do them from a mere sense of duty, because of their promise, will soon learn to perform them with delightful pleasure. The performance of these required details will, without doubt, prove a great help in the building up of Christian character.

Epworth League: "That I will make stated seasons of private prayer and the daily study of the Bible the rule of my life."

Christian Endeavor: "That I will make it the rule of my life to pray and to read the Bible every day."

By "the rule of my life" is meant the regular customary habit. It clearly provides for such occasions and peculiar circumstances where it might be impossible to comply with the literal conditions of the promise. No Christian would think of living without private prayer. We cannot realize God or come into right relation with Him without personal communion.

Prayer is not a mere wish or charm, but a real fellowship of man with God; it is contact of the human and Divine spirits. Who can experience spiritual life and continue in its enjoyment without such abiding vital union?

Equally impossible is it to grow in Christian graces without studying the Bible. Divine truth is necessary to the promotion of godliness. "Thy word is truth," said Jesus, when He prayed for the sanctification of His followers "by the truth." From this and other Scriptures we learn that the effectual instrument used by the Holy Spirit to cleanse the heart from sin and purify the life from unrighteousness, is "the word." We cannot, therefore, afford to be a single day without reading and thinking of, at least, one verse of Scripture. We should have a Bible, not only at home, but in our travels, so that we could always keep this part of our pledge. Nor should its observance be a mere occasional consultation or chance reading, but regular, systematic study—a getting hold of the mind of the Spirit. We cannot "do our heavenly Father's will," or know what "Christ would like to have us do," unless we "learn" His will and see the "example" of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures. To read and study the Bible is, therefore, no less the necessary duty of all Christians than to pray. Both combined as a daily habit will produce growing, thoughtful, useful, intelligent, consistent Christians.

The motto of the Epworth League of Christian Endeavor is, "Look up and Lift up for Christ and the Church." We, therefore, declare our membership in, and assume pledged duties to the Church as a means of performing our fundamental obligation.

Epworth League: "As a member of the Church, I will conscientiously endeavor to be true to all my duties, especially by attending the Sunday and mid-week services and the Sunday School."

Christian Endeavor: "And to support my own Church in every way, especially by attending all her regular Sunday and mid-week services, unless prevented by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Saviour."

There cannot be loyalty to Christ without loyalty to His

Church, in fact, it is only as "members of the body of Christ, which is the Church," that we can "do our heavenly Father's will." Joining a Church does not make us Christians, but everyone who is a Christian should be connected with the Church. The Church is of Divine origin, and the ordinances of Divine appointment, and our duty thereto is of supreme importance. That the Apostles recognized this is without doubt, and as the people became Christians they were "added to the Church." We can only become visible "members of Christ's Church, which is His body," by joining some particular branch thereof. We should unite where we can best serve the interests of God's cause by doing the most work for man. The soldier, to serve his country, must not only enlist in the army, but in some company of a particular regiment, and in connection therewith drill, answer roll-call and do active service. Similarly we should be regular and constant upon the training and teaching, and active and earnest in the work of the particular Church of our choice. And that Christian will receive the most help from the Church who most truly sustains the services and work of his own local Church.

Our pledge gives no place for the church-tramp or "itching-ears" hearer, for instead of going to some other church because "they have such good meetings, or singing, or preaching," the aim is to make the services of that Church with which we are connected *the best*. Be loyal and true to your own local Church, its pastor, its work, its responsibilities and its services, and to the denomination of which it forms a part, is the unqualified requirement of every Christian, and by the pledge we say, "I admit and will perform this duty." It must never be forgotten that the Young People's Society is in and for the Church, and must never supplant or take the place of the Church either as to meetings or membership, work or interest.

Every person on taking the Active Member's Pledge should, if not already a member of the Church, become one; and every church member who joins the Young People's Society, should do so as an Active Member. This is not only in the interests of the Church and the Society, but of the individual himself and for the good of the Associate Members and such other young people as are not decided Christians.

That the Young People's Society may be an actual and reliable means of extending the kingdom of God and building up Christian character, it is necessary that the interest of the meetings be kept up by the regularity of attendance and individual participation of the members. This is wisely provided for in the pledge as follows:

Epworth League: "As an active member of the League, I will, when practicable, be present at and take some part in every meeting of the department of Christian Endeavor."

Christian Endeavor: "As an active member, I promise to be true to all my duties, to be present at, and to take some part, aside from singing, in every Christian Endeavor prayer-meeting, unless hindered by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Lord and Master. If obliged to be absent from the monthly consecration-meeting of the Society I will, if possible, send at least a verse of Scripture to be read in response to my name at the roll-call."

Those acquainted with the original purpose and intended working of the Methodist Class-meeting will recognize how identical this clause of the pledge is with that God-honored institution. The principle is to attend and take part in the weekly meeting, and especially the monthly consecration service. If meetings for the promotion of spiritual life be a necessity, then it is the duty of Christians to sustain them by attendance and participation. That Associate Members and other young people who are not avowed Christians may be inspired to attend, it is needful that the Active Members be present and by taking part, see that the interest of the meeting is maintained. If the Apostolic injunction, "edify one another," have any application to modern Christians, then it is not only our duty to attend but to take part personally, which can be done by public prayer, testimony, experience, reciting Scripture texts, quoting passages from authors, relating anecdotes or incidents, etc., and showing how these have helped us. Thus one benefit of the pledge is to cause the members to come with some thoughtful preparation on the particular subject for the meeting. All preparation should be with a view to the edification of others. If "with the mouth confession is

made unto salvation," and if we must "confess Christ before men" in order that He will confess us before our heavenly Father, then the complete fulfilment of Christian responsibility is only accomplished by our public testimony as it is written: "And they overcame him (the accuser) by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony." "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord," most certainly has a responsible application unto us, of whom Christ said, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me." Hence the Christian Endeavor prayer-meeting is following the "example" of Christ and in accord with "our heavenly Father's will." Such public confession of Christ and for Christ is not only a benefit to others but a blessing to ourselves. It enkindles and deepens, purifies and strengthens our love to God and man. Expression is necessary to the existence and growth of real love, and such a meeting for Christian fellowship affords an excellent means for the mutual exercise of this need. Publicly witnessing to spiritual things puts us definitely on Christ's side and in right relation to the world. The giving of our testimony, relating our experience, exhorting or instructing others in righteousness, encourages our own faith and destroys the fear of man. Viewed from these standpoints, attendance upon the meetings may properly be used as a test of membership in the Society, the more especially since if a member cannot be present provision is made that he may give a written testimony, or respond by sending a passage of Scripture or verse of a hymn that has been helpful. The one great advantage of the pledge, then, is to make all the members feel, that whether present or absent, they are in sympathy with each other and personally devoted to the furtherance of the interests of Christ's kingdom among men.

Our pledge is of a pre-eminently practical character, not dealing in mere generalities, but with specific duties, aiming specially at making Christians of the "out and out" sort. Each Active Member definitely and decidedly declares himself to be a Christian, and promises to live as such.

Epworth League: "As a Christian, I will abstain from all amusements and habits upon which I cannot ask God's blessing. I will honor God with my substance as He has prospered

me. I will endeavor by kindly words and deeds to cultivate the spirit of Christian friendship and bring my young associates to Christ."

Christian Endeavor: "And that, just so far as I know how, throughout my whole life, I will endeavor to lead a Christian life."

This specific promise settles the oft-repeated questions: "Can I do this?" "Can I do that?" "Can I go here?" "Can I go there?" A standard universally approved is set up, and what comports with it is to be done, and all else avoided. What would Christ do, is the test. Who can find fault with such a reasonable settlement of a perplexing problem? What Christian would refuse to act in harmony with its principles? The settlement of each particular thing is left with the individual conscience, but care should always be taken not to mistake freedom of conscience with freedom from conscience.

It will certainly be admitted that a person cannot "lead a Christian life" without honoring God with his substance. There is nothing more plainly taught in the Bible than that there is no true religion, no spiritual life within the soul, without the impulses which lead to the offering of our substance to God. Not only does it teach that with spiritual life will be the impulse to offer of our substance to God, but in both the Old and New Testaments the duty of systematic and proportionate giving is clearly set forth, as contrasted with spontaneous and unregulated offerings. Our givings should be an act of worship, and should at least equal that of the Hebrew when we compare our privileges with his. It should not be understood that he felt that one-tenth only belonged to God, but rather that the whole was God's property, and that tithes were given as an acknowledgment of his loyalty to God and a pledge that the rest should be used for His glory. "Freely ye have received, freely give."

Lastly, can a person "lead a Christian life" who does not cultivate the spirit of Christian friendship, and endeavor to bring others to Christ? This clause of the pledge strikes directly at that selfishness that sees no other purpose in Christianity than the saving of one's soul in heaven after death. It

adopts the self-sacrificing spirit of Christ and lives for others, feeling that he does most for God who does most for man. The aim is not to populate another world with dead saints, but to transform the present age by living ones.

Such is our Christian covenant which we assume in the following explicit words: "In witness of this my pledge, I hereto set my hand and give my heart." And it should be sacredly kept, not for the vow's sake only, but because of the essential principles therein contained. The true teetotaller abstains not because pledged, but because he approves the principles of total abstinence and takes the pledge as an evidence of that approval. Our aim is to produce Christian principles, not mere religious emotions or formal churchianity. The pledge should not be treated lightly, but regarded as an oath with God who will hold us to, as well as help us in, its keeping. "If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond; he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth."

The Epworth League and Christian Endeavor Society do not exist solely for the benefit of those who are church members, but to do good to all young persons. Its special aim is to reach those who are not decided Christians, and affiliate them with Christian work and workers with a view of bringing them, in time, into active membership. Therefore a pledge epitomizing certain general duties and giving an assurance of sincerity of purpose upon the part of Associate Members is required of those who are not qualified or willing to become Active Members. The Associate Member's Pledge is as follows:

EPWORTH LEAGUE.—"Believing in God as my Father, in Christ as my Saviour, and in the Holy Spirit as my Helper, and desiring to lead a Christian life, I promise habitually to attend some Church and Sunday School and the Christian Endeavor meetings of the League.

As an Associate Member, I am willing to serve on committees, and to work as I may be required to advance the interests of the League, and will, by conversation, conduct and choice of companions, endeavor to sustain its Character as a Christian Society.

I also declare that I will more carefully consider my duties to my God, to humanity, and to myself.

In witness that I will endeavor to abide by this my pledge, I hereto affix my name."

CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.—"As an Associate Member I promise to attend the prayer-meeting of the Society habitually, and declare my willingness to do what I may be called upon to do as an Associate Member to advance the interests of the Society."

The advantages of taking such a pledge are many. It gives a right tendency to moral character; it is a step towards

decision for Christ; it gives opportunity for association with active Christians; it is an actual admission of and public commitment to Christianity; it is a becoming responsible for the good reputation of the Church; it is assuming a personal interest in the Society and its work; it is undertaking the performance of certain beneficial duties; and finally it is entering into a covenant with God.

“When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou hast vowed.

“Better it is that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay.”

Toronto, Ont.

A. M. PHILLIPS.

Copies of this article to be had from the author at 5c. each; or, 50c. per dozen.

The “Committee-of-One” Pledge.

READ.—John i. 40-48; xii. 20-22; James v. 16, 19, 20; Daniel xii. 3; Acts viii. 4.

*F*OLLOWING the example of Andrew and Philip, with God's help and “In His Name,” I PROMISE to become a personal worker to win individuals to Christ. I will make an earnest effort each week to bring at least one within hearing of the Gospel, as set forth in the services of the Church and other means of grace; and I also agree to pray daily for such persons, for the spread of Christ's kingdom in the world, and for God's blessing upon the labors of all who are engaged in this work.

Name

Date

This Pledge Card may be had from REV. A. M. PHILLIPS, Toronto, at 50c. a hundred.

Editorial Reviews of Books and Periodicals.

None Like It: A Plea for the Old Sword. By JOSEPH PARKER, author of "Ecce Deus," "The People's Bible," etc. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago and Toronto. 12mo, pp. 271. Price \$1.25.

Dr. Parker is too well known as a writer to need any formal introduction to the readers of the REVIEW. The characteristics of his style are strongly marked, and they stand out prominently on every page of this work. He writes with the confidence of one who has no doubt that he has a thorough knowledge of the subject which he treats, or that he is thoroughly competent to discuss it. And considering that he has made the Bible his life-study, and written so many clever things founded upon it, the popular verdict will probably be that this confidence is not ill-founded, and this view will be, no doubt, strengthened in the minds of many by the reading of this eloquent and, popularly speaking, really clever book. But Dr. Parker's study of the Bible has been from the standpoint of a preacher rather than that of a critic; and hence he does not seem to be capable of putting himself in the position of the men whose alleged errors he has undertaken to refute so as to really understand them, not to say as to appreciate the value and importance of the service which they are rendering to the cause of truth by their critical labors.

The object of the book is, primarily, to refute certain opinions held and expressed by Mr. Horton and Prof. Bennett, but they are only taken as types of the entire school of thinkers to whom they belong. The scourge of small cords which he applies to them is intended to reach the backs of the whole tribe of modern Biblical critics. To the high personal character and worth of those gentlemen, Dr. Parker frankly and gracefully bears the most emphatic testimony. He holds them to be "brethren, not enemies; believers, not infidels," and admits that "their conception may some day prove itself to be right." In this respect Dr. Parker's spirit is in striking contrast with that of but too many of those who regard themselves as specially set for the defence of the truth in dealing with those whom they are not able to understand, and whose work they are not able to appreciate. Of Prof. Bennett, he tells us "he has won a very high reputation as a professor of Old Testament literature and criticism, and that he is intensely evangelical in his love to Christ and his belief in the spiritual uses of the Bible," and if it had occurred to him, no doubt he would have given an equally flattering certificate of character to Mr. Horton. Among the great preachers of the city of London there is probably not one—not even excepting Dr. Parker himself—who presents the essential truths of the Gospel to his congregation with greater clearness and force, or who is doing more to confirm the faith of people perplexed with doubts and difficulties, than the accomplished author of "*Verbum Dei*." He is not only an able preacher, but a scholar and thinker, capable of ministering to a congregation largely composed of scholarly and thoughtful people, in a way that but few are.

The opening chapter of this book is devoted to the vindication of the application of the phrase, "The Word of God," as it is commonly used among evangelical Christians, to designate the sacred books of the Old and

the New Testament. The style, in the treatment of this branch of the subject, is trenchant, and the use of sarcasm and ridicule is unsparing. Altogether it is well calculated to make an impression upon the popular mind, especially upon such as have not read or thought very profoundly upon the subject. But those who have even a tolerable understanding of it will, however, probably find it difficult to rid themselves of the conviction that if our author is not tilting at windmills, he is often fighting with shadows. In the loose and popular sense in which he seems to apply this phrase to the Bible, probably even the most radical of the "Liberals" would not object very strongly to its use. The Rev. R. H. Haweis is generally supposed to represent this class; and yet in a sermon preached in the spring of 1888, in exposition and defence of the views of the Broad Church party in the Church of England, he is reported to have spoken on this subject in substance as follows: "We believe that the Word of God is in the Bible rather than that the Bible is the Word of God; but the Bible is so immeasurably superior to everything else as a disclosure of the character and will of God, that we do not hesitate even to call it the Word of God, though not in such a sense as to exclude the idea of possible defect or error in it."

Now, it is probable that both Mr. Horton and Prof. Bennett, neither of whom has the reputation of being quite so radical as the gifted incumbent of St. James', Marylebone, would heartily accept the position taken in the sentence which has just been quoted. And how does this differ from the view held by Dr. Parker himself? He says: "When we speak of the Bible as 'the Word of God,' we may be using a symbolic idiom, an idiom that represents the supreme purpose of the book—its vital contents and soul—a sense and measure which no merely literary definition can fully express. . . . To describe it as the 'Word of God' is, in my view, to describe the book by its supreme purpose. . . . I know the penmanship is human; I know what is human is imperfect, yet that does not affect the Divine purpose, except in the sense that the limited instrument necessarily modifies the illimitable music. . . . Eternity is incommoded when endeavoring to typify itself on the dial space of time. It is the culmination of irony. The Bible is the revelation of God—ineffable—in the only setting or framework possible in the present condition of life. To bring God into language is to bring Him within limitations."

Now, all this is highly poetical and beautiful, but when translated into plain prose such as Mr. Haweis is reported to have used, and such as we may suppose Mr. Horton or Prof. Bennett would be disposed to use, what does it mean? An idiom is a peculiarity of phraseology or expression; and a symbolic idiom may be understood to mean, a phrase or expression the peculiarity of which consists in the fact that it uses one thing as an emblem or representation of something else. In short, it is a peculiar and highly figurative phrase in which the book is employed as an emblem of the Divine idea or purpose concerning it. And this phrase applies not to the body of the book as it lies open to criticism, but to its soul, the spiritual essence which pervades it—to the jewel, and not its "framework and setting," which *ex necessitate*, in the very nature of things, being human must be defective. Surely neither Mr. Horton nor Prof. Bennett, nor indeed any Christian critic would be disposed to quarrel with the application of the phrase "the Word of God" to the Bible when understood in this idiomatic and symbolic sense, though for the purpose of scientific definition, when applied to the body of the book, and not to its soul, they might object to it as inexact and misleading.

Dr. Parker objects to the Bible being described as containing the record of a Divine revelation. He holds that it is both a record and a revelation. Probably neither Mr. Horton nor Prof. Bennett would be disposed to

quarrel with him on this point either. They may think it more exact to speak of the Bible as the record of a revelation than as being itself the revelation ; but the record of a revelation made to the souls of men in the past is certainly a revelation to those of the present and the future. Nevertheless, the revelation is one thing, and the record of that revelation is another, and to confound them with each other can only lead to confusion. Take the Bible story just as we find it ; disregard all that has been said to the disparagement of the historicity of the early books of the Old Testament ; accept the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Genesis as undoubted, and then see how the facts of that story can be made to quadrate with the theory which identifies the revelation with the record. God revealed himself to Adam, to Noah, to Abraham, and to others of the patriarchs ; but assuming that Moses was the original historian of these Divine transactions, it was not until hundreds of years after they were given that the record of them was made. These Divine communications had not only been made, but they had accomplished their purpose in the religious education of the primitive peoples among whom they had been preserved either as written or unwritten traditions, during vast periods of time before Moses came upon the stage, and to confound them with the record of them which he made so long after they were given, is not in the interest of accurate thinking.

Dr. Parker objects very strongly to that sort of treatment of the Holy Scriptures which is expressed by the word "dissection." But what does the dissection of the sacred books, or indeed of any other literature, mean? It means simply taking them to pieces in order to examine them in detail. And how is it possible to study this large and complex subject in any other way? In proportion to the greatness of anything that we propose to make the subject of careful, thorough, and, as far as possible, exhaustive investigation, does the necessity for the application of this method to it become imperative. It is because of the greatness of the Bible, the mystery that surrounds its origin, the complexity of its contents, the marvellous and many-sided part which it has played in the history of the world, and the extent to which the dearest interests and hopes of mankind, both for time and for eternity, are bound up with it, that men persist in picking it to pieces, and putting every fragment of it as it were under the lens of a solar microscope. It is the highest compliment that mankind could have paid to the book, that in these modern times it has been studied with such intensity that it has become the subject of a whole family of sciences, each having to do with some particular part or aspect of it. And if we believe that it has nothing to fear from the light, but that the more thoroughly it is known, and everything concerning it is understood, the more influential for good will it be we should welcome any sort of inquisition to which it can be subjected, however severe.

Another thing which awakens Dr. Parker's fierce opposition is what he describes, rather contemptuously, as "testing Scripture by what is called 'experience.'" He ridicules Mr. Horton for objecting to the "generally accepted interpretation" of a difficult passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the ground that if that were its real meaning, it "would not be confirmed by experience." But if the Holy Scriptures are not to be subjected to searching and thorough criticism conducted on strictly scientific principles, and if human experience, including the moral intuitions of the soul, is not to be taken into the account in their interpretation, it is not easy to conceive what test can be applied to them. One is led to wonder whether the Scriptures were made for man, or man for the Scriptures. It seems sometimes to be forgotten that man was made in the image of God, and that however deeply he may be fallen, there is still something in him, even in his ruin, that responds to the truth of God. He may be disobedient and rebellious, but

if he allows the spiritual element in his own being to speak, his confession will be that in his conscience he believes it to be true; and if this is true of man in his ruin, what shall we say of him when he becomes the subject of a new creation, and is not only renewed in the image of God in knowledge, and in righteousness and true holiness, but is made the subject of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

One marvels at the lightness with which men sometimes speak of experience, in view of the fact that the Bible itself is made up largely of the recorded experience of men and women whose hearts God had touched. What is what we call revelation but the disclosure of himself and His will, which God has made to individual souls? There is no other revelation; there can be no other revelation of a spirit to a spirit but this; and this is always accomplished by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit. Whatever importance may attach to miracles and prophecy, visions and dreams, in a word, of all those extraordinary occurrences which have played such a conspicuous part in the religious education of the race, they are rather the machinery of revelation than the revelation itself. Even the Bible itself, precious as it is as the grand instrument of revelation, does not reveal the things of God 'till its truths are borne in upon the mind and applied to the conscience by the Holy Spirit. It is as true now as it was in the days of St. Paul: "As it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God." Spiritual truth comes to us not through sensation, not by hearsay, not by the imagination or the affections, but by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit. And the condition of this revelation is love. These things are prepared for them that love God. To them, and to them alone, is this spiritual revelation made. This is the eternal law of revelation, and to it there are no exceptions.

There is something novel and unique, too, in Dr. Parker's notion of inspiration. He says: "By inspiration I mean a statement, doctrine, message or discipline that separates itself from all ordinary thinking; which so separates itself as to throw ordinary thinking into obvious contrast, and which associates itself with such a quality of moral discipline as to exclude the idea that itself can be the fantasy of a wanton imagination." Now, when we turn to the Bible itself, and try to ascertain its own account of inspiration, we do not find that, according to its representation, it consists of either of these, or of all of them put together. These may be the result of inspiration, but, except in a loose and figurative sense, entirely unsuited to a discussion of this kind, they cannot be said to be inspiration itself. The word inspiration occurs only twice in the whole of our English Bible; and in both instances it means *breath*—the breath of God. And the first act of inspiration which we find described is that in which God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul. It is in reference to this, doubtless, that it is said in the Book of Job, "There is a spirit in man: and the inspiration (literally, the breath) of the Almighty giveth them understanding." This was the final act of creation, and it was in reference to what we may regard as the final act of the new creation, the communication to redeemed man, the Holy Spirit in His fulness, that our Lord breathed upon His disciples and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Now, the breath is the life, and when God breathes upon His people, He imparts to them His own life. This is inspiration. Whoever has this breath of God, this Divine life in him, is an inspired soul. Of this inspiration there is more to-day in the world than there was at any period in all the past, and there will be more of it in the future than there

is at present. But who can tell what different degrees of it may exist, or what diversity of form it may take in different individuals and in different periods. Of this, however, we may be sure that if we could understand all the possibilities of this God-given and Divine life, we should understand all forms, and, perhaps, we should add, all degrees of inspiration that has ever existed, or that ever will exist.

This inspiration is the highest possible qualification that any human being can possess for any form of service which he may be divinely called to perform either in the Church or in the world. The full maximum of our power for usefulness never can be reached without it, and it is just as indispensable to-day as in the days of the prophets or the apostles. Whether it ever assumes the same form in these days that it did in those far-off times is, of course, an altogether different question. All forms of life are modified by environment. This Divine life is not an exception of this rule. Besides, if the Church and the world are under the continuous superintendence of Divine Providence, we should expect the life which results from the direct inbreathing of the breath of God to vary in its manifestations in accordance with the necessities of each successive stage in the life of the Church, and in the religious development of the race. But whatever specific form it may take at any time, or in any particular case, it will always be found associated with a supernatural acuteness of spiritual sensibility, clearness of vision, strength of conviction, decision of character, courage and fortitude in the presence of danger and suffering, and above all, with habitual and uninterrupted communion with the Spirit of Truth, whose office it is to lead into all the truth. These observations are not intended as a complete exposition of this subject, but simply as an indication of the line along which the investigation of it must proceed if any really satisfactory results are to be reached.

There were other things in this book opposite which we had placed a note of interrogation, and which we should have liked to have examined, but our space is full. Two or three specimens of Dr. Parker's reasoning may, however, be given, though it will have to be without note or comment. "If the Bible is wrong in history, what guarantee is there that it is right in morals?" "If the Bible is not a reliable guide in facts, how do we know that it is a trustworthy guide in doctrines?" Certain of the critics point out two accounts of the creation in the Book of Genesis; but Dr. Parker says, "If there be two creations, why may there not be two resurrections?" The critics account for the discrepancies in the genealogy of our Lord, as given by Matthew and Luke, by supposing that there were two genealogical tables extant at the time that the Gospels were written, the one being used by the former of these writers, and the other by the latter. But Dr. Parker says, "If there be two genealogies, why not two Christs?" And as a final specimen of the *argumentum ad hominem*, he says: "If the Bible is untrustworthy upon points that we can definitely test, how do we know that it can be depended upon in matters that we cannot prove?" But in spite of what we cannot help but regard as weaknesses in this book, it is well worth reading, and will no doubt prove a great favorite with a certain class of conservative Biblical students. Sententious, epigrammatic, eloquent, it is pleasant reading, and contains much that is excellent. But we seek in vain in it for accurate thinking, or very definite statement. These do not seem to be Dr. Parker's forte. He is a poet and a rhapsodist, brilliant, interesting, eloquent, and often instructive, but a rhapsodist still. His mind is of that intuitional order that sees visions, and dreams dreams, that—if we may say so without irreverence—makes the clouds its chariots and walks upon the wings of the wind, but that hardly condescends to pursue the slow and laborious logical processes by which common people reach their conclusions.

The Christian Life. A Popular Treatise on Christian Ethics. By C. F. PAULUS, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology at German Wallace College, Berea, Ohio. Translated from the German by F. W. SCHNEIDER, A.M. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Toronto: Wm. Briggs. Octavo, pp. 415. Price \$1.50.

Christian Ethics is coming to be regarded as one of the most important subjects in Christian thought and life. It has long held an important place in the German universities, but as yet has gained only a nominal position in most of the American theological colleges. This is deeply to be regretted inasmuch as the speculative and practical aspects of the theology have here their destined union in the fulness and perfection of the Christian life.

The writer well remembers the inspiration and help experienced some twenty years ago in reading Wuttke's "Christian Ethics," published also by the Methodist Book Concern, New York. That work still remains one of the best on the subject. Its deep spiritual tone, combined with rare speculative insight, will long give it a chief place in its chosen field. Since then we have the exhaustive and masterly production by the late Dr. Dorner, the more practical, but not less suggestive, volumes of the late Bishop Martensen, while our American literature has been but lately enriched by a very able and ample volume from the pen of Dr. Newman Smyth. This last volume combines in a rare degree, clearness of thought, fulness of treatment, and from beginning to end is permeated with the deepest spiritual conceptions and suggestions that cannot fail to be fruitful in their influence upon the higher spiritual life.

The book before us is not so pretentious in its strictly philosophical character as any of the above, and for this reason will have a wider field of usefulness, because of its adaptation to a much larger circle of readers. It is written in plain simple language, and not overburdened with a minuteness of divisions and subdivisions. The Introduction extends through forty-two pages, in which the author clearly sets forth the meaning and scope of his subject, some fundamental conceptions relating thereto, the place of Christian ethics in theology, and especially its relation to dogmatics or the doctrine of faith.

Ethics in general is defined as "the science that treats of the moral as the life-mission of man." It proposes to systematize the sum total of moral action. Human life is a mission, and the moral consists in its realization, and such realization constitutes the moral life.

"Christian ethics embraces the moral life in its connection with the redemption of Christ Jesus, *i.e.*, as it appears under the regenerating and sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost. This life we designate the 'Christian life.' Hence the purpose of Christian ethics is *the presentation of the Christian life.*"

This life is viewed, not as it appears in any one individual, but "as it should appear in all instances, according to the Divine will." It is the ideal life rendered possible by man's endowment in bearing the Divine image, and in redemption by laying hold "by faith upon Christianity, . . . by the help of which he may acquaint himself with the various stages of Christian life, with the cliffs and dangers of each stage, and the successive goals to be reached in each." What these stages are will be intimated subsequently.

What are some of the fundamental conceptions without which we can have no ethical science, and consequently no Christian ethics? The answer is—the Divine will and nature as constituting the basis and source of the moral law; free rational will providing for the self-destination of

the personal life ; and love as the fundamental principle of the moral, or the moral itself.

Out of, and in relation to, these arise the three fundamental moral ideas : (a) "Viewed from the standpoint of the moral law, the moral appears as *duty*." (b) "If the nature of the will which lies at the bottom of moral action is the point of view, the moral appears as *virtue*." (c) Finally, "to the thoughtful mind the good presents itself as the realized purpose, as the ever-present ideal of his efforts and actions, as the end of his most earnest longings, as the state of perfection which, for the individual, is vested in the restored image of God ; but for human society, of which the individual is a member, in the kingdom of God. From this point of view the moral appears as *the highest good*." Thus, taking holy love as the central idea in the presentation of ethics, and in a wide sense, as comprising the three fundamental ethical ideas—duty, virtue, the good—the Divine ideal is realized and our moral task accomplished. "And as the three fundamental ideas unite in love, so their opposites are united in selfishness." The central idea of Christian ethics is holy love realized in the Christian life.

Originally perfect man is now fallen, and in this condition is morally helpless. From the formal standpoint his freedom cannot be denied, but on the other hand, sinful inclinations exert such a powerful influence that reformation cannot be accomplished by man himself. Our ideal is thus incapable of realization unless by an act of regeneration God implant the new life-giving principle of holy love. The ethical life thus depends upon the Christian life for its complete and final realization. The perfect life is the union and identification of the two—the ethical ideal energized by and realized through holy love. The ethical life needs the supplementing force and influence that come from redemption in Christ ; while this in turn demands the activity that pertains to our formal freedom. Our perfect life is neither "all of self," nor "all of grace." It is a mistaken notion that "man can make of grace a pillow for his indolence, and expect of God what it is his own personal duty to do. . . . Hence, true Christian ethics must be theological ; that is, it must recognize as its source the historically manifested Christian revelation, in opposition to philosophical ethics, which considers reason its only source, and derives from reason its idea of the moral. But the cardinal points of Christian revelation are the facts of sin and redemption," and "these two facts throw the right light upon the problem of our existence," and both of these are facts, and must be recognized as such. In no sense can they be deduced or derived by logical necessity from reason.

Ethics, on the one hand, and dogmatics or the Christian doctrine of faith on the other, are thus the two sides from which we must view the necessity and the possibility of realizing the perfect life. The two are most intimately connected. Dogmatics has more of an *instructive* character, while ethics is *more practical*. "Dogmatics proceeds from God and the objective facts of salvation in redemption ; ethics, from man and the subjective facts of experience in the Christian life. The former shows what God has done in the moral world for the realization of his thoughts of love, and what the free creature has done in opposition to these thoughts of love ; the latter, on the contrary, treats of the Divine thoughts of love as the task for the free creature, and shows what they shall do to realize these thoughts of love. The precepts of dogmatics are presuppositions in ethics, and the practical demands of ethics are the complements of dogmatics."

Christian ethics has then to do with the Christian life, and such a life is concerned with what man is and what he ought to be. It starts with man as sinful and condemned ; it ends with him as holy and undefiled by

sin. The subject thus divides itself into two parts, the outline of which is as follows :

Part I., The Natural Life.

Under this we have the following subdivisions : 1. The Moral Endowment of Man. 2. Man in the Sinful State. 3. Death of the Natural Man.

Part II., The Christian Life.

Under this we have as a first division, "The Christian Life of the Individual" traced through the several stages of Conversion, Regeneration and Sanctification, closing with "The Consummation of the Christian Life," which is thus expressed : "The Christian is fully transformed to the image of God, and Christ's words in His interceding prayer are now literally fulfilled : 'That they all may be one ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.' 'And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them ; that they may be one, even as we are one ; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.' An absolute communion, an unbounded commingling of divinity and humanity, is expressed in these words. . . . Here is that perfection desired by Paul in his hymnic praise of love. 'Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known.' Here there is nothing obscure and enigmatical to unravel ; here the hidden and secret truth appears, being evidenced by purest light. The Divine and the human horizon coincide completely. This is eternal life."

The second division treats of social ethics under the Family, Society, the State, the Church. Under each of these subdivisions we have again numerous subdivisions giving to a clear and well-defined outline, a thorough investigation and discussion of the varied relations that constitute the individual, social, civil and religious life of man.

The book is characterized by good sense, manly vigor, an earnest Christian spirit, and an unflinching trust in the doctrines of revealed religion. It is alike a credit to the scholarly author and to the publishers, who have recognized in it a strong and vigorous agent for the dissemination of Christian thought and life. It deserves a large circle of readers. On the leading social and public questions of the day, as for instance, marriage, divorce, dancing, the theatre, master and servant, capital and labor, chastity, temperance, etc., we have clear ringing sentences and well-sustained argument based upon reason, experience, history and revelation. No one can read the volume without having his views broadened, his religious convictions deepened, his patriotism intensified, his private and social life purified, his religious zeal quickened, and his spiritual nature tending to perfect itself in love.

The Law of Psychic Phenomena. A Working Hypothesis for the Systematic Study of Hypnotism, Spiritism, Mental Therapeutics, etc. By THOMAS J. HUDSON. Chicago : A. C. McClurg & Co. 12 mo, pp. 409.

Recent investigations, especially those which have been conducted by the Society for Psychical Research, have given to the subjects treated in this volume a peculiar interest. Hitherto the work done has been, in the main, in collecting, authenticating and classifying facts. The author of this volume, who has apparently made a very careful study of these weird and wonderful phenomena, has set himself to discover the underlying principle or law of which they are the manifestation. And he is of opinion that when this law is understood, it will simplify and correlate the whole subject-matter, and remove it from the domain of the supernatural. The fundamental fact upon which the whole of this occult science, or family of

The Canadian Methodist Review.

sciences, is to rest, according to this author, if we understand him aright, is the duality of the human mind; or, in other words, that "*man has two minds,*" an *objective* and a *subjective* mind, and that each of these has special attributes of its own, and that, scientifically speaking, it is governed by different laws. The subjective mind, for example, is constantly amenable to control by suggestion, and is incapable of inductive reasoning.

This subjective mind, or second self, of the existence of which there is no evidence when we are in a normal condition, which only reveals itself in an abnormal state, but concerning which the proofs are multiplying to such an extent that there no longer seems to remain much room for doubt, seems to differ from the objective mind, or ordinary self, in mode of acquiring knowledge. It is independent of the mediation of the senses and of those mental processes which we call reasoning. It learns by open vision, by direct contact with the objects of knowledge, or by something analogous to intuition. Its memory is perfect. What enters it once remains there forever. But the curious thing about this mysterious part of our complex and marvellous being is, that it remains in such a state of complete subjection to the more energetic and self-assertive part, so completely overawed and silenced by it, that with all its transcendent powers and vast accumulations of knowledge—during the greater part of our lives, or during the whole of most lives—it would appear as if it were not.

The question arises, Has it no part to play in the present state of being? Does its acclivities belong to another sphere, and are the stores which it is gathering and hoarding with so much care, for use in another life? Here is opened up a large field for speculation and for investigation. Mr. Hudson is of opinion that the most perfect exhibition of intellectual power is the result of the synchronous action of the objective and subjective minds, and he says, "when this is seen in its perfection, the world names it *genius*. . . . There are certain classes of persons whose intellectual labors are characterized by subjective activity in a very marked degree. Poets and artists are the most conspicuous examples." Great orators, too, in their inspired moments, when they seem to be carried away with their theme, and say what in their inferior moods they could not have said; this is the result of the conjunction of the objective, and the subjective mind. The material thing, however, is that there is this double self, this duality of being, this subconsciousness which, though generally apparently dormant, wakes into activity at times, and this seems to suggest the idea of the present imperfection of our being, that we are being built up, so to speak, in different segments or compartments which, when brought together, will make us complete and fit us for the nobler activities which await us in the life to come.

The book is well written, the facts which it describes are apparently collected with care, and there is no reason to doubt that in the main they are genuine, and what is said about the *subjective* mind, interesting and important, and no doubt furnishes the key to many of the phenomena of this occult science; but as to the mental therapeutics and other things discussed in the book, we shall have to give them more thought before we can express an opinion. The book, however, will be found interesting and otherwise well worth reading.

Inspiration and Inerrancy. A History and a Defence. By HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, Professor in Lane Seminary. Containing the original papers on Christian Scholarship and Inspiration. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. Octavo, pp. 374.

Whatever may be the outcome of the action of the courts of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America in respect to Dr. Briggs

and Prof. Smith, so far as these gentlemen are concerned, it is evidently having an educating effect, not only on the ministers and members of that particular communion, but on the general Christian public. Never before did the Biblical students of this hemisphere know anything like what they do to-day respecting the question involved in these cases; and that the interest is increasing rather than subsiding is evident from the number of books on these subjects which are constantly issuing from the press. Not only are foreign works of higher criticism, textual criticism, and other kindred branches of sacred learning being reprinted, but home production is stimulated. With the works written and edited by Dr. Briggs, most Christian readers who are at all up with the times are familiar. Dr. De Witt's book on "What is Inspiration," has been already introduced to our readers, and now we have another book bearing on the same subject.

This is what the title purports, a history and a defence. It is a history of the case which has been decided in the Presbytery of Cincinnati against Prof. Smith, together with all the facts and circumstances leading up to it, and, at the same time, it is a presentation of the "case" of the defendant. But apart entirely from the personal interest which attaches to it, the book is one of considerable interest. It opens with a chapter on "The Situation," in which a rapid sketch is given of the history of the Presbyterian Church in the States, with special reference to the broadening of Christian thought, and the development of Christian doctrine. This is followed by a chapter on "The Occasion" of the present movement, of which the judicial action in the case of Prof. Smith is an incident. Then we have two important essays on "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," the former by Dr. Evans, late president of Lane Seminary, and the latter by Prof. Henry Preserved Smith. A chapter entitled "The Debate," contains a further discussion of the questions involved in the trial. Then comes two papers from the pen of Prof. Smith which appeared in the *New York Evangelist*; one on "How Much is Implied in Ordination Vows," and the other on "The Sin of Schism." This is followed by the "Charges Brought" against Prof. Smith; his "Response"; the "Reply and Rejoinder"; "Guilt or Innocence"; "The Argument"; "The Judgment"; "Amended Charges and Specifications."

Of course, every person who desires to understand this case and to have an intelligent comprehension of the position, to which that important branch of the Christian Church has, at least by implication, committed itself, should by all means read this book. It is not the first time, it is true, that some of these documents have been published, but they will be new to many, and even those who have met with them elsewhere will be glad to possess them in this permanent form, and in association with all their historical connections.

The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Ages. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, M.A., Professor of Hebrew in Free Church College, Glasgow. London: Hodder & Stoughton; Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 16mo, pp. 60. Price 35 cents.

Anything from the pen of George Adam Smith is well worth reading. This lecture was delivered as an inaugural address on the occasion of his induction to the Chair of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, which he still fills. It rapidly sketches the part which the Old Testament, or Hebrew Scriptures, has played in the preaching and teaching of the Christian Church from the beginning, commencing with Christ and His apostles and following the history of the Church down to the present. And from the part which these writings have played in the past, he infers what they are destined still to do. It is a lucid presentation of an important theme.

Object Sermons in Outline, with numerous illustrations. By REV. C. H. TYNDALL, D.D. With introduction by A. F. SCHAUFFLER, D.D. New York and Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 12mo, pp. 253. Price \$1.00.

This little volume will be found specially helpful to preachers and teachers, particularly to those of them who find it difficult to interest and keep the attention of the young. It shows how the eye may be made to assist the ear, and how both working together may better help the understanding and memory than either of them, unaided by the other, could do. The use of object lessons is as old as the Bible at least ; it is the method pursued by every teacher of science who knows his business, when in the lecture-room ; it is coming into more and more common use in the Sunday School, and there does not seem to be any good reason why the "Object Sermon" may not be introduced occasionally in the course of the regular ministrations of the Lord's Day. The forty-five sketches which make up the principal part of this volume show how this may be done.

John B. Gough, the Apostle of Cold Water. By CARLOS MARTYN, editor of *American Reformers*, and author of "Wendell Phillips, the Agitator," etc., etc. New York and Toronto : Funk & Wagnalls Company. Octavo, pp. 336. Cloth, \$1.50.

This is another book of the series entitled "American Reformers," published by this house, and we shall be surprised if it is not found to be quite equal in interest to any of those which have preceded it. The author has been fortunate in having an excellent subject, and the subject has not suffered from the manner of its treatment. It is a graphic picture of the man and of his wonderful career, from the pen of one who is evidently in thorough sympathy with both Mr. Gough and his work. It has all the interest of the most exciting work of fiction ; at the same time, it teaches valuable lessons, and can scarcely fail to stimulate the serious reader to good works. It will be specially helpful to those who are engaged in temperance work, and its wide circulation in this country at this time can scarcely fail to do much good.

The World's Congress of Religions. The addresses and papers delivered before the Parliament, and an abstract of the denominational and other congresses held in the Art Institute, under the auspices of the World's Columbian Exposition. Profusely illustrated. With marginal notes. Edited by J. W. HANSON, D.D. Chicago : Chas. Webb & Co. Sold only by subscription. Price, silk cloth, \$2.75 ; morocco, \$3.75, which includes the price of our REVIEW ; i.e., both the *Report* and the REVIEW may be obtained from our Business Manager for the price of the *Report* if the order is accompanied with cash.

This *Report* of the most notable religious event of the nineteenth century is all that it claims to be. It is in every sense an authentic and reliable work, and gives the productions of distinguished divines, prominent laymen and earnest women, representing Protestant and Catholics, Jews and Gentiles, Christians and Mohammedans. Every known faith, sect, creed and denomination from every part of the world is heard from in this greatest book of the age. The topics which formed the subjects of the addresses and papers delivered are not only scholarly treatises on the great religious beliefs of the world, but embrace many questions which constitute an integral part of the whole religious fabric. Every subject discussed is of great interest and importance to ministers, and should find a place in their libraries.

The International Teachers' Bible. London and Glasgow : William Collins, Sons & Co. ; Toronto : William Briggs.

We are here again asked to review the Bible, which we shall not essay to do except to call attention to the specialties of this edition. As a Bible, whether for teachers or others, it has this advantage over all others that we have seen : its very clear type. "The Bible Reader's Manual," or Aids to Biblical Study, edited by Rev. Chas. H. H. Wright, D.D., which is appended, will supply a long-felt want to students of the Holy Scriptures. This Manual of Helps contains contributions from eminent scholars on both sides of the Atlantic, hence the name International. In the introduction we have articles on How to Study the Bible, Inspiration, The Bible and the Christian Church, The English Versions of the Bible, The Ancient Versions of the Bible. The main contents are "The Books of the Bible and Apocrypha," in which the character and purpose of each book is concisely given ; "Studies on the Old and New Testaments," discussing questions of interest peculiar to each ; "Subsidiary History," treats of Jewish and sub-Apostolic history ; "The Bible and Ancient Monuments," throws much light on scriptural truths ; "Helps and Bible Study in General," is full of important material touching geography, ethnology, lexicography, etc. ; "Helps to Devotional and Practical Study," is very suggestive to the Christian worker and Sunday-school teacher ; to all these are added an index, concordance, gazetteer and maps.

Joseph : Beloved, Hated, Exalted. By F. B. MEYER, B.A. New York, Chicago and Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, \$1.00.

This is one of the four books by the author that constitute the "Series of Old Testament Heroes," viz., Abraham, Elijah, Israel, Joseph. It is a biography in which the scenes in the life of Joseph are treated with such spiritual fervor and holy aspiration, that its perusal will sweeten, deepen and enliven the piety of all who read it. The whole life is covered by a series of sixteen studies with special reference to an application to Christ, and will, no doubt, be of interest to the young, but useful to those who are their instructors in connection with present Sunday-school work.

Inductive Studies of the Twelve Minor Prophets. By WILBERT W. WHITE. Chicago : Young Men's Era Publishing Company. Cloth, 50 cents ; paper, 30 cents.

Bible Studies for Normal Classes, Assemblies, etc. By A. E. DUNNANG D.D. Boston : Congregational Publishing Society. New York : Hun & Eaton. Paper, 30 cents.

Twenty-six Lessons in Inductive Bible Study. By REV. EDWIN A. SCHELL. Chicago : Cranston & Curts. Paper, 15 cents.

Inductive Bible Studies on Samuel, Saul, David and Solomon. By PRESIDENT WM. R. HARPER, Ph.D. Hartford, Conn. : The Student Publishing Company. Cloth, 50 cents ; paper, 30 cents.

Here is an excellent set of helps. The first is the outcome of a summer course with college students, and is full of suggestive material. The next has long been a text-book for advanced normal work, and is prepared specially for Sunday-school teachers. The third is prepared for the Epworth Leagues as preparatory to the devotional meetings, and would be equally helpful to the Christian Endeavor and other young people's societies. We are glad to see this effort to secure increased Bible study among the young. The last consists of twenty-four "studies" in a thorough and exhaustive manner. Our fourth-year probationers for the ministry could not do better than to get this work as a guide in their preparation for their examinations.

The Biblical World, continuing "The Old and New Testament Student," furnishes a prospectus of the freshest thoughts on Biblical subjects for 1894. In the January number the editorial is on "Three Attitudes of Mind toward the Early Stories of Genesis." There is begun "Twelve Studies in Genesis," a series of letters from representative pastors on "How Much I Study the Bible and How," and "Twelve Living Topics," the one in this issue being "Jesus' Idea of the Kingdom of God." There are many other interesting articles and departments, but we only mention "The Babylonian Account of Creation" as being now of special interest. In February, an editorial on "Why is it Necessary to Study the Bible?" There is also a revised translation of "The Chaldean Account of the Deluge"; and in March the editorial is on "Bearing of our Views of the Historical Character of Genesis on the New Testament," with able articles on "The Theology of Paul and John Compared," "Hinduism Points of Contact with Christianity," "The Duties of Man as Taught by the Book of Proverbs."

The Thinker, a review of world-wide Christian thought, has an attractive bill-of-fare for 1894, covering "The Theological Questions of the Day," "The Gospel in Nature," "Some Controverted Articles of the Apostles' Creed," "The Synoptic Problem," "Religion and Science," "Some Prominent Difficulties in the Gospels," "Current Christian Thought," besides expository and a great variety of other papers. Some of these are begun in the January number which is the first number of Volume V. In the February number, under Bible Thought, the concluding paper on "The Westcott and Hort Text of the Greek Testament" is given; and in March the departments of Expository, Theological and Scientific Thought are especially good.

Christian Literature and Review of the Churches is the combination of these excellent monthlies. The first issue of the new series was in November, 1893. The aim of this publication is to give a monthly record of the religious thought and action of the world. The general editors are: American, Amory H. Bradford, D.D.; English, Henry S. Lunn, M.D., with special editors representing the Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist and Methodist Churches. It stands for Christian unity and aims to present the best thoughts of the best minds in the religious world. In the January number appears "The Stumbling Block and the Hope of Christian Unity," "The Teaching of Our Lord as to the authority of the Old Testament," "Christianity and Roman Paganism," and other articles. Perhaps the most interesting departments are "The Progress of the Churches," "Progress of the Re-Union Movement," and "Our Philanthropic Agencies." The February number contains articles on "The Brotherhood of Christian Unity," "Agrapha," "Socialism," "The Teaching of our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament"; and among others specially interesting to our readers, will be Archdeacon Farrar's account of "Dr. Stephenson's Hours," Miss Willard's article on "La Marichele," and an illustrated paper on the "World's Parliament of Religion."

Christian Thought for December, the last work of Charles F. Deems, with the American Institute of Christian Philosophy. It is an "Inspiration" number as we have "The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration," by Prof. Warfield, "Inspiration in the Old Testament," by Prof. Mitchell, "Inspiration under Review," by Revs. Lampe and McLane, and Dr. Warfield's "Reply to his Critics." The other articles are: "Lessons from the Parliament of Religions," by Lyman Abbott; "A Pen Picture of the Parliament," by Miss F. E. Winslow, and "Criminals not the Victims of Heredity," by Wm. F. Round. The number opens with a sketch of the life of Dr. Deems.