

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., AND E. H. BARNETT, D. D.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D.

VOL. X.

1896.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

Richmond, Va. :

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.

NEW YORK: ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH & Co

1896.

PRINTERS,
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.

X
 Rec
 P 925A
 1.10

CONTENTS.

VOLUME X.

	PAGE.
Adeny's <i>Song of Solomon, and Lamentations</i> ,	252
Allen's <i>History of the Unitarians</i> ,	256
Babel and its Lessons,	John F. Cannon, 131
Baird's <i>The Huguenots and Revocation, etc.</i> ,	Robert Price, 250
Balfour's <i>Foundations of Belief</i> ,	Francis R. Beattie, 110
Bavinck's <i>Gereformeerde Dogmatick</i> ,	Henry E. Dosker, 281
Beet's <i>The New Life in Christ</i> ,	Robert A. Webb, 391
Bennett's <i>Book of Jeremiah</i> ,	252
Beyschlag's <i>New Testament Theology</i> ,	Francis R. Beattie, 103
Briggs' (Dr.) <i>Confession of Faith</i> ,	Samuel M. Smith, 138
Briggs' <i>The Messiah of the Apostles</i> ,	Samuel M. Smith, 109
Cabrera's <i>Cuba and the Cubans</i> ,	402
Christianity Insistent, Uncompromising, Catholic,	James Little, 171
Christology, The New,	Robert A. Webb, 1
Church of the Living God, The,	Henry M. White, 458
Claims of Home Missions,	W. C. Clark, 236
Confessions and Catechisms, Authority of,	Henry Collin Minton, 470
Criticisms and Reviews,	103, 247, 391, 522
Crockett's <i>Men of the Moss-Hags</i> ,	Thos. C. Johnson, 530
Crockett's <i>The Stickit Minister</i> ,	Thos. C. Johnson, 533
Deacon, The Office of,	Robert P. Kerr, 202
Driver's <i>Deuteronomy</i> ,	254
DuBose's (H. C.) <i>Memoirs of J. Leighton Wilson</i> ,	J. Lowrie Wilson, 120
DuBose's (W. P.) <i>Ecumenical Councils</i> ,	Thos. C. Johnson, 522
Eddy's <i>History of the Universalists</i> ,	256
Effectual Calling—Regeneration,	John W. Primrose, 520
Fairbairn's <i>Religion in History</i> ,	Samuel M. Smith, 115
Foreign Evangelist, The,	P. D. Stephenson, 304
Foster's <i>Creation: God in Time and Space</i> ,	Robert A. Webb, 247
Gerhart's <i>Institutes of the Christian Religion</i> ,	Robert A. Webb, 1
Giving, Christian, in the Sanctuary,	Ralph E. Prime, 479
Gordon's <i>How Christ Came to Church</i> ,	D. N. McLaughlin, 529
Gospel, Paul's Summary of the,	T. W. Hooper, 73
Green, Jubilee of Dr. W. H.,	W. M. McPheeters, 381
History, a Perversion of,	James A. Waddell, 338
Home Missions in our Seminaries,	George Summey, 98
Home Mission Work and its Claims,	W. C. Clark, 236

	PAGE.
Immersionist History, An Episode in,	387
Institutional Church, The,	359
Irish Church Testing System,	489
Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii, Authenticity of,	31
Jusseraud's <i>Literary History of the English People</i> , ..	398
Kerr's <i>Hymns of the Ages</i> ,	243
Lanier, Sidney, vs. Robert Browning,	85
Life and Immortality,	193
Loyalty, Presbyterian,	91
Maggregor's <i>History of New Testament Apologetics</i> , ..	113
Mark xvi. 9-20, Authenticity of,	516
Moore's <i>Commentary on Judges</i> ,	396
Paul's Summary of the Gospel,	73
Philosophy of Religion, The,	157
Praise, Our Book of,	101
Praise, Our Book of,	240
Presbyterian Church, Historical Sketch of,	351
Presbyterian Loyalty,	91
<i>Principium Externum</i> , The,	281
Recent Publications,	124, 258, 403, 534
Religion, Philosophy of,	157
Ruling Elder, The Office of,	63
Sabbath-Schools, General Secretary of,	222
Sanday's and Headlam's <i>Romans</i> ,	398
Seeing God, Passages which Speak of,	501
Seminary Curriculum, The,	413
Seminary Students' Temptations,	93
Seminaries, Home Missions in the,	98
Social Reform and the Old Testament,	442
Sociology, Christian,	46
Sokrates, on Death and Judgment,	208
Southern General Assembly, 1896,	368
Testing System of the Irish Church,	489
Theleman's <i>Heidelberg Catechism</i> ,	394
Theology the Science of Religion,	267
Vance's <i>Church Portals</i> ,	116
Walker's <i>History of the Congregational Churches</i> , ..	256
<i>Woman Suffrage</i> ,	121

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 35.—JANUARY, 1896.

I. THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

THE completion of Dr. Gerhart's *Institutes*¹ prepares the way for a full consideration of the theory which the distinguished author sets forth and maintains. The volumes give us a new work on systematic theology. They emanate from the Reformed (German) Church. They are able and entertaining. The spirit of their author is calm and reverent; his mind is broad and grasping; his method is positive and constructive rather than polemical and controversial; his style is plain and vigorous. The work possesses great value, but that value is chiefly negative, because these volumes are a concrete demonstration of the utter inability of modern progressives to fulfil their promises of a new theology and to make good their criticisms upon the old. Others of this school have written incisively upon topics in theology, and have had the polemical advantage of having that particular topic separated to itself, so that it could not be reinforced from the general system of truth to which it belonged; but Dr. Gerhart, bolder, braver, fairer, and truer than all his school, undertakes the construction of a system. His mind sees, and his heart feels, that, if the new principle be

¹ *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. By Emanuel V. Gerhart, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa. Complete in two octavo volumes, 1744 pages; per volume, \$3.00. New York, London, and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1894.

He, it must have both the courage and the ability to organize and articulate all the facts of theological science into a harmonious system. He undertakes the task which is thus logically imposed, and prosecutes it with as little special pleading as is possible. The work has been done as well as it could be done. That it is a failure is not due to Dr. Gerhart, but to the organizing principle with which he wrought. He is able, but his theologic principle is weak. His logic is prevailingly good, but his premises are prevailingly bad. His reverence and devoutness are everywhere manifest. He loves Christ; he loves the truth. He moves from a false centre. This is the single and sufficient explanation of all the entanglements in which he involves the gospel and all theology. These volumes are another proof of the indestructibility of Calvinism. Having withstood Pelagianism and Arminianism, Dr. Gerhart's failure will evidence its superiority to the new theology, which may be denominated *Christologicalism*.¹

The true method of investigation in any science is *natural*. The student follows the structure of the object. He does not make, but finds and follows, natural cleavage lines. He does not force his way along paths of his own making; that would be to be arbitrary and artificial. As Goldsmith said of Burke's oratorical method, "He winds into his subject like a serpent." The ancient, mediæval, and Reformation methods in theology were topical. The Trinity was the basis. Beginning with the divine existence and trinal nature of God, the investigator then discussed the acts and works of God in creation, providence, and redemp-

¹While I was reading these *Institutes*, Dr. Gerhart came to Clarksville on a visit to his brother, who resides here. In this way I made his acquaintance, and enjoyed his fellowship for a few days. He impressed me as a man of great intellectuality and piety. His spirit was sweet, like that of his Master. I heard him preach, and he preached about the kingdom of Christ as one who had come under its power, and whose chief end was to promote its interests. On account of trouble with his eyes, he dictated both of these great volumes to an amanuensis. Because of the place in which I have installed him in my regards, it has been a great pain to me to find so much and so serious fault with his books. However, he would not love the man who would love him more than the truth. The office of an interpreter is always a difficult one. If I have misconstrued him at any point, it will give me great regret.

tion. During the present century Christology has been adopted by some theologians as the genetic topic in theology. They have filled the air with the cry, "Back to Christ." They have charged other systems with carrying the mind of the church away from Christ and centering it upon orthodoxy. In the new, the person of Christ is offered as the Archetype, the Organ, and the End of all theological facts. He, in his theanthropic constitution, is conceived as the pattern, the efficient cause, and the final purpose of all God's acts and revelations. He is these three things with reference to theism, cosmology, angelology, anthropology, hamartiology, soteriology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, and eschatology—the alpha and the omega of all theologizing. The new theology is an evolution, in which Christ, as theanthropic, is the antecedent and original ideal; then the active and organific principle; then the teleological and ultimate end. All began in him; all proceeds through him; all ultimates in him. He is the universal substance, the universal power, the universal phenomenon. Dr. Gerhart's *Institutes* are an earnest and able effort to construct a complete system of theological science "from the Christ-idea as its standpoint"; "it is an earnest effort to make answer to the call for a doctrinal system in which Jesus Christ stands as the central truth; not only as the instrument of redemption and salvation, but also as the beginning and the end of revelation." The Christ-idea is "the fundamental law of Christian doctrine." The incarnation of the Second Person in the Trinity—that was the eternal intention, the efficient means, and the final execution of all the energies of the Divine Being, of the intransitive as well as of the transitive activities of the Deity, of all Trinitarian motions *ad intra* as well as of those *ad extra*. The incarnation is the dynamic centre and purpose of the Godhead and of the universe. The aim is a pious one, namely, to honor the Saviour of sinners.

I. EXPOSITION OF THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

1. *The Nature of Christ's Person.* This topic is recognized as one of primary and regulative importance. The new Christology conceives and sets forth Christ as a divine-human person. So far, the language sounds orthodox enough. But the interpretation of

e hyphen, binding together the words "divine" and "human," leads to serious departures from the confessional doctrine of the Reformed churches. What is the nature of this union between divinity and humanity in the person of Christ? The question possesses primary and ruling significance for dogmatics. Dr. Gerhart gives the following interpretation of this union:

"1. The relation between God and man in the person of Jesus Christ is *internal*; it is brought about, not by forces foreign either to the infinitude of the Creator or the finitude of the creature, but by virtue of an original affinity and sympathy between the finite personal creature and the infinite personal Creator; there is adaptation of the nature of each to the nature of the other.

"2. Being internal, the relation is also vital or *organic*. The absolute life of God and the relative life of man become in Christ one personal life.

"3. The organic relation involves *ethical* unity. The life of God is the life of absolute love. The normal life of man is a life of love in God. God's love to man and man's capacity of love towards God are essential conditions of the personal union of God and man in Christ.

"4. The union of divine life of infinite love and of human life of finite love implies an *historical process*. The union has epochs and stages through which it passes according to laws of growth. It has a beginning, an onward progress, and a final consummation."—*Institutes*, Vol. I., p. 155.

These explanatory propositions are very definite. The relation between deity and humanity in Christ is *internal, organic, ethical, and progressive*. What is the import of these words as thus applied? Dr. Gerhart proceeds to make his meaning very plain by expounding these predicates throughout some thirty consecutive pages. In characterizing the union between divinity and humanity in Christ as an *internal* one he means to indicate the cause of that union; by denominating it an *organic* union he points to the metaphysical nature of it; by denominating it *ethical* he designates its moral quality; and by denominating it *progressive* he points out the development of it. These are all important and reconstructive in their influence. I shall attempt to bring out these points yet more clearly.

(1), The union is an internal one. Here we have a denial and an affirmation. It is denied that the union between divinity and humanity in Christ's person is constituted either by the will of God acting sovereignly, or by any circumstances in the history of man, such as his sin and fall. It is affirmed that the union was a necessary one, springing out of a correlation between God and

man. Between God and man there is a reciprocal fitness, a mutual aptitude. Deity craves humanity; humanity equally craves deity. Deity is a necessary complement to humanity; humanity is a necessary complement of deity. Each gravitates towards the other. Deity and humanity meet and merge in Jesus Christ. This union "is not effected by the operation of a cause or influence of an occasion other than the essential nature of God and the essential nature of man." There is no outward force acting upon God's nature, humanizing that nature, nor is there any outward force acting upon man's nature, deitizing it; but the motion in each nature towards the other is spontaneous and subjective; the resultant union is an essential one, the product of normal tendencies, which were eternal in God, but were created in man. The analogue is that of chemical affinity. The result is a divine-human person. "If human nature were not assumed into organic union with God, the original idea of manhood would fail of final actualization. The constitution of finite personality would be radically deficient." The converse of this, though not formally stated, is logically implied and plainly hinted: "If divine nature were not assumed into organic union with man, the original idea of Godhood would fail of final actualization. The constitution of infinite personality would be radically deficient." The author does say: "God and man become a unity in Jesus by virtue of a law of reciprocal demand immanent in both—in God as Creator, and in man as the crown of creation" (Vol. I., p. 158.) If the incarnation is the result of a demand immanent in the essential nature of God, prior to the incarnation God was a deficient God, even as man was a deficient man. Upon this first point the explicit teaching is, that the union between humanity and divinity in Christ was the result of reciprocal demands immanent in both God and man.

(2), The union is organic. This is the second feature of the union between humanity and divinity in Christ. "God and man are not composite parts of the Christ. Nor are they in juxtaposition. But Jesus is the God-man, the divine-human personal organism. . . . An organism is neither compounded of parts, nor does it consist of parts; it is a unity in which the whole and the

parts are alike original. . . . The personal One at the instant of conception was neither God as God, nor man as man, but a new creation, in which the life of deity and the life of humanity, Spirit and spirit, became one twofold principle in embryo. The divine factor supposes and includes the dynamic presence of humanity; the human supposes and includes the dynamic presence of deity." (Vol. I., pp. 159, 160.)

Here is an advance upon the church doctrine of the hypostatic union. According to the Reformed creeds, the union between humanity and divinity in Christ is personal. The metaphysical bond is personality. In the new Christology this bond is vital. Its metaphysical nature is life. The result is a "vital unity" instead of a personal unity. Christ is neither God nor man, but a third sort of being, called divine-human. His essence needs to be expressed by a new word, *theanthropicity*. "In the Son, the Creator and the creature, the infinite and the finite, the heavenly and the earthly, meet. Opposition and diversity are resolved into oneness and harmony." (Vol. I., p. 168.) As to the nature of his being, Jesus Christ is a metaphysical blend of deity and humanity. According to the established Christology, Christ is very God and very man, but one person; personally considered, he is a unit, but realistically considered, he is two. The new Christology considers him as both a personal and a metaphysical unit at one and the same time. His metaphysical, monistic substance is theanthropic in its essential and formative nature.

(3), This union is ethical. We have seen that divinity and humanity came together in Christ under the influence of reciprocal demands immanent in both divinity and humanity. We have seen that the resultant of such a union was a metaphysical, monistic, theanthropic organism. Now, it is further affirmed that this union possessed an ethical quality also; that is, God would have sinned and man would have sinned, had there been no incarnation of the Son. How shall we ground the morality of an immanent law, a movement which is the result of the essential nature of God and the essential nature of man? Appetencies which are connatural are generally construed as morally complexionless. Free agency and voluntariness are generally under-

stood to be the prerequisites of moral responsibility. But the incarnation was the result of demands which were immanent in both divinity and humanity. What, then, is the basis of the ethical character of such an incarnation? The new Christology works out an answer to this question in this way: "God is absolute spirit. The nature of absolute spirit is love. . . . Love is reciprocal. God's love to man implies man's capacity of loving God. . . . Love has its own sphere and its own conditions. The condition of love is love." (Vol. I., p. 169.) Love requires love. God is absolute love; that love ethically demands a responsive human love. Man is relative love; that love ethically demands a responsive divine love. To realize these reciprocal demands of divine and human love, the incarnation becomes an ethical necessity; without it, God could not fulfil his uncreated obligations to humanity; without it, man could not fulfil his created obligations to God. In Christ, God fully meets his moral obligations to man, and man fully meets his moral obligations to God. Hence the ethical quality of the incarnation is grounded in the essential nature of love.

(4), The union was progressive. It grew and developed. What grew and developed? This vital unity, the divine-human person. "This historical process is to be predicated of the organic whole, of the one person, Jesus, the Christ of God, in whom the divine nature and the human nature are a unity. The entire Christ is historical. We may not say that the human nature alone developed itself agreeably to the laws of growth, the divine nature being meanwhile unaffected. . . . God is, indeed, the infinite being; but infinite being is not rigid fixedness. . . . At his birth deity in Jesus was an infinite potentiality, a fulness of divine being, which was gradually actualized, from point to point, in his life, in his will and consciousness. No less God metaphysically at his birth than at his glorification, yet at his glorification the process of ethical unification had become complete. The status of his personal history was reached when the divine nature had imparted the largest measure of its fulness to the human nature, and human nature had developed the highest spiritual capacity of appropriating the infinitude of God." (Vol. I., pp. 175, 176.)

Christ is the unit which is presented for analysis to the theo-

logical chemist. By analysis he finds that this person is constituted of two elements—divinity and humanity. He also finds that there is a third element—that which unites them in his person. Why do they combine in his person to form the divine-human unit? The answer is, because of a law of reciprocal affinity immanent in both. When they are thus combined by this power of affinity, they make a neutral third, neither divine nor human, but a theanthropic and vital organism. But because of the nature of the combining elements, the personal unit possesses not merely physical qualities, but moral qualities also. And still further, because of the nature of the unit thus formed, it is capable of growth and improvement. Such is the Christ of the new Christology. “He is the ideal man,” the goal of the evolutionary struggle of humanity. He is also, by logical implication, the *ideal God*, for the essential nature of deity contains an immanent demand for humanity, even as humanity contains an immanent demand for “infinite of God.” Without humanity, God is deficient; without deity, man is deficient. Jesus Christ is the God-man—the ideal God, and the ideal Man.

The biblical representations of the person of the Redeemer make him to be a *complex* person, constituted of two natures. He is not merely God, nor merely man, but a union of both. He is a God-man. Four factors are necessary to a complete conception of the person of Christ: (1), True and proper deity; (2), True and proper humanity; (3), The union of deity and humanity in one person; (4), The distinction of deity from humanity in the one person, so that there be no mixture of natures. The Unitarians deny the deity of Christ; the Apollinarians deny his humanity; the Nestorians deny the unity of his personality; the Monophysites deny the duality of his natures. We understand this new Christology to be monophysitic in its character; that is, that the divinity and humanity in Christ unite to form one nature, and this new compound nature is denominated *divine-human*, or *theanthropic*.

2. *The Necessity of the Incarnation.* According to the confessional Christology, the necessity of the incarnation of the Son of God was purely pactional. The advent of the Second Person of

the Godhead, and his whole human history, became a necessity because of sin and the covenant of grace. Had there been no fall, and had there been no purpose of redemption, there would have been no incarnation. Christ came into the world to save sinners; had there been no sinners and no salvation, Christ would not have come into the world. The decree of election grounds the decree of incarnation. But the new Christology refers the incarnation to a necessity which was original and absolute. It affirms that there would have been an incarnation if Adam had never fallen. A glorified Christ, being the last in a divine-human series, was the first in the intention of God, so that the whole world and all world-history came into existence as so many stages or steps towards this final end. From this system, as ably developed by Dr. Gerhart, we are able to resolve this general reason for the incarnation into four particulars. From one point of view, the incarnation was a metaphysical necessity; from another, ethical; from a third, incidental; from a fourth, pactional or historical. These points need further development.

(1), The incarnation was metaphysically necessary. A true exposition of the metaphysics of the divine nature will show, as existing in the essential nature of God, an immanent demand for man—an uncreated, original, and necessary affinity of divinity for humanity. Such a primary and native aptitude is one of the facts in the divine constitution. A sound, human metaphysics, on the other hand, will discover a reciprocal, responsive, correlative demand for God immanent in man. Because of this psychological constitution, there is a movement downward of deity to man, and a movement upward of humanity to God. The two movements must meet, else each would fail to realize its ideal. When the two movements did actually meet, a divine-human person was the result, and the incarnation was a fact. In this reciprocal movement of each towards the other, under the influence of a law of attraction immanent in the essential nature of both alike, lies the psychological necessity of the incarnation. The principle of the incarnation is thus grounded “in the reciprocal connection between God and man.” The incarnation was, consequently, for God as well as for man. A few extracts will at once prove and clarify this position.

“The advent is in the first instance referable to God. In a subordinate sense it is referable also to man ; referable to both, the personal Creator and the personal creature, in their reciprocal vital connection. Therefore, the advent is not an afterthought, not a supplement of the first creation ; it is anticipated by the divine idea of the world. . . . The divine idea anticipates an actual development of the world from an inchoate beginning, through a succession of kingdoms, a history in time, and a given teleology. The proximate end of the creative process from below upward was the primeval man, the first Adam ; the ultimate end of the primeval man, and through him the end of the entire creative work, was the ideal man, the last Adam. Conformably to the logic of universal history, grounded in the divine idea of creation, which, under the direction of Providence, is in process of normal actualization, the Christ comes into the world. . . . To man’s nature in its original relation to God, the advent is referable by virtue of the fact that human personality is formed in God’s image. . . . Man as man, apart from his sinfulness and misery, demands a transition from the lower to the higher plane of life ; a transition from his original actual state in the domain of the natural and earthly, a transcendent state in the domain of the spiritual, world. Conformably to this profound human demand, a demand which is the outcome of God’s own eternal purpose actualized in man’s creation, God moves from heaven toward earth, descending in the person of his Son into the organic depths of humanity. . . . The ground of the advent is to be seen in both (God and man) as connected by the economy of creation. . . . If we look upon the incarnation, the advent of the Son of God in human nature, as having its grounds in God’s eternal purpose respecting the history and scope of the universe, it will be seen to be not an afterthought, not an appendix devised by divine wisdom to supplement a defect in the plan of creation, or to display and glorify punitive justice, or merely to remove the consequences of man’s failure. . . . In purpose and in possibility, the birth and history of Jesus Christ antedate both the fall of man and the fall of angels. More than this, it antedates the very beginning of the work of creation.” (Vol. II, pp. 173-177.)

Comment is unnecessary. The passage grounds the necessity of the incarnation in the original, constitutional, and metaphysical connection between God and man. The passage is supported by the catholic teachings of both volumes. The same position is taken by Bishop Martensen in his *Dogmatics*, by Principal Fairbairn in his *Christ in Modern Theology*, and by Dr. Stearns in his *Present Day Theology*. The doctrine rules a certain type of modern Christology.

(2), The necessity of the incarnation is not only metaphysical ; it is also ethical. The advent of Christ is thus grounded in the moral relations between God and humanity. Had there been no advent, there would have been no actualization of either metaphysical or moral being ; such a failure would have been at once a consummate blunder and an atrocious crime.

“The organic relation [between God and man] involves ethical unity. The life of God is the life of absolute love. The normal life of man is a life of love in God. God’s love to man and man’s love towards God are essential conditions of personal union of God and man in Christ.” (Vol. I., p. 155.)

“Not the physical only, but the ethical also, enters into the idea of the incarnation. The love of God to man conditions the love of man to God. If God were not absolute love, if man were not created in the image of absolute love, there would not be in God the aptitude of life-communion with man. Man occupies towards God a reciprocal attitude. . . . On the basis of vital affinity is developed ethical reciprocity. The organic union is perfected by the ethical union. And the ethical union, like organic unity, involves a process. . . . Ethical unity does not identify the two factors of our Lord’s personal life. . . . This process of ethical oneness presents two phases. . . . The process of ethical transformation of human nature into ideal oneness with the Son of God is the process of self-assertion of distinctively true manhood.” (Vol. I., pp. 168-173.)

“The tap-root and the immutable law of the advent is the eternal principle of love, the communion of love in the glory of the tri-personal Godhead.” (Vol. II., p. 177.)

The law which rules the incarnation is the law of love. That law exists in and over the essential nature of God, and in and over the essential nature of man. God is love; man is the image of love. The law of love requires that love shall love love; God is under an ethical obligation to love himself because he is love, and to love man because he is the image of love; and man is under an ethical obligation to love God because he is love, and to love himself because he is the image of love. The ethical principle is subjective to the very nature of love. In order for love to fulfil its ethical duties to itself, it must, so to speak, create an object which will unify itself—a divine-human person, who is love’s ideal and ethical satisfaction. The law of love holds reciprocal sway over God and man, and immanently draws them together into ethical oneness, and that ethical unit is Christ. If we think of the incarnation as not taking place, we must think of love as disappointed—as morally wronged and outraged. Love is the essential nature of God, and man as originally constituted is like God; love has a moral right to an object upon which it can fully and happily expend itself, for self-manifestation is of the very essence of love; hence, were there no incarnation, love would be wronged, and through love God would be wronged in his essential nature. The union, then, between God and man in Christ was not only organic and metaphysical, but it was also judicial and ethical. The

incarnation was a moral necessity, and the morality of that necessity was reciprocal between God and man; it was not, therefore, a duty which was purely and only pactional in its obligation, but one which was original, springing out of the inmost law of love reigning over divinity and humanity. From an ethical law of love as a premise, the new Christology in this way evolves the moral necessity of the advent of Christ.

(3), The necessity of the incarnation is not only metaphysical and ethical, but it is also incidental, that is, the grounds of the incarnation are partly circumstantial and adventitious. Here the new Christology is in sharp conflict with the old Christology. According to the traditional doctrine, the advent of sin and God's elective purpose concerning redemption are the exclusive reasons for the advent of Christ. Had there been no sin, there would have been no incarnation. Had there been no decree of redemption, there had been no enfleshment of the Son of God. But for the episode of the fall, there had been no assumption of humanity by divinity. What, therefore, the new Christology construes as an incidental and accidental reason for the incarnation, the old Christology postulated as principiant and exclusive; what, in the one system, is a secondary reason, in the other system is primary and of exclusive importance.

"The original communion of love between God and man is, however, by itself insufficient to explain the actual character of the advent. Due account has to be made of man's sinful condition, and the abnormal relation of the race to God which sinfulness involves. This abnormal relation is not really a factor of the advent. . . . The sent one of God, Christ, comes as the revelation of eternal love to a fallen world. He not only accomplishes the purpose of divine sovereignty, but he also satisfies the sympathy and compassion of God. God so loved our apostate race that he gave his only begotten Son. No less really does Christ come to satisfy all our human needs, especially the needs growing out of the prevalence of sin and the dominion of Satan. Whosoever believeth on the Christ shall not perish, but have eternal life. In revealing the divine compassion he becomes the Saviour of sinners; in coming to save sinners from the condemnation of sin he fulfils eternal love in the character of grace and mercy." (Vol. II, pp. 178-182.)

The fall affected both God and man. The change so wrought was both metaphysical and ethical in its character. Man and God are metaphysically and morally correlated to each other. Sin is an abnormal disturbance of that correlation, a foreign interfer-

ence with the reciprocal gravitation of divinity and humanity towards each other; if let alone, sin would prevent the union, but that union must be effected both for metaphysical and ethical reasons, hence the necessity of the incarnation; it was necessary to a normal and ideal evolution. But there is another point of view. God loves man; man becomes sinful and miserable, and these new attributes of his moral being elicit God's love in the forms of grace and mercy; they do not destroy the divine love, they only intensify it; hence, the original necessity for the incarnation rising out of the law of love is, by the fall, simply intensified. Sin and the covenant of grace made because of sin do not create the original necessity for the advent of Jesus; they modify that original necessity; they enhance, but do not make, the necessity for the birth of the Son of God and his history in human flesh. The new necessity is twofold—original and accidental.

(4), But there is yet a fourth ground of necessity for the incarnation. We have seen that it was made necessary by the very metaphysics of divinity and humanity, by the ethical relations of the two, and by the accidental fact of sin as a disturbing and disuniting factor in the metaphysical and ethical evolutionary process towards an organic oneness of God and man. This fourth factor roots itself in the covenant between God and man; it is pactional in its character.

“The twofold attitude of fallen man—his inborn aptitude for communion with God, and his profound yearning after reconciliation—is the natural basis of the pre-Christian economy of grace, founded by the Abrahamic covenant. A supernatural manifestation of God rooted in the primeval promise and an act of sovereign grace, this economy was no less a direct response from the bosom of Jehovah to the instinctive longings and the intense cries of distress that went forth from the heart of mankind.” (Vol. II., p. 183.)

“In the life of the covenant people molded under the training of the law and the prophets we may, therefore, recognize a necessity for the advent of the Messiah which is peculiar.” (Vol. II., p. 186.)

“The event [the birth of Jesus] may be said to have been the legitimate outcome of history, the result of natural and human forces, developed, disciplined and ripened by the covenant in the life of the chosen nation; not the result of human powers moving on the plane of ‘the natural man,’ nor yet merely of human life purified and ennobled by the sanctifying virtue of pre-Christian revelation. The event was the result of a concrete historical necessity; a necessity, on the one hand, referable to God as the author of the world and of man; on the other hand, the result of a necessity present and active in the constitution and

history of the Adamic race as lifted up, molded, and ennobled by the supernatural communication of Jehovah with man in the elect nation. Undoubtedly an event due to supernatural agency, the conception of Jesus is, however, just as certainly a natural mystery. It was the legitimate issue of spiritual laws and forces silently working for ages in the bosom of the Adamic race as individualized in the posterity of Abraham, and nurtured by the covenant." (Vol. II, p. 193.)

We are to think of God as eternally desiring fellowship with man; and we are to think of man as persistently yearning for fellowship with God. This reciprocal desire has an earthward and heavenward movement for gratification. One step towards its actual gratification was the creation of man. The fall damaged, but did not destroy, it. The next positive step towards its realization was the protevangelium, the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. The third great step was the formation of the Abrahamic covenant, which created a school of discipline in which the Adamic race was to be ripened for the reciprocal fellowship. The fourth step was the historic advent of Jesus, who, in ripening himself for glory, ripened the fellowship and union of God and man. When the evolution of this desire for a divine-human fellowship reached the stage of the Abrahamic covenant, the necessity of the incarnation took on a new form, and became pactional.

We now have the whole teaching as to the ground of the necessity of the incarnation, as set forth by the new Christology, before us. It was necessary, first of all, to realize the metaphysical tendencies which were immanent in the essential nature of both divinity and humanity. It was necessary, in the second place, to realize the ethical correlation between God and man, which was reciprocally ruled by the law of love. It was necessary, in the third place, to reverse the abnormal tendency which set in through the sin and fall of man, and so to prevent both a metaphysical and ethical miscarriage of the reciprocal motions of divinity towards humanity. It was necessary, in the fourth place, in order to fulfil the compact between God and the Adamic race as specialized in Abraham, which compact had been evolved by the co-working of supernatural and natural forces. For these reasons, so the new Christology teaches, it was necessary for God and man to get together—to organically unite in one person.

3. *The Mode of the Incarnation.* Upon this point the new Christology is out of harmony with our ancestral and confessional faith. "Christ, the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, and so was and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures, but one person, forever." So wrote the Westminster Assembly in its Catechism. We do not know of a single Reformed confession which goes beyond or falls short of this statement. The Father sent the Son into the world; the Son took to himself a human body and soul; the Spirit fashioned this human nature for him out of the substance of the Virgin Mary. The process of the incarnation is thus conceived and set forth as supernatural, miraculous, and sovereign. On the other hand, the progressive school represent the incarnation as the result of a pantheistic and evolutionary process; it is the product of demands which are immanent in the essential nature of both divinity and humanity.

"Religion is but the symbol of the kindred natures and correlated energies of God and man. It means that each nature seeks the other, is capable of finding it, and is susceptible to its touch." (Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 493.)

"The Christ-idea means not only that the Logos became flesh conformably with his own eternal nature, but that he became flesh also according to all the laws and normal processes of humanity. . . . At his birth deity in Jesus was an infinite potentiality, a fulness of divine being, which was gradually actualized, from point to point, in his life, in his will and consciousness. No less God metaphysically at his birth than at his glorification, yet at his glorification the process of ethical unification had become complete. The status of his personal history was reached when divine nature had imparted the largest measure of its fulness to the human nature, and human nature had developed the highest spiritual capacity of appropriating the infinitude of God. The incarnation is in no respect magical. . . . Not man, as man was born of Mary, nor God as God, but Jesus was conceived and born. He who was God in man and man in union with God; he who lived the life of God and the life of man in indissoluble personal unity, *he* was born. The birth of Jesus is an actual historical fact, including his Godhead as really as his humanity." (*Institutes*, Vol. I., pp. 175-196.)

"Jesus Christ in the process of becoming the perfect man realizes himself the divine ideal. . . . God in the person of his Son became man, and man, to appropriate the language of the Athanasian Creed, was 'assumed into God.' A union so real, so indissoluble, argues a profound essential connection between these two terms, God and man. . . . God and man become the same. Either God descends to man, or man ascends to God; either the divine takes possession of man, or man is transformed and deified. . . . His history is the concrete exposition of humanity. From his glorification we learn the truth hidden in pantheism. . . .

God adopts man into union with himself in the person of the incarnate Son, and translates man from present cosmical connections to his own right hand in heaven." (Vol. II., pp. 3-16.)

"The human nature is not less, but more truly, human for such exalted development and fellowship; since such exalted fellowship is none other than the fulfilment of the original intention of the Creator in forming man after his own image. And the divine nature is no less properly divine for the assumption of human nature into itself according to human laws and natural conditions; inasmuch as God's being is the archetype of man's being, and the normal life of man's constitution is the noblest and most perfect organ of God's presence and revelation." (Vol. II., p. 233.)

The idea of an evolutionary and pantheistic incarnation is everywhere taught by this new school. "The Normal Development of Jesus" is the caption of a chapter. The "Jesus" that is developed is a divine-human unit, the divinity in connection with the humanity, as well as the humanity in connection with the divinity. There is in humanity a "latent aptitude for divinization," and there is in divinity a fitness for "life-union with man." Deity is not "rigid fixedness." "God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated, man the permanent capability of incarnation." There is an "affinity" between divinity and humanity. The union is effected "gradually" by the law of "kinship." There are ante-natal, natal, and post-natal stages in the process. God moves downwards to man; man moves upwards to God. The union was not constituted; it "became." The "becoming" was by "processes," "stages," and "epochs." At the end of the processes, stages, and epochs stands the "ideal man"—the "glorified Christ." There is a gradual "depotentiation" of deity and reciprocal "impotentiation" of humanity, until the two come into "internal," "organic," and "ethical" union. To a certain extent there is an "impoverishment" of deity and a corresponding "enrichment" of humanity, until finally a level is reached and union takes place. Finally, "the incarnate Son," says Dr. Gerhart, "the seed of the woman, opens into bloom and consummates life in full-grown fruit." We do not understand him, however, as teaching that divinity and humanity are so merged and mixed in the person of Christ as to lose their identity, though he often employs language which would bear this interpretation. We understand him as teaching that there was a process of union, a gradual

and evolutionary and reciprocal approach of deity and humanity, and that this divine-human movement was consummated in the glorification of Christ, when he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high as the perfectly incarnated God, the ideal man.

4. *The Influence of the Incarnation.* The new Christology construes the incarnation as the central, the ruling, the underlying and informing fact of God and the universe. The incarnation is not a means to an end, but is itself the chief end of itself and all things. In the traditional and confessional theology, the incarnation of the Son is a means to the end of God's glorification of himself in the redemption of sinners; but in the new system, the incarnation is the ultimate end of all activities in the Divine Being and of all activities in human life—the historic goal of all divine and human movements. "The new movement," says Dr. Smyth, "is an endeavor to put all theology upon a christological centre." It insists "that all the doctrines contained in the Protestant confessions shall be lifted bodily up, off from their foundation in a system of decrees, and placed upon a thoroughly ethical and human—in one word, a christological—revelation of God." This new foundation for every theological fact is the "incarnate Word." "Not God's sovereign will, not God's eternal decree, but God himself, God in Christ, is the central truth and glory of Christian life and thought." Dr. Martensen tells us: "The advent of Christ, the revelation of the highest good, cannot be viewed as a means towards something else, but must be looked upon as its own end; all things, all nature, and all history must be looked upon as a means to Christ." Dr. Gerhart says: "Christ is the dynamic necessity of the universe, and its governing law. He is the law, 1, for the order and harmony of heaven; 2, for the development and teleology of the world; 3, for the origin, growth and triumph of the church; 4, for the final consummation of all things. This law Christ, is as the second man, as the head of the new race and the Redeemer from sin in one mystery." The incarnation is thus set forth as the dynamic centre of universal activity; he is the efficient cause and the final end of universal movement and history. All activities, proceeding from him as a source, return into him as an end. God, the world, man, angels, heaven and

hell—all are means to the incarnation, they bring about and interpret the Christ.

II. CRITICISMS UPON THE NEW CHRISTOLOGY.

1. The christological method so comprehensively and carefully followed by Dr. Gerhart is *fractional*. It is, therefore, inadequate and misleading. God incarnate is a single person in the Godhead; it is illogical and contrary to facts to rule the whole Godhead by him. Redemption is only one of the works of God; it is likewise illogical and contrary to the facts to conceive and interpret all the works of God in the light of this particular one. Sin is an anomaly in the universe, and all that history which is made by sin is episodic; it is thoroughly misleading to deal with sin and its eccentric history as original, and regulative of all theological science. The method does not cover the whole ground; the principle does not rule all the facts. It is not natural, it is not logical. All the spokes in the theological wheel do not go to the new centre. The alleged centre is a false one, because all theological truth must articulate at some point to form a system, an organism. A few illustrations will exhibit the truth of this assertion.

Theology proper is the doctrine of God. As a branch of general theological science, it seeks to prove the existence of God, to describe his spiritual and tri-personal nature, to enumerate and expound his attributes, and to trace the historical execution of his decrees. Our assertion is, that "the Christ-idea" will not interpret this department of theological science. Dr. Gerhart makes the attempt for us. Let us see what success he has met with, for his experiment, it may be safely assumed, is as good as can be made.

Does God exist? If so, what sort of being is he, and what has he done? These primary questions must be carried to Christ for their answers. He is their answer, their complete and only answer, according to the new system which we are reviewing:

"The doctrine on God is to be developed, not from natural intuition, nor on the basis of any philosophical system, either of ancient or modern times, but on the basis of the idea respecting the God-man. Belief in the Deity and theological conceptions do, indeed, antedate Christianity. The revelation of new truth by

Christ presupposes natural consciousness of God. This consciousness is universal. Nevertheless, the Christian doctrine, or the conception of the divine nature, which may stand as absolute truth, can be obtained only by reflection on God as manifested by Jesus of Nazareth." (Vol. I, p. 188.)

This passage gives up what it affirms. Does God exist? The incarnate God, Christ, is the answer to that question. But it is admitted that "the revelation of new truth by Christ presupposes natural consciousness of God. This consciousness is universal." Only those who know Christ can know God, yet there is a universal knowledge or consciousness of God antedating the very incarnation of Christ, and pregrounding every revelation made by him! This is a glaring contradiction, made necessary by the facts of the world's history. Was there no knowledge of God before the advent of Christ? Do the heathen, who possess no knowledge of Christ, possess no knowledge of God? Dr. Gerhart is too intelligent and too honest to contradict facts of so patent a character. He admits that God may be known, and is known, aside from Jesus of Nazareth. In making such a concession he surrenders the very principle for which he wrote these volumes, namely, that theology proper is, and must be, christo-centric. If the God-man, Jesus of Nazareth, is the only answer to the question, "Is there a God?" then he who does not know of Jesus of Nazareth does not know whether there be a God or not; but both the pre-incarnate world and the heathen world do know that God exists, and it follows, therefore, that "the light of nature" does teach the doctrine of the divine existence. If it be affirmed that Jesus of Nazareth is a glorious commentary upon that native knowledge which the world has of God, that is cheerfully conceded and contended for; but it is not the proposition of the school whose teachings we combat. Their proposition is, that ignorance of Christ necessitates entire ignorance of God, because "the Christ-idea" is the informing idea about the existence, nature, constitution, and works of the Godhead. The new Christology, so highly praised by its discoverers and its distinguished friends, breaks down when applied to the doctrine of God. A theology proper logically and chronologically precedes and presupposes all Christology.

Not only so, but the new method, when logically applied, yields

a false conception of God. The contention of this school is that Christ, the theanthropos, is the archetype, organ, and end of all theological contents, and so of theology proper. It must follow from this premise that the immanent *pattern* of divinity is divine-human, that the immanent *energies* of divinity are divine-human, and that the evolved *end* or *form* of divinity is divine-human. The logic remorselessly requires the substitution of a divine-human idea as the inmost and truest notion of the divine nature in lieu of the historic notion of trinity. The divine-human is the archetype, organ, and end of deity. Is there a God? According to the new theology, the divine-human Christ is the only answer to that question. If there be a God, what sort of a being is he? The new theology must answer, He is theanthropic in his constitution. What is the mode under which this Divine Being energizes? Again we get the answer, Through a theanthropic agent, a divine-human Christ. And what is the chief end of all divine activities? The answer comes back, the theanthropic Christ. God's existence, nature, life, works, activities, purposes, are all defined as theanthropic, divine-human. Such revolutionary consequences must logically follow the premise of this school, namely, that Christ, as divine-human, is archetype, organ, and end of theology proper.

But let us turn to anthropology with the new christological premise. Dr. Gerhart boldly affirms that the constitution of the humanity, in the first Adam, was potentially theanthropic.

"Jesus Christ in the process of becoming the perfect man realizes in himself the divine ideal of the race. To develop a Christian conception of humanity, of its beginning, its ultimate end, and present abnormal condition, it is needful to study the person and history of the Son of man." (Vol. II., p. 3.)

"What Jesus became as the result of his mediatorial work, that the first man was as to possibility and intention from the beginning." (Vol. II., p. 4.)

"The logic of Christian thought requires us to assume that the session of Jesus of Nazareth at the right hand of his Father in heaven is the final actualization of that divine principle of life which at his creation man received from the inbreathing of God." (Vol. II., p. 14.)

"So intense does the affirmation of the close connection between the divine nature and the human nature become, that both belief and philosophic thought identify the two worlds. God and man become the same." (Vol. II., p. 15.)

"We may develop an anthropology which holds the truth that underlies both

theories, pantheism and evolution, and escapes the one-sidedness and confusion which involve both in fatal error." (Vol. II., p. 34.)

Our author is a realist of pronounced type. He holds that humanity was created when Adam was created—the genus with, in, under the species. Humanity, as created in Eden, was much more potentially than it was actually. The first Adam was the normal beginning of human history; the ultimate end was theanthropic reality. If he had not sinned, if he had developed his possibilities normally, he would have developed into a divine-human being, into a Christ; the first Adam would have become the second Adam. But here is a great inconsistency as well as a great absurdity. Suppose the first Adam had not fallen, but had developed as God designed, he would have evolved into a theanthropic being, into the second Adam, into Christ; but, as we have seen, the new Christology teaches that there was an immanent necessity in the Divine Being which necessitated the incarnation of the Son; then, had the first Adam reached the theanthropic goal, starting from humanity as the initial point of evolution, and had the Son, starting out of the Godhead, reached the same theanthropic goal, we may ask, would there have been two Redeemers? or would the two evolutions have met and merged into one theanthropic unit? "What Jesus became as the result of his mediatorial work, that the first man was as to possibility and intention from the beginning." Our question is, What would have been the *status* of affairs if that "possibility" and "intention" had been realized? The author tells us that his anthropology is a blend of pantheism and evolution, an anthropology developed from the premise that Christ, the theanthropos, is the archetype, organ, and end of the constitution and history of man. The results are revolutionary, vague, and contradictory.

But let us turn, for further illustration, to the doctrine of sin. Is it possible to develop a sound hamartiology from the premise that Christ is the archetype, organ, and end of moral evil? The negative is obvious. We do not find our author even attempting it. The new Christology, as a theologic principle, is a failure.

2. The new Christology is in grievous error in that it represents the incarnation as the *end of itself*.

The orthodox confessional theology is accustomed to present the incarnation as a means to the redemptive purpose of God as the end. Christ came into the world to save sinners. But this new doctrine represents him as coming into the flesh under a reciprocal and immanent law of human and divine natures. The chief end of all decrees was the incarnation. The chief end of all works was the incarnation. The chief end of all sin was the incarnation. The chief end of the incarnation was the incarnation. The low Calvinistic theology is accustomed to give us the following order of the divine decrees: (1). Creation; (2), The fall; (3), Election; (4), Redemption; (5), Vocation. In this series the order is chronological, not logical. The creation was not in order to the fall, and the fall was not in order to election, and so on; but, in the order of time, creation was first, the fall second, election third, and so on. Now, this new Christology construes the incarnation—the union of God and man—as the chief end of all this series. In order to the incarnation, God created, permitted or brought about the fall, elected, redeemed, and called. The first in intention, the last in execution, was the incarnation. Universal history finds its meaning in the incarnation of the Son of God.

The objections to this view of the position and influence of the incarnation in the economy of redemption have been well stated by Dr. Watts, late professor of theology at Belfast, in his *New Apologetic*, page 199:

“1. It sets aside the sovereign will and eternal decree of God, to which we are indebted for the incarnation itself. Apart from that decree there had been no incarnation; and the incarnation is but one step in a vast chain of means, every one of which has been ordained of God for the execution of his eternal purpose of grace. In doing this it sets aside God the Father, and ignores his relation as the fountain-head of the whole economy. 2. Instead of being its own end, the incarnation is declared in Scripture to have been a means towards the expiation of sin. Throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews our Saviour's assumption of the nature of the sons of God, who are constituted his brethren, and whom he was appointed by the Father, in ‘the divine decree,’ to lead to glory, is represented as subordinate to the expiation of their sins. It was because of this that a body was prepared him, and it was for this reason that it behoved him to have somewhat to offer. 3. This is certainly the view of the ‘christological centre’ presented in the preaching of the apostles. Paul does not single out the incarnation as the ground of his glorying. On the contrary, he emphasizes the cross and the crucifixion, and avows his determina-

tion to know nothing among those to whom he ministered, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. This preaching he proclaims as the power of God and the wisdom of God. 4. The cross, and not the incarnation, is 'the central truth and glory' in conversion. . . . 5. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' in sanctification. Here holiness is the end, and the suffering and death of Christ the means. 'Far be it from me,' says Paul, 'to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' This is the rule by which he walked, and upon as many as walked by it he invoked peace and mercy. 6. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' of heaven. The great burden of 'the new song' is the redemption achieved through the blood of the Lamb; and when the angels join their voices to swell the volume of the mighty anthem, they found their ascriptions of 'power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing' upon the fact that he was slain. 7. The cross is 'the central truth and glory' in the functions of Christ's mediatorial office. This is very beautifully symbolized in the Book of Revelation, chapter v. 6, where the seven horns, representing Christ's omnipotent power as King, and the seven eyes, symbolical of the plenitude of the Spirit possessed by him as the Prophet of the church, are ascribed to him as the Lamb that was slain. It is as the Lamb that he occupies the throne, bears the sceptre, and administers the sealed book; and it is as the Lamb that he leads and feeds his blood-bought, blood-washed church."

The church has prevailingly held that the cross was the chief end of the incarnation; that there was a Bethlehem in order that there might be a Calvary; that, "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons"; that the saying which is "faithful and worthy of all acceptation" is, that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; that the Word which was made flesh, and dwelt among men, was "full of grace and truth"; that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; that "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." The incarnation is thus uniformly connected with salvation as a means to an end. Had there been no sin, there would have been no redemptive purpose; and, had there been no redemptive purpose, there would have been no incarnation. These modern reconstructionists are in error, therefore, and out of harmony with the historic Christology, when they represent the whole scheme of redemption as revolving upon the incarnation; for the end of the incarnation was redemption, and not the mere enfleshment of God, not the mere realistic union of divinity and humanity.

3. This new Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of atonement:

“Given the idea of a veritable incarnation of the Son of God in the Son of man under violated law, and, as a logical sequence, we have the idea of a Mediator bearing the condemnation of violated law. The condemnation abiding upon a sinful world is not merely imputed to him; the juridical consequences of transgression attach to the humanity which he assumed. The humanity with which he is identified being under sentence of condemnation, he, by assuming it, voluntarily subjected himself to that condemnation. The Mediator came into the world to save sinners, giving his life a ransom for many; yet he offers himself on the cross, not primarily on behalf of individuals, but on his own behalf as the Mediator. As he was conceived and born to be the second man; as by parable and by miracle he declared himself to be the truth and the life; as he always did those things only which pleased his Father in heaven, because to do the will of the Father was his meat and drink; so, for the same reason, it was his will to lay down his life for the sheep. . . . The sufferings of Christ, like his positive obedience, were due from himself as the Mediator between God and the Adamic race. . . . Inasmuch as the sacrifice of Christ was due to God from himself as identified with the Adamic race, it avails for the benefit of all men. Scientifically considered, the Mediator did not lay down his life either directly on behalf of an elect few, or directly on behalf of all men. He suffered death on his own behalf. . . . The incarnate Son came into the world to reveal God and mankind in himself, and in himself effect a reconciliation of God and mankind. . . . The new human race of which he is the head is not circumscribed by the limits of our earthly history; the new race embraces believers in the intermediate state as well as believers on earth.” (Vol. II., pp. 337, 344, 374.)

In Christ there was the realistic union of humanity and divinity. The humanity was tainted and judicially condemned. The humanity, now united to his divinity, was to be purged and freed from guilt by his life, death, resurrection, and ascension. This union had taken place under a reciprocal law immanent in both divinity and humanity. Hence Christ died primarily for himself. He made the atonement mainly for himself, because he could not deify at God’s right hand an unholy and guilty humanity. It was humanity, the generic or specific substance, that fell in the first man, and it is this same humanity which is redeemed in the Second Man. The atonement was made for all men, because it was made for humanity, the human essence. This is realism run mad. Dr. Shedd, Dr. Baird, Jonathan Edwards, and others, have held to the doctrine of the constituted, or numerical, or specific unity of Adam and his posterity, so that the fall of Adam was the fall of the species, but these great theologians draw back and decline to apply

the same principle to the union between Christ and his spiritual posterity. Holding that the union between Adam and the race was realistic, they hold that the union between Christ and his posterity was forensic and representative, or federalistic. But Dr. Gerhart is a logical realist. "As in Adam, so in Christ." The union in Eden was realistic; the union on Calvary was likewise realistic. The first Adam was the father of a fallen race; the second Adam is the father of a regenerated race. The logic of the union requires this theologian to hold that Christ died primarily for himself, and secondarily for sinners. His mission, that to which he had been eternally commissioned, was to unite humanity and divinity. When the fulness of time came for him to execute his mission in concrete and historical fact, he found humanity a corrupt and a guilty thing; he had to take it as he found it, purge it, and justify it; individuals are incidentally beneficiaries of his mediatorial work; his primary object was to effect the incarnation, the union of divinity and humanity. Now, there is nothing in Scripture about Christ dying for himself, about his suffering and dying in order to the incarnation. This new view construes the atonement as being made for the sake of the incarnation.

In historic Calvinism, substitution and imputation are the Jachin and Boaz of the atonement. This neo-Christology substitutes for these ideas the incarnation. In the confessional theology the atonement is a real vicarious satisfaction of the law of God on behalf of the elect. In this new scheme the atonement is accomplished by a union of God and man. The necessity of the atonement is the necessity of this union, dating back to the eternal reciprocal aptitude of deity for humanity. The extent of the atonement is the extent of this union. Christ died for himself as the head, the realistic head, of "the new race." Christ glorified is conceived as the colossal heart of redeemed humanity, sending the fulness of his life and salvation throughout the mystical body, pretty much as the blood-currents flow from the first Adam through all the members of the human family. The deepest nature of the atonement is pantheistic; its profoundest necessity is in the eternal, immanent yearning of divinity for humanity, and the object of the atonement is abstract humanity. Dr. Gerhart repudiates

universalism, but it looks to us as if the logic of his system carries him to the extreme of universal redemption.

4. The new Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of the church. A few quotations from our author will exhibit the new doctrine:

“Mankind in the person of the second man was translated into that new and ineffable order of fellowship with God for which Jesus was conceived and born, a fellowship, moreover, which was the goal of ‘the first man’ in the image of God. . . . The growth of the mustard seed, the vine and its branches, and the human body, suggest the best figures of speech by which the teaching of the New Testament concerning the church may most fitly be represented in ecclesiology. If thought be governed by this imagery, we discover the church to be, not an aggregation of individuals, not an organization devised by human genius, but a spiritual organism, all of whose parts, like the mustard tree developed from the mustard seed, grow forth from the mystery of the personality of Christ glorified. The mustard tree is developed from the mustard seed by vegetal laws; the human body from the embryo by human laws; but the church of God, the body of Christ, attains unto a full-grown man, ‘unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,’ by ‘the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.’ . . . More real than the mustard tree, more mysterious than the human body, or the Adamic race, the church not only confronts natural perception, but addresses faith as a constitution, existing, living, firmly maintaining herself against her foes, and advancing from conquest to conquest, from age to age, by her own intrinsic vitality. The mode of her organization is constructed, like the size and shape of the body of an individual man, from within, by the law of her life; and by the force of the same immanent law she is constantly reconstructing and readjusting the form of her activity to her own inner growth, and to the changing needs of her environment. . . . Inasmuch as the Christian church is the new or second human race descending by spiritual birth from the glorified Christ, and grows by the immanent presence of the Holy Spirit, she is in a pre-eminent sense an organism, a living mystery. She possesses the marks and reveals the phenomena of a living constitution. . . . History presents three main branches of church life: the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, and the evangelical Protestant. Though no one of these main branches has developed an ideal character, nevertheless each has a wealth of vitality peculiar to itself, which has been unfolded in varying forms of doctrine, worship, and organization. . . . Jealousies, antipathies, antagonisms, violate the fellowship of the church of Christ, not confessional or theological variations. . . . The Christian church, being the organized form of the race of the second man, is the sphere in which the redemption of the Mediator has normal force, and is fulfilled in its faithful members.” (Vol. II., pp. 399, 461, 464, 472, 480, 481, 643, 646.)

The church is the technical name of the new race. This new race has a realistic descent from the second man. The life of the new race is the indwelling Spirit. This race progresses and

changes by an inherent vitality as the old race does by the power of its subjective life. The new race is the race of salvation. Membership in the church is the "transition of the sinner from membership in the race of Adam to membership in the race of the second man." The continuity of the race is unbroken. *Humanity* was the generic nature of the first race; *theanthropicity*, if we may coin such a word, is the generic nature of the second race. As the mustard tree grows from the mustard seed, as the human body grows from the embryo, so the church grows from Christ as a seed, as an embryo. The force is called spiritual in its nature, but the process by which this force acts in the production and development of the church is naturalistic evolution. The patriarchal church was one species; it was transmuted into the Abrahamic church, another and different species; and the Abrahamic church was transmuted into the Christian church, with some intermediate forms, and the Christian church is an entirely different species from any church which has preceded it. The glorified church is the glorified race of the second man—a goal which has been reached by a spiritualistic evolution. Every member of the heavenly race is like its head—a theanthropos, a divine-human individual in a divine-human organism.

All this pantheistic, evolutionary folly about the church is the logical fruitage of a false conception of the nature, the necessity, the mode, and the significance of the incarnation. The scriptural argument by which it is supported is drawn from certain parables and images which Christ employed to illustrate the nature of the kingdom of heaven. That which is avowedly metaphorical and figurative is dealt with as literal and substantive. The church is the *body* of Christ in a metaphorical, not a literal, sense. There is a mystical and vital union between Christ and his people, but this union is not realistic in the sense that whatever is Adamic in the Christian has been displaced by something which is Christic or theanthropic. The church is not a vital organism—a live society with Christ for a real head and with the Holy Spirit for a real heart. On the contrary, it is an aggregation of redeemed individuals, organized by Christ into a society, drawing all its rights as a society from him, and all its power from the Holy Spirit.

The conception of a person, with Christ as the head, and the church as the body, and with the Spirit as the life, is purely fanciful. A realistic church, whose external form is a new race with racial life, attributes, and powers, is a novelty. The idea is radical and reconstructive.

5. This Christology yields a novel and unacceptable doctrine of regeneration.

"Pentecost is a creative epoch. The gift of the Holy Spirit brings into being a spiritual constitution which before had no existence. The epoch may be compared to natural birth. Birth in one respect is the natural result of an antecedent process of the growth of the embryo; in another respect it constitutes a new individual and begins a new history. So, whilst Pentecost is the legitimate consequence of the mediatorial life and work of the incarnate Son on earth, this event brings into existence a new human race and begins a history for all time to come, which in point of quality is different from all other history, Jewish or pagan. This new race is the community of the Christian church, the body of which Jesus Christ is the head." (Vol. II., p. 445.)

Something was born on the day of Pentecost. What was it? The Christian church, the body of Christ, the new race. This birth was not figurative, it was literal. The thing born was not a society, it was an organism, it was the body of Christ, the new race. This new, regenerated race has an ethnic life, a racial life as distinguished from individual life. The original of this life, its heart and source, is the glorified Christ, and the glorified Christ, who was regenerated first of all, is communicated to the church, the new race, by the Holy Spirit, who descended into the body of Christ on the day of Pentecost. Up to that time the body had been in an embryonic state. Now it is born. Its life is the Holy Spirit. He circulates through it, like the blood, which is the life, courses through the natural body. But how does a member of the old race become a member of the new race? By birth, by a literal birth, a literal regeneration. In the first birth the Adamic substance is communicated to the child; in the second birth the Christic substance is communicated to his child.

"The Spirit does not beget a person anew by implanting Christ into him. By the Spirit he is implanted into Christ. The Son of man glorified is the principle of regeneration. He is the one new man, the regenerate personality. His sin-conquering life is the type of the new race. Men are born again by participation in his resurrection life. As we are members of the Adamic race by participation in the life of the first Adam, so we become members of the second race by par-

ticipation in the life of the last Adam. Whilst it is true that the Christ by his Spirit lives in his members as really as his members live in him, yet the order of this life-communion requires that fallen men pass from the natural economy into the spiritual economy. The natural man is implanted into Christ, and by that act he becomes a member of the new community. As a consequence, Christ by his Spirit lives in him." (Vol. II., p. 449.)

Birth implies the transmission of the *nature* of the parent to the child. Birth in the Adamic race means that every human being possesses the Adamic nature—a body and soul, with their respective endowments. Birth in the new race implies the possession of the new Adamic nature by every one of the new-born. The nature of the new Adam is dual, divine-human. He is not merely God; he is not merely man; he is both. He is proper and true deity; he is proper and true man; he is yet uni-personal. The Christian nature, accordingly, must be in like manner complex. Regeneration is a change of substance. The old substance, or nature, was Adamic, that is, only human. The new substance, or nature, is theanthropic, that is, divine-human. In regeneration the subject is born into a new race, with the theanthropos as the form, and with the Holy Ghost as the soul or spirit. "By incarnation human nature was assumed into organic union with God in his Son; so by the new-creating work of the Holy Spirit men are translated from 'this world' into mystical union with our risen and perfect Lord." As the Holy Spirit organically united divinity and humanity in the womb of the Virgin, even so does the same Spirit organically unite the sinner and the glorified Christ; and in the consummation of the case in sanctification, the humanity is eliminated and nothing is left but Christ in the Christian; he is, in a literal and substantive sense, Christianized. "When the young bird is mature," says our author, "it breaks the shell of the egg in which it has been developed. The shell is broken because the form of life is too vigorous for confinement within its walls. Analogous is the death of the Christian. He reaches the point in his history when 'the earthly house' is no longer his fit tabernacle; then 'the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved.'" The thief on the cross must have ripened with remarkable rapidity!

Regeneration is not the creation of any new *substance*. We

are the same sort of beings after regeneration that we were before that change. Regeneration is not a transubstantiation. But this seems to be Dr. Gerhart's idea. We are not merely changed, by the subjective work of grace, into the likeness of Christ's character, according to this new Christology, but we are changed into the likeness of Christ's substance, his nature. What is Christ glorified in his constitution? We have seen that he was the ideal man—the product of an immanent law of evolution, immanent in divinity and humanity. What is the Christian in the complete and final form of his religion? He is like Christ in his constitution. Not merely the character, but the being, of the Christian is Christ-like. Regeneration, expanded through sanctification, has transubstantiated him. We can make nothing else out of it. As a result of the new Christology, the new man, the new church, the new race, the Christian finally becomes a *Christ!*

The absurdity has reached its climax.

R. A. WEBB.

II. THE AUTHENTICITY OF ISAIAH XXIV.-XXVII.

THE division of the books of the Old Testament, and the multiplication of authors for the separate parts, has long been a favorite pastime with biblical critics of the advanced schools. The intelligent public, through the abundant means of platform, press, and pulpit, is familiar, though but superficially, with their work in this direction upon the so-called Hexateuch. The text of these books has been broken up, not simply into three or four original documentary sources, in itself a perfectly plausible theory, and in harmony with the origin of other ancient documents,¹ but into a most wonderful literary mosaic, contrary to all analogy and utterly repugnant to sober reason. Sections, chapters, sentences, clauses, are divided, sub-divided, and assigned in a bewildering way to P and J and E and JE and D and R and others, until the whole business threatens to become distinctly absurd.

For instance, how can even the acutest scholarship, at a remove of, say, two thousand five hundred years, and with the very limited data at its command, reasonably discover in the simple statement of Gen. vii. 17, that "the flood was forty days upon the earth, and the waters increased," no less than three distinct authors, of whom one is said to be responsible for seven words, another for four, and another for two? And such instances could be multiplied. Surely, intelligent men who have no hobby to ride will forever refuse to believe that so voluminous and harmonious a document or collection of documents as the Hexateuch was brought into existence by means of such puerile patchwork. To accept the suggestion requires a far greater strain upon our credulity than is now imposed upon it by the "traditional" view so distasteful to the higher "instincts" of the critics.

Nor have the other books of the Old Testament escaped. Judges, Samuel, Kings, are all, according to the critics, more or less astonishing compilations. So, also, are certain of the prophets, notably the greatest among them, the son of Amoz. Ever since

¹ Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 31.

Aben Ezra suggested a separate origin for the latter half of the prophecy of Isaiah, the critics have preyed with avidity upon one chapter after another, until scarcely fifteen of the sixty-six ascribed to him by a universal tradition of seventeen centuries remain free from "doubt." The other chapters have been variously divided among sundry Pseudo, Deutero, and Babylonian Isaiahs, or ascribed to a convenient but elusive great unknown; according to Ewald, to seven of them strung along a period of nearly two hundred years. And Canon Cheyne, who is nothing if not original, opines that this division by his great instructor errs upon the side of moderation. His judgment is, that an indefinite number of writers wrote, recast, edited, and re-edited what the world for centuries has accepted as the genuine work of the peerless Isaiah. *Sic transit gloria prophetorum!*

Now, we are firmly convinced that this mutilation of so splendid a product of the golden age of Hebrew prophetism is entirely unwarranted by the facts. Nor is this conviction due to prejudice. If biased at all concerning the great questions of biblical study raised with such vigor and resource of scholarship by earnest, honest thinkers in Europe and America, we confess to a decided leaning towards the newer and fresher lines of thought of the largely misunderstood and dreaded "higher critics." It has not, since first we felt the thrill of independent thought in our college days, been our habit to bow in servile acquiescence to what the critics so often sneeringly refer to as "tradition." But neither do we accept untried the "tradition" of the critics. We prefer to align ourselves with the apostle who would "prove all things," and hold fast only that which is good. We have, therefore, devoted some attention to the critical questions connected with the Book of Isaiah. And we have come to very definite conclusions on some of them. We cannot, of course, presume to speak with authority, for that is the exclusive prerogative of the higher critic, but we think we can show that many of the arguments upon which the critics rely for their division of the book are largely inconclusive. We are confident that we can prove, in many instances, a *non sequitur*. In this paper we propose to do this in the case of chapters xxiv.-xxvii. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

According to Dr. Driver, one of the best representatives of the moderate wing of the higher critics, and for whose learned and reverential handling of Scripture we have the highest respect, modern scholars agree generally¹ with his own conclusion, that the contents of these four chapters are wrongfully ascribed to Isaiah. In his very candid *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* he tells us that he has come to this conclusion because, (1), The prophecy “lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah’s age”; because, (2), “The literary treatment is in many respects unlike Isaiah’s”; and because, (3), “There are features in the representation and contents of the prophecy which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah’s.”

Having, upon these grounds, persuaded himself that the prophecy could not have been pronounced by Isaiah, Dr. Driver finds it necessary, of course, to assign it to some other and more suitable chronological and historical berth. We are not surprised that in this he met with difficulties. In his *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, he supposes it to have been written “on the eve of the Babylonian captivity,”² whereas, in his *Introduction*, published three years after, he tells us that “it may be referred most plausibly to the early post-exilic period,”³—about one hundred and fifty to two hundred years later.

Now, just how much are these conclusions worth? In order to estimate them at their proper value, it will be necessary to go somewhat further back than Dr. Driver’s well-merited reputation for accurate and profound scholarship. It will be necessary to follow him step by step, diligently scrutinizing his so-called facts, and weighing carefully the arguments based upon them. We have every reason to believe that, so doing, we shall be able to show—better than by voluminous counter-argumentation—that the position Dr. Driver has permitted himself to assume towards these chapters is, to say the least, an extremely weak one. Let it be said just here, and let the reader bear it in mind as we proceed, that it is not so much our present object to *prove the authenticity* of chapters xxiv.—xxvii., except as that will follow indirectly, as it

¹ *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 208.

² *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, p. 119. ³ *Introduction*, p. 210.

is our purpose *to disprove the validity of Dr. Driver's facts and the reasoning based upon them.*

We will begin with his subordinate arguments, to weaken in advance, if possible, the one upon which he seems, in the main, to rest the correctness of his conclusion, namely, that there is wanting a suitable occasion for the prophecy in Isaiah's age.

As ancillary to this contention, Dr. Driver asserts that "the literary treatment is in many respects unlike Isaiah's," and that "there are features in the representation and contents of the prophecy which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from Isaiah's." Of course, Dr. Driver seeks to lend the usual force to these assertions by the familiar multiplication of references and lists of words and phrases, so awe-inspiring to the uninitiated. But a patient analysis will largely divest them of their terror by showing that a vast deal of this accumulation of detail is nought but hay and stubble.

In order that we may understand just how "the literary treatment" is unlike Isaiah's, Dr. Driver informs us that "the style is more artificial" than that prophet's. The proof of this second statement is then given in the citation of a variety of linguistic and rhetorical phenomena supposed to be more or less peculiar to the unknown writer of these chapters. We say "more or less" advisedly. Dr. Driver himself admits that quite a number of the features cited by him as indicative of his unknown's style "may be found occasionally in Isaiah," though "never aggregated as they are here," and that therefore these chapters "may rest upon an Isaianic basis." So distinctly and so stubbornly, indeed, do these "peculiarities" of the unknown's style approximate Isaiah's that Dr. Driver is driven (a thousand years hence this little word-play would probably be an infallible index to our style!) to the poor, but ever-ready, expedient of asserting that the unknown "sometimes borrows expressions from" the genuine Isaiah's writing.

It has been well said, by one who himself largely failed to bear the truth in mind, that "there is no more delicate problem than to select linguistic evidences of the date of a biblical Hebrew document."¹ This is true, with increased emphasis, of all attempts

¹ Cheyne, *The Psalter*, Bampton Lectures, 1889, p. 461.

to determine the authorship of a document by the same criteria. It can be asserted, without fear of successful contradiction, that at this distant remove in time, and with our very superficial knowledge of the successive phases of the Hebrew language, together with the limited range of any given author's work, the linguistic argument can never have more than subsidiary value in determining the date and authorship of documents. It can never be of primary importance in the higher criticism. Add to this the consideration that from the very nature of the case this kind of argumentation must be largely subjective, that is, must develop itself along the lines of the critic's individual impressions, and we readily understand how it has been, in the past, so largely fallacious.

A striking example of the truth of these observations is found in the character of the references cited by Dr. Driver in support of his theory of literary treatment unlike Isaiah's. They are supposed, of course, to clinch the argument. But it is evident that peculiarities of style, in order to *prove diversity* of authorship, must be *bona fide* peculiarities; they must either be strictly confined to one author, or, otherwise, common-place phenomena must be employed by him in a distinctly characteristic manner. Dr. Driver is fond of repeating that "it is the *differences* between authors which are characteristic, and form, consequently, a test of authorship."¹ We must insist, therefore, upon *bona fide* differences, not similarities due to borrowing. We deny his right to shelter himself behind his wholly arbitrary and all too-subservient borrowing hypothesis, nor shall we permit ourselves to be hoodwinked by the ostentatious claim so often set up by the critics in reply to the proof that their detailed diversities are fictitious, that it is not so much words in themselves, as "the peculiar articulation of sentences and the movement of the whole discourse by which an impression is produced," that show the matter is not Isaiah's. We insist that such an "impression" that these chapters are of a different mold from Isaiah's genuine productions can necessarily only be produced by individualities of diction, by the minute details of the language. Dr. Driver tacitly admits as much when he submits for our inspection his microscopic proofs of diversity.

¹ *Isaiah*, p. 201.

We claim, upon the principle laid down by Dr. Driver, that if it shall appear that any one or more of the features claimed by him as proofs of his unknown's authorship are shared by the genuine Isaiah, then, by so much, is this part of his argument weakened, if not entirely destroyed. And such is precisely the result of a careful examination of his references. As we shall see, by no means do they support Dr. Driver's contention.

But before we pass to this detailed examination of the alleged proofs, we ask the reader to note a difficulty which confronts the critics at the very outset of every argument about this or any other biblical author's style. It is this: In order to judge whether or not any given document, or portion of a document, is in harmony with a given author's style, it is, of course, absolutely necessary to be in possession of an undoubted product of that author's pen. But where, in this instance, is this to be found? In the first twelve chapters of the canonical Isaiah, says Dr. Driver. But how does he know? By the evidence, it is said, of his theory of Hebrew history, a history largely "reconstructed by a combined effort of criticism and imagination."¹ Dr. Driver claims to find an agreement between the contents of these chapters and the history of Isaiah's age. He thinks (as it happens, correctly) that he can find a suitable occasion for them during the time of that prophet's activity, and upon the strength of that supposition supposes that Isaiah was their author. But the supposition is entirely too large. Let it be granted that the internal evidence clearly enough demonstrates that these chapters must have been written during Isaiah's lifetime, surely that fact of itself does not connect them positively with Isaiah as their author. After placing them, upon historical grounds, in Isaiah's age, it yet remains for the critic to fix upon the individual author. The all-important fact of Isaianic authorship must still be proved. But how can that be proved? The mere fact that the mysterious letters of Junius were published during the lifetime of Sir Phillip Francis did not of itself imply that they came from his pen. Other evidence, such as his peculiar handwriting, and his familiarity with the technicalities of state-craft, was needed to fix upon

¹ Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. vii.

him the responsibility of the letters. But in the case of Isaiah there is absolutely nothing in or out of Scripture upon which Dr. Driver can put his finger and say positively that it is characteristic of Isaiah, and since the first twelve chapters contain the self-same trait, therefore they also are Isaiah's. If, nevertheless, he does attribute them to that prophet, he puts a great deal more into his conclusion than is contained in his premise. The simple truth is, that Dr. Driver, with all of us, is shut up to the *verdict of tradition* that chapters i.—xii. are from Isaiah's pen; and tradition is equally emphatic about all the other chapters in the book. And if, as Dr. Driver so strenuously maintains, tradition is so often at fault about the greater portion of the book, why may it not also be at fault about the first twelve chapters? According to his own principles, Dr. Driver is thus left without an adequate criterion of the prophet's style by which to judge the four chapters under immediate consideration. He only succeeds in securing his object by a certain amount of reasoning in a circle. He first introduces his theory of the history to prove the date of chapters i.—xii., and then appeals to the standard of style thus obtained to disprove the authenticity of chapters xxiv.—xxvii. The process may just as easily be reversed. Upon some other theory of the history, chapters xxiv.—xxvii. might be looked upon as Isaianic. It would then follow that chapters i.—xii. were written by one or more of the many and shadowy great unknowns created by the critics. For excellent examples of this kind of fallacious reasoning the reader is referred to the various dates assigned by different critics to the same documents in the Pentateuch. The so-called priest-code, for instance, was once unanimously set down as the first of all the "sources" in the order of time. It is now, by the reigning hypothesis, made the very last. Why? Simply because the critics have been pleased to change their views of the history!

But, conceding that Dr. Driver, by means of his critical processes, has shown that chapters i.—xii. belong to Isaiah, our argument now will be to show that even with so much of Isaiah's style to guide him he has failed to make out a clear case of "diversity of literary treatment" against chapters xxiv.—xxvii. We

shall not, in imitation of Dr. Driver's laborious effort, seek to meet the force of his argument for diversity by accumulating long lists of words and phrases common to these chapters and the acknowledged work of Isaiah. We know in advance the reply, that "similarities may be due to other causes than identity of authorship." They may be due to "affinity of genius," or, forsooth, to the borrowing habit.¹ We shall simply confine ourselves to an effort to prove that the "characteristic differences" cited by Dr. Driver are not differences at all, much less characteristic differences. If successful in the attempt, Dr. Driver's argument, of course, breaks down. His imposing array of technicalities will amount to nothing. Let us see.

Dr. Driver cites, as a peculiarity of literary treatment, "the frequent combination of nearly synonymous clauses," as in chap. xxiv. 3, "The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled." But, unfortunately for Dr. Driver, the same trait is to be found in other writings (see Ezek. iii. 5, 6, 8), and especially in the admittedly genuine Isaiah. The truth is, Dr. Driver's assertion is unpardonably erroneous in view of Isaiah viii. 13, "And let him be your fear, and let him be your dread"; and Isaiah i. 13-16; v. 21, 22; viii. 10, 14-16; xxviii. 15; xxix. 9, 14.

Another peculiarity, according to Dr. Driver, is "the repetition of a word," as in chap. xxiv. 16: "My leanness, my leanness." But neither is this a *distinctive* feature. The self-same phenomenon appears in the undisputed portions of the prophecy, although, it would seem, but four times. In chap. viii. 9 we read, "gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces; gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces." In chap. xxi. 9 we find, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen." In chap. xxi. 11, "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" In chap. xxix. 1, "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel." This fourfold occurrence, inasmuch as Dr. Driver can point out but six examples in chapters xxiv.-xxvii., is amply sufficient to negative the argument sought for by him at this point.

Still another peculiarity is said to be "the numerous alliterations and word-plays aggregated in these chapters, as in chapter xxiv.

¹ *Isaiah*, p. 201; *Introduction*, p. 209.

1, 3, 4, 6, 16, etc. Now, the *frequency* of this trait just here is admittedly remarkable, but the trait itself is by no means the exclusive possession of Dr. Driver's unknown. Hebrew poets and prophets took great delight in such alliterations and plays upon words.¹ That the genuine Isaiah knew how to bring out the varied and contrasted meaning of words by this means is amply evidenced in his writings. Thus, in chapter ii. 19, we find לַעֲרִץ הָאָרֶץ; in chapter x. 18, כַּמֶּסֶס נֶסֶס; in chapter xix. 18, וְנִשְׁבַּעוֹת צְבֹאוֹת. The curious reader will find further interesting examples in chapters i. 23; v. 6; xvii. 1; xxix. 9; xxxii. 18.

And still a further peculiarity is a so-called "tendency to rhyme" discernible in these chapters. We must freely admit our inability to follow Dr. Driver at this point in his argument. It seems to us that he has here outdone even himself in the discovery of what does not exist. We have heretofore been under the impression that there was no such thing as rhyme, in its true sense, in classic Hebrew poetry. When, therefore, we were told by Dr. Driver that there was in these chapters a "tendency" to what we had supposed did not exist at all, we naturally scanned his references with great care and interest. We fully expected to find "some new thing." But we were disappointed. Even after repeated conscientious efforts to detect it, that "tendency" has managed to elude our vigilance. For a time we were tempted, because of our great confidence in Dr. Driver's skill to detect such hidden clues to authorship, to accept the "tendency" theory on faith. But our past experience with the critics saved us from such credulity. We had learned that most of their assertions must be taken *cum grano salis*. And further examination emboldened us to believe that, except, perhaps, in one solitary couplet (chap. xxiv. 8), there is not in any one of Dr. Driver's examples anything like a rhyme in clear distinction from what in other instances he is pleased to look upon as simple assonance or alliteration. We print his very first example of this "tendency," an example, by the way, which also serves him as an illustration of a word-play, a reminiscence from another prophet, and an alliteration; chap. xxiv. 1—

¹ Briggs, *Bib. Study*, p. 256.

הנה יהוה בוקק הארץ ובולקה
ועוה פניה והפיץ ישביה

We must also give another example of what Dr. Driver's higher criticism can accomplish when certain theories are to be upheld. The reader may find amusement by discovering, if he can, in this short verse no less than four characteristics unlike Isaiah, namely, the repetition of a word, alliteration and word-play, a trait not in the manner of Isaiah, and a tendency to rhyme; chapter xxiv. 16—

מכנף הארץ זמרת שמענו צבי לצדיק
ואמר רוּי־לי רוּי־לי אוי לי
בגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו

If the above are fair illustrations of this so-called tendency to rhyme, then the following couplets, taken at random from admittedly Isaianic poetry, must also, we think, be placed in the same category; chapter i. 23—

שריך סוררים
וחברי גנבים

Chapter viii. 13—

והוא מוראכם
והוא מעריצכם

In chapters ii. 19 and vii. 9 other examples of this exceedingly obscure tendency may be found. There are, no doubt, very many more. Dr. Driver, we are sure, could be depended upon to ferret them out, did his theory require it.

The nineteenth verse of the twenty-sixth chapter is also a stumbling-stone and rock of offence. That the prophet Isaiah should have had even the dimmest conception of a literal resurrection, such as is referred to in this verse, is apparently entirely beyond Dr. Driver's powers of comprehension. Just why this is so it would be difficult to say. Perhaps we may here more clearly than elsewhere recognize the exigencies of a theory. To permit the appearance of a hope of a resurrection at this early (?) period in the religious life of the Hebrew people would sadly interfere

with certain set notions of the critics. According to them, the resurrection hope is an infallible sign of late age in biblical writings. References to such a hope in earlier documents must, therefore, be eliminated, or the date of the document brought down to harmonize with the theory. The process is a very simple one. It is here employed by Dr. Driver. If he has any other reason for his rejection of this reference as non-Isaianic, he has failed to speak of it in his published works.

Dr. Driver also incidentally mentions that the animal symbolism in chapter xxvii. 1 is a trait "not in the manner of Isaiah." We would like to know how he knows it. The symbolism occurs but once in these chapters, and is almost as rare in Isaiah. In chapter v. 29 the Assyrians are symbolized by a roaring lion. In chapter xxvii. 1 they are spoken of as a dragon or leviathan. In quite the same arbitrary way Dr. Driver would deprive Isaiah of the privilege of an occasional pious reflection concerning "the way of the just," as in chapter xxvi. 7 ff.

Such is Dr. Driver's entire case against these chapters from their contents and linguistic and rhetorical phenomena. We have traversed it in its details. We confidently submit to the reader's judgment whether or not, in this part of his argument, Dr. Driver has made good his claim that the literary treatment, *in spite of certain phraseological points of contact*, is different, and some of the features of the contents not only different from, but later than, Isaiah's thought.

But evidently the main ground upon which Dr. Driver rejects the traditional authorship of these chapters, and places them several centuries later, is the alleged absence of an occasion for the prophecy in Isaiah's age, or, as he puts it in his admirable life of the prophet, "no event of Isaiah's age, *with which we are acquainted*, constitutes a *sufficient* occasion for this prophecy." At first glance, this seems to be a very plain, definite statement. In reality, it means nothing, except, indeed, as its involuntary admissions, which we have italicised, cut the ground from under Dr. Driver's feet. Upon what does he base such a statement—upon historical fact, or upon his own opinion? The answer, strange as it may seem to the reader, must be, that historical facts have no-

thing whatever to do with it except as they are arbitrarily looked upon by Dr. Driver, through the haze of time, as either sufficient or insufficient as suitable occasions for the form and matter of the prophecy. In other words, this *dictum* of Dr. Driver is a purely subjective judgment of, at best, indistinct historical facts as suitable or unsuitable as a framework for these chapters. As such, it has weight by so much only as we may have learned to esteem Dr. Driver's honesty and scholarly attainments, but no more. In our esteem of him we yield to none. But we are not yet blind to the fact that he is not infallible. Critics may and do err.

We venture to assert, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that Dr. Driver can find no *historical data* in the prophecy itself that sustain his position. To make good this assertion it is only necessary to refer the reader to Dr. Driver's books. The absence of such data beneath the multiplication of words is palpable and painful. Dr. Driver is evidently not an expert at making history where there is none. He should learn the art from his friend and sympathizer, Canon Cheyne, whose book on the Psalms will forever remain a monumental example of how to *make* history. But who ever knew a higher critic to be troubled either by the presence or absence of facts? That very convenient thing to have about, the "historic imagination," never fails him. In this case, although he quotes with approval the discriminating judgment of another, that the prophecy "has too universal an application . . . to be applied to an actual historical situation," and that it "fitly crowns the long list of Isaiah's oracles upon the foreign nations," and that, therefore, "its place in the Book of Isaiah is intelligible,"¹ Dr. Driver's imagination has, nevertheless, enabled him to fix upon *two other dates* at variance with that fixed by tradition. In his *Isaiah*, after telling us that "the positive data for fixing the occasion of the prophecy do not speak decidedly," he writes it down as pre-exilic. In his *Introduction*, after telling us that the "absence of *distinct* historical allusions" makes it difficult to say to what period of Hebrew history it is to be assigned, he does not hesitate to assign it to the post-exilic.

¹ G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah, Expositor's Bible*, pp. 416 and 430.

What are the historical data in the prophecy itself? We will let the reader judge for himself as to their utility in identifying the prophecy with a limited historical situation. In chapter xxiv. 14–16 there is a vague suggestion of a situation which has thus far baffled critics of all schools. In chapter xxv. 10, 11 we find an allusion to Moab, which, if it implies anything, implies a pre-exilic date. In chapter xxvii. 1 there is a possible reference to Babylon; it is too obscure to afford any help. In chapter xxvii. 9 Judah is accused of idolatry, and in verses 12, 13 Assyria and Egypt are mentioned, allusions which can only point to a date before the exile, if they do that. An unnamed city, powerful and oppressive, is spoken of in chapter xxv. 2, 3, and in chapter xxvii. 10. This may hint at Babylon, and it may not. If the former, this reference is also pre-exilic. And this is all. For, since Dr. Driver nowhere informs us to the contrary, we may safely assume that he has not come into possession of any new facts from an extraneous source, such, for instance, as might be supplied by the new and vigorous science of archæology, and which might be supposed to have brought him so confidently to his conclusions. Therefore it must be solely upon the enigmatic suggestions of the text, and despite their slight pre-exilic leaning, that Dr. Driver builds his theory, nay, asserts as an historical fact, that the prophecy was written after the exile. We respectfully protest that the judgment is unjustifiable. Dr. Driver's vacillation itself goes to show that the data, both within and without the prophecy, are too obscure to be relied upon in an attempt to wrench this section of the Book of Isaiah from its ancient place.

A few moments ago we referred to the "historic imagination." This is not simply a pet phrase, it is also a favorite and very active faculty of the critics. With it they can accomplish much. Without it they are frequently shorn of their strength. It is, in this instance, Dr. Driver's sole dependence. Let us see how it has enabled him to reach his improbable conclusions about these chapters. The reader will, we think, agree that by the same process it can as easily be shown that it lacks a suitable occasion in any age.

It seems clear that Dr. Driver reached his conclusion, not so

much by evidence or strength of argument, but because he *imagines* himself to be so perfectly acquainted with Isaiah's historical environment, especially with the rapidly-changing social, moral, and religious details of that environment (for it was a kind of *sturm und drang* period), which could, no doubt, have afforded a far less acute statesman and alert religious teacher than the king of the prophets innumerable occasions to pronounce just such prophecies.

Dr. Driver is assisted in coming to his conclusion because he *imagines* himself to be so thoroughly at home in the literary and historical details of the very obscure periods of Jewish history, just before and after the Babylonian exile, that he can at this day take a brief and confessedly now obscure prophecy from its immemorial chronological place, and assign it with great precision to a niche in either period!

Dr. Driver is very greatly helped to his conclusion because he *imagines* his own judgment of what could have been a *suitable* occasion for the prophecy to be superior to the prophet's on that point. It by no means follows, because Dr. Driver considers the prophecy ill-timed and ill-advised, that Isaiah had the same opinion, and therefore did not deliver it!

Dr. Driver can come to his conclusion because he *imagines* that he can better appreciate than could Isaiah the immediate and *future* political and religious needs of the Jewish community whom he addressed. It is undoubtedly true that the messages of the prophets are "always brought into some relation with the age in which they live, and adapted to the special circumstances of the persons whom they address."¹ But it is plain that it by no means follows, because Dr. Driver cannot *now* see the relationship between the, to him, largely unknown circumstances of those or *subsequent* times and the contents of this obscure prophecy, that such a relationship never existed. It is unjustifiable to claim, because Dr. Driver cannot *now* discover, from incomplete records, an historical occasion in his judgment sufficiently distinct and important to call forth this prophecy, that therefore the occasion never existed.

¹ *Isaiah*, p. 3.

Dr. Driver, seemingly, reaches his conclusion because he *imagines* that the *occasion of* and the *motive for* the prophecy are identical, a palpable confusion of thought.¹ Dr. Driver may be able to prove—though he has not done it—that what we know, from Scripture and the monuments, of the history of Isaiah's days does not seem to offer a suitable *occasion* for this prophecy; but he would find it, we imagine, quite another and much more difficult thing to prove that Isaiah, a far-sighted statesman and an inspired teacher, could have had no *motive* to say what the prophecy contains.

And, having freely *imagined* some or all of these things in advance, it was not difficult for him to imagine the vagaries which we have pointed out above concerning the linguistic and rhetorical phenomena of the prophecy. If we must say it, these accumulated mechanical lists of words and phrases, containing as they do so much that is far-fetched and vague, have always seemed to us like so many after-thoughts on the part of the critics. Their preconceived theories must, at all hazards, be sustained.

We feel that we have accomplished our task. We think that we have succeeded in showing that in his denial of the authenticity of chapters xxiv.—xxvii. of the Book of Isaiah Dr. Driver depends upon wholly insufficient facts and arguments. We claim to have proved a palpable *non sequitur*. But of this each reader must judge for himself.

W. W. ELWANG.

Orlando, Florida.

¹ McPheeter's *Driver on Isaiah xiii. and xiv.*, QUARTERLY, October, 1894, p. 492.

III. CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

It is said that the French positivist philosopher, Comte, was the first writer that used the word Sociology. He believed it to be a possible physical science, whose laws could be so clearly ascertained as to allow prediction of future social facts. Herbert Spencer is unquestionably the most far-reaching investigator and voluminous writer on the subject. With the aid of intelligent assistants, he has gathered a vast mass of social facts in the history of all the races of man, from the lowest to the highest; and these facts he has systematized under appropriate heads.

There are other reputable workers in this field, but it is manifest that the science of Sociology has not passed the embryonic stage. Those who are cultivating it have not been able to agree even as to the proper limits to be assigned the science. There is confessedly a group of social sciences, embracing Ethnology, Comparative Philology, Comparative Religions, Ecclesiastical and Profane History, Economics, Jurisprudence, Ethics, and Politics. Some would make Sociology merely a generic term, under which to place these special sciences; others limit it to what is common to them all; others make it a philosophy of society; others confine it to social institutions; and others, still, limit it to the investigation of the evils of society and their remedy. It would seem most proper to make it a fundamental, generic science, confined to those social facts and laws which are basic in their character, and which pertain alike to all the special social sciences.

Not only are sociologists at variance as to the sphere of their science, but they are equally so as to its philosophy. There are, at least, three great schools. Sociology was born of evolution, and has been rocked in its cradle. Most sociologists hold evolution to be the philosophic basis of their science. They range themselves into two sections, according as they hold that all social facts have a purely physical basis, as Spencer teaches; or, on the other hand, admit the psychological as well as the physical, as Mr. Lester F. Ward and Prof. Giddings do. The difference, however,

is more apparent than real; for the psychical itself has with them a physical origin and basis. The second school is represented by Prof. Simon N. Patten, who antagonizes the first doctrine, and holds that Sociology is distinctively an economic science, not exclusively founded upon biology. The third school is not necessarily separate from the other two, and has as its distinctive doctrine the recognition of Providence as the author of all social laws and the superintendent of their workings.

Christian Sociology would affiliate with psychical and providential theories, and would add to them such social truths as are matters of scriptural revelation.

We propose in this discussion to limit ourselves to the presentation of such scriptural facts, truths, and principles as bear upon the social relations which men sustain to each other.

A.—THE ORIGIN OF SOCIETY.

I. The Bible teaches that *God*, by his creative power and providential orderings, is the *author* of society. We are taught that God made man; as in all his states and conditions he is gregarious, it is certain that his nature, as God made him, is social. We are expressly told that he was made male and female, and thus the basis was laid for his entering into association; the woman was created and given to man as his companion, to be a "helpmeet for him."

II. Society originated by the will and act of God in the *family*. This is an interesting and important fact. Society did not begin with an aggregation of units, drawn together by political interests, or by the impulse of elective affinity. Whatever may have been the inducing causes of its enlargement into nations, into political and commercial associations, it surely began with the family. There is a doubt, raised by certain investigators, as to the primitive universality of patriarchal government. Whether this doubt be justified or not, it is clear not only that the family tie was the primitive bond of union, but also that it never loses its controlling influence in the formation of societies. In both church and state to-day, it is the rule to find families in the same organization. This is true even in the United States, where popu-

lation is more mixed and heterogeneous and free of movement, physically and mentally, than the race has probably ever elsewhere known. Adam and Eve, with Cain and Abel, their children, were the first human society that this world ever knew; that is, the first family was the first society.

B.—THE BASIS OF SOCIETY.

I. *Community of Origin.* The Bible begins with a single pair, and apparently teaches that all the races have sprung from them. As lately as thirty years ago the possibility of this was denied by many scientific men. Indeed, fifty years ago it was probably the current belief amongst biologists that the Caucasian and the Negro could not have had common progenitors. Now it is as currently believed by the same specialists that man and the ape have come from the same stock; not only so, but man and the animals, vegetables, and minerals, are now held by many scientists to have had a common origin. While, however, it is conceded, with practical unanimity, by all anthropologists, that the various races of men might have come from the same pair, it is but fair to say that many doubt whether, as a fact, they have really done so. Moreover, it is also proper to state, that the Bible nowhere explicitly says that Adam is the one father of the race of man.

However this may be, the Scriptures clearly and repeatedly teach that the race has a common origin in God. Such is the sublime lesson taught in the simple words with which the Saviour began the prayer he gave to his disciples, "Our Father." He is to man a Father, and he is the common Father—"Our Father." This furnishes a basis for society as broad as humanity, and as deep and true as the Fatherhood of God.

II. *Community of Nature.* 1. The Bible teaches that all the races are essentially one. Paul says to the Athenian philosophers, Acts xvii: 25, 26, God "himself giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." This is a broader statement than as found in the old version, whose teaching was limited to the physical unity of the race. The corrected text makes Paul declare to these blue-blooded Athenians that all men, physically and

mentally, are made by God substantially alike. This truth is confirmed by the anatomist and the psychologist, who find the same tissues and organs, the same faculties and capacities, in all the races. The same truth was known and taught by Solomon, Prov. xxvii. 19, "As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." There is an endless diversity in all God's handiwork; and nowhere is this more true than in the individuals and tribes that make up the family of man. But amid these differences there are not only great types of character, but also an essential oneness, which extends to every constituent element of the body and every power of the mind.

2. So far as the higher nature of man is concerned, Christianity affirms that this unity consists in his *likeness to God*. All things have come from the creative power of Jehovah; but man alone, of all things earthly, has the impress of the lineaments of his divine original. God is a spirit, immortal, intelligent, sensitive and free, with a nature responsive to the true, the beautiful and the good; and so has he endowed the children of men.

On this basis of the community of nature the whole structure of society chiefly rests. Take the state in its main functions. Civil law, while founded upon the principles of absolute justice, must, in all of its details, be applied to man as he is. Were there no common nature, there could be no common law. This makes it necessary that the legislator, the judge and the executive shall be conversant with all the essential elements of human nature. This is specially true of the legislator, whose work is fundamental and preparatory to that of the judiciary and executive. This knowledge they obtain, not from observation alone, but also and mainly from their familiarity with humanity as it is realized in themselves.

It is the bond which causes men to recognize and realize the brotherhood of the race. The lowest can look up to the highest and know that there is a kinship which links the peasant to the prince. The philosopher cannot fail to see himself, dwarfed and distorted indeed, in the rudest, crudest man he may meet on the highway of life. All races, all conditions of men, can together say, "Our Father."

III. *The Fall of Man.* The Scriptures assure us that "God made man upright"; that, as he came from the hand of his Maker, he was "good." It would, indeed, have been unaccountably strange had it been otherwise. The mystery is deep and dark enough as it is, but had man dropped as a spurious coin from the mint of heaven, faith and hope would have been lost in the despair of atheism. Though originally pure, man is no longer upright or good. We are told that the stream of humanity was polluted at the very fountain-head, and has continued to flow with ceaseless impurity ever since. This is confirmed by universal tradition, history, observation and experience.

The connection of man's depravity with the basis of society may not seem at first view apparent; it is, nevertheless, real and important. The two greatest institutions of society are founded upon this fact, and every social relation is more or less colored by it:

1. The chief purpose of the *state* is the organization of a government, which, by the administration of law, shall protect its citizens; in other words, it is justice organized. Why does justice need organization? Why must law sanction its precepts with a penalty? Paul says, 1 Timothy i. 9, "Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unboly and profane, for the murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers," etc. He says, again, Romans xiii. 4, that the ruler "is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." Peter expresses the same truth, 1 Peter ii. 14, "Governors are sent by God for vengeance on evil-doers." An intelligent student lately remarked, in one of my classes, that anarchy is the ideal government for the ideal man. This is true; were man both intelligent and conscientious in the discharge of his duties to his neighbor, he would not need a government to teach and constrain him to perform those duties. Civil government is thus made necessary by the fall of man.

2. The same is true of the *church*. Had sin not entered the world, the church, at least as we know it now, would not have been needed, and, therefore, would not have existed. There are

some who may fail to see this, because they have mistaken conceptions of what the church is. They look upon it as a kind of heaven here upon earth, and think that Christians are relatively pure and perfect. In a sense, the church is a type of heaven, and believers are "the salt of the earth," "the light of the world." But the church is also a militant body, contending with foes without and foes within; it is a hospital for the cure of the spiritually sick, a school for the instruction of the spiritually ignorant; it is composed of sinners, exclusively of sinners, penitent, believing, loving sinners, indeed, but, nevertheless, sinners, who daily need to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses."

Moreover, were this not true, were every member of the church to become perfect immediately upon conversion, the need of the church as an institution among men would grow chiefly out of the fact of man's sinful, fallen condition. Manifestly so; because the very mission of the church is to save men, lost men, depraved, guilty men; to win them by the means of grace to a holy life, that will make them "meet for the inheritance of the saints in light."

In view of our common fall and condemnation, we gather together and plead for mercy from "Our Father."

IV. *The Redemption of Man.* The Bible includes all men in the fall and all men in the redemption by Christ, who "by the grace of God tasted death for every man." (Heb. ii. 9.)

The organization of society into the state has no immediate connection with this great truth; but it is the basis of the *church*. The universal depravity of man alone would not have justified the church; it would have merely banded the race together in a hopeless solidarity of despair. It is the atonement of Christ, the great distinctive doctrine of Christianity, which, as the complementary truth of man's guilt and pollution, gives the church the ground of its being, a basis for its hopeful work. The church is a society organized for the salvation of men through the redemption of Christ. Its mission is to make effective the work of the Redeemer; to execute his commission by preaching the gospel to every creature; to rescue men from the power of Satan and self and sin, and bring them into the liberty of the children of God; to form man-

kind into one grand loving brotherhood of grace, and thus to cause every knee to bow and every tongue to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. The Master said, John xii. 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." 'Tis even so; he is the central power; his cross is the magnet which is ever drawing the hearts of men to himself, and thus, as they cluster around him and receive his spirit, they draw nigh to each other, and, becoming one family are able to say, "Our Father."

Christianity thus presents as the basis of society, the common origin of man, his common nature, his common fall in Adam, and, finally, his common redemption by the blood and obedience of Christ.

C.—THE ETHICS OF SOCIETY.

Christianity has several positive words to say on this branch of the subject:

I. *The Golden Rule.* Granting that man has a social nature which leads him to discard the isolated, hermit life and affiliate with his kind, it is most important to know the fundamental law which regulates his social conduct. Some evolutionists say that it is the law of might, called "the survival of the fittest." In harmony with this view, some moralists—Christian as well as non-Christian—assert that self-love, or personal happiness, is the primal law of life. This may be a question of fact or of morals:

1. From the standpoint of *fact*, it seems true that, in both the organic and the inorganic realms, those forms of being best adapted to their environment would naturally outlive those not fitted to their surroundings, and that they actually do survive them. It is also true that vegetables remorselessly prey upon one another; that animals feed upon vegetables; that the stronger animals constantly capture, kill, and consume the weaker; that man unhesitatingly destroys vegetable and animal life for his own gratification; and that the more vigorous races and individuals among men not only outstrip, but often trample and crush in their outstripping, their feebler brethren.

All this is true as a fact, with one important exception soon to be noted, and we concede not only the fact, but the *beneficence* of the general fact. All things considered, it is wise that the weak

should yield to the strong, the ignorant to the intelligent, the vicious to the virtuous, the worst to the best. The fact and the law, however, have their limits. These limits are traceable even in the animal world—where we see the parents guarding and nourishing their helpless young, and the stronger members of the flock or herd protecting the weaker. With man the line of limitation is strongly drawn. It is seen first, and doubtless best, in the family, where not only the father and mother, but the other more vigorous members, also, assiduously nurse the sick and deny themselves for the comfort and welfare of the feebler. Moreover, the primary design of the state is to put restrictions on the dominion of the strong over the weak, even to cause the strong to protect the weak and bear their burdens.

2. So much for the issue of fact; we are more concerned with the issue of *right*. Is the law of might, the law of self-love, the law of personal happiness, the supreme law of social ethics? The common judgment of enlightened, virtuous men has declared the contrary. Judaism teaches, through Moses, Leviticus xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; through the author of Tobit iv. 15, "Do that to no man which thou hatest"; through Hillel, "What is hateful to thee, do not to another." Mohammed says that one of the six duties is "for one Mussulman to wish for another what he wishes for himself." Aristotle says that we should act towards others "as we should wish them to behave towards us." Isocrates, "What you are angry at when inflicted on you by others, this do not do to others." Confucius was asked, "Is there one word which may serve as a rule of practice for all our life?" He replied, "Is not reciprocity such a word? What you do not wish done to yourself, do not do to others." Buddha went so far as to hold it a duty to do good to our enemies. Jesus put his imprimatur upon this universally recognized law in his memorable utterance of it, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them."

To this benevolent voice of the Golden Rule, Herbert Spencer and his school refuse to hearken. He is opposed to public schools and all other public charities, holding that they en-

courage the improvident, and that society is lowered physically, intellectually and morally by any artificial preservation of the inferior classes or individuals. Christianity, on the contrary, builds schools, almshouses, asylums, hospitals, and teaches (Rom. xv. i.) that the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak, and not please themselves. Christianity causes the master and his servant, the parent and the child, the teacher and his pupil, the rich and the poor, the vigorous and the weak, to realize the oneness of humanity, and to join in the common prayer to "Our Father."

II. *The New Commandment.* So far, Christianity has the company of the other religions, of sound philosophy, of benevolent morality, and of the natural judgment of good men. It, however, goes beyond all these, and has a distinctive social moral law of its own. It is as much higher than the Golden Rule as heaven is above the earth. The Golden Rule bids us love our neighbor as we love ourselves; Jesus says (John xiii. 34), "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; *even as I have loved you*, that ye also love one another." The standard of the Golden Rule is human, fallible, ever variable; the standard of the new commandment is divine, infallible, constant. Jesus commands and demands that the force of gravitation which binds men into a loving harmony shall be no less strong than his own unspeakable love to us. This gives an infinite emphasis to his wonderful words, "Our Father."

III. *The Law of Property.* The Christian law of universal, Christ-like benevolence is not blind, nor without proper limitations, which, however, merely interpret, and do not abridge or weaken it. It teaches us to love our enemies. Christ did this, and we must do it; Christ wept over Jerusalem, but none the less did he pronounce its doom, and none the less did he allow that doom to be executed. God loves the world, loves the sinner, and yet he punishes the impenitent. So the law of love, the cement of society, binds the strong to help the weak; and yet this is not communism, nor is it an injunction to indiscriminate charity.

It is not communism. Communism is the ideal economic con-

dition of man, just as anarchy is the ideal political condition; but both are utterly impracticable as man has ever been, still is, and is likely to be. Communism works well in the small circle of the family; and, with a few select spirits, it has succeeded in a somewhat wider sphere. Common sense and common observation, however, clearly show that it cannot be made the general condition of society.

It has troubled some sincere minds that the early Christians, under the direction of the apostles, practiced communism (Acts iv. 32), "they had all things common." It is manifest, however, that this was not only restricted to the local church at Jerusalem, and was but temporary there, but also that it was purely voluntary on the part of those who participated in it. This is seen in what Peter said to Ananias (Acts v. 4): "While it remained, did it not remain thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" That is, it lay with Ananias entirely whether he should sell his land or not; and after he had sold it, it still lay with him exclusively whether he should give any of it to the common fund; and, if any, how much. It was probably ten years after this that we read, in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, of the disciples as gathered together in "the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark"; so that these prominent and earnest Christians had probably not sold their home. It is also probable that the Apostle John did not do so, as the mother of Jesus had been committed to his charge partly because he owned a residence in Jerusalem. The distinction of rich and poor is recognized in the later New Testament Scriptures as existing in the church. More than one church is mentioned as meeting in the house of one of its members. There is no trace in tradition, history, or Scripture, of the practice of communism to any extent in any other of the primitive churches. Paul recognizes (1 Tim. vi. 2) the property of Christians even in slaves, and goes so far as to send Onesimus back to his Christian master, Philemon.

While it is clearly true, therefore, that Christianity recognizes the right and the expediency of property, and gives no countenance to economic communism, it is also true that there is a sense

in which communism is the very spirit of Christ. We are told that we hold what we have, not absolutely, but as stewards of God and trustees for Christ; charged to use our possessions for God's glory, for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, for the relief of the helpless poor. That none of us fully realize this in heart, or practise it in life, does not disprove the fact. The church is growing in the recognition of it. It adds richness to the words of our Saviour, as the wealthy and the poor together bow at the mercy-seat, and unitedly, as brethren, say, "Our Father."

IV. *The Law of Work.* Intimately connected with the right of property is the law of work; because, outside of the direct appropriation of God's gifts, the foundation of the right of property is the labor which has produced it. Neither the Golden Rule, nor the new commandment, binds us to dispossess ourselves of that which is rightfully ours in order that it may be indiscriminately bestowed on those who have nothing. These laws do obligate us to assist, according to our ability, the helpless poor, the sick, the maimed, the lunatic, the idiot, the aged, the infant; but they do not extend to the indolent, those able to do, and yet who will not do.

Labor is the law of being. Even dead matter is the home of forces, ever ready to exert themselves when the conditions exist that make it possible. Every living, growing, vigorous plant or animal is always busy, and earns its bread by the sweat of its brow. The angels and the spirits of the just made perfect serve God day and night in the holy, blessed ministries to which he appoints them. God does not exempt himself from the operation of this law, but, as the Master said (John v. 17), "My Father worketh even until now, and I work."

Man is under this law for body and for soul. He was put into the garden in his primitive innocence "to dress it and to keep it"; when he had sinned, he was made to eat his bread as the product of his labor, and Paul forcibly presents the law to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 11, 12), "We exhort you, brethren, . . . to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing"; again, still more strongly

(2 Thess. iii. 10-12), "This we commanded you, if any will not work, neither let him eat. For we hear of some that walk disorderly, that work not at all, but are busybodies. Now, them that are such, we command and exhort by the Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread."

Christianity has no sympathy with that false charity which would support the able-bodied in idleness; on the contrary, it forbids such gifts as degrading and injurious to the beneficiaries themselves. The poor-laws of England, at the close of the past and the beginning of the present century, were based upon this namby-pamby sentimentalism, and brought ruin to those affected by them. There is much state and church, as well as individual, charity in this country which is amenable to this criticism. The law of work is just and kind and expedient and Christian; and no idler can appropriately join with the industriously useful in saying "Our Father."

V. *The Law of Obedience.* Christianity utters no uncertain sound on this point. It recognizes three social institutions, all of which are held to be of divine authority, and obedience to which is presented as a sacred duty:

1. The *family*. Here the parents are recognized as the authority to which the children must submit. Eph. vi. 1: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right." Servants are exhorted (Eph. vi. 5) "to be obedient unto them that, according to the flesh, are their masters." As the family is the germ and integer of the state and church, the lesson of obedience to rightful authority is to be taught and learned there, and failure there is almost surely fatal to obedience in the broader relations.

2. Christianity no less explicitly enjoins the proper recognition of the authority of the *state*. Rom. xiii. 1, 2, 5, 6: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God. . . . Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of the wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also." Anarchy has no encouragement in

Christianity; nor has needless rebellion, nor that loose morality which considers it shrewd to evade the payment of taxes.

3. God has also established the *church* to be (1 Tim. iii. 15) "the pillar and ground of the truth." Into it he requires all who are his people to come and enroll themselves. The church is not a mob, nor a mere mass of believers; it is an organism, a government, a kingdom. It has its officers, who rule in the name of the King, and whose authority, he commands, shall be respected. Hebrews xiii. 17: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them; for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account."

All rightful authority in this world is ordained of God and represents him. This is true of the family, the state, and the church; not a tyrannical, but a benignant, paternal authority, which we must recognize as we say, "Our Father."

VI. *The Social Sphere of Woman.* 1. *Governmental Subordination.* In every government there must be a head; this position, by the Scriptures, is assigned to the man. Ephesians v. 23, 24: "The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, being himself also the Saviour of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives also be to their husbands in every thing."

2. *Social Privacy.* First Corinthians xi. 5: "But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head." 1 Tim. ii. 9: "In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety." 1 Cor. xiv. 34: "Let the women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak."

3. *Social Respect.* Ephesians v. 25: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." 1 Peter iii. 7: "Ye husbands, in like manner, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the woman as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint-heirs of the grace of life." Eph. vi. 2: "Honor thy father and mother (which is the first commandment with promise), that it may be well with thee."

Taken from man's heart, designed for his help and companionship; physically and politically weaker, socially equal, morally su-

perior; one with him in love and life and destiny, she joins her sweetness and purity with his strength and mastership in the common prayer, "Our Father."

D.—THE DESTINY OF SOCIETY.

Buddha taught that life was essentially and incurably evil; and that the only hope was release from the endless chain of transmigration by the extinction of personal being in Nirvana. So Schopenhauer held that the greatest curse to humanity is the will-to-live in this world of Cimmerian darkness and despair; and that true philosophy leads us to long and strive for annihilation of all will-to-live. Herbert Spencer says that the stoical doctrine of cycles is true; that the earth and its inhabitants will continue to develop until the possible maximum of perfection is reached, and that then everything will again be reduced to cosmic dust, to repeat again and again the same round of development and destruction. Plato believed that this was the best possible world, and that all things were moving on to a consummation, when "the good shall be uppermost and the evil undermost forevermore."

Christianity has an unmistakable utterance on this issue. With faith in an omnipotent, all-wise and all-gracious God, with a sure and sovereign remedy for all the ills of humanity, her eye is bright, her step elastic and her heart hopeful, as she confidently believes in the unfolding of the divine, providential plan for the removal of the curse and the development of the race. Christianity is, it must be, optimistic.

I. *Material Progress.* Rom. viii. 19–21: "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." Isa. xi. 6–9: "And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall

play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the basilisk's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Joel ii. 22-26: "Be not afraid, ye beasts of the field; for the pastures of the wilderness do spring, for the tree beareth her fruit, and the fig tree and the vine do yield their strength. Be glad, then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God; for he giveth you the former rain in just measure, and he causeth to come down for you the rain, the former rain and the latter rain in the first month. And the floors shall be full of wheat, and the fats shall overflow with wine and oil. . . . And ye shall eat in plenty and be satisfied, and shall praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you; and my people shall never be ashamed."

All questions as to the relations of labor and capital, as to the rights of the people, shall be wisely and justly settled. Psalm lxxxv. 12: "Yea, the Lord shall give that which is good, and our land shall yield her increase." Beggary and want shall be unknown, for idleness shall be a thing of the past. The general march of improvement will allow the production of all bodily comforts by the labor of a few hours each day; and the remainder will be spent in other pleasant ways: in the improvement of the mind, in the acquisition of knowledge, in the enjoyments of cultured association. Isa. ii. 4: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

II. *Intellectual Progress.* Daniel xii. 4: "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Mathematics will be enlarged, the sciences outgrow their crudities and be adjusted to each other, and philosophy will no longer seem the vagary of a disordered brain, but will solve her problems so as to command universal belief. Knowledge will be loved for its helpful ministrations to the wants of the race, for the developing and strengthening power which its pursuit and acquisition give to the mind, and because it is held to be excellent in and of itself. The kin-

dergarten, the primary school, the academy, the college the university, with all professional and technical schools, shall form a graduated, concatenated, universal system for the enlightenment and culture of every mind of the race.

III. *Spiritual Progress.* This culminating civilization shall not be satisfied with material prosperity and mental advancement; it shall not be Godless, nor Christless, nor soulless. So the old seers saw, and so we see. (Daniel ii. 34, 35.) The stone that was cut out of the mountain without hands shall fill the whole earth. Isaiah lx. 3-5: "And nations shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: they all gather themselves together, they come to thee; thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be carried in the arms. Then shalt thou see, and be lightened, and thine heart shall tremble and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be turned unto thee, the wealth of the nations shall come unto thee." Jeremiah xxxi. 34: "And they shall teach no more, every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more." Joel ii. 28, 29: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days shall I pour out my Spirit." Phil. ii. 9-11: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Romans xi. 25, 26: "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved."

The Lord has created and redeemed man for himself. His word is sure, for his omnipotence is behind it. Satan shall not win the victory. The Lion of the tribe of Judah shall prevail.

He that rides upon the white horse goes forth conquering and to conquer. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied. Darkness may seem now to cover the earth, and thick darkness the people. Human ignorance, error, superstition, depravity, wretchedness, may appear beyond the power of remedy. But the night is not wholly dark, and has not been for centuries. There are glintings of light on the mountains; the hills have seen the early coming of the day; and the valleys shall yet be bathed in the glory of the Sun of righteousness. Then, from hill to valley, and from valley on to hill; from land to sea, and from sea borne on to land; as the light encircles the world, earth's ransomed millions shall lift the prayer, "Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name."

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Virginia.

IV. THE OFFICE OF RULING ELDER.¹

THE Presbyterian form of church government differs from all others, mainly, in that it is administered by or through ruling elders, who are chosen by and from the people. Those who are thus chosen are, in this capacity, the representatives of the people, or the body of believers out of which they are called, and are the overseers of the flock, having entrusted to them that authority which is vested in the church for the preservation of doctrine and order. They do not in and of themselves constitute the church, invested with full power to act without being amenable to those over whom they are placed. They are not a priestly hierarchy, immeasurably separated from the people over whom they exercise authority, but they are the instruments in and through which the body of the membership expresses its will, and declares its acquiescence in the law which it recognizes as of divine authority.

The power that vests in every congregation of believers, organized for the worship of God and for mutual edification, is not relinquished in the act of choosing certain men to regulate the affairs of their organization and administer disciplinary power among them. That power finds its expression in the administrative acts of a few whom the many esteem fit to have it entrusted to them.

The simplicity and safety of this system is apparent in the mere announcement of it. It is not cumbersome, nor exposed to the risks which attend the efforts to deliberate and conclude grave questions in large aggregations of men, women, and children. It is easy of application, and it embodies the fundamental principles which inhere in all government that is by and for the people. It is guarded by limitations and checks, which a constitution provides in the interests of justice and equal rights. It affords relief in the case of incompetency, immorality, or any sort of unfitness in an officer; and it protects the church against the lordly dicta-

¹Delivered before Arkansas Presbytery, April 19, 1895, and published at its request.

tion and tyrannical rule to which prelacy, even in its simplest form, offers constant temptation.

This form of church polity, it is claimed by its advocates, has Scripture warrant. We adopt the theory that "the form and arrangements of ecclesiastical government have not been left to be fixed by the wisdom of man, nor reduced to the level of a question of mere Christian expediency, but have been determined by divine authority, and are sufficiently exhibited in Scripture. We hold that in respect of its government and organization, as well as in respect of its doctrine and ordinances, the church is of God, and not of man; and that Scripture, rightly interpreted and understood, affords sufficient materials for determining what the constitution and order of the Christian society were intended by its divine Founder to be. . . . Church government, according to this belief, is not a product of Christian discretion, nor a development of the Christian consciousness; it has been shaped and settled, not by the wisdom of man, but by that of the church's head. It does not rest upon the ground of human expediency, but of divine appointment."—*Bannerman*.

The existence of elders in the church as the representatives of the people antedates the existence of the Christian church. "In the system of the Jewish synagogue, according to the model of which the Christian church was undoubtedly organized, the whole government and discipline was conducted by a bench of elders, and not by the body of the people." The Lord sent his messages to the people of Israel through the elders. He spake to Moses with directions to communicate what he received to the children of Israel; but it was communicated to them through their representatives: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. . . . Go, and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared unto me, saying, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt." (Ex. iii. 14-16.)

At the institution of the passover, "Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out and take you a

lamb according to your families, and kill the passover." (Ex. xii. 21.)

"Moses with the elders of Israel commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day." (Deut. xxvii. 1.)

When Moses delivered his final charge to Joshua and the people, it is said, "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel." (Deut. xxxi. 9.)

The foregoing citations are sufficient to show the prominence of elders in the affairs of the Israelitish nation. These elders were a body of men selected for wisdom and experience to administer justice in their respective localities and tribes. They were chosen from the tribes to which they belonged; and owing to the peculiar constitution of the Jewish church they were both the civil and ecclesiastical officers of the people. When the Christian church was grafted upon the Jewish synagogue, this class of officers was still in existence; and as the first converts to Christianity were all native Jews, who had been accustomed to the exercise of government by benches of elders, they very naturally adopted the same plan of church government, and the apostles in organizing the primitive church ordained elders in every congregation.

There was in these churches a class of elders distinctly spoken of as those who ruled well: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine." (1 Tim. v. 17')

The last clause of this passage would be superfluous and without meaning, if there were not a class of elders who ruled only, and a class who both ruled and taught. The common inference from the passage is, that those who are to be commended for ruling well are ruling elders alone; but this inference is not justified by the language. All elders who rule well are to be counted worthy of double honor; and this is especially true of those who, in addition to ruling well, labor in word and doctrine. But the inference that there were two classes of ruling elders recognized by the apostle *is* justified by what he says. One class were teachers of the word as well as rulers; the other class could not have been

teachers, but must have been such officers as had committed to them the power to rule, authorized to take oversight of the flock, inspect its needs, and deliberate on all those delicate and momentous questions which are connected with receiving, admonishing, rebuking, suspending, excommunicating, and dismissing the members committed to their care.

These elders existed in every church constituted in the labors of the apostles. It was intended that there should be a plurality of them associated together with equal power in government. There is no good reason to believe that those of them who labored in word and doctrine had any superiority over others in the matter of authority. The sole distinction consisted in the fact that some were qualified and authorized to teach in addition to bearing rule.

Another feature of that system of church government which is by ruling elders, of which notice ought to be taken, is, that while the elder is chosen by a particular church or congregation of believers to bear rule in that body, he also belongs, in a sense, to the whole church, composed of an aggregation of individual local churches. These congregations are bound together, being of the same faith and order, by a system of graded courts rising one above another, having the power of review and control. Matters of dispute may be carried from the lowest to the highest of these courts by complaint, reference, or appeal. A ruling elder may, and does, sit in every one of these courts, being chosen thereto by the body respectively which is entitled to representation in it. He is there as a representative, not as a delegate. He is not subject to instruction by the court which has chosen him, and is restricted in his actions by the constitution alone. When he gives in his account to the constituency which has chosen him, it is respecting his diligence and fidelity.

Presbyterianism differs from Prelacy on the one hand and from Congregationalism or Independency on the other. It is not a one-man power, nor does it recognize each local church as distinct from and independent of every other in the matters of faith and order. It believes in the existence of many in one. Our congregations are all members one of another. If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; if one is honored, all rejoice with it.

You observe, then, that in the highest court of the Presbyterian Church, the General Assembly, the whole church is represented in the elders, who there counsel for the welfare of every individual congregation throughout the connection. Indeed, in every church court, from the lowest to the highest, all the members of said court are ruling elders. Some of them are preaching or teaching elders as well as ruling elders; but the special function which they exercise as members of the court is ruling, not teaching; and in this respect they differ in nothing from those who are known as ruling elders alone. The one class has as much authority as the other.

This is what we term the parity of the eldership. For a long time the Presbyterian Church, while holding to this equality in theory, ignored it in practice. It was not until about ten years ago that the language of our *Form of Government* was so amended as to make our practice conform to our theory. Discrimination had always been made in some respects in favor of the teaching elder, which implied a distinction not warranted by the doctrine of parity. The practice of the church had never made those who are only ruling elders eligible to the office of moderator in any of the courts above the session. But now we recognize that eligibility, and they are chosen to the moderatorship in the Presbytery, Synod, and General Assembly. The initiative in this step was taken by our Southern Church.

The sweep of this principle of parity may yet take wider range. The General Assembly of 1894 had before it an overture from the Presbytery of South Alabama, asking whether "a ruling elder may give a charge to the people at the installation of a pastor?" Of course, the Assembly could do nothing else in reply than cite the written law, which is as follows: "After which the minister presiding, or some other appointed for the purpose, shall give a solemn charge to the pastor and to the congregation." (*Book of Church Order*, Par. 121.)

Ruling elders are members of the court which ordains and installs a pastor. They lay on hands in ordination. They do not preach. Is not preaching the only function they may not perform? Under what head does the charging of the pastor and the

congregation fall? Presumably, according to the constitution, under the head of teaching or preaching, and it is, therefore, limited to the teaching elder. If this presumption be correct, the question is not open to debate. But it is evident that the correctness of this view is not clear to the minds of many, else the above overture would not have found its way to the Assembly, and the practice would not have been indulged in, as it has been of late years, of appointing ruling elders to charge the congregation. The spirit of amendment may yet find work here to do.

But we pass on to say something respecting the qualifications and duties of the ruling elder.

Our *Book of Church Order* says, "Those who fill this office ought to be blameless in life and sound in the faith; they should be men of wisdom and discretion, and by the holiness of their walk and conversation should be examples to the flock."

The Scriptures prescribe such qualifications as "not self-willed," "not soon angry," "not given to wine," "no striker, not given to filthy lucre," "a lover of hospitality," "a lover of good men," "sober, just, holy, temperate, holding fast the faithful word." These requisites are the very highest in point of character that can be demanded of any man for any position in this world; and it must be seen that they are not too exacting, since those who are called to this post of dignity and responsibility are to be overseers of the flock of God, and to watch for the souls of men, counseling for their spiritual welfare and guiding them in faith and duty. Those who are chosen and solemnly ordained to exercise authority in the church of God, which he has purchased with the blood of his Son, are not to be men of sinister motives, corrupt minds and an unchristly spirit. This is no place for the display of unholy ambition, or the seeking of personal and selfish ends. These officers are commissioned of the Holy Ghost "to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood."

It is because of the high character to be borne, and the peculiar qualifications to be possessed, by an elder, that Paul charges Timothy to "lay hands suddenly on no man." The utmost care is to be taken by the church in its selection of men for this position. It ought to be done only after the most thoughtful consid-

eration and sincere prayer to God for safe guidance. The injury that may be, and often is, inflicted upon the church by the incompetency, or unfaithfulness, or perverseness, or unchristian character of men who fill this office cannot be computed. The vicious results of their misdoings are often entailed upon the people whose religious life they are appointed to promote. The whole body suffers for the disrepute of its official members, who are to be examples to the flock. They must have a good report of them which are without, lest they fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

An elder should be a man of good intelligence, sound judgment, unbiassed views, discreet action, and unquestioned piety. The affairs of his office are of the most delicate and difficult character. Mere prominence and influence do not constitute fitness for his work. These things may prove to be a snare to him and a menace to the church. Activity and energy will not of themselves suffice. They are as liable to be used wrongly as rightly. Gifts of both nature and grace are needed in him that he may rule well. Self-conceit is a serious blemish; love of power and prominence is a source of mischief and danger. Every species of self-seeking is incompatible with his official fidelity.

Of the duties of the ruling elder, our book says, "Ruling elders, the immediate representatives of the people, are chosen by them, that, in conjunction with the pastors or ministers, they may exercise government and discipline, and take the oversight of the spiritual interests of the particular church, and also of the church generally, when called thereunto. It appertains to their office, both severally and jointly, to watch diligently over the flock committed to their charge, that no corruption of doctrine or of morals enter therein. Evils which they cannot correct by private admonition they should bring to the notice of the session. They should visit the people at their homes, especially the sick; they should instruct the ignorant, comfort the mourner, nourish and guard the children of the church; and all those duties which private Christians are bound to discharge by the law of charity are especially incumbent upon them by divine vocation, and are to be discharged as official duties. They should pray with and for the

people; they should be careful and diligent in seeking the fruit of the preached word among the flock; and should inform the pastor of cases of sickness, affliction, and awakening, and of all others which may need his special attention." In the act of ordination they promise "to study the peace, unity, edification, and purity of the church."

Here is a considerable catalogue of grave duties which no candid man can ponder without feeling that this is no work for a novice or a trifler. Solemn vows are upon him, which he cannot disregard with impunity. He is in charge of the highest and most solemn interests of men. He is put into the closest relations with his fellow-Christians. He is a spiritual adviser in the kingdom of grace and truth. A watchful eye is to be kept on every want and condition of the spiritual household. He is to foster the religious life of the people, not hinder it. He is to be a helper of the pastor in his work, not an obstacle in his way. He is to study the welfare of the church; inquire, ponder, meditate with reference to what is good and profitable.

It does not pertain to the elder's office to lord it over God's heritage, harbor secret enmities, sow the seeds of dissension, encourage discontent, or pursue the disorderly with malice. It is a sad truth that while ruling elders are sworn to study the peace, unity, and purity of the church, much of the discord, division, and other evils which menace and mar our congregations is attributable to the failure of these officers to observe the vows which they have taken. They have been known to become intriguers for the working of petty schemes; to counsel in the interests of a special class; to quietly approve the worldliness of the fashionable and wealthy; and to ignore serious defections of character in both members and officers for the sake of patronage. They have been known to be the most turbulent of any, when they should have poured oil on the waters; and through weakness and fear they have made unrighteous concessions to the whimsical and irreligious. It is sad that it is so, but for the good of the elders let the truth be told, that they may keep in mind the fact that their office is beset by dangers, and that they need to take heed to themselves as well as to the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers.

It is difficult to see how a Christian man can consent to enter or remain in this relation to the church of Christ and repudiate his sacred obligations; or how he can make it comport with the functions of his office to neglect the study of the word, the duty of prayer, and an intelligent acquaintance with the people. This office requires diligence, labor, and self-sacrifice. It is not a sinecure. Its incumbents are not honorary functionaries, chosen only to attend roll-call at meetings of the church courts, and file up in dress parade on communion days. They have obligations of a grave character imposed by the head of the church, who, with the utmost fidelity to truth, takes account of his servants.

It is the duty of the elders to gather the people together for public worship, and in the absence of a minister to conduct the services of the sanctuary, to present to the people the claims of charity and benevolence, to admonish them of their duty to support with their money, and otherwise, the ministrations of the gospel. It is incumbent on them to regularly appoint one of their number to attend upon the meetings of Presbytery and Synod, and to see that there is no failure to have their church represented in these courts, whenever such representation is possible, and to keep themselves and their people informed respecting the affairs of the church at large.

These duties cannot be urged too strongly. The evils of their neglect are well known and widely felt. The languishing state of our feeble and scattered churches might be much relieved by a vigorous application of our church polity. There are difficulties, it is true, in doing so in all particulars; but a greater degree of conscientiousness, heartfelt interest, and consecration would solve many of these difficulties. Let it be felt that this is the Lord's work, and that this is his way of doing his work, and means will be provided where there seem to be none. I have never known churches to languish in which there was an earnest, godly and faithful bench of elders, no, not even where there was one consecrated man.

Now, let me admonish you who are ruling elders to *magnify your office*. Degrade it not to the level of a human institution. Permit no private concerns, secular claims, political interests, or

temptations to ease, to override the claims of God and his church. Let it be your ambition to "rule well," that you may be "counted worthy of double honor" for God's glory and the enlargement of his Zion. If God has called you into official position in his church, he has conferred upon you very great honor. Walk worthy of this your vocation, in all lowliness and meekness of mind. Keep yourselves unspotted from the world. Study to shew yourselves approved of God. Watch for souls as they that watch for the morning. Be ye co-workers with God. "Endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ." "Consider what I say: and the Lord give you understanding in all things."

T. C. BARRET.

Little Rock, Ark.

V. PAUL'S SUMMARY OF THE GOSPEL.

“BUT of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” Thus wrote Paul to the Corinthians, and in that terse language, and comprehensive sweep of thought, he compresses a whole system of theology. To analyze and elucidate, as far as may be, in Scripture language, the meaning of these words, will be the object of this paper.

“Of him are ye in Christ Jesus.” God is the origin and source of this new life in the soul. This is true as to the very scheme of love on which the salvation of the soul is founded: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John iii. 16.) “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 John iv. 10.) “But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” (Romans v. 8.) The very fact that there is a method by which those who are dead in sin may be brought to life is due to God's own adorable grace. There was no eye to pity, and no arm to save, when God took on him to furnish a plan for the salvation of the lost. There was no desert in man, but of God's free will and adorable mercy he made this covenant with his own co-equal Son, to furnish a ransom for the sins of the lost.

God, too, is the source of life to the individual believer: “So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.” (Rom. ix. 16.) It was not that we first chose him, but that he chose us in Christ, before the foundation of the world. It was due alone to the special grace, to the distinctive love and mercy of God, that any one of us was called from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. “I have loved thee,” he says, “with an everlasting love; therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee.” (Jer. xxxi. 3.)

And then, too, it was God who inwrought this new life in the soul by the Holy Spirit: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. ii. 1.) "Quickened together with Christ," when he breathed the very life of Christ into our souls. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." (John iii. 8.) "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 12, 13.)

This same apostle says: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." (1 John iii. 9.) And again, "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God, and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." (1 John iv. 7.) And again, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." (1 John v. 1.) And again, "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." (1 John v. 20.) From these precious words we are obliged to believe that God himself is the author of this spiritual life which we feel throbbing within us. As in the beginning God breathed into Adam the breath of life, and he became a living soul, so, in each case of genuine conversion, God does breathe into such a soul a new life, a spiritual life, a life which is just as immortal as the life of God himself. And what is taught us in the word is confirmed by our own personal experience. Explain it as we may, or rather as we may try to do, there is a consciousness in the heart of every true child of God that whatever of good is found in him is due to the sovereign and adorable grace of God. If he is a Christian, it is because God took him as he was, and made him what he is; took away the old, hard, insensible heart of stone, and gave him a heart of flesh; washed away his sins in the blood of Christ, and made him a new creature, or a new creation in Christ Jesus, so that old things passed away, and all things became new.

Then, again, this life which we receive from God is "in Christ Jesus." "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus." To prove this, we have only to call to mind some of those familiar texts in which Christ is held up as the source of light and life to the believer. "I am the light of the world." "I am the bread of life." "I will give you that water, which if a man drink he shall never thirst." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." "I am the vine, ye are the branches." "Abide in me, for without me ye can do nothing." Or, as John says, "This life is in his Son." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii. 36.) This mysterious and subtle something which we call "life" no one can understand. It eludes our search, no matter how, or where, we seek to find the hidden source. Men dig down into the rocks and find "fossils," which, they say, were once the abode of life. They have followed it down from one form to another, lower and lower still, and away down in what seems to be a mere mass of spawn, or "protoplasm," there is what is called life. And all the way up from this lowest germ to its highest form of animal, or reptile, or insect, there is still what is called life. From the microscopic animalcule in a drop of water to the great whale in the Northern seas there is this same principle of life. It bursts in the little flower that blooms under the eternal snows of the Alps, and grows as a giant in the immense trees of the Yosemite. It has been known to hide itself in a grain of wheat, wrapped in the folds of a mummy for thousands of years, and when that grain of wheat was planted, the life there would show itself and burst out into "first the blade, then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear." It is found in the insect coral that gradually lifts the reef to the surface of the ocean, and in the monsters of the deep that make their beds in the grottoes of these coral reefs. It is in man a principle, an element of his being, that causes the heart to beat, the lungs to breathe, the blood to pulsate, the stomach to digest, the hands to work, the whole nervous system to be sensitive to every impulse. It is that strange, mysterious, subtle something, which no microscope can see, which no lancet can dissect,

which no anatomist can locate in this human body, itself so fearfully and wonderfully made. We all know it is here somewhere, hidden away—the secret spring that keeps all these wheels in motion. But where it is, and what it is, no scientific man can tell. While here in the body, there is life and motion and activity; but when withdrawn, or crushed out, as it may be at any moment, we are dead. There is a sudden collapse of the system, a sudden paralysis of the powers, and we are dead, and crumble back to dust from which we sprang. And now, as there is a life in the body, so there is a life in the soul; a spiritual, immortal life, which God breathed into the soul. “And this life is in his Son.” Says Paul, “For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.” (Phil. i. 21.) “For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” (Gal. ii. 19, 20.) And again, “To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you the hope of glory, whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.” (Col. i. 27, 28.) “Which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.” Here is the point. This life is in Christ. It is Christ in you, a spiritual life, a divine life within this human life, that vitalizes these mortal bodies.

And what is more, that life is an immortal life. There is no power in this universe that can crush out that life. The cold of winter and the heat of summer cannot reach it. The most malignant of diseases cannot touch it. Satan himself cannot take it away, as he could not take away the life of Job after God said to him, “Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life” (Job ii. 6), *i. e.*, “You may afflict him with all sorts of calamities, but you shall not touch his life.” So God says to Satan now, “Here is the body of my saints, and you may send sickness and disasters and all sorts of troubles and calamities to rack these frail bodies. Here is their soul, and you may tempt them away from the right path, and allure them by false lights, and fascinate them with the

glitter and glare of what seems bright and dazzling. But there is a life there, a secret life, a hidden life, a spiritual life, an immortal life, which you dare not, and shall not, touch. It is Christ in the soul, and you can no more tempt him now than you could when you tried all your subtle arts in the wilderness, where he was led to be tempted of the devil."

"Of him are ye in Christ Jesus." There is the ground of Christian stability and perseverance. The life of Christ in the soul makes him one with Christ, and a union thus formed by the grace of God can never be broken. The true branch can never be cut from the true vine. The living member can never be cut off from the living head. The real sheep can never be so thoroughly lost that the Good Shepherd will not find it and bring it back into the fold. If it were an artificial limb, it might be taken off; but it is a living part of a living body, and the same blood circulates in all parts of the body. If it were a fungous growth, like the mistletoe, it might suck the sap from the branch on which it grows, and thus destroy the life of the tree, and thus its own life also. But it is a branch of the true vine, drawing its own life from the life of the vine, and growing and bearing fruit to the glory of God's grace. If it were a galvanized dead body, when the galvanic current ceased the apparent life would cease also. But it is a living body, and a living soul, a living body because it is animated by a living soul. And Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the life of that living soul. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." (Rom. viii. 9, 10, 11.)

And now, having glanced at these points, let us look at the logical results of this mystical union. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us *wisdom*." On this point let us study the wholesome words of Dr. Archibald Alexander: "In him was life, and the life was the light of men."

Christ is the Sun of Righteousness, from whom and through whom emanate all the rays of divine truth which ever enter the mind of man. "This is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." Christ is that great Prophet that should come into the world, like unto Moses, whom the Jews expected, but whom they would not receive when he actually made his appearance. He is the great Teacher, by whose instruction all the children of God are brought into the path of life. "All thy children shall be taught of God."

There is no interference in the prophetic office of Christ and the teaching of the Holy Spirit, but a perfect concurrence. Christ furnishes the lesson and the Holy Spirit renders it effectual. "He shall not speak of himself, but he shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." "Christ executeth the office of a prophet, in revealing unto us by his word and Spirit the will of God for our salvation." "In him dwell all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Man is endowed with reason, but by sin his mind has become blind, and reason itself is perverted. He not only needs external light, but to have the organ of vision rectified, without which the light "will shine in darkness, and the darkness comprehend it not." Christ becomes wisdom to the believer, by making him wise to know the way of salvation. He first teaches the sinner something of the depth and malignity of his disease. He wounds that he may heal. When by law the knowledge of sin is acquired, then he guides the convicted sinner to the cross, and opens his eyes to behold the Lamb of God.

He is not only the wisdom of God, as he instructs the ignorant, and opens the eyes of the blind; but, as the God-man Mediator, is the most wonderful exhibition of the wisdom of God ever made to the universe. The whole plan of redemption is resplendent with wisdom. The contrivance of a way by which God can be just, while he justifies the ungodly, is so replete with wisdom, that the angels contemplate it with profound astonishment. The gospel, which is the revelation of this plan, is, therefore, called the "wisdom of God." In this there is a depth which human reason cannot fathom. The Apostle Paul, therefore, says, "But

we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world, unto our glory." We may, therefore, in the contemplation of this subject, exclaim with the apostle: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"

Christ is then "of God made unto us wisdom" in a twofold respect: 1, As he is the brightest display of the infinite wisdom of God; and 2, By teaching his people all that is necessary to make them wise unto salvation. He teaches them what they are to believe, and what they ought to do.

Again, "He of God is made unto us *righteousness*." This does not mean that the moral character of Christ is infused into believers. This false notion sometimes causes confusion in the mind of those who are anxious to know the truth. Justification is an act, not a work of God. It is an act of his grace, in which he counts over to us, or sets down to our account, the righteousness of Christ. It is clearly brought out in these words, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) Here it is plainly intimated, that just as Christ was looked upon as a sinner, despised, rejected, condemned, and crucified as a sinner, so we are looked upon as righteous, justified as righteous, "only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." In other words, there is legally and really a transfer of the sin from the sinner to the sinless; and then there is legally and really a transfer of this righteousness from the Righteous to the sinner. And hence, in the eye of the law we stand justified and complete in Christ. "He is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." "He is the Lord our righteousness."

It was in this sense that Paul wrote: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." (Rom. v. 11.) "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk

not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." (Rom. viii. 1, 2, 3, 4.)

"For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." (Rom. viii. 29-34.) Here, then, we have a statement of the doctrine in the words of the Bible, that Christ of God is made unto us, not only wisdom, but righteousness.

Again, "Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and *sanctification*." "Sanctification," says the *Shorter Catechism*, "is the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man, after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness." Granting that this is correct, we notice the sharp contrast presented between sanctification and justification. The one is an "act of God's grace," and the other is the "work of God's grace." The one is a judicial act that is done in a moment, and forever; the other is a work which commences with regeneration, continues all through life, and is only completed in "the glory which is to be revealed hereafter." It is that mysterious process by which, through grace, we are "changed into the likeness of Christ," are made "partakers of the divine nature," are cleansed, purified, sanctified, until at death the souls of believers are made "perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory."

Now, the agent for this specific work is the Holy Spirit, hence the question arises, How is Christ made to us sanctification? There are two senses in which this is true. It was due to the work of Christ, predicted and then performed, that the Holy Spirit came. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." (John xiv. 16, 17.) "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me." (John xv. 26.) With these words of promise agree the words of Paul: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v. 25, 26, 27.) Peter also says, "Seeing that ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." (1 Peter i. 22, 23.)

But there is another sense in which Christ is made unto us sanctification. Paul said, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Gal. vi. 14.) There is no power on earth that has such a sanctifying influence on the believing soul as the cross of Christ. There is no pathos like the pathos of the cross. There is no scene that so tends to soften and subdue, and make tender the heart of a Christian as that sad and solemn scene which tells us of a Saviour's sufferings, testifying to a Saviour's undying, unquenchable love. The judgments of the Lord may startle us. The terrors of the Lord may frighten us. The justice and the vengeance of the Lord may drive us to Christ as a refuge. But the cross of Christ alone can draw us to Christ, as he said: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me."

And under the shadow of that cross, "with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. iii. 18.)

Lastly, "he of God is made unto us," not only "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification," but "*redemption.*" In one sense, this may be regarded as a summing up of all the rest; but more than that is wrapped up in that word "*redemption.*" "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. iii. 13.) "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." (1 Peter i. 18, 19.) "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body." (Rom. viii. 23.) It is in such texts as these, comparing Scripture with Scripture, that we are to find out the full meaning of that word "*redemption.*" It is more than justification, and more than sanctification, while it includes both.

In the old days of savage warfare the captives were sometimes redeemed with a heavy ransom. When the money was paid, the captive was set free. But he may have contracted, during his confinement, some dreadful disease, and this required many years and many remedies for his complete restoration. Even when released, he might be a long distance from home, and might have to pass through many a scene of danger, of hardship, and of trial, to reach his distant home. So it is with Christ's ransomed or redeemed saints. The ransom has been paid in full with his own precious blood. It is a full satisfaction to the law and to the justice of God. It is a ransom for the body, and a ransom for the soul. But the ransomed ones are still diseased with a dreadful malady. There is a remnant of corruption. There is a law in the members that wars against the Spirit. And then, too, they are far away from home. There is a long, dreary, dangerous pilgrimage before them. It is through much tribulation that they are to enter the kingdom. When John saw some of them in

heaven, the angel told him, "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." (Rev. vii. 14.) But they had come out of the tribulation, and had washed their robes and made them white. And, blessed be God, so shall it be with all his ransomed ones. The ransom is all paid, and "he that hath begun a good work in us shall continue it until the day of Jesus Christ," and "we shall be kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation." The soul must be tried, and "purified so as by fire." The dross must be burnt up, and the gold be refined. The long journey must be travelled, amid dust and weariness. The body must die, for it "is not quickened, except it die." It must be buried, as Christ himself was buried. But it shall rise again, as "he rose again, and became the firstfruits of them that slept." "Sown in corruption, it shall be raised in incorruption." "Sown in dishonor, it shall be raised in glory." "Sown in weakness, it shall be raised in power." "Sown a natural body, it shall be raised a spiritual body." "So when this corruption shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. xv. 54-57.)

Thus have I tried, in Bible language, to bring out the meaning of this comprehensive sentence: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." And the natural and logical result of it is, "That according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." It is well for us, now and then, to take up some such pregnant passage as a summary of the whole gospel, and get as clear a conception as we can of God's plan of "salvation by grace." It is well for us to dig down to the very foundation of our hope, and thus "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear." (1 Peter iii. 15.)

Such a subject, such a summary of sound doctrine, may tend to humble the pride of man, but "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted"; and, certainly, it does tend to exalt, and to magnify, and to glorify, "the grace of God which bringeth salvation." "Salvation by grace" is the key-note to the whole gospel, and this is the song that shall be sung at that time of which we read in Isaiah: "And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

T. W. HOOPER.

Christiansburg, Va.

VI. SIDNEY LANIER vs. ROBERT BROWNING.

THE position held in England by Robert Browning is in America being accorded to Sidney Lanier. Each of these has in the past been a sealed book to his own people, and on each the public is now pouring its hottest fires of criticism. The numerous Browning societies find their counterpart in the investigations of devoted admirers of our Southern—national—musician—poet.

There is much correspondence to be found in the works, in the genius, in the life, of the two men. Neither belonged to a school; each was a protest against the materialistic tendencies of the age, and the comparison is the more interesting for the reason that one was a development of high life, ease, and congenial surroundings, while the other was the son of poverty and the victim of disease.

Lanier's analytic power, his love of music and poetry, were doubtless in a measure inherited. His educational advantages were not considered, by himself, at least, to have been very respectable; but, being a sedulous reader and student, he soon made up for deficiencies, and was recognized as authority in both literary and musical art. Actual experience made him acquainted with war and all the horrors that it entails, besides bringing him into closer contact with the outer world. His literary career began in 1867, though some of his poems, as the *First Joust of the Tournament*, date back to 1862, when he was nineteen years of age.

Robert Browning from his earliest childhood showed a strong inclination to reading and poetry. He had the advantage of a university education and extensive travel. His first literary venture, *Pauline*, appeared in 1833, when he was twenty-one years of age. Two years later came *Paracelsus*, showing boldness of thought, lofty aspirations, and a keen insight into human passion. Raised at once to distinction, surrounded by wealth and appreciative friends, of sound, robust constitution, Browning could not fail, but stands out as the great psychological poet of the century. Lanier's life was one of struggle, disaster, suffering. The wonder is that he succeeded as he did.

When we compare points of genius, we find a remarkable sim-

ilarity between the two poets. Browning, bold, energetic, ethereal; Lanier, breaking away from conventionalities, always working with warmest instincts and deepest sympathy. But the one was buoyant, cheery, inspiring; the other suffered and was patient, resigned, hopeful. Lanier's strongest protest was against the material spirit of the age, and he cried :

“O Trade ! O Trade ! would thou wert dead !
The time needs heart—'tis tired of head.”

—*Symphony.*

Browning, before him, had sung :

“Because man has shop to mind
In time and place, since flesh must live,
Needs spirit lack all life behind,
All stray thoughts, fancies fugitive,
All loves except what trade can give ?”

—*Shop.*

But Browning, with his restless, subtle spirit, makes his strongest protest against the mere intellect, and, quoting from Wordsworth, “with this same key Shakespeare unlocked his heart,” adds, “Did Shakespeare? If so, the less Shakespeare he!” He emphasized the intuitive side of human nature, and with a reverential spirit declares that “Truth is within ourselves; it takes no rise from outward things, whatever you may believe. . . . To know rather consists in opening out a way whence the imprisoned splendor may escape, than in effecting entry for a light supposed to be without.”—*Paracelsus.*

Both were in the highest degree imaginative. But Browning's imagination differed from Lanier's in this, that where Lanier found its objects in nature around, Browning preferred the analysis of the heart. Browning was psychological, where Lanier was natural—both genuinely realistic. For instance, Browning sings:

“Methinks I'm older that I bowed myself
The many years of pain that taught me art !”

—*Cleon.*

Thus he moralizes :

“'Tis an awkward thing to play with souls,
And matter enough to save one's own ;
Yet think of my friend, and the burning coals
He played with for bits of stone !”

—*A Light Woman.*

Again we hear him singing :

“Dearest, three months ago,
 When the mesmerizer snow
 With his hand’s first sweep
 Put the earth to sleep :
 ’Twas a time when the earth could show
 All—how was earth to know
 ’Neath the mute hands to and fro ?”
 —*A Lover’s Quarrel.*

And again :

“ Be a god and hold me
 With a charm !
 Be a man and fold me
 With thine arm !”
 —*A Woman’s Last Word.*

In *St. Martin’s Summer* he gives a good illustration of his power of imagination, in which is interwoven his idea of the relation of love to law :

“ Love’s corpse lies quiet, therefore,
 Only Love’s ghost plays truant,
 And warns us have in wholesome awe
 Durable mansionry ; that’s wherefore
 I weave but trellis work, pursuant
 Life to law.”

One of his most exquisite pieces of imaginative work is found in *Wanting is—What?*

“ Beamy the world, yet a blank all the same,
 Framework which waits for a picture to frame :
 What of the leafage, what of the flower ?
 Roses embowering with nought they embower !
 Come, then, complete incompleteness, O Comer,
 Pant through the blueness, perfect the summer !”

Lanier seldom attempts so bold a flight, but is more frequently found skimming along the placid surface ; and as he does he sings in pretty undertones, as :

“ Run home, little streams,
 With your lapfuls of stars and dreams.”
 —*Sunrise.*

Again, the stars haunt him, and he murmurs :

“ Each winding creek in grave enchantment lies,
 A rhapsody of morning stars.”
 —*Sunrise.*

In the *Psalms of the West* he tells:

“How Life was the dropping and Death was the drying
Of a tear that fell in a day that God was sighing.”

In the *Song of the Future* the cry is:

“Go, trembling song,
And stay not long; oh! stay not long;
Thou’rt only a gray and sober dove,
But thine eye is faith and thy wing is love.”

He closes the *Symphony* with this exquisite touch:

“Music is love in search of a word.”

In comparing their ideas of the mission of poetry, we may take their own words. Browning, discussing Shelley’s poetry, represents it as “a sublime fragmentary essay toward a presentment of the correspondency of the universe to deity, of the natural to the spiritual, and of the actual to the ideal.”—*On the Poet*. This idea appears throughout his poetry. Lanier writes: “My experience in the varying judgments given about poetry have all converged upon one solitary principle. That principle is, that the artist shall put forth humbly and lovingly, and without bitterness against opposition, the very best and highest that is in him, utterly regardless of contemporary criticism.” Since “putting forth . . . the highest and best that is in him” is but another way of making the “presentment of the actual to the ideal,” it can readily be seen that their ideas of the mission of poetry are not materially different.

It is probably in their views on religious questions that we find the parallel most clearly marked. Lanier was an ardent nature-worshipper, and recognized it as the handiwork of nature’s God. In the *Marshes of Glynn* we find this couplet:

“Oh, like to the greatness of God is the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the literal marshes of Glynn.”

Probably the best statement of his religious belief is found in *Tiger-lilies*: “For I am quite confident that love is the only rope thrown out by heaven for us who have fallen overboard in life. Love for man, love for woman, love for God, these three chime like bells in a steeple, and call us to worship, which is to work.

. . . Inasmuch as we love, in so much do we conquer death and flesh; by as much as we love, by so much are we gods. For God is love, and could we love as he does, we could be as he is"; or else, as he expresses it in his poem entitled *In Absence* :

"When life's all love, 'tis life; aught else, 'tis naught."

It was doubtless his unquestioning confidence in the goodness and sympathy of his divine Master that enabled him to endure and rise amidst the worry and suffering that he had to bear. He thus expressed it in a letter to Hayne: "I say to myself, 'Where are the strong arms in which I, too, might lay me and repose and yet be full of the fire of life?' And always through the twilight come answers from the other world, 'Master! Master! there is one, Christ, in his arms we rest.'" His passion for music was closely connected with his religious sentiment, for in *Tiger-lilies* he declares that "Music means harmony, harmony means love, and love means, God!" In the ascription of spirituality to nature, Lanier most nearly approaches to Ruskin.

When we turn to Robert Browning we find religious belief more etherialized, but none the less pure. Corson says that "Christianity is with Browning, and this he sets forth again and again, a *life*, quickened and motived and nourished by the personality of Christ." Again, the same authority states that "Browning is the most essentially Christian of living poets." (This was written in 1886.) This is evident from a reading of his poems. Especially is this true in the case of the poem *Cleon*, where Browning shows himself, as Corson puts it, "the poet who, more emphatically than any of his contemporaries have done, has enforced the importance, the indispensableness of a new birth, the being born from above as the condition, not only of soul vitality and progress, but also of intellectual rectitude." In *A Death in the Desert* we find this sentiment :

"God's gift was that man should conceive of truth
And yearn to gain it, catching at mistake,
As midway help, till he reach fact indeed."

Another sentiment that he dwells upon is the idea of change, a rising to higher planes. He tells us in *James Lee's Wife* to

“Rejoice that man is hurled
From change to change unceasingly,
His soul’s wings never furled.”

Again, he says:

“Man knows partly, but conceives beside,
Creeps ever on from fancies to the fact.”

—*Death in a Desert.*

While there is here and there in Lanier a giving way to despair which approaches asceticism, we find nothing of the kind in Browning. There is always a healthy tone in the writings of the latter. In *Saul*, he sings of physical life:

“How good is man’s life, the mere living! how fit to employ
All the heart, and the soul, and the senses forever in joy!”

As his critic observes, this glory of earthly life articulates everywhere the spiritual, so to speak, makes it healthy and robust, and protects it against volatility and from running into mysticism.

In conclusion, the relation between these two master-poets of the two worlds is beautifully expressed in the words that Browning puts into the mouth of Shakespeare “at the Mermaid”:

“Have you found your life distasteful?
My life did, and does, smack sweet.
Was your youth of pleasure wasteful?
Mine I saved and hold complete.
Do your joys with age diminish?
When mine fail me, I’ll complain.
Must in death your daylight finish?
My sun sets to rise again.”

D. F. EAGLETON.

Austin College, Sherman, Texas.

VII. NOTES.

PRESBYTERIAN LOYALTY.

PRESBYTERIANS constitute a highly respected class of people the world over, and wield an influence which is a credit to their character and to the consistency of their religious life and opinions. They will be found among the foremost in all public-spirited movements, and can be depended upon as a helpful, conservative, and progressive force in all the perplexities and emergencies of society. They are not behind any people in liberality, hospitality and philanthropic activity, and in all the better qualities of citizenship and the graces of neighborliness they have the cordial recognition of their fellows of other denominations and of no denominations. Yet, curiously enough, there prevails a notion among many people that Presbyterians are illiberal and intolerant in religious matters. There are people, ignorant of the Calvinistic theology, who assume that it is so severe and rigorous a system it constrains its devotees within narrow doctrinal lines which shut them out from the exercise of a thorough sympathy with, and a generous tolerance of, the differing opinions of their Christian brethren of other denominations. There never was a greater mistake. Of a truth, Presbyterians are the most liberal and tolerant people in the world. They are a liberty loving, and a liberty giving people that have always been among the first to champion the freedom of thought and conscience, and their theology, which is the only logical system, because it is the unexpurgated Bible system, has in it the very substance and spirit of the perfect law of liberty. So far from being amenable to the charge of a narrow sectarianism, there is ground for the complaint that Presbyterians are not sufficiently zealous in contending for the faith which is in them. The average Presbyterian seems rather loath to press his doctrines upon others, for the apparent reason that they are not easily understood or explained. Because so many people not only will not understand, but will persistently misunderstand, we are prone to avoid the difficulty of instruction, and to omit occasion to magnify the grand old doctrines to which we hold.

Out of our respect and consideration for other people's opinions and feelings, we often neglect to properly maintain our own convictions before the world. Too many Presbyterians place themselves in an apologetic attitude, and seem to shrink even from the mention of some of the great and fundamental doctrines of their theology. We need, as a people, to emulate the more aggressive zeal of other churches, not in a spirit of disputation or proselytism, for that is an abomination, but in a noble and courageous loyalty to our own church and its teachings.

The criticism is made that when Presbyterians undertake to bring sinners to Christ, they put aside the formidable doctrines that distinguish their system, and in this way make an implied confession that their theology is unsuited to the masses, and especially to the more ignorant who must be saved. This is an unfair criticism, and applies no more aptly to Presbyterians than to all other denominations. The Presbyterian system of faith is thoroughly suited to the masses, for it embodies Bible principles without emendation or avoidance, and no Presbyterian should be guilty of the disloyalty of admitting that any declaration to the contrary has force or foundation. It is the complaisant desire to avoid giving occasion for criticism, or the fear of becoming entangled in abstractions, which prevents many of its adherents from standing up boldly, when the proper opportunity is offered, in advocacy and in defence of the Calvinistic faith.

How foolish this is, can be seen when it is remembered that the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism are no more difficult of explanation than those cardinal doctrines that are held in common by all evangelical churches. The doctrine of election is no more mysterious or unexplainable than the doctrine of the incarnation, or the doctrine of the Trinity, or the new birth. What folly then for a Presbyterian, old or young, to feel embarrassed and discomfited when he is asked to reconcile election with the fact of man's free agency. The simplest believer can answer by pointing to the plain, unequivocal and unmovable declaration of both doctrines in the Bible. If it be still demanded how a man can be a free agent and yet be fore-ordained, the questioner of another denomination should be asked first to demonstrate lucidly how three persons can be but one person, or how our blessed Lord can be both God and man, or to explain the mystery of the existence of evil and its tolerance by an omnipotent deity. It is ludicrously absurd for any one to make a stumbling block of election, which is essential to any just conception of God, and at the same

time accept the other doctrines of grace, which are equally difficult of explanation.

Presbyterians are, as a rule, nobly loyal in their love and pride of church, but there is need of a heartier and more earnest assertion of the doctrines of the church. We should not hide these great Bible principles under a bushel. We should delight to magnify them to the glory of God.

G. H. BASKETTE.

Nashville, Tenn.

SEMINARY STUDENTS' TEMPTATIONS.¹

In the customary course of Seminary events, it falls to my lot to utter the words formally beginning the labor of the sixty-eighth year of this institution.

It is not proposed, in what shall follow, to single out any topic whose discussion would anticipate the treatment it should and probably will receive during the year, in some one or more of the departments, but to deal with some points of general interest and practical utility.

And first of all, I wish to utter a word of mutual congratulation and of thanks to Almighty God, that our lives and health have been spared, and with a Faculty of unbroken ranks and with a goodly number of students, we are now once more assembled to start in making up the record of another year's service to the church through this venerable institution. May the Master's approval and blessing rest upon us as in past years!

I desire to note for the students a few distinct points, in few words.

1. The first is this: That we want you individually to look on the several members of this Faculty as your personal friends. By any other view, you wrong us and also yourselves. If, after such an announcement and assurance, you choose to stay away from our homes, ignoring our hospitality persistently, and, after awhile, formulate in your own minds or give expression to a complaint, that the members of the Faculty take only an official and no personal interest in you and show you no personal attentions, the fault will be your own; and even such a thought will show a querulous, unamiable disposition and temper of mind. Ordinarily and chiefly and as a matter of course,

¹ Extracts from the opening address delivered before the Faculty and students of Columbia Seminary, September, 1895, requested for publication.

our business is with you in the class room. This is beyond question. You are here to acquire theological scholarship with our help. If you are sick or in distress, it is your rightful claim and our pleasure that you should have every possible and needed attention, and none of you shall experience neglect. How many professors, and among the most helpful of them, have I had whom I never knew personally, never met nor spoke to out of class room. We have a right to assume that you are grown young men and mean business, and not little boys or children that need to be dandled, cozened and coaxed. The Faculty should not be expected to act as wet nurses. Samples of simpering simpletons are liable to find their way into any body of students.

1. The simple hard fact, however, is that you are not here for social and sentimental reasons, but for business, and social attractions are one of the many thieves of time against whose seductive reprisals you need to be warned and constantly on your guard. The social element is like condiments in your food, a little is delicious and appetizing and wholesome, but there are cases on record where too much common table salt has proved to be a deadly poison.

I would impress upon your minds, and stamp on your social lives, this governing idea: *Be not chameleons in your social intercourse*, taking on the shades of worldly mindedness, of indifference to religion, or, perhaps, the positive ungodliness of those about you; but be manly Christians, with such prepotency of Christian character that, whatever society you enter, it shall fully reflect your religious sentiments and tastes, instead of impressing on you its religionless tone. If a simple minded godliness be your temper, it will be as a bouquet of sweet roses and load the atmosphere wherever you go with the delights of its fragrance. There was no pharisaical severity, nor lordly pompousness, but ease and loving gentleness in all the Saviour's life with us; and in no instance did he compromise himself, or fail to impress his character on all about him* instead of chameleon-like reflecting theirs. Assert yourselves as Christians, which means to assert Christ always and everywhere.

2. You know the story of Atalanta losing the race by being diverted from the straightforward course to pick up the golden apples that her competitor flung to her view, on either side of the course.

Literary attractions and miscellaneous reading constitute another golden apple. I sometimes look over the entries in the Library book. You call on some one, and, perhaps, an exhibition is made of an acquaintance with the latest butterfly novel. You are somewhat dazed

and nonplussed, but your vanity is touched and you keep in the swim, it may be with a bevy of these beautiful humming birds, to the neglect of the strong mental pabulum of Hebrew and Greek roots and the strong meat of other Seminary dishes. But spoon victuals will not give you theological fibre. Flabby class-room work is the inevitable and sad consequence. The possibilities and opportunities of becoming a good and useful preacher are soon spoiled. In regard to these diversions and relaxing attractions, the aphorism, "drink deep or taste not," is not only out of place but reversed. By students in their theological course, such things are merely to be tasted, and even that may intoxicate some brains. But tasted they should be, and if any are so feather-like as to be blown away by such zephyrs, the sooner it happens the better. Let me commend to you a rule: Do your reading in the line of class-room labor. Religiously turn your back on all else; and even that reading should be judiciously chosen. As enforcing the practicability of gaining the most refined æsthetic culture by pursuing this course, it may be worth while to dwell on this point a little. . . . Such, then, is the Bible; such its poetry, its history, its philosophy, its religion, its anticipations of the greatest achievements of man. As a farther illustration of the estimation in which the Bible is held by men of genius, and in perfect keeping with our subject, we may refer to an incident taken from Halsey's *Literary Attractions of the Bible*, which is one of the most touching and beautiful to be found in modern biography. It is an incident in the last days of Sir Walter Scott.

"If there is any one among all the brilliant writers of this nineteenth century who may be said to have raised himself above his fellows by the force of literary genius, and to have won the very highest position in the world of letters, so as to be fairly entitled to a double chaplet of poesy and prose, it is that gifted son of the North, the author of *Marmion* and of *Waverley*, who held the world so long spell-bound while he was only known as the 'Great Unknown.'

"When he, thus crowned with honors at home, and with the laurel-wreath of a world-wide fame, was at last crowned with length of days, and confined to his bed by that sickness from which he never recovered; and whilst he lay there at Abbotsford in the bosom of his family, calmly awaiting the hour of death, then near at hand, on one occasion of partial relief, he requested a friend to read aloud for him. 'What book shall I read?' asked the friend. 'Why do you ask such a question?' said the dying man. 'There is but one; there can be but one now; bring me the Bible.'

“Verily, there is a time in every man’s life when the Bible is the only book, the last and only book for the peasant and the prince, for the dying child and the dying man of genius.” This book is not only your manual in death-bed scenes, but the book of your lives.

“Holy Bible, book divine,
Precious treasure, thou art mine.”

You can afford to be men of *one book*. Let it be the sun of your literary and scholarly heavens, around which all your acquisitions shall cluster and revolve. Then will your religion be a life indeed and ye shall be living epistles known and read of all men.

Would that this thought had been urged on my own attention when at your stage of life, as I would now urge it on yours.

3. In the case of Atalanta she yielded to the tempting of three golden apples and lost the race which she had undertaken. The misleading influences of social and literary attractions have been instanced, and now let me with emphasis mention as a third peril, *preaching* out of the seminary *in term time*. On this subject a very decided and wholesome change has come over the mind of our church, in the past year, in the way of correcting the irregularities on the part of candidates. As some of you may not have seen it, I make no apology for using in this connection two extracts from an argument by myself entitled *Premature Licensure*, published in the *Southern Presbyterian*, March 21, 1895, against a plan then pending before the presbyteries. The plan was overwhelmingly defeated, only thirteen out of seventy-four presbyteries giving a straight vote for it.

According to the scheme laid down on pp. 216 and 217 of the *Minutes* of the Southern General Assembly, 1894, col. b., there are two distinct curricula proposed, though not entirely different, for several subjects overlap: (1), One is the *Licentiate curriculum*, and (2), the other is the *Ordination curriculum*.

This is viewed by some as virtually instituting a new order of ministry. But the avowed idea is that, on this plan, a more thorough education or mastery of the ordination curriculum will be secured to the ordained preacher than on the present plan.

It is conceived that there is one feature of the proposed plan which is fatal to the realization of that cherished purpose, and that is the preaching of students during term time. This is confessedly a working feature of the plan, and is urged as a virtue of it. In the nature of the case, it may be confidently affirmed that it is not possible to

make such a combination as that a success. Let us glance at it. There is a solid and irreversible principle underlying the working possibilities of the student, and of all other workers, which is here violated. In every educational institution, the course of study is organized on the basis of the average ability of the students. Some may be able to do a little more and rise above it, others may fall below. But the average mental ability of a sound mind in a sound body, coupled with persevering diligence, is demanded for success.

Every man has, within any twenty-four hours of his life, a given quantum of nerve energy on which all his activity depends. Assume his bodily and mental state normal. This nerve energy may be used up by both mental and bodily effort. All study involves physical endurance; and if the organized exercises of the institution equal the average mental energy and physical endurance of the students, then both the student and his study must suffer by his taking on any serious additional labor. A possible extraordinary exception furnishes no criterion for our guidance. Hence it is a wise rule observed by some Faculties that when the labors have been apportioned to the students, no Professor can give additional work without the knowledge and approval of his colleagues, and if need be a re-apportionment.

How, then, can preaching or trying to preach, under such inauspicious conditions increase or improve, as is urged, the mastery of the divinity course, *i. e.*, the *ordination curriculum*, to be consigned to this experiment? Can these youths be expected to beat their oil for lighting the sanctuary with more facility than full-fledged preachers? Dr. B. M. Palmer in his Biography of Dr. Thornwell gives an incident which may serve as a side light on this vexed question. In speaking of their "experience" in sermonizing, Dr. Thornwell remarked to him:

"Take, for example, two days for a sermon, knowing that it must go up in that time, and you will concentrate your powers of thought, so as to complete the address before it is worn out."

There is a somewhat extravagant incident from the life of Robert Hall, the great Baptist orator of England, which may be placed alongside of this. When asked how many discourses a minister could get up in a week, it is related that he gave this answer: "If he is a deep thinker, one; if he is an ordinary average man, two; if he is an ass he will produce half a dozen."

This is enough to enforce the view that sermonizing in term time by students in the Seminary *must* seriously mar their scholarly acqui-

sitions. Instead of aiding it is more likely to emasculate class-room work. And to the extent that there is reasonableness in this criticism of the supposed excellence of the proposed scheme, it should "give pause" to such as may seriously think of its adoption.

These are certainly cogent reasons for apprehending that the proposed scheme of mixing active preaching with active Seminary work forebodes only evil, evil to the young men, evil to the Church, I mean especially the Presbyterian Church.

* * * * *

We need not suppose that it was affectation that induced the great Ambrose whose eloquent preaching was so serviceable in the conversion of the greater Augustine, to flee and hide himself when chosen bishop of Milan. Augustine was thirty-eight when he began to preach; Chrysostom was about the same age and Origen was 45. These three names are the most distinguished for influence on their own age and on subsequent ages among the church fathers of the first five centuries—the first as a philosophic theologian, the second as perhaps the most wonderful pulpit orator that has arisen in the Christian church, and the third for his unsurpassed though erratic genius and learning. Tertullian of the second and third centuries, like Chrysostom of the fourth and fifth, was a lawyer before he became a preacher, and Jerome was a mature man and scholar when ordained a presbyter.

No young man with the ministry in view can make a more serious mistake than to suppose that the sum total of the usefulness of his life as a minister is at all likely to be increased by hurrying into its active work before making the most thorough possible preparation for it. The few cases instanced, as occurring at the moment of writing, are sufficient and such as inculcate impressively this important lesson of holy reserve and conscientious self-control.

Indeed, the wonder is that there should not be a spontaneous demand that no licensure should be given, in this age, sooner than at the end of the three years' course, and that a fourth year should not be more in demand.

S. S. LAWS.

Columbia, S. C.

HOME MISSIONS IN OUR SEMINARIES.

It is a fact worthy of note and full of richest promise to the church that in most of our institutions for the education of the ministry special emphasis is now laid upon the subject of Home Missions. Three of

these institutions have formally adopted plans for a systematic course of some kind upon the subject. One of them provides for special lectures, followed by class-room work, on missions in general, by a professor who is admirably fitted for the duty. Another observes one entire day in each month, when all other work is suspended, as a day for conference and giving of information on the subject, alternate months being devoted to the foreign and home field; and a devoted professor in this institution, accompanied by several of his students, has during the past summer given a practical exemplification of the work by going out into the mountains to spend the summer vacation in carrying on evangelistic efforts. A third provides for a series of lectures, delivered by representative Home Mission workers from the several Synods which govern the institution, setting forth the history, condition, and needs of their fields, each delivering as many lectures as may be needed to cover the ground, these lectures being followed up with examination in the class-room by the professor of missions.

This movement, simultaneously made by our leading institutions, is most significant. It indicates an increasing interest in the work of the church in destitute and frontier fields. It emphasizes the fact that missions are missions, and are not to be discriminated, in general principle, or in their claim upon the attention and interest of the church, as home and foreign. It indicates that the great heart of the church is beating with healthy pulsations, and that the life of Christ is throbbing through all her body. It shows that the fact is realized that reliance must not be placed upon sentiment or uneducated impulse to carry on the work of Christ, but that the demands and conditions of the field must be studied with a view to intelligent consecration to the cause. It shows that the mind of the church has grasped the idea practically that the great strength of our church lies, at last, in the country districts, and that the careful cultivation of these will be not only doing the Lord's will but also strengthening the church. It is a reaching back to the fountains and seeking to make them clear and pure and abundant. And may we not add, that it will prove a corrective to a danger, or a tendency at least, which seems to exist in our church, or which some fear, that our coming ministry will become a "citified ministry," from the fact that all our seminaries are located in communities of ten thousand or more inhabitants?

Few who know the conditions of work in destitute regions will question the need for increased interest in that work and devotion to it. The movement towards the cities, the depletion of our country dis-

tricts, the increasing weakness of churches which were once strong and vigorous, the little hope of maintaining active and growing churches in such regions, discourage those who are ready for a field of labor.

There is little of inspiration in a scanty crowd in a school-house, or dilapidated church, perhaps of some other denomination, and in long and muddy roads, and in homes widely scattered, and in a life of separation from books and spent largely in the saddle, and in results apparently so meagre that one cannot see the work of the Lord prospering in one's hand, or have the privilege of announcing in the church papers large accessions. The support in such work, too, is rarely adequate to even a most economical, frugal living. And more serious than all, it has almost come to be the popular notion of the church that none but second or third rate men, men incompetent to work in better places, are found in these destitute and discouraging fields. It has become almost a stigma to be announced as a "Home Missionary." How false is this notion may be readily seen by the fact that it is from the ranks of this class that the larger number of the most efficient workers in the stronger churches have been drawn. No men are so well fitted to assume the charge of the most ambitious of our churches as those who have endured hardness, and learned wisdom and practiced patience and overcome difficulties in the Home Mission work. Yet, all the same, these discouragements and deterring causes do exist, so that it requires rare consecration on the part of our young men and great urgency in setting forth the needs of the field to induce them to think of this class of work. After the struggles and deprivations of their years of training, it is but natural that they should wish an adequate support, plenty of good books, and, perhaps, also the privilege of "leading about a wife." The spontaneous movement in our seminaries, then, may be justly regarded as a genuine revival, with its call to self-denial and increased consecration.

Another hopeful and happy feature of the present interest in these institutions is that the benefit will not be limited to our destitute fields and frontier work. Many young men who cannot give themselves to this department of work will take charge of well equipped and active churches. Having been themselves filled with increased interest in Home Missions, they will do far more to develop that interest among their people, and the result will be a quickening everywhere, with increased contributions, better support, more universal sympathy with the Home Mission workers, and a correct judgment that of all our

ministers none are grander, greater, better men, men more entitled to all the honor and rewards of the church, than those who have gone out into the highways and hedges to call men to the feast.

OUR BOOK OF PRAISE.

The appearance of a new hymnal, formally prepared and published by our sister church beyond the line, suggests the inquiry whether our own church is acting the part of wisdom with reference to her book of praise. To a plain observer, a practical man, it seems that our church is all at sea in this respect. While the denominations around us unify their people by the use of a common book, publish and sell such a book in sufficient quantities, because all use it, to be able to place it within the reach of all by reason of its low price, and even in most cases put money in their publishing houses' treasuries, we use everything and anything.¹ Beginning with a fairly good book of psalms and hymns, to which there was added subsequently a "supplement," which was the first step towards breaking our uniformity, a little later an adequate "tune book" was published. We next endorsed and put the church's *imprimatur* upon Dr. Robinson's series, published by the Century Company, of New York. A little later still, when a demand came for something better suited to its wants and purposes and means, the church, through its Assembly, appointed an *ad interim* committee, one minister from each Synod, to consider the question, and then ended the whole affair, with no full report from the committee, which never met, by placing its *imprimatur* upon still another collection, made by one of our own most successful pastors. Thus it stands now. One will sometimes find three several books in as many churches in the same city. Here are *Psalms and Hymns*, there are *Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs*, with differentiae of *Spiritual Songs for Social Worship, Laudes Domini, New Laudes Domini*, etc., yonder are *Hymns of the Ages*, while nearly as often, under the influence of cheapness and popularity, and with a spirit of irregularity fostered by the action of the church at large, will be found *Gospel Hymns, Select Songs, Combined 5 and 6*, with here and there, too frequently, a lot of stuff prepared and set adrift (for a consideration)

¹ We have heard it stated, and from a most reliable source, that the Southern Methodist Publishing House, which came out of the war bankrupt, was rehabilitated in a few years by the profits on its sale of the church's hymn-book.

by the "singer" of some strolling, irresponsible evangelist of the high pressure type and of any or of no denomination.

The dignity of our church, its uniformity in worship, its education of its young people, its formation of healthy religious associations, all demand that we adopt one or another of our present books and publish no other, directly or indirectly, or else that we follow the wise example of our own former days and the practice of our brethren about us by making and publishing a book of our own. That the latter is practicable may be seen from the fact that private enterprises of this kind have succeeded, and have put money into the compilers' pockets. That it is desirable may be seen from the fact that our present practice is educating us away from one another, so that we are losing the advantage which comes from uniformity of worship, the cultivation of kindred spiritual habits, the creation of similar religious associations. It used to be one of the sweetest pleasures which the stranger enjoyed to go to a church where all were unknown to him but where, once the hymn was started, he felt himself to be with friends, to be at home. Now he may be further from his old associations in the singing than in any part of the service. That it is to be demanded for dignity's sake, few will deny who have had inflicted upon them the doggerel of the popular collections and the villainous stuff which passes in these days for church music. We do not wonder that our friends of "Seceder" stock so persistently maintain the principle of using "God's own words" in worship, and so stoutly oppose those of "human composure." At our present rate of movement, it will not be long till very many of us will wish to get back to David's psalms, which are so dear to that good people that a mother among them once said that she was sure that Hannah must have raised the little Samuel on them. Alas! for the fact that these same psalm-singers are now in some quarters, even in their publishing house, we believe, adapting the Sankey and Bliss style of music to those venerable productions of the "sweet singer of Israel," and dinning into our ears God's precious word in the strains and refrains of "Sailor, pull for the shore," "Hold the fort," *et id omne genus*.

It is to be hoped that some movement will soon be made towards our church publishing her own book of praise, making it comprehensive and yet not too full, seeking the best possible literary and musical merit, preserving the old associations of certain hymns and tunes, and putting it forth at such reasonable price that all can afford to possess it. Such a course might be prejudicial to private enterprises, but it would in the end secure the greater good of the church at large.

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEYSCHLAG'S NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, OR HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS AND OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY, ACCORDING TO THE NEW TESTAMENT SOURCES. *By Dr. Willibald Beyschlag, Professor of Theology at Halle; Translated by Rev. Neil Buchanan.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Two Volumes. Pp. xxiii., 419, and xii., 517. Price, \$6.00.

In many respects this is a great treatise, and from some points of view it is a good work. Its author has been Professor of Theology at Halle since 1860, and he is now past seventy years of age, so that we have in this work the ripest results of a life-long study of this particular field. His *Das Leben Jesu*, in two volumes, published in 1885-'86, indicated great ability in arranging the materials, and in powerful delineation. In the volumes before us these qualities, and others to be presently noticed, come very prominently into view. The literary style at once arrests attention. With but few exceptions it is written in an exceedingly simple and lucid manner. To say this is to say much, for to the English reader the German style of writing is often obscure and involved. This treatise is a notable exception, and consequently any ordinary English scholar can read it with delight. It is proper to add in this connection that Mr. Buchanan, the translator, has done his work exceedingly well, and has preserved the life and movement of the original in an admirable manner. As we have not a copy of the German original by us as we write, it is not possible to institute careful comparisons between it and the translation, but we can testify to the attractive and evidently accurate manner in which the translation has been executed. The task of the translator in putting such a work as this into an English dress is by no means an easy one, and when well done it deserves to be commended.

A comparison of this treatise with the able work of Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Professor of Theology in Berlin, on the *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, also published in two volumes in 1879, and translated into English nine years later, would be an interesting and instructive undertaking. In some respects the two works resemble each other, but in others they are quite different. Both are partly exegetical and partly historical. In Weiss the historical is subordinate to the exegetical, while in Beyschlag the historical is made quite prominent. It may be added that Weiss is less destructive and less constructive than Beyschlag. By this we mean that he does not run counter of dogmatics nor make an effort to construct any system, while our author does much of the former and attempts something in the latter task. There is room, however, for both treatises; and while that of Weiss will always be a valued book of reference, we are inclined to think that Beyschlag's will be read more continuously. The introduction of the

historical element in larger measure gives movement to the presentation, which attracts and holds the reader.

As to the author's general *standpoint*, he might almost be described as a critical and dogmatic Ishmaelite. In other words, he can scarcely be said to belong to any distinct school of critics or theologians. He confesses that to a certain degree he follows his great teacher, Dr. C. J. Nitzsch, but he at the same time claims to write with entire freedom. He expects to excite equal displeasure alike with advanced criticism and traditional dogmatism. In regard to the former he admits that he regards the standpoint of historical criticism as the only one for scientific theology to occupy at the present day in dealing with the Scriptures, but he has no sympathy with that type of radical criticism which scouts the conservative position but puts nothing better in its place, and which seems more anxious to say something new than something tenable. In regard to traditional dogmatism he takes a stand which may be not inappropriately described as *dogmatic* opposition. In the *Preface* he says that the would-be orthodoxy of to-day is "like a somnambulist going with his eyes closed on the housetops of the century." And all through the treatise the "traditional," the "scholastic," the "dogmatic" theologian is often treated with scant civility. He thinks that the biblical method is richer and deeper, and more satisfying to the intellectual and religious life. There is no doubt some truth in this as against certain types of dogmatic theology, but the severe language of our author, and the indiscriminate manner in which his scoldings are administered, and, above all, the fact that he is often threshing a man of straw, and going out of his way to do it, considerably weakens his defence of a sound view of the value of biblical theology. If one were to mention Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* to our author, no doubt he would rank it among the traditional dogmatism which he denounces, while, in the judgment of any one who reads Calvin's great work with care, we are sure that the conviction will be fixed that the *Institutes* are distinctively biblical, while severely systematic.

In order fully to understand our author's *standpoint* it should be added that "he unreservedly renounces the inferences drawn from that antiquated theory of inspiration which has done more to encumber the Bible than to illumine it." (P. xx. What that particular doctrine which he renounces is, he does not inform us, nor does he define in what sense he regards the Bible to be inspired. From the free manner in which he deals with the Scriptures it is evident that his doctrine of inspiration is by no means definite, but to us quite inadequate. He makes little difference between the New Testament canonical books and the writings of the early Christian church, and about the only kind of inspiration he appears to hold is a subjective illumination of a high order.

We have been thus at some care to indicate the critical and dogmatic attitude of our author. Against radical criticism he does good service, but his attitude in regard to the Scriptures scarcely satisfies us. Against what he calls traditional dogmatism he is too severe and indiscriminate; and, in some cases, his weapons here used might be turned fatally against himself. In a general way our author may be said to belong to the *mediation school* in Germany, and yet he is too independent at times to escape being regarded as an Ishmaelite even in that school. But we proceed to give some account of the book itself. It is evident that we cannot go into details of any kind with nearly one thousand pages of compact and scholarly writing before us.

A brief outline of the plan of the treatise may be helpful at the outset. In the first volume, after an Introduction, which deals mainly with the *problem*, the *standpoint*, and the *method* of the work, the discussion is divided into three books. In the first, "The Teaching of Jesus according to the Synoptics" is set forth. In the second, "The Teaching of Jesus according to John" is unfolded. In the third, "The Views of the First Apostles" as found in the Acts of the Apostles are exhibited. In Book I. there are eight chapters, with the following titles: Introductory, The Kingdom of God, The Son of Man and the Son of God, The Heavenly Father and the World, The Way of Righteousness, The Messianic Salvation, The Church, and The Judgment of the World. In Book II. there are five chapters, as follows: Introductory, God and the World, The Testimony of Jesus to Himself, The Founding of Salvation, The Development of Eternal Life. In Book III. there are three parts. The first part deals with the First Apostles in four chapters: The Standpoint of the First Apostles, The Preaching of the Original Apostles, The Life of the Primitive Church, Further Developments. The second part treats of the Epistle of James in six chapters, as follows: Introductory, God and Man, The Salvation that is in Christ, Faith and Works, Justification, The Christian Life. In the third part the First Epistle of Peter is the theme in five chapters: Introductory, God the Father and the People of His Inheritance, The Person and Sufferings of Christ, The Pilgrim State and Walk of the Christian, The Preaching to the Dead, and The Judgment of the World. Let it be noted here that our author does not admit the canonicity of the Second Epistle of Peter.

In the second volume there are also three books. The first (Book IV.) deals with the Pauline System, the second (Book V.) treats of the Primitive Apostolic Method of Teaching, and the third (Book VI.) takes up the Common Christian and Post-Apostolic Modes of Teaching. In each of these the treatment is entirely complete and exhaustive, as the following headings will fully show. In Book IV., which treats of the Pauline System, the headings of the nine chapters are as follows: Introductory, Flesh and Spirit, Adam and Christ, God and the World, The Establishment of Salvation, The Way of Salvation, The Life in the Spirit, The Christian Church, The Consummation of the Kingdom. In Book V. there are three parts. In Part I., which deals with the Epistle to the Hebrews, the following are the titles of the five chapters: Introductory, The Covenant God and His Promises, The Son of God and Mediator of the New Covenant, The High Priesthood of Christ, Means and End of Salvation. Part II. treats of the Apocalypse, and has five chapters, as follows: Introductory, Heaven and Earth, The Lamb of God, The Community of the Saints, The History of the End. In Part III. there are six chapters, dealing with the following topics: Introductory, The Only-Begotten, God and the World, The Work of Salvation, Faith and Love, The Church and the Consummation. In Book VI. there are only three chapters, and they have for their consideration the following topics: The Synoptic Gospels, together with The Acts of the Apostles, The Epistle of Jude, The Second Epistle of Peter, The Pastoral Epistles. In each chapter there are several paragraphs.

We have been at some pains to set down this inventory of these two comprehensive volumes. Our main object in placing it before the eye of the reader in this formal way is to show how comprehensive and thorough the plan of our author is. To read such a treatise, even though one is often compelled to dissent from the views expressed, is a fine educational exercise. The *method*, we may add here,

seems to us in every way admirable, even though in many instances we would not agree with our author in the way he applies his method, and with the results which he obtains. We are inclined to think that this treatise presents as good a *method* of biblical theology as any work yet published. This causes us all the more to regret that our author had not made a better use of such an excellent method: a good example, so far as method is concerned, to some competent English-speaking scholar with sound doctrinal views to go over the ground substantially as our author has done, and to give us better exegetical and theological results.

In what we have further to say upon this work we shall be content to indicate our author's dogmatic position in regard to several important doctrines of the Christian system. In general it will appear that there is a decided departure from the evangelical Reformed faith at several crucial points, and there are not wanting indications that our author seeks to conform his exegesis of Scripture texts to his views quite as much, if not more, than the scholastic theologians with whom he has a standing feud.

In regard to the divinity, and specially to the pre-existence of Jesus Christ, he holds peculiar views. In the synoptic Gospels he says that there is no trace of pre-existence in the case of Jesus. In the fourth Gospel he admits that at the outset this idea comes in by reason of the pre-Christian Logos idea of the Alexandrian philosophy. In the Christology of Paul he admits that there are statements which imply pre-existence, but he makes frantic exegetical efforts to explain them away. Some of the texts which we have been accustomed to regard as very plain, he says are "remarkable and enigmatic." Others teach a sort of ideal pre-existence, where by reason of the influence of the Logos idea the distinction between ideal and real pre-existence has been lost. Still other texts are explained by "the general notice of a heavenly pre-existence, just as the Israelites regarded all their sacred things as originally pre-existing in heaven." As a sort of summary on page 78, Volume II., we have the following "remarkable and enigmatical" statement: "The apostle nowhere really establishes or teaches the pre-existence of Christ, but, specially in his earlier epistles, pre-supposes it as familiar to his readers and disputed by no one. It must, therefore, have been a notion which was not in the least strange even to the primitive apostolic Christians before Paul. But, on the other hand, it clearly added nothing essential to the simple Christology of the primitive apostles, so that not a trace of it can be found in the first three Gospels, in the speeches of the Acts, in the Epistle of James, or in 1 Peter."

In regard to the doctrine of the two natures in one person, he asserts that even Paul knew nothing about it. The Son of God on coming into the world assumed only the *sarx*, which was exchanged for the spiritual body at the resurrection. In short, the Christology of the apostle is anthropocentric, not theocentric.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews and in John's writings our author admits that a higher type of Christology appears, but he stubbornly refuses to admit that it is original or that it is to be regarded as carrying with it the idea of the two natures or the notion of proper pre-existence. Then the pre-Christian Logos is the scape-goat upon whose head the blame is laid, so as to have it borne away out of sight for ever. But the *scape-goat* method is scarcely sound exegesis, nor in harmony with the historical method which our author professes to constantly pursue. It need only be added in justice to our author that he does not in the least degree favor the kenotic doctrine in any form. But what his own doctrine is we can scarcely

gather. In John he finds the highest form of Christology, and it is thus expressed: "The eternal self-revelation of God became in Jesus an object of sensuous perception, so that the disciples could see it with their eyes and handle it with their hands." There is no "incarnation" and no "kenosis." (Vol. II., p. 425.) Again: "In Jesus of Nazareth there appeared personally the self-revelation and the self-communication of God; in him it entered into a human life; so that we may certainly speak of its God-like character, though we do not mean that a divine was added to a human or a human to a divine personality." There was "a real entrance of a divine life and being into humanity, and if Christ is not of us, a true member of our race, then what is his is not ours, but Godhead and humanity are separated by the same distance as before." (P. 426, Vol. II.) May we not properly call this monophysite socinianism in modern attire?

Another important doctrine where our author's views may be tested at a crucial point relates to the personality of the Holy Spirit. He terms the personality of the Holy Spirit "a vague traditional conception," and he rejects it at once. (P. 206, Vol. II.) "The Spirit of God is God himself in his living presence in the world, in his holy self-communication to men, which everywhere wards off the assaults of sin." (P. 205, Vol. II.) "The Holy Spirit is the power of holy love with which God in Christ lays hold of the human heart." (P. 205, Vol. II.) Our author adds, by way of explaining the mode in which the Spirit comes to be spoken of as personal by Paul, "Our apostle has, indeed, poetically or rhetorically personified the Holy Spirit now and then, just as he has personified the flesh, sin and death." (P. 207, Vol. II.) But no more is needed to exhibit the views of our author, and we need do no more than add, that with his doctrine in regard to Christ and the Holy Spirit before us we can justly charge him with destroying the doctrine of the Trinity. At best there remains to us a sort of modal, temporal Trinity, while uni-personality is always asserted of the Godhead.

Another cardinal doctrine to be considered in the light of our author's teaching is that of the atoning death of Jesus Christ. At this point we regret to say that we find the views of our author sadly defective; and, what is, perhaps, worse, they are supported by such perverted exegesis of texts as to cause one to grow quite impatient with the efforts. All along the painful conviction is forced on our minds that he is among the dogmatists after all, and has brought his preconceived views to the Scripture, and then tried to make the Scripture fit the doctrine.

The vicarious nature of the satisfaction which Christ made is repudiated, and the sacrificial nature of his death is not admitted. There is no strict atonement, and, of course, no imputation, so that justification is in a vague way pardon and restoration in Christ. By faith grace is received, rather than Christ accepted. In a word, the whole of what may be called *objective* soteriology is repudiated, and we are left with only a sort of subjective aspect of the work. But upon all this we cannot now dwell. We simply point out the radical defect here.

Serious fault must also be found with much of the eschatology of our author. There shall be no real bodily resurrection: "The Holy Spirit is the divine principle of the life of believers, the living centre of their personality, and when this principle reaches its full development it finds its expression in a body which corresponds to the perfect inner life, and this is called *the spiritual body*." (P. 268, Vol. II.) Thus there is no resurrection save for the just. (P. 268, Vol. II.) Second probation and final restorationism are both found in Paul's teaching. A passage

like, "In the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, even of things under the earth," is taken "to pre-suppose a preaching of the gospel to those formerly dead." (P. 276, Vol. II.) This curious statement meets us on page 275: "If the apostle has nowhere expressed the possibility of conversion, and, therefore, of salvation after death, it is undeniably pre-supposed in his doctrinal system." We ask, How? Where? This passage indicates restorationism. "He (Paul) has rather taught a final redemption and deliverance of all." (P. 278, Vol. II.) Hence universalism is the final outcome of the consummation. But this must suffice to show the drift of the doctrine of our author here.

There are many other things we would like to say in reference to the doctrines which this scholarly work sets forth. It would be interesting to notice the views of our author in regard to predestination which are anti-Calvinistic, in regard to the monistic philosophy which underlies his doctrine, in regard to the views set forth in reference to the import of baptism and the Lord's supper, in regard to the church and the kingdom, and in regard to the second advent and the judgment, but we must not enlarge.

It would also be an interesting thing to point out how studiously the miraculous elements are avoided. In the Gospel narratives, and in the Acts, it is simply amazing how little is said in a work so exhaustive as this in regard to the miracle. The explanation is to be found in part in the way in which the supernatural factor is excluded or minimized all through the narrative. The views taken of inspiration, already referred to, harmonize with this attitude in reference to the supernatural. It is a source of deep regret that such an able treatise should so fail us at this important point. There is so much that we like about the author's method and style that our regret is all the greater on this account.

In concluding this review we make a brief estimate of this work along some other lines, which may help its readers to a comprehensive view of the whole:

1, Critically, a good deal can be said in its favor, for our author takes firm ground against radical views and methods. This is a good sign for Germany, and is instructive for us. While at not a few points, as in regard to the synoptic problem, the Second Epistle of Peter, and the authorship of Hebrews, his views may be questioned, yet in regard to the Fourth Gospel, and the Pauline Epistles and the Apocalypse he deserves praise for his work and conclusions.

2, Exegetically, the work shows great ability. When his hands are not tied by the bonds of doctrinal prepossessions his exegetical work is of a high order, but when he wishes to explain away some traditional doctrine of the dogmatic theologian his very ability becomes a snare, and leads to most ingenious explanations of texts and facts. This is one of the features of the work which we are inclined to think most careful readers will be sure to notice. An anti-dogmatic bias may be quite as hurtful to the exegete as the dogmatic of which our author has so many hard things to say. The one extreme is quite as objectionable as the other. The centre of gravity and the emphasis should always be carefully regarded by the exegete.

3, Historically, the method of the work is a good one. To follow out the development of the various doctrines in the Scriptures from the proper standpoint in regard to their nature is a fruitful source of sound conclusions. In every case the nature of the Scriptures must be kept in mind as this method is pursued.

Save for the free way in which our author deals with the Scriptures we have much to say in praise of his general method.

4, Doctrinally, the conclusions as we have seen are not in harmony with the consensus of the Reformed creeds. The author concedes this, which does not help the case. For us, therefore, the doctrinal result is of little value at many cardinal points. Its chief benefit here is to put us on the defensive of our own doctrines, and for this purpose the treatise is worthy of careful study. Such a book from a sound, doctrinal basis would be invaluable.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

BRIGGS' THE MESSIAH OF THE APOSTLES.

THE MESSIAH OF THE APOSTLES. *By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Crown 8vo, pp. xv., 562. \$3.00.

In 1886 Professor Briggs published a volume on *Messianic Prophecy*; this was followed by *The Messiah of the Gospels*, appearing in 1894. Our present volume forms the third in the series, in the preface to which we have the promise of two additional volumes, to be entitled *The Messiah of the Church* and *The Messiah of the Theologians*.

The series evidently contemplates a thorough, systematic and exhaustive discussion of the development of the "Messianic Idea" from its germs in earliest prophecy down to the modern phases it assumes in the synthesis of philosophic theology of latest times. There is something inspiring in the scope of this scheme. We confess a keen curiosity as to the contents of the two volumes yet to appear; what contrasts they will present to the biblical conception treated in the preceding volumes, and what may be revealed as the difference between *The Messiah of the Church* and *The Messiah of the Theologians*; the very titles are suggestive and prophetic of much that may prove very interesting reading.

In his preface to the volume now under consideration the author says:

"No one who has studied through the literature of Christology can do other than say that the researches of recent scholars have put the whole subject in such new lights that the writings of the older scholars have become, for the most part, antiquated. There are doubtless many still living who are unwilling to accept any theological opinions which have not been stamped with the approval of the antiquarians. For such the author does not write. The readers he desires are the open-minded and truth-loving, who would see the Christ as the apostles saw him, and who will not be restrained from the heavenly vision by the pretended perils of the Higher Criticism and of Biblical Theology, or by the supposed safer paths of traditional and ecclesiastical theology. . . . The Christ of the New Testament appears in fresh lines of grace, beauty and grandeur with every fresh glance at him. The author has done his best to turn away from the Christ of the theologians and of the creeds and of the church, and to see the Messiah as he appeared to each writer in each separate writing. The diversity is great. It is not always possible to combine the diverse representations in a higher unity. It would have been easy to construct what some call a logical system. But it would not have been possible to constrain all the material into such a system of deductive logic. Such a method involves the sacrifice of material which is essential to the portraiture of the Messiah. . . . The summary statement in the concluding chapter gives the Christology of the apostles in quite different proportions to those familiar in the dogmatic systems. But these proportions are the proportions of the truth and facts of the apostolic writings. If I were writing the Christology of the church, or the Christology of the dogmatic system, other proportions would doubtless appear."

Dr. Briggs was too manifestly serious in penning those lines to create any suspicion of fun, but he would have been perfectly excusable if his eye had twinkled the least bit as he wrote, "There are doubtless many *still living* who are unwilling to accept any theological opinions which have not been stamped with the approval of the *antiquarians*"; the italicized words are very amusing to us. The alignment of the Higher Critics in the next sentence will prove pleasing to the altitudinous.

Whether the author has attained to that "heavenly vision" to which he aspired may possibly be a question in the minds of some of his readers; there will be less doubt perhaps of his measurable success in the effort "to turn away from the Christ of the theologians and of the creeds and of the church."

The chief thing of note in the book is that Dr. Briggs has reversed his judgment as to the composition of the Apocalypse. In 1888 he published in the *Presbyterian Review* a brief, but very able article, attacking the theory of the composite character of the Apocalypse; he now accepts heartily this theory, and a large portion of his work is the ingenious re-assortment and re-arrangement of the document as it has passed through the four different editions of it before reaching its final form. He does not in this volume vindicate his change of view, he simply announces it and proceeds to the re-arrangement of the Apocalypse in accord therewith.

In conclusion we feel constrained to say that the method pursued in this study does not commend itself to our experience of it; "the effort to see the Messiah as he appeared to each writer in each separate writing" seems to have some manifest advantages, but the general effect is not the best. It is something like trying to form an idea of the appearance of a man of forty-five years of age by examining the pictures of him taken in infancy, in childhood, in youth, and then upon reaching his majority, and combining the series by an effort of the imagination into one portrait; the series would be an interesting study of the man's gradual growth and development, but we would have a far more satisfactory impression of the developed man by seeing *one* picture of him *after he had developed*. Just so, speaking for one's self only, the impression made by this study of the Messiah is a confused fragmentary one; we put forth this judgment with diffidence; let each reader decide for himself, but comparing the presentation of Christ made by this specimen of Biblical theology with that offered by systematic theology, notwithstanding the danger of being ruled out of "the open-minded and truth-loving" class, we are compelled to record our verdict in the language of our Master: "No man also having drunk the old straightway desireth the new; for he saith, THE OLD IS BETTER."

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C.

BALFOUR'S FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF; being Notes introductory to the Study of Theology. *By the Right Honorable Arthur James Balfour, author of A Philosophic Defence of Doubt, etc.* New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1895. 12mo, pp. 366.

This is an able book by a busy British statesman, who for five or six years was Secretary of State for Ireland under the recent Liberal ministry in Great Britain. But its interest does not rest merely upon this fact, for it is a book marked by considerable freshness and power. One wonders how the author, amid all the

duties of his office, and while wrestling with Irish Home Rule, was able to get time and quiet to produce a volume having many features of philosophical importance.

To a certain extent it follows up a previous work of the author's entitled *A Philosophic Defence of Doubt*, although it deals with certain phases of belief in relation to religion. The sub-title of the work indicates that the author intends it to serve as an introduction to the study of theology. How far it will properly serve such a purpose it is very difficult to say, for it is not easy to decide whether the book is written for or against the theology of supernatural religion. Whilst naturalism is severely criticized it can hardly be said that supernaturalism is vindicated. In some respects the agnostic positions are indirectly favored, although it would, perhaps, scarcely be fair to place our author among the agnostics.

The book consists of four parts. The first deals with "Some Consequences of Belief," the second with "Some Reasons for Belief," the third with "Some Causes of Belief," and the fourth makes "Some Suggestions Towards a Provisional Philosophy." The fourth part is the most important.

The order in which the topics are treated at once strikes the reader as peculiar. To deal first with the *consequences* of belief seems a little strange, to say the least. Our author seems to acknowledge this peculiarity, and to confess that his choice of this order was intentional. He hopes thereby to secure the interest and attention of the reader more fully. This, of course, is a worthy ambition on his part, but it may be seriously doubted whether he has not succeeded in puzzling the reader rather than instructing him in the first half of his treatise.

In the first part, in which some consequences of belief are sketched, naturalism in three respects is considered. The scheme known as naturalism in this book has been, the author says, also described as agnosticism, positivism and empiricism. As a system of thought its main position is that we know phenomena, and the laws which connect them, but we know nothing more. This system is treated of first in the sphere of ethics, secondly in the realm of æsthetic, and thirdly in the field of reason. In each case naturalism is inadequate as a true philosophy. Its chief defect is that it supplies no fixed factor in morals, in the matter of beauty, or in philosophy. But while the author points out with great acuteness the inherent defects of what he calls naturalism it can scarcely be said he does much to justify the opposite scheme. Indeed, he seems to be so cautious in committing himself to any conclusions that one almost catches the spirit of "philosophical doubt" while reading it. Perhaps this excessive caution in the realm of philosophy is, in the case of our author, the unconscious consequence of his life as a statesman, especially while dealing with the knotty subject of Home Rule for Ireland. All through a certain vagueness appears in the discussion, arising in part, at least, from the fact that the term *belief* is not defined. We are left to gather, as best we can, our author's meaning from his somewhat unsteady use of the term.

In the second part of the book, where "Some Reasons for Belief" are given, the philosophic basis of naturalism is first shown to be defective, and then the system of idealism is shown to be but little better. Then the author deals with philosophy and rationalism, and with rationalistic orthodoxy. All through this part of the treatise the reader is puzzled more and more to catch the precise

drift of the author's teaching. Sometimes he is dealing hard blows to the naturalistic scheme, and again he is reading a serious lecture to the traditional theologian. Sometimes the belief of the one seems to be spoken of, and, again, the belief of the other seems to be before our author. In short, our author would have greatly aided the reader if he had told us whose belief he was constantly dealing with.

Then in the third part "Some Causes of Belief" are considered. Two main topics are here considered under the headings "Causes of Experience" and "Authority and Reason." Here, again, we wish that our author had favored us with some explanation of the sense in which he uses the terms "experience," and "authority." The origin of experience he finds partly in reason and partly in authority. Indeed, he gives authority a large place in the process. But he uses the term authority in a wide sense, and coins in this connection a peculiar phrase to denote in a happy way his meaning here. That phrase is "psychological climate," and by it in a measure what others term environment is denoted. Now our author finds the origin of experience, and so of our beliefs, largely in the "psychological climate," in which we may be placed, and at times he seems to be almost back on the ground of the naturalism which he had already repudiated.

In the fourth part of the treatise where "Suggestions Towards a Provisional Philosophy" are made, six topics are briefly discussed. First, "The Ground-work"; secondly, "Beliefs and Formulas"; thirdly, "Beliefs, Formulas and Realities"; fourthly, "Ultimate Scientific Ideas"; fifthly, "Science and Theology"; and sixthly, "Suggestions Towards a Provisional Unification." These topics are set forth in rather an abstract way, yet with philosophical ability, and a good deal of wit appears in the whole discussion. Space forbids any full exhibition of the contents of this the most important part of the book, for it is here that the author's positive views, so far as he expresses any such views, are set forth.

He points out that our beliefs may be considered from three aspects. They may be considered from the view-point of their practical necessity, of their philosophical proof, and of their scientific origin. He also makes some ingenious remarks to show why men more easily abandon a scientific belief of any sort than a religious belief, and that the abandonment of the former may not affect conduct while the latter will surely do so. Then our author, on the one hand, severely criticises Herbert Spencer, and on the other he scolds the traditional theologians heartily. All the while he is practically hiding his own views, at least from open inspection, which is scarcely fair.

Our author concludes with the brief statement of four broad principles which he says emerge from his discussions. First, any system of knowledge which we may be able to construct must suffer from obscurities, defects of proof, and from incoherencies. Secondly, No unification of belief of the slightest theoretical value can take place on a purely scientific basis, that is, by an induction from particular experiences. Thirdly, No theory of knowledge can be satisfactory which does not find room within it for the fact that so far as empirical science can tell us anything about matter, most of the proximate causes of belief, and all its ultimate causes are non-rational in their character. Fourthly, No unification of beliefs can be practically adequate which does not include ethical beliefs as well as scientific ones. He adds that to enforce, illustrate, and apply these principles is the main object of his book, and in this way he hopes to establish the interdependence of the great religious, ethical, and scientific truths to which our beliefs relate.

To make a general estimate of the ultimate value of the book is to our mind not easy. It is written in an easy, ready style, and yet it is so cautious and marked by so many qualifications that we confess great difficulty to discover its precise import. At times his subtle exposure of what he calls naturalism inspires one with high hopes as to the goal to which our author will lead us. Then, again, when he seems to intimate, indirectly at least, that, perhaps, no other system is very much more complete, we grow fearful lest we are to be led into the cold shades of agnosticism. In brief, while apparently this book is a critique upon naturalism on the one hand, on the other we shall not be surprised to discover, perhaps, years hence, that it proves to be one of the most acute and dangerous books that has been recently written in the interests of skepticism in its agnostic phases. This is a present fear of ours; we hope that it may be proved groundless. In any case the book is stronger in its destructive than in its constructive parts, and to our thinking affords no adequate introduction to the study of theology.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

MAGGREGOR'S HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT APOLOGETICS.

HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT APOLOGETICS. *By James Maggregor, D. D., Sometime Professor of Systematic Theology in the New College, Edinburgh; Author of the Apology of the Christian Religion; The Revelation and the Record; Bible Class Books on Galatians and Exodus, etc., etc.* Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. New York: 1894. 8vo, pp viii. 370. \$3.00.

This able book is really much more than it purports to be. It contains real apologetics of no meagre or mean sort. Possibly, from the very nature of the subject, this could not be avoided, and possibly, also, it was to be expected. For by blood the author is a Scotchman ("my name is Maggregor"), and by appointment he was "sometime Professor of Systematic Theology." His belligerency, therefore, comes "both by nature and by practice." He cannot witness a fray without taking a hand in it. All this, while palpably outside the scope of the book, really adds to its absorbing interest. Among its finest paragraphs are those in which, anent the swine miracle and believing Christ while not believing on him, the "weapons of precision" are wrenched from Prof. Huxley's hands and turned against him with telling, murderous effect. In hand-to-hand encounters of this kind the author is at his best.

The volume under review concludes a series of three, the other two being *Apology of the Christian Religion* and *The Revelation and the Record*. Each is complete in itself and independent of the others, but all treat in an exhaustive way different periods or phases of the same general subject. The author has entered and possessed a field hitherto but partially occupied so far as treatises with this distinctive end in view are concerned. He has done his work in a thorough and scholarly manner; to the immediate task is brought a wealth of knowledge of the Bible, sacred history, and contemporary literature in higher criticism and agnostic speculation that is simply marvellous, while wherever he touches the controverted fundamentals of Scriptural faith, he is conservative and sound to the core. Not only the history of apologetics, but apologetics also, at least in outline, are brought up to date in a manner eminently satisfactory to those who believe with the author in uncompromising defence of Christianity as embodied in the orthodox views.

Except in dates and certain minutiae about which the best authorities differ, we find but one defect in the book. There is a lack of perspicuous, clear-cut directness in the style; while relieved frequently by intervals of perfect lucidity, and even by flights of thrilling eloquence, in the main, it is rather tedious. Dashes, with breaks in the sense, and multitudes of long parenthetical clauses and sentences, make one sigh over "hope deferred," and then go back to get the connection. A sensation is felt (if the similitude may be pardoned) like that of riding a slow horse that switches and bites at every fly that buzzes about him. This applies, however, almost exclusively to the first part of the book. Later, there is either an improvement or an adjustment to the reader, that makes the objectionable feature to almost entirely disappear. We shall make no attempt at an exhaustive review of this admirable work, but content ourselves with an outline, throwing in special emphasis here and there. It covers the period from Christ to the present, and is divided into two books of two chapters each, besides appendices, notes, and a copious index.

The first book is occupied with New Testament apologetics proper. Under the head of the *Ministry of Christ* are discussed his introduction to apology (Luke xii.) and his apologetic practice, including appeal to the Old Testament, to miracle, and his personal testimony. The treatment of Christ's relation to the Old Testament and the use he made of it, is especially valuable. He argues powerfully to the effect that belief in the Old Testament involves logically belief in the New, and that any kind of true belief in Christ as the divine Saviour invalidates many of the conclusions of Higher Criticism in regard to the different books of the Old Testament.

There is nothing original, of course, in such an attempt, but there is much freshness in the arguments and the method of them. Then the *Apostolic Ministry* is reviewed with reference to the evidential value of the resurrection of Christ, and along with the fact of definite belief in miracle at and before A. D. 60. This chapter closes with the apologetics of the Petro-Pauline practice, embracing appeal to the Old Testament, to apostolic miracle, and to personal knowledge and experience. A hand, evidently a master's, grasps even details with a vigor that is practically irresistible to the honest seeker for truth. This feeling is intensified by the consideration that the basal facts are from sources acknowledged as trustworthy by such hostile critics as leaders of the Tübingen school, and even Renan himself.

The second book handles the *two post-apostolic periods of apologetics*. The section on the apologetic survey of the heathen world is especially entertaining, probably the most so in the book. The student of limited or superficial reading usually gets the idea that devilish hatred of truth and holiness is alone responsible for the imperial persecutions of the early Christian era. This book sets forth the rational causes, we think, with a thoroughness superior to Uhlhorn in his *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, which is saying much. Christianity, in its nature, was opposed to the very genius of imperialism. While other religions were exclusive, and even selfish, this one was possessed of an irrepressible propagandism. While others were tolerant outside of their native districts, this one aimed at world-wide dominion and stigmatized falsehood everywhere. The chapter closes with an extended notice of the apologists of that early day and a general survey of the period.

The last section is a history of apologetics from the close of the sixteenth century down to the present. In reading these pages one is impressed anew with the fact that objections claiming to be new are brought against Christianity to-day which were conclusively answered over and over again more than a thousand years ago. And yet from age to age the storm-centre has shifted. Early Christians defended the character of their religion, laboring to show that it subserved personal uprightness and obedience to constituted laws. Later the well-known rational arguments for the existence of a God were formulated. During the time of the Reformation the Bible was appealed to in defence of justification by faith against the papal errors and abuses developed in the Dark Ages. And now the flaming centre of conflict is the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the Bible, especially the Old Testament. Much on the last subject is contained in the notes, and frequent reference made to *Moses and his Recent Critics*, a book which every one craving a knowledge of the status of Old Testament criticism should possess and study. We have risen from the present volume feeling benefitted, and most heartily recommend it to those desiring weapons with which to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

D. N. McLAUGHLIN.

Chester, S. C.

FAIRBAIRN'S RELIGION IN HISTORY, ETC.

RELIGION IN HISTORY AND IN MODERN LIFE. Together with an Essay on the Church and the Working Classes. *By A. M. Fairbairn, D. D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.* New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company. 1894. \$1.50.

One of the most common vices in discussion is assumption, the tendency to take for granted certain positions, statements, opinions, and the like, because confidently alleged and generally believed, without due examination into the grounds for such assertion or belief. Among other instances may be mentioned: The Decline of the Pulpit, The Non-attendance of Young Men upon Church, The Failure of the Church to Reach the Masses, The Indifference of Men (as distinguished from women) to the Church.

Discussion of these topics has become periodic; we have begun to expect a regular renewal at certain stated intervals. Unfortunately, with a large class of minds simple iteration is influential, and hence comes it to pass that a great many statements are quietly accepted solely because clamorously repeated. On this account, when an author undertakes to explain and counteract the alienation of the people (*i. e.*, the masses) from religion, our first impulse is to inquire into the assumption. Are the masses alienated? Are the common people, those in the humbler walks of life, less religious than those who are above them in wealth and the social scale? We shall not be prepared to admit the allegation until more convincing evidence than has yet been forthcoming shall have been offered.

And, first, it ought to be recognized that religion is broader than any church, indeed, than all churches. It is not inconceivable that a man may fail to find any church that commands his adherence as a just and satisfactory exponent of his ideas of religion, and hence may remain aloof from every church without being irreligious. Such a position we would by no means approve as wise under any

circumstances, or even consistent, but at the same time such a position is at least possible.

Again, a man may absent himself from church from purely practical and personal considerations. His situation in life may be such that no accessible church offers a congenial atmosphere; he may have no choice between the condescending charity of the mission and the rather rarefied air of the wealthy and fashionable congregations, both alike and equally repellent to the self-sustaining, self-respecting man of smallest means.

Moreover, when a man works hard the week through, early and late from Monday morning until Saturday night, the Sabbath offers the only day for rest, recreation, and society with the home circle. It is not strange that a family, that has been—all of them that are old enough to work—on the drive the whole week, should prefer to spend the entire Sabbath quietly resting together at home or walking in some convenient park rather than in attendance upon services in some church. It is easy for those who are of the comparatively leisure class, and to a certain extent can control their hours, to condemn this, but many of them would not do differently were they in the same situation; and all must admit that, however wrong, it is at least eminently natural.

On the whole, we are by no means sure that the masses are any more alienated from religion than those more fortunate in worldly position; the latter certainly have more opportunity to attend and less inducement to neglect religious services; gilded godlessness is doubtless just as offensive to God as that of coarser external.

So much for the general question; as to this particular presentation of it, we incline to the opinion that Professor Fairbairn's portraiture and analysis are more accordant with the situation in Great Britain than in this country. The same causes, the same traditions, the same prejudices, do not operate. The whole constitution of society, the character of politics, the position of the church in its relation to the state and to society, its identification with the peculiar institutions of a country controlled by privileged classes deriving their privileges from the accident of birth; all this renders much of his discussion, particularly in details, inapplicable here. This, from the very nature of the case, is inevitable, and it does not detract in the least from the merit of the work to assert it.

The discussion is discriminating, able, and interesting; we have read the book with great pleasure and profit. The style is unusually fine, always vigorous, and frequently rising with the fervor of oratory. Judging solely from our own impressions of the book we would say that it would amply repay a perusal.

Columbia, S. C.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

VANCE'S CHURCH PORTALS.

CHURCH PORTALS. *By James I. Vance, D. D., author of The Young Man Foursquare, and pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1895. Price, 75 cents. Pages 145.

It goes without saying that this handsome little book so neatly printed on extra good paper, and so substantially bound in beveled boards is a good book. Both author and publishers are unquestionable guarantees of this fact. The author has already proved himself to be a "young man foursquare," and his name

is the only pledge we want to assure us that the work with which it stands connected has been well done.

It only needs that I note the contents of this volume, and hint briefly at some of its excellencies. It contains eight chapters with the following headings: Chapter I. Honest Doubts—Test! Chapter II. The Doors of the Church—Come! Chapter III. The Doors for the Church—Go! Chapter IV. Within Church Doors—Love! Chapter V. The Great Proof—Work! Chapter VI. The Sacrament of Birth—Cleanse! Chapter VII. The Sacrament of Growth—Remember! Chapter VIII. Under the Church Dome—Co-operate! Standing without the portals, one might doubt whether all these topics are covered by the title of the book; but once within the portals, he does not care whether they are, or not; they are all essential to the author's plan, and are linked together sufficiently closely to give unity to the whole. The first four chapters adhere more closely than the last four; and their contents are admirably summarized on page 82: "First, What brings me to the door of Christ's church? Second, What makes me a member of Christ's church? Third, What am I to do as a member of Christ's church? Fourth, What am I to be as a member of Christ's church? Faith in a personal Saviour brings me to the door; the profession of that faith makes me a member; my whole mission is to go; my whole duty is to love." There is such symmetrical development and rounded completeness in these four chapters that one almost wishes the book had ended here; and yet it would not have been so valuable a book, nor answered its purpose so adequately without the succeeding chapters.

The fifth chapter is an answer to the question, "how may one assure himself, and certify to the world that he is a member of the invisible as well as the visible church?" This question had really been answered, and finely answered, in the preceding chapter where it was so strongly insisted that love must prove its genuineness by keeping Christ's commandments. No one, however, will object to this further answer, but on the other hand would be glad to have an additional chapter with yet another answer.

The two sacraments are treated in the next two chapters. How to discuss baptism and avoid hackneyed arguments is a problem that few could solve. Dr. Vance has solved it, by starting with the proposition that "baptism is primarily and fundamentally the church rite for infants, and for adults only because they have failed to receive the rite in their infancy." He stakes the whole issue on the continuity of the church, and the membership of infants. His ground is well taken and well maintained in a few brief, but exceedingly lucid interpretations of Scripture teaching. Circumcision signified three things: First, church membership; second, purity of heart; third, a seal of the covenant of grace. Baptism signifies three things: church membership, purity of heart and a seal of the covenant of grace. The former was a rite ordained for children; *ergo* the latter is also a rite ordained for children unless the contrary can be shown. The contrary cannot be shown, but strong inferential arguments support the conclusion reached.

The chapter on the "Sacrament of Growth" is a fine specimen of the author's skill at word-painting. It is a good companion piece to Leonardo da Vinci's "Last Supper," and seems to be in part an exposition of that famous painting. Very vividly the sacred scene in the "upper room" is brought before the mind's eye, each figure distinctly defined, and the tenderly solemn significance of the

sacramental meal is clearly and strongly set forth. The prime value of this chapter is its vindication of the simplicity of this sacrament against all mysticism in its meaning, and pageantry in its administration.

The last chapter defines the right attitude of Christian to brother Christian, and denomination to sister denomination. The attitude should be that of cooperation, not competition; a striving together, not a striving against.

The conspicuous merits of this book, *me judice*, are,

1. It is intensely practical in its aim. The author thus expresses his aim in the introduction: "This book is the product of experience. It is the result of efforts to meet the practical difficulties of real people. The questions discussed are those of continual recurrence in church life. They meet every pastor; they suggest themselves to all who seriously contemplate church membership; they are of vital interest to all earnest churchmen." Dr. Vance sticks closely to this earnest practical purpose, and avoids the discussion of all profound subtleties of doctrine that have indeed a show of wisdom, but minister nothing to the edification of the reader. He stretches forth a friendly hand to the thoughtful soul to lead it by the straightest, plainest way into God's earthly kingdom of grace and through that to God's heavenly kingdom of glory.

2. It makes its appeal to the minimum of faith. It brings a message to the feeblest child in God's family, and, therefore, a message to the whole family. The friendly hand is extended to the faith which is so dim of sight that it has not yet found its way to the door of the church. He does a great service to the maturest saint who makes clear the initial stages of the Christian life. No one ever knows so well that he does not wish to know better just how Christ is to be accepted and the first steps taken. It is pleasing to know how great a faith God's grace can develop; but it is more pleasing to know how small a faith God's grace can accept.

3. It exalts to view the maximum of mercy. The helpful hand leads Little Faith to a wide door that moves easily on its hinges. It is taken for granted that the "strait gate," of which Jesus speaks, does not stand at the entrance to the Christian church. Our author hears Isaiah saying, "Thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles," and he understands the prophet to mean that "God intended it should not be hard to gain entrance to the church during the gospel age. It is our good fortune to live in the day which the prophet saw, and to be blessed with the ministry of that church whose doors are 'whosoever,' opening inward to the kingdom of heaven, and swinging free and large to the prayers of all men." One gets the impression that Dr. Vance fairly revels in the privilege of proclaiming a gospel that reveals "a wideness in God's mercy like the wideness of the sea." There is much in the Bible to encourage the belief that God did not construct his church with a view to keeping sinners out. Christ might easily be understood as countenancing the contrary view when he said, "The kingdom of heaven is like a net which was cast into the sea and gathered of every kind." A net is a fish-catching machine with a very inviting opening, a very accessible interior. The master of the feast seemed almost reckless when he bade his servants to go out and compel them to come in. His object seemed to be to fill his house at all hazards. One could find much in the language of Jesus to justify the conviction that he was not nearly so much concerned about the purity

of his church as about the saving of sinners. I take the liberty, therefore, of setting it down as one of the excellencies of this little book, that it sets the door of the church wide ajar.

4. It points all who cross the broad threshold of the church to other doors, and rings in their ears with startling distinctness the command of God bidding them not to pause till they enter these. Here is the author's conservative position. Turning his face to those without he utters the invitation, "Come," with all the sweet persuasiveness of a most gracious gospel; then turning his face to those within, he utters the command, "Go," with all the authority of an unyielding law. I know of no more pungent and convincing plea for world-wide evangelization than is contained in chapter iii. Take this sample: "Here is the church, and yonder is the heathen world. Here is the force, and yonder is the field. Here is the ability, and yonder is the need. Here the command is sounding, and yonder is the open door. Here God's word says, 'Go,' and yonder God's providence says, 'the way is clear.'" The argument of the chapter is to the effect that the faith which does not respond to duty so clear and urgent is not little faith, but dead faith.

5. Its style is transparent and glowing, light suffused with heat. Presumably the book was preached before it was published. It ought to have been, and should be, preached after being published. Every chapter is a gem of a sermon, a happy blending of exposition, argument, and persuasion. The sentences are formed for the ear, rather than the eye, and are marshalled in such fine rhetorical order that while they please the fancy, they sweep down with cumulative power on the heart.

6. It is marked by strong individuality. The themes are old. Put into the terms ordinarily used in discussing them, the headings of the chapters would read something after this fashion: Doubts, their Cause and Cure; Tests of Church Membership; Obligation of Missions; Love, the Crowning Grace; Worthlessness of a Dead Faith. Who would read a book with such chapter-headings? You would know at once that the author was threshing over old straw, and using the very same old flail that has done service through the years.

The same individuality that is manifest in the title and in the chapter-headings is manifest on every page. The matter is old, but the man is new, and under his manipulation the matter has all the freshness and interest of novelty. There is not a rut in the book. Its tone is healthful and hopeful, healthful because hopeful. There is not a sentence from beginning to end that casts a shadow of any kind. A genial sympathy and a broad catholicity breathe through its pages.

If I should try, I could possibly find a sick fly in this bottle of fragrant ointment. A book reviewer is tempted to hunt for an insect of this kind, just by way of showing that he could compound a better ointment. But I am content to forego the search, feeling assured that there is not enough putrid insect in this bottle to offend the most sensitive olfactories. It is a great pleasure to commend this book to all classes. It will prove wholesome reading to laity and clergy, to saint and sinner.

Nashville, Tenn.

R. C. REED.

DUBOSE'S MEMOIRS OF J. LEIGHTON WILSON.

MEMOIRS OF REV. JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, D. D., MISSIONARY TO AFRICA AND SECRETARY OF FOREIGN MISSIONS. *By Hampden C. DuBose, D. D., for twenty-three years a missionary in China.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1895. Pp. 326. \$1.50.

This volume is from the pen of our own gifted and consecrated missionary in China, Rev. Hampden C. DuBose, D. D. Possibly the writer's strong attachment to the author and personal regard for the noble character of the biographed, while still with us, may to some extent bias his judgment as to the real worth of the volume. But be this as it may, he esteems it a gem of intrinsic value, and worthy a place in the hearts of God's people alongside of Bonar's inimitable *Memoirs of McCheyne*, Palmer's *Life of Thornwell*, Edward's *Life of David Brainerd*, the lives of *Edward Payson*, *Henry Martyn*, *Summerfield*, and others of that class. He feels that the department of religious biography has been enriched by it. Certain it is that its perusal brought more moisture to the eye and warmer throbb-beats to the heart than any book he has read for years.

Of the author, he has this to say, that no living name on the roll of the Southern Presbyterian Church stands higher in the esteem of those who know him, than HAMPDEN C. DUBOSE. Genial, affable, warm-hearted, cultured, he is a South Carolinian of the olden type, of whom his native State has reason to be proud. The writer first met him in Columbia, at the Theological Seminary, in the session of 1868-'69, when the foundation of a life-long friendship was laid. Graduating there in 1871, he set out a few months later for China, where he was stationed at Soo-Chow, in the Province of Kiang-Su, on the Grand Canal, which has been his home ever since. Returning to this country in 1890, on a visit, he was by unanimous vote chosen Moderator of the Synod of South Carolina, which met that year at Yorkville. In May of the following year he was, in like manner, made Moderator of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church in its sessions at Birmingham. His facile pen has given to the press several volumes of a high order, such *e. g.*, as *Preaching in Sinim*, or *The Gospel to the Gentiles*, and *The Dragon, Image, and Demon*, or *The Three Religions of China*. But it is in his *Memoirs of John Leighton Wilson* that the writer knows him best. There both head and heart are in exact alignment. The author was certainly favored above most men in having such a subject to sketch; and the biographed was hardly less favored in having such a biographer.

Of JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON, it is almost needless to speak—at least to Carolina Presbyterians; for to them he stands forth as a grand Colossus, whose name was for many trying years a Gibraltar-rock, around whose base a desolated church gathered itself together for fresh inspiration after the most calamitous war of the nineteenth century.

Born in Sumter county, South Carolina, in the year 1809, of a godly ancestry of the approved Scotch-Irish variety, his early life was spent amid the rural enjoyments of the typical, old-time Southern home. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., in 1829, and in 1831 entered the Columbia Seminary, a member of its first class. Then followed his marriage, and his bridal tour to the "Dark Continent," where, for nineteen years, he lived and labored—the pioneer missionary of the American Board in Western Africa. For seven years he was

stationed at Cape Palmas, just outside the eastern boundry of Liberia. There, from his modest little mission-home above the beach, his eye looked out on the broad stretch of the blue Atlantic on the one hand, and on the other, on the jungle-groves, where lurked wild beasts, and men hardly less savage than they. There, all but isolated from congenial companionships, save that of his devoted young bride, he was stricken down with the deadly African fever—the same which, in more recent years, deprived the Southern church of its glorious young LAPSLEY, on the threshold of his promising career. After seven years of semi-immolation at Cape Palmas, he was transferred to the Gaboon, a station still lower down on the equatorial coast, just above the mouth of that great river, the Congo, on whose banks the Presbyterian Church now has a prosperous mission, ministered to by that remarkable son of Africa, the gifted and eloquent Sheppard!

After a dozen years of faithful service in the Gaboon, he came back to his native land with health enfeebled and constitution much shattered, but with love unquenched and unquenchable for the perishing of the "Dark Continent." His heart ever continued to be—

"Where Afric's sunny fountains
Roll down their golden sand."

Soon after his return he was made Assistant Secretary of Foreign Missions in the Presbyterian Church. But with the disruption of that body on the outburst of the Civil War in 1861, he cast in his lot with the people of his native Southland. At once he was called to the Secretaryship of Missions of the Presbyterian Church in "the Confederate States of America." Cut off from the outside world by the blockade of our entire seacoast, his energies were for the time restricted to labors for the Indian tribes in the southwest, and to gosselling the Confederate armies. But with the advent of peace—with ruined homes, dismantled churches, and an impoverished people all around him—his extraordinary administrative ability shone forth with a brilliancy seldom equalled. Fired by his stirring appeals, Christian people went to work to rehabilitate their prostrate Zion, and as their consequent, chaos soon gave place to order. Courage, enthusiasm, hope, were inspired by his counsel and example. New houses of worship sprang up everywhere as if by magic, and the Southern Presbyterian Church emerged from its desolation, "rejoicing as a strong man to run a race." Its magnificent missionary operations of to-day, which, in a measure, begirdle the world, were the project of his brain! God be praised for the gift of such a man!

This, in brief, is the meagre and imperfect outline of the man and his work as so admirably given to us by his biographer. Reader, buy that book, and let Dr. Du Bose himself tell you the thrilling story of JOHN LEIGHTON WILSON.

J. LOWRIE WILSON.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

THE WOMAN-SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES: A Study. *By a Lawyer.*
Boston, Mass.: Arena Publishing Company. 18mo, pp. 153. 1895.

This is a vigorous and eloquent protest against the proposed innovation. The dedication, which is as beautiful as brief, foreshadows the author's position: "To my mother, whose mind moved the hand that held the pen." The main tenor of his plea throughout his argument is, that woman be left in that sphere for which

her Creator fitted her and to which his revealed law assigns her, the sphere which Southern matrons occupied so faithfully and adorned so nobly, that of mother and queen of the household.

The foundation stones of our author's impregnable structure are chiefly these : That according to Scripture and sound reason the marriage of one man to one woman is not merely a civil contract of two free equals, but a divine and religious ordinance, instituted by the Heavenly Father for the creation of the family and the godly rearing of children. (See Mal. ii. 15.) That to fit woman for this destiny, God created her not inferior to, but essentially dissimilar to, the male, and expressly ordained her domestic subordination to the husband as head of the family. That the family thus instituted is the foundation integer of the commonwealth, so that, if the former be vitiated, the latter will unavoidably be corrupted, and at length destroyed. That when we make marriage merely a civil contract between free equals we thereby destroy its permanency, because legally and equitably the right of dissolving such contracts inheres in both parties to them ; that thus the family is broken up, the right rearing of children destroyed, and the wife reduced to a concubine, stripped of all security for her rights and honor as mistress of the household. That the deduction of so-called "woman's rights" from the doctrine of universal equality is a sophism, and is not republicanism, but deadly Jacobinism. That the new theory, like the abolitionism which was its fatal forerunner, is simply infidelity; for both distinctly contradict the word of God, either openly with profane insolence, or covertly with malignant deceit, in that Scripture expressly declares what they deny, that the woman shall be subject to her husband, and that involuntary bondage for life may, in some cases, be legitimate and righteous; and hence, that when "women's rights" prevail, marriage and the family will perish, woman will be degraded, children will be reared to vice and impiety, Christianity will be corrupted, and civilization will putrefy.

The innovators will doubtless characterize this view, in the terms of their customary nauseous slang, as thoroughly "pessimistic." And here is one of the darkest features of our times, that whenever philosophy, historic experience, or the wisdom of God himself in Holy Writ, utters its protest against some new caprice of these socialistic loco-focos, however certain and solemn the warning may be, they think they can fling it away with the flippant and impertinent cry: "Oh, that is pessimism!" This way of dealing with arguments, sensible men are aware, is nothing but wilfulness and humorsomeness, follies which can lead only towards the perdition of those who indulge them. But our author fortifies his conclusions by many broad and just citations from history. He shows that the theory of marriage on which the claim of "women's rights" proceeds is the pagan theory (while the true one has been taught only by the Bible and the church). That in pagan society this theory was what vitiated the family, led to frequent divorces, and at last destroyed the civilization of Greece and Rome, and made the Dark Ages. This he supports by the testimony of the Christian synods, of Gibbon, of Lecky, and of Mommsen. He shows that the United States, in which this pagan theory of marriage is now current, already have the bad eminence of granting more divorces annually than all the rest of the civilized world together. This he holds is an alarming confirmation of the law that the new doctrine must always destroy true marriage. Our author also lays a severe accusation against the Christian pulpit in our country for its cowardly silence concerning the innovation. This charge is in

part just. He argues that this is an entirely proper topic for pulpit inculcation and remonstrance; because the true doctrine of marriage is a proposition of Holy Writ, and concerns itself immediately with morals and religion, as well as sociology. But our readers must peruse the book itself in order to acquaint themselves fully with its boldness, vigor, and wealth of illustration.

It is most true that "woman's rights," like abolitionism, are a natural and unavoidable corollary from the false Jacobinical construction of human equality. The latter has already reared the horrent crop from its dragon's teeth; the former seems equally likely to prevail; and when it does will work a yet wider ruin.

There is a sense in which "all men are by nature equal," the sense of the British laws (peer and peasant equal before the law), and of all constitutional republican states. All men, namely, have the same humanity, the same Heavenly Father, the same immortality, and the same moral accountability. All have the common moral right to use their faculties and improve their several franchises for realizing their several shares of righteous welfare in this life, and their future destiny. But *those shares are not equal, because the faculties and franchises of different classes of men are not equal.* The fact is, that these are endlessly unequal. Therefore the Jacobinical attempt to confer all the same prerogatives on the naturally disqualified which are righteously due to the qualified is not a moral equality, but an equally violent folly and wickedness. But this is the sense in which this democratic fad is now almost universally held and taught, That whatever prerogatives the law confers on the best-qualified citizens, all the same must be conferred on all the citizens, or a natural injustice is perpetrated. This monstrous dogma needs only to be dragged into light in order to show its absurdity. The attempt to give it full effect can never construct society, but must ever destroy it. It is the universal law of nature, that all her structures, and, much more, all her organisms, material, vegetable, animal, and social, must be built, not of equal parts, but of unequal and dissimilar, which must have, not the same, but unlike functions in the organism. The apostle found this true even of the church of God, the highest of all. (See 1 Cor. xii. 14-23.)

Our author teaches that marriage cannot be reduced to a mere contract between free equals, so that both the parties shall really exercise equal privileges in it, without destroying its permanency. He might have proved this, not only from history and jurisprudence, but from universal domestic experience. We presume that there never has been a marriage in which husband and wife practiced this equality in fact. One or the other has always held a predominancy. If the husband has not been head of his family, he has always been more or less henpecked, and the wife was the virtual man of the house. It is no more possible to have this actual equality and freedom in a permanent marriage than to have an inverted cone stand permanently upon its apex in unstable equilibrium.

R. L. DABNEY.

Victoria, Texas.

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

BIBLE COURSE : OUTLINE AND NOTES. *By Rev. F. H. Gaines, A. B.* I. Creation to the Kingdom. Atlanta : Franklin Printing and Publishing Co. 8vo, pp. 183. Price, \$1.00. 1895.

This is a very valuable book, and admirably suited to the purposes for which it is intended. It has been strongly commended by such biblical scholars as Prof. Beattie, of Louisville Theological, Prof. McPheeters, of Columbia Seminary, and Prof. English, of Union Seminary. Its analysis of the Scriptures is very thorough, bringing out the great lessons taught in such form that they may be grasped by any intelligent student. It has been used for several years with great success by the author in Agnes Scott Institute, Decatur, Georgia, and might be used by any intelligent teacher with much benefit to pupils in any of our Christian schools. It would be found invaluable, also, for young ministers and Bible classes wishing to make a thorough study of the Scriptures.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH. *By William Henry Green, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Pp. xiv., 184. \$1.50.

With a wealth of learning, yet in style as clear as crystal, and in language adapted to the plainest English reader, Dr. Green here presents the whole question of the composition of the Pentateuch, with the arguments on either side. Its reasoning is strong and vigorous. No candid mind will fail to see its cogency, or to recognize the author's fairness as well as strength. In the preface he properly defends the Higher Criticism in its genuine sense, and shows that it is a perversion of the science that is at fault. The author's own statement of the method of treatment is so clear and comprehensive that we give it in full: "It is the purpose of this volume to show that the faith of all past ages in respect to the Pentateuch has not been mistaken. It is what it claims to be, and what it has always been believed to be. In the first chapter it is exhibited in its relation to the Old Testament as a whole, of which it is not only the initial portion, but the basis or foundation upon which the entire superstructure reposes; or rather, it contains the germs from which all that follows was developed. In the second, the plan and contents of the Pentateuch are unfolded. It has one theme, which is consistently adhered to, and which is treated with orderly arrangement, and upon a carefully considered plan, suggestive of a single author. In the third it is shown by a variety of arguments, both external and internal, that this author was Moses. The various forms of opposition to this conclusion are then outlined and separately considered. First, the weakness of the earlier objections from anachronisms and inconsistencies is shown. In the fourth chapter, the divi-

sive hypotheses, which have in succession been maintained in opposition to the unity of the Pentateuch, are reviewed and shown to be baseless, and the arguments urged in their support are refuted. In the fifth chapter the genuineness of the laws is defended against the development hypothesis. And in the sixth and last chapter these hypotheses are shown to be radically unbiblical. They are hostile alike to the truth of the Pentateuch and to the supernatural revelation which it contains." The book is one which should have a wide circulation, for many people are inquiring the meaning of these movements in the critical world, and the defenders of God's word must be prepared to meet and combat the so-called learning which impresses the popular mind and awakens its suspicions.

A CREEDLESS GOSPEL AND THE GOSPEL CREED. *By Henry Y. Satterlee, D. D. Rector of Calvary Church, New York.* Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 1895. \$2.00.

This is a strong discussion by one of the distinguished Episcopal ministers of New York city. The book grew out of the author's condemnation of the Parliament of Religions held in Chicago during the World's Fair. The implications and logical corollaries of the endorsement of this Parliament seemed to the author to involve a radical defection from true views as to the absoluteness of Christianity and the unique inspiration of the Scriptures.

His book is divided into three parts: In Part I. he examines the proposed basis for Christianity in science, philosophy, ethics, natural religion, sociology, and shows that any of these, or all together, yield a pseudo-Christianity, which he denominates a Creedless Gospel. In Part II. he examines the great fundamental dogmas of the creed revealed in the sacred Scriptures, as to the character of God, incarnation, problem of sin and evil, the resurrection, ascension, spiritual power as dependent on the Holy Ghost, the church in relation to society, and the judgment in relation to justice. While the learned reader would find nothing new in these chapters, he would be pleased with the clear, interesting, and forceful manner in which the orthodox dogmas are presented and illustrated. In Part III. he examines the qualifications of the witnesses for Christ. While this part of the book stands in no sort of logical relation to the other parts, the views presented are intrinsically so important, and illustrated with so much charm, as almost to redeem the logical defect of incorporating them in the book at all. On the whole, the volume indicates logical power, some philosophical acumen, a scholarly acquaintance with the history of Christian doctrine, a strong faith in the historic orthodoxy, and a fervent spirit of Christian piety. The volume is beautifully printed in large type on fine paper, and is a delight to the eyes which read it.

QUESTIONS OF MODERN INQUIRY. A Series of Discussions. *By Henry A. Stimson, D. D., pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Congregational Church of New York City.* Pp. 270. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1895.

The preacher gives us here eighteen discourses delivered on as many Sabbath evenings to his people. They are direct and practical, and deal with questions which confront us almost every day. "About the Bible?" "Why not give up miracles?" "How far is the Bible inspired?" "What is faith?" are some of the inquiries to which the preacher here gives, in most cases, evangelical, scriptural answers. The collection will be most suggestive to pastors who are called

upon to deal with such problems, and to those who wish light upon questions about which they honestly doubt. On some points the author departs from the most orthodox, conservative views.

ABREAST OF THE TIMES. A Course of Sermons on Social Subjects. *Organized by the London Branch of the Christian Social Union, and preached in the Church of St. Edmund, King and Martyr, Lombard street, during Lent, 1894. With a preface by the Bishop of Durham.* New York: James Pott & Co., 114 Fifth Avenue. \$1.25.

We have here a series of sermons on some of the living questions in social and political life. While of unequal merit, they are all valuable and suggestive. Some very wholesome doctrine is presented in a plain and pointed way by some of these discourses. This is notably true of the two sermons on the "Ethics of Property," by Principal Ottley. The "Imperial Christ and his Democratic Creed," by Dean Stubbs, is well worth the careful reading of those desiring light on sociological themes. The other discourses are not, perhaps, the equals in all respects of those mentioned, but are not unworthy of publication. The writers, of course, occupy the standpoint of the Anglican church, but this appears only incidentally, and in no sense vitiates the value of the discussion. The book while made in a composite way, and thus lacking in unity, has a certain kind of organic continuity of thought and structural oneness, arising from the substantial agreement of the authors in their views as to the relation of Christian doctrine and practice to the great social, economic and political issues of the day.

QUICK TRUTHS IN QUIANT TEXTS. *By R. S. MacArthur, D. D.* 12mo, 336 pp. Price, \$1.25. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut street. 1895.

A series of twenty sermons preached on Sunday evenings in Calvary Baptist Church, New York. The texts are chosen from the less familiar parts of the Bible. The subjects of some of the sermons will indicate the text, as for instance, "The Powerless Gates," "The Brave Three Hundred," "The Ennobled Ox-goad," "The Swimming Iron," "The Crude Cake," etc. Dr. MacArthur is well known as a successful, forceful preacher. This volume of sermons sustains his reputation. The discourses are not sensational, as one might think from the topics, but are earnest and faithful presentations of truth.

THE HYMNAL. *Published by authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sunday-school Work. 1895.

This hymnal has been compiled by Hon. Robert N. Willson, Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D., Franklin L. Sheppard, Esqr., and Rev. Louis F. Benson, a Committee of the Board, aided by William M. Gilchrist, Mus. Doc. It was ordered by the General Assembly in 1889. The standing committee of the last assembly, having examined the proof-sheets, recommended that the assembly heartily commend the Hymnal to all the churches, and urge its general adoption. This resolution was passed unanimously by a rising vote.

Following the preface is a table of contents, carefully prepared, and elaborate enough to be a great help in finding hymns suitable to different subjects and occa-

sions. Next follows an index of first lines, a feature which is usually relegated to the last of the book. We like it at the beginning. Next, there is an alphabetical index of tunes, followed by a metrical index. The Lord's Prayer, the commandments, the creed, and appropriate opening sentences follow. Seven hundred and twenty-four hymns come next, a number somewhat smaller than usual in such collections, but ample, as experience shows, for all purposes. Nineteen ancient hymns and canticles next find a place. The remainder of the Hymnal proper is made up of a full index of authors and composers, and of indices of subjects and occasions and Scripture texts which are more complete and minute than any we have ever seen and which will be a wondrous help to the minister. A supplement contains *Selections from The Psalter*, arranged by Dr. Craven and Rev. Mr. Benson, and using the text of the American Bible Society.

The tunes are more numerous than in most collections, and are taken from a wide range, embracing all the best of the old, and some of the new which will last. The arrangement is such that oftentimes a choice can be made between different tunes for the same hymn without turning a page. Not many of the lighter class of tunes, so popular of late, are introduced. There are many hymns for special occasions. The type is clear and distinct and sufficiently large. The book has a somewhat sombre appearance, in the dark green cover and green edges of the copy before us, but we suppose there are many other styles of binding to be had. Altogether, we think this the best collection that has yet appeared.

THE CHRISTLESS NATIONS. *By Bishop J. M. Thoburn, D. D.* A Series of Addresses on Christless Nations and Kindred Subjects. Delivered at Syracuse University on the Graves Foundation, 1895. 12mo, pp. 214, \$1.00. New York: Hunt and Eaton. 1895.

The sub-title describes fully the nature of this work. The author does not devote himself to an account of his own special work or personal observation on the mission field, rich as are his experiences in this way, but he seeks to move those whom he addresses to a profounder consideration of the importance of the Saviour's command, and of the manner in which that command is to be obeyed. *Missionary Possibilities, Woman in the Field, Missionary Polity, New Testament Missions, and Wayside Views*, form the titles of the several addresses, all of which glow with the author's fervor, and show an earnest and intelligent grasp of his subject.

THE ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC—From the Old to the New. A Compendious Sketch of Missions in the Pacific. *By Rev. James A. Alexander.* New York: American Tract Society. 1895. 8vo, pp. 515. \$2.00.

This book grew out of an effort to sketch the history of the Hawaiian Mission. This involved an account of the history of other islands of the Pacific, as mission work in all of them has been closely related in origin and results. The author will succeed in his purpose of promoting interest in Christian missions wherever this book is read. It is a deeply-interesting history, with descriptions of the peoples, customs, life, and needs of the several islands. The illustrations are very numerous and striking. The work will prove a most valuable addition to the missionary library.

THE COLLEGE WOMAN. *By Charles Franklin Thwing, D. D., President of the College for Women of Western Reserve University.* 16mo, pp. 169. \$1.00. New York : The Baker & Taylor Co. 1894.

The author studies here Some Problems Respecting Her, The Principle, Content, and Proportion of Her Studies, Her Environment, Her Health, Methods in Her Education, Demands Made by the Community upon Her, After Her Graduation. In a clear and charming style, and from the standpoint of his own ample experience, President Thwing discusses, first, whether woman should have a college education, and what it should be, and then what conditions are best adapted to give her the proper education. He discusses fully the subject of co-education, co-ordinate education, and separate education. The arguments on all sides are well stated. He advocates that form of co-education or co-ordinate education which brings the women under the same professors, into the same libraries, and subject to the same discipline and administration as those for men, but in distinct colleges and separate class-rooms.

GREAT RACES OF MANKIND. An Account of the Ethnic Origin, Primitive Estate, Early Migrations, Social Evolution, and Present Conditions and Promise of the Principal Families of Men. Together with a Preliminary Inquiry on the Time, Place, and Manner of the Beginning. Complete in Four Volumes. *By John Clark Ridpath, LL. D., author of a "Cyclopædia of Universal History,"* etc. Profusely illustrated with colored plates, race maps and charts, type pictures, sketches and diagrams. Cincinnati: The Jones Brothers' Publishing Company. Quarto. Each Volume nearly 800 pp. *Sold only by Subscription.*

This magnificent work is so fully described in the title and sub-title that we need scarcely say more of it. Reserving for a future review a full account of the work, and a thorough study of some of the principles and theories adopted by the author, we are content now to call attention to it as one of the most elaborate works of the kind, by one of the most charming writers of the day. A vast amount of research is shown on every page, and the reputation which Dr. Ridpath has already attained will be augmented by these great volumes. They are splendidly printed on thick, calendered paper, and bound in the most elegant manner. The illustrations, many of them full page, are of the costliest kind, and add immensely to the interest of the subject treated. A large number of colored illustrations and plates, not cheap and tawdry, but elegantly finished, lend attraction. While dealing with a profound subject, the author will be followed with interest by the youngest reader. His *Cyclopædia of Universal History* has already been almost worn out by our children, and we expect these splendid volumes to be equally popular with them and with everybody else who possesses them.

THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, NATIONAL AND STATE. New and Revised Edition. *By B. A. Hinsdale, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of the Science and the Art of Teaching, in the University of Michigan.* Chicago and New York. The Werner Co.

This is a careful, scholarly and thorough discussion of our American political institutions. It is well adapted for use as a text-book in our higher institutions of

learning. It will, perhaps, not be widely used in the South, not so much on account of the views expressed as because of the mode in which the author elects to speak of the late war (see p. 365). Despite this fact, there can be no doubt of the ability, scholarship and interest of the volume.

THE SOUTHERN STATES OF THE AMERICAN UNION. Considered in their Relations to the Constitution of the United States and to the Resulting Union. *By J. L. M. Curry, Author of Constitutional Government in Spain, etc.* Richmond, Va.: B. F. Johnson Publishing Co. 1895.

We have here a book which deserves to be a classic throughout our Southland, and for which we hope a wide circulation throughout our entire country. In sixteen brief chapters the author has condensed a profoundly interesting historical account of the relation of the Southern States to the Constitution and the resulting Union. The book contains, upon the grounds of historic facts and authentic records, a triumphant vindication of that view of the Constitution and of the nature of the Federal government which obtained in the Southern States. The volume, while composed by a Southern man, is broad and natural in its sympathies, and while vindicating his people's interpretation of the Constitution, the author sincerely and honestly accepts the results of the war as settling finally and forever some of the questions once hotly contested in the field of political debate.

We would like to see this book extensively read by the young people of the South in order that they might intelligently appreciate the positions of their fathers, and we should be glad to see the volume widely circulated in the North in order that the people of that section might be convinced of the patriotism and national spirit of their brethren of the South, and at the same time might have their eyes opened to the standing in historic fact of what might be called the distinctively Southern interpretation of the Constitution.

There is not one line in the book to which the most illiberal in either section could object, and we congratulate the author and the country upon the publication of this volume so hopeful in its promise of a better understanding between the sections of our common country. We are glad to know that the book is being used as a text-book in some of our colleges and higher institutions.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 36.—APRIL, 1896

I. BABEL AND ITS LESSONS.

“ALL the languages of the earth,” says an eminent authority, “have affinities enough to indicate a common origin; but they have differences enough to show that some great dislocation has occurred in their history.” The Scriptures tell us when and how this dislocation occurred. It was a judgment of God inflicted upon men because of their rebellion against his will.

The descendants of Noah had greatly multiplied since the flood, and the earth was again filling with people. They had spread themselves out over the East until the centre of population seems to have been the plain of Shinar—that fertile region which lies between the Tigris and the Euphrates Rivers. There, under the leadership probably of Nimrod, the Cushite, they devised and undertook the ambitious scheme of building a great city, with a tower whose top, in their hyperbolic speech, should reach unto heaven. Josephus says that their purpose was to secure themselves against destruction from another flood. If such was the animus of the movement it is easy to see why it should have been displeasing to God and deserving of his judgment. He had given his promise that the earth should never again be destroyed by a flood; he had set his bow in the cloud as a pledge of faithfulness to that covenant.

Now if, instead of resting on that divine promise as a sufficient and infallible guarantee of safety, they set themselves to provide a refuge of their own, they plainly betrayed the most

flagrant unbelief and rebellion. But it must be confessed that there is nothing in the record to indicate that this was their purpose. They are represented as saying, "Let us make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth" (Gen. xi. 4). This was their avowed purpose. They proposed to establish a grand centre of empire, a seat and source of power, from which the whole race should be governed and held together. The dangers and inconveniences incident to the peopling of a new world they would avert from themselves by means of this great city with its massive tower. The whole animus of the movement, and the various ends at which it aimed, we may not be able, with the light that has been given us, fully to understand. But some things are plain. First, the undertaking was purely selfish in its aim—"Let us make *us* a name." It was conceived not for God's glory, but for their own; not to make his name great in the earth, but theirs. They were seeking to establish their own interests; to provide for themselves a safe, sure and desirable portion in the earth upon which they had been placed. Thus they contravened the true end of their creation, which was "to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." They were bent on glorifying themselves and enjoying the earth. Again, it is plain that in the whole movement *God was ignored*. He was not in all their thoughts. There was no consulting him to ascertain his mind; no seeking for his guidance and help; no recognition of their dependence on him or of his claims upon them. They took counsel only of flesh and blood; they leaned unto their own understandings; they trusted in their own arms. Their project was thus not only self-exalting, but God-excluding. Some one has said that here was the "birth of heathenism." Whether this be true or not, it is certain that the whole movement was essentially heathenish in its spirit and purpose. In the third place, the undertaking was in opposition to God's revealed plan and purpose for the race. It was his design that they should scatter abroad upon the face of the earth to subdue and till it, and form those nations for which, as Moses tells us (Deut. xxxii. 8), "God divided out the earth;" that they should be held together not by outward, but by inward bonds; not by geographical boundaries, or the hand

of force, but by their common allegiance to him. "Unity in diversity" was his law for mankind as for all nature. But here was an effort to hold men together in another way—by a common earthly portion, by carnal and selfish ties; an effort to build a society, "not by faith in an unseen God and his covenant, but upon faith in brick walls"; a society whose underlying principle should be a common desire, not to serve and glorify God, but to promote and protect their own interests. Hence, God, in righteous judgment, blasted their project. He confounded their language. Misunderstanding arose, and alienation and antagonism, so that "they left off to build the city." They began to build, and were not able to finish.

Thus, at that early stage in human history, an example was set for the instruction and warning of all future generations. Here was an exhibition, on the one hand, of principles that are native to the human heart; and, on the other hand, of principles that are uniform in the government of God. This experiment on the plain of Shinar mankind have been repeating from that day to this, in many different ways, and on many different scales. The spirit exemplified by those Babel-builders is the spirit which has inspired every civilization of the past. When Nebuchadnezzar, for example, centuries afterward, building, as there is some reason to believe, upon the very foundation of this unfinished work, reared the splendid city of Babylon, and the powerful empire of which it was the centre, he had the same inspiration and aim as these early builders. In the Book of Daniel he is represented as walking in his palace and soliloquizing thus, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom *by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?*" (Dan. iv. 30.) What proud self-exaltation! What blasphemous defiance of God! No wonder that the hand of divine judgment was laid upon him, so that he was driven away from among men, and found his dwelling with the beasts of the field. I need not stay to show that the selfsame spirit animated that civilization which was built up on the banks of the Nile—of which the pyramids stand to-day as the mournful witnesses—and also those of Greece and Rome. The aim and motive of them all were identical. Through vast

confederations of men, through a world-wide domination of the race, they sought to establish their own earthly interests, and to promote human glory, in entire forgetfulness of God, and in opposition to his revealed will. Hence, all came to naught. The only signs we see of their greatness to-day are their ruins. In all these experiments of the past there is a significant lesson for us of the nineteenth century. "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; . . . and there is no new thing under the sun." (Ecc. i. 9.) If our civilization has any better issue it will be because it is marked by a different aim and spirit. If we build more surely it will be because we build after another plan and of other material. But, alas! the signs are only too convincing that the masses of mankind, even in Christendom, are intent upon repeating the follies of the past.

One of the most marked tendencies of the times in which we live is a tendency to association. Combination is, perhaps, the most characteristic feature of the age.

On all sides and in every department of life men are saying to each other, "Go to, let us build together; let us make common cause; let us associate ourselves." And why? For what ends, and upon what principles, are such confederations projected? Too generally their principles and aims are purely selfish. All are looking upon their own things, seeking, through the influence of numbers, to protect and advance their own interests, to the neglect, or at the expense, of the interests of others, and in utter forgetfulness of God, as if he had no claims worthy of being considered and had made no revelation of his mind worthy of respect. The great combinations which are making themselves felt in our modern civilization are, with few exceptions, selfish and godless. They "neither fear God nor regard man." Well, the lesson which is thundered in our ears by this Old Testament incident, and by all the experience of the past, is that all such associations contain within themselves the elements of their own destruction. They will inevitably end in confusion and failure. "Too low they build who build beneath the stars." God's sentence has gone forth, and stands to-day unalterable and sure; mankind cannot, and shall not, be combined and held together in helpful, suc-

cessful co-operation upon such a basis, for such ends, or by such bonds. The basis is too narrow, the ends are too low, the bonds are too sordid. To all such the word of the Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, is addressed: "Associate yourselves, O ye people, and ye shall be broken in pieces; . . . gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken in pieces. Take counsel together, and it shall come to naught." (Isaiah viii. 9, 10.) "That which is built on selfishness," says Frederick W. Robertson, "cannot stand. The system of personal interest must be shivered into atoms. Therefore we who have observed the ways of God in the past are waiting in quiet but awful expectation until he shall confound this system as he has confounded those which have gone before; and it may be effected by convulsions more terrible and more bloody than the world has yet seen. While men are talking of peace and of the great progress of civilization, there is heard in the distance the noise of armies gathering rank on rank; East and West, North and South, are rolling towards us the crushing thunders of universal war."

Let us now turn from this scene to the counterpart of it as portrayed in the second chapter of the "Acts of the Apostles." There we have God's plan for unifying the race—the principles upon which he would have men confederated together; the method by which he would have human interests protected and advanced. It was on the day of Pentecost, and there were assembled at Jerusalem devout men from every nation under heaven. The disciples of Christ were gathered together with one accord, in one place, waiting for the fulfilment of his parting promise. "And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." When the multitude came together they were "confounded, because that *every man heard them speaking in his own language.*" The miracle of Babel was reversed. The confusion of tongues was healed.

In almost every particular the one scene stands in contrast with

the other. The disciples were gathered around the person of the risen and glorified Saviour, and were inspired by a supreme desire to exalt his name and make it glorious in the earth. They spake, not the wonderful works of *man*, but "the wonderful works of *God*." Instead of the spirit of Babel, which sought the exaltation of self, they were possessed by a spirit which sought to glorify Jesus and exalt his name. Instead of self-interest, the bond by which the Babel-builders were held together, their ruling passion, and the unifying principle which made them of one accord, was love—love to God, and love to their fellow-men, for Christ's sake. Personal interests were entirely subordinated, yet no one suffered, "for neither was there among them any that lacked." They had all things common; "neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own." Not from any outward compulsion of commandment or law, but under the influence of the Spirit of love, "they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all as every man had need." The golden rule became operative in their lives. They looked not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Thus we see in practical operation God's plan for uniting men together for his own glory and their highest good.

"So the whole round world is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

Babel was man's work, Pentecost was God's. The one displayed the energy of the flesh, the other the energy of the Spirit. The disciples at Jerusalem, equally with the men of Shinar, were builders—only after a different plan, and in another spirit. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and in his power, they were laying the foundations of a temple whose top shall indeed reach unto heaven, and against which the gates of hell shall never prevail—a temple which is built not of brick, an imitation of God's creative work, but of stones, living stones, each one of which is linked in vital and indissoluble union with every other and with the Chief Corner-stone. Slowly but surely that temple is growing to completion. The Apostle John gives us a prophetic glimpse of its glorious consummation when he says, "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of *all nations and*

kindreds and people and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." (Rev. vii. 9, 10.)

The spirit of Babel and the spirit of Pentecost are still in the world. They are contrary the one to the other. There is an irreconcilable conflict between them. Each is striving after ascendancy over us and expression through us. The Babel spirit controls the world; the Pentecostal spirit should control the church. But, alas! she may be invaded by the opposite spirit. There is her supreme peril, and she is often and solemnly warned against it. Let a church in any measure be possessed by the spirit of Babel, becoming earthly in her aims, selfish in her motives, and unscriptural in her methods, and to that extent she loses her character as the Bride of Christ, and takes on the character of Babylon, for whom a cup of fury is reserved. She may still be active and zealous and full of works, but she builds of wood and hay and stubble, and her work will not abide. Her safety, her glory, and the permanence of her work depend upon her steadfast adherence to the aims and methods of Pentecost, and her absolute subjection to the Spirit who dominated that scene.

J. F. CANNON.

St. Louis.

II. DR. BRIGGS' CONFESSION OF FAITH.¹

THIS volume is Prof. Charles Augustus Briggs' latest contribution to biblical theology, forming the third in a series of five: *Messianic Prophecy* (1886), *The Messiah of the Gospels* (1894), *The Messiah of the Apostles* (1895), *The Messiah of the Church*, and *The Messiah of the Theologians*.

The series as projected evidently contemplates an exhaustive presentation of the Messianic idea in all stages of its development up to the present time.

We confess a keen curiosity as to the contents of the two volumes yet to appear—what contrasts they may present to the biblical conception set forth in the three preceding volumes, and what shall be revealed as the difference between the Messiah of the church and the Messiah of the theologians. The titles are certainly suggestive, and seem prophetic of much that may prove very interesting reading.

In his preface to the volume now under consideration our author says:

"No one who has studied through the literature of Christology can do other than say that the researches of recent scholars have put the whole subject in such new lights that the writings of the older scholars have become for the most part antiquated. There are doubtless many still living who are unwilling to accept any theological opinions which have not been stamped with the approval of the antiquarians. For such the author does not write. The readers he desires are the open-minded and truth-loving, who would see the Christ as the apostles saw him, and who will not be restrained from the heavenly vision by the pretended perils of the Higher Criticism and of Biblical Theology, or by the supposed safer paths of traditional and ecclesiastical theology. . . . The author has done his best to turn away from the Christ of the theologians and of the creeds and of the church, and to see the Messiah as he is set forth in the writings of the apostles."

These are very frank words, and as significant as they are frank. We will not pause to note the implicit contrasts instituted, the very serious assumptions involved, and the far-reaching implica-

¹ *The Messiah of the Apostles*. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Crown 8vo, pp. xv., 562. \$3.00.

tions of both contrasts and assumptions; we content ourselves with simply inviting the reader's careful attention thereto, and pass on with the free acknowledgment that a part at least of the author's purpose has been crowned with a fair measure of success.

Within the last quarter of a century there has been evident a growing revolt against the dominating pre-eminence of systematic theology. The inevitable result has been an emphasis of what is called biblical theology, which first brought it into active competition with the former, then placed it upon an equality, and now seeks to crown it with an unquestioned superiority which squints towards a practical relegation of systematic theology to a niche in the museum of antiquities.

The astuteness of our very progressive age, in this as in countless similar instances, manifests itself in the name assumed. If the *title* be just and the new department as opposed to the old is distinctively biblical, the battle is won beforehand, and nothing remains but a reverent burial of the venerable deceased.

At first we were inclined to view with great favor the advent of this new rival in the field of theology; we had been frequently impressed with a suspicion of danger, that to the severity of system might be sacrificed the free proportions of truth, that sometimes violence was done to the author's scope and intent by the isolation of single texts in order to their grouping under certain heads of divinity, that the demands of a philosophic system occasionally thus proved a bed of Procrustes for the word of God, and hence we felt an increasing conviction of the importance, nay, of the absolute necessity, of far greater attention to exegesis, not simply by way of illustrating methods by a few specimen cases in the class-room, but in extended and extensive study that should cover large tracts of Scripture consecutively and exhaustively, not merely imparting skill in exegetical work, but adding actually and greatly to the student's field of biblical knowledge. This is still our conviction, but we have reached the conclusion that the comparatively modern school of Biblical Theology is not likely to meet the want. The volume before us is the latest work of one of the most eminent representatives and learned professors of this school; it may be regarded, therefore, as a very favorable speci-

men of the work it proposes to do and a fair illustration of its most improved methods. This method is, in brief, "an effort to see the Messiah as he appeared to each writer in each separate writing." Apart from the author's success in the pursuit of his purpose, we are not fully satisfied that the purpose itself is wise; we seriously incline to the opinion that the very method is vicious. Immediately upon announcing his effort to see the Messiah as he appeared to each writer in each separate writing, the author goes on at once to say, "*The diversity is great.*" We italicize this statement because it suggests what our experience indicates is a most grave objection to the method, viz., a distressing lack of unity in the impression made upon the student. This piece-meal presentation produces a fragmentariness of effect that is painful. It is something like a careful study of features in detail: the nose by one artist, the eyes by a second, the mouth by a third, the brow by a fourth, and so on through the whole series, until finally we emerge from these diverse impressions with the inevitable feeling that, notwithstanding the painstaking care of our very scientific method, the result on the whole is somehow rather unsatisfactory so far as any clear-cut, well-defined picture of the person is concerned. And so when we have finished such a study of the Messiah as is here presented we feel like echoing the request of certain Greeks: "Sir, we would see Jesus."

This very elaborate and very improved method, in its *practical results*, bears about the same relation to the "heavenly vision" promised the student, that a scientific analysis of the chemical constituents of food elements bears to a good dinner. "And it shall be as when a hungry man dreameth, and behold he eateth; but he awaketh, and his soul is empty." Recurring, therefore, to the announcement made by Prof. Briggs in the outset, we are constrained to the fear that while few may be found to question the success of his effort "to turn away from the Christ of the theologians, and of the creeds, and of the church," yet to his endeavor "to see the Messiah as he is set forth in the writings of the apostles," it is not altogether sure that there will be voted the meed of an equal success. Certainly, so far as one reader is concerned, this twofold purpose goes halting, and, alas! it is the better leg of the two that seems to be lame.

There are certain features of the discussion that command our cordial commendation. The author has convictions; he walks with a firm tread. One would never imagine that there was anything less solid than ascertained facts beneath his confident feet; there is no hesitancy, no uncertainty, no diffidence. Whatever doubts concerning the positions maintained the timid, conservative reader may have, it is patently evident that the author has none. His assurance continually reminds us of Lord Melbourne's celebrated saying about Macaulay. Prof. Briggs resembles the great essayist in this respect. As he has convictions, so has he the courage of them. His bitterest enemy could scarcely charge him with any servile subservience to theologian, creed or church; he is certainly free from the reproach of being "unwilling to accept any theological opinions which have not been stamped with the approval of the antiquarians." Dr. Briggs' attitude towards these same antiquarians suggests the severely simple and comprehensive declaration of principles once announced by a "blooming" immigrant from Erin, who, immediately upon arrival on American soil, struck his heels together and exclaimed, "If there's a government in this country, I'm agin it." We cannot recall a single instance in which our author favors the conservative position on any point whatever. If there be any conservatism in a view under discussion, you may with probable safety set down Dr. Briggs as against it; his independence (of "antiquarianism") is so straight that it leans backwards.

His style is strong and clear; with the exception of one or two paragraphs, his meaning is transparent. His composition is eminently suited to a treatise of the character of this, reaching a very desirable mean between the ornate, on the one hand, and the slovenly on the other. His scholarship is constantly in evidence; the abundant foot-notes display a wide acquaintance with the field traversed.¹ Such extended reading is a wonderful tribute to the indefatigable industry of a life so busy as that of the eminent professor must be.

We have been particularly impressed with the happiness of

¹ The reader will find so many references to the author's preceding volumes as to make it exceedingly helpful to have them also at hand, particularly *The Messiah of the Gospels*.

his renderings of Scripture. With a few trifling exceptions, his translations of the New Testament are beautifully apt. We cannot recall at this writing an author within the range of our reading who, on the whole, is superior to Dr. Briggs in this respect. In the matter of exposition, or perhaps expository paraphrase or summation would better describe it, he is more variable. His work in this respect strikes us as being very unequal, presenting both extremes, some of it being so conspicuously fine as to set us to wondering how other of it could possibly be so inadequate and unsatisfying. For such characteristics the work deserves great praise, and we desire to render it here, trusting that the tribute paid him may not be discounted by its brevity.

In some respects we think the volume is open to unfavorable criticism :

1. Judging from our author's presentation of the subject, one would suppose that there was one side only to the views discussed. No one ignorant of the real state of the case would ever imagine that, except in matters of unimportant detail, any difference of opinion existed. He seems utterly to ignore the conservative side ; with him it is all *res adjudicata* ; there is practically nothing in issue. Now, while this may be, and probably is, Dr. Briggs' decided conviction, yet there are many who differ from him ; antiquarians they may be, but as serious and sincere in conviction as he, and they are, at least by repute, scholars. It would not have been unseemly in our author to have recognized their existence, and to have conferred upon them at least the dignity of a foot-note reference. We do not remember anywhere in the volume the name of a single writer representing the distinctly conservative school of critics. There are a few paragraphs which we suppose refer to conservatism, but they are mere allusions, slight and slighting, and but thinly veil his contempt. It may possibly be a question in the minds of some of his readers whether his altitude justifies his attitude.

2. With all Dr. Briggs' candor in certain directions, there is at the same time something that has impressed us as an inexplicable reserve in other directions, an absence of certain positive statements that one would naturally expect in certain connections.

Would it not seem strange that one could traverse the whole field of apostolic Christology and give no decided, unequivocal indication of his views on the fundamental matters of faith that divide the various churches? Is it not remarkable that an author can discuss Paul's introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, and yet leave the reader wondering whether the writer be a Calvinist or an Arminian? Would it not be held to indicate a rare reserve in a writer to set forth the Christology of Romans, Galatians, and Hebrews, and give no certain indication of his views of the Atonement? Incredible as the statement may seem, we do not believe that, judging from this book alone, a reader could, with any positiveness, assign the author any distinct position among the various churches or any clear alignment amid the differing schools of theological thought. So far as this volume goes, he might be a Methodist, a Baptist, an Episcopalian, or a Presbyterian—well-nigh anything but an "antiquarian."

3. He discusses the development of the Messianic idea just as if it were purely and solely a natural growth. He nowhere says this in so many words. There is no single statement which could be selected and adduced as irrefragable proof that he holds this view, and we do not wish to be misunderstood as charging this or anything like it. At the same time there is no statement anywhere which clearly and unequivocally implies or involves the contrary. If there be in the whole volume any distinct reference to the Spirit of God revealing and inspiring, guiding, restraining, and guarding, such reference has escaped our notice. The phraseology¹ again and again is such as accords perfectly with a purely natural development under the ordinary influences of the Spirit promoting growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and it is equally inconsistent with any such view of divine inspiration as we have been taught to hold.

In this connection it is worthy of note that the discussion begins, as did *The Messiah of the Gospels*, with extra-canonical writings. These are cited as the beginning of the Messianic development, and they are cited with no intimation that as to authority they stand upon a footing entirely different from that of

¹ See, for example, pp. 21, 30, 31, 59, 73, 80, 176.

the New Testament books. Of course, our author may have intended this to be taken for granted; it is altogether likely that he did, but at the same time a sentence saying so much in express terms would not have been at all out of place, particularly in an author whose windows are so wide open towards Germany.

4. In keeping with the foregoing, it seems clearly involved in more than one statement¹ of the author that the declaration of an apostle at any time reveals the full content of that apostle's knowledge at that time, that in each instance he tells all he knows; if later he adds anything, our author seems to infer that he has learned that much more in the meantime. The necessity for such an inference we cannot appreciate. Why the apostles should be bound on any occasion to tell all that they knew about Christ any more than Dr. Briggs is bound to put in this volume all that he knows about the apostles is difficult to say. The Professor would probably claim to have said all that he thought called for by the occasion and the audience addressed, and such a course seems to us no less right or rational for Paul and Peter in their writings. It is, to say the least, a plausible explanation, and, as such, is preferable to the implication of ignorance.

5. Of course, in a discussion pursuing the method followed in this volume, an author would have frequent occasion to refer to the "Pauline Idea of the Messiah," the "Petrine," and the "Johannean." But there are ways more than one of doing this; one is to refer to these "ideas" as if they were altogether original and independent, emphasizing the points of difference as due, doubtless, to difference of view-point, differences of knowledge, of opportunity, of Christian experience, of growth—in short, such variations as would inevitably result from a purely natural development in different minds working under different influences. Another way would be to refer these differing conceptions to the individualizing of the same truth conveyed by one and the same inspiring Spirit of God, but taking on something of the color of the mind and heart through which the revelation in each instance was given to the world. While we may not with too much assurance state that Prof. Briggs pursues the former course, we can,

¹ See pp. 30, 31, 44, 59, 251.

with all confidence, assert that he certainly does not pursue the latter. There is ominous absence of reference to the Holy Ghost as the great unifying element in the various Messianic ideas.

6. Once more in this same connection: We are somewhat startled to find allusions made to mistakes, errors, misconceptions, and ignorance in the apostles or their writings, *e. g.* :

“But the apostle is arguing against the distributive sense of the seed, and in this he is correct. He is incorrect in referring it to Christ alone as a person.” (P. 138, note.) “Paul nowhere in his epistles seems to know of the conception of Jesus in theophany, as described in the Gospel of Luke. . . . But the lack of knowledge of the apostle does not exclude the reality of the event.” (P. 143, note.) “It refers to the daily offerings of the high priest, whether this is an error of ignorance, as Pfeiderer and others think, or an error of inadvertence, summing up, in the work of the high priest, unconsciously, the work of the entire priesthood.” (P. 264.)

We have become accustomed to such references and allusions in other quarters, but to find them so quietly and incidentally and naturally made in a volume published by a professor in a Presbyterian theological seminary in the United States is something novel.

7. Lastly, in the line of general criticism, we dislike exceedingly Prof. Briggs' way of referring to difficulties. We have no patience at all with anything like a complete ignoring of difficulties. We have contempt only for a removal which evidently does not remove; we have small sympathy with any spirit of orthodox bravado which essays simply to “whistle them down the wind,” so to speak. The only dignified, fair, scholarly course is an honest recognition of difficulties where such exist. Nothing is ever really and permanently gained by denying, ignoring, or evading them; but at the same time *one should be as just to faith as he is to doubt*; and if a writer believes the case stronger for the former than for the latter, it should be made evident to every reader. With the statement of difficulties there should always go some facts, if such there be, to render them less formidable. This course is not pursued by Dr. Briggs. For example, in introducing the Revelation of St. John he says:

“The Apocalypse of John has been, from the earliest times, the most doubtful writing in the New Testament. Pious bishops, theologians, and reformers

have either denied its canonicity or have expressed grave doubts whether it ought to be included in the canon of Holy Scripture. It is also the most difficult writing in the New Testament." (P. 284.)

Now, of course this is true; but to leave the statement just as it is, with no reference whatever to the fact that a majority of "pious bishops, theologians," etc., have accepted it in the face of all difficulties; that the grounds for its acceptance outweigh the objections; that the very contest greatly strengthens its claims, in that it has sustained successfully such severe test; to omit all such qualification as this, is to fall short of a full and fair statement of the case. Again, as before stated, it is altogether likely that Dr. Briggs intends this to be taken for granted. It is unfortunate, however, that in every instance *whatever risk there be* must be taken by that side of the controversy on which the author is supposed to stand. We cannot think Dr. Briggs' statements of difficulties at all happy; they are not such as to strengthen faith; on the contrary, we fear that many readers will lay down his work with the uncomfortable feeling that the case is even worse than they thought it to be. Our author is always just to skepticism; were he as fair to faith, we would have no fault to find. This ought he to have done, and not to have left the other undone.

So much by way of general criticism. Going somewhat more into detail in the matter of specific criticism, we mention a number of points in which, if we have interpreted him correctly, the distinguished author seems to hold views, if not peculiar, at least out of accord with those commonly held in the Presbyterian Church. We shall not lengthen this paper and burden the reader with quotations in every instance to sustain these criticisms; foot-notes, in most cases, will indicate the passages upon which the points are based, and each reader can test for himself the critic's conclusions.

1. Dr. Briggs seems to hold to a general as opposed to a particular redemption. As between the Calvinist and the Arminian here, we think that the views advanced in this volume would align the author on the Arminian side.¹

2. It seems involved in certain references and allusions that the

¹ See pp. 124, 152, 474, 491, 516.

author believes in some kind of a purgatory; just what, we are not prepared to say, but we think there are some statements in the volume clearly inconsistent with the declaration that "The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory."¹

3. That for some persons dying unsaved there is a probation after death. Of course our author limits the application of this probation to those who have never had an opportunity of accepting Christ during their lifetime. We need not detain readers with the obvious difficulties that confront this attractive hypothesis. If probation at all, why not a wider extension? Why for the heathen in Africa any more than for the heathen in the United States? Why for the heathen at all anywhere, if condemnation for sin be just? If condemnation for sin without opportunity to accept Christ be unjust, wherein consists the grace of salvation? But we cannot enter this inviting field of discussion; our purpose is mainly to indicate the author's view,² not to discuss it.

4. The author plainly indicates the possibility of salvation out of Christ, suggesting a distinction between the Messianic salvation and some other, between "*the* salvation," "*the* life," and some indefinite anarthrous salvation and life, not of "the kingdom," and not brought through the Messiah; *e. g.*,

"Peter³ does not mean to teach that all who know not of this salvation will be condemned to everlasting punishment at death. Such a doctrine is nowhere to be found in Holy Scripture. . . . He teaches that Jesus is the only Messiah. No other Messiah will come. He is the only corner-stone of the kingdom of God. No other will ever be laid. He has brought the Messianic salvation into the world. No other is to be expected. His salvation is the Messianic salvation, and no one else can give it. He is the only Saviour who can give this salvation." (P. 34.)

Commenting on 1 John v. 12, he says:

"The definite article is important, because it indicates that the life here spoken of is the eternal life given unto us by God in his Son; and it does not imply that those who have not received it are altogether destitute of religious life and deprived of every hope of salvation." (P. 491, note. See also p. 518.)

The only salvation we know anything about is "*the* salvation"

¹ See pp, 56, 130, 362, 531, 532, 534.

² See pp. 35, note, 40, 56, 58, note, 362, 493, note, 517 and note, 518.

³ Acts iv. 8-12.

revealed in the Scriptures; the word of God gives not a hint even of any other. This word is certainly the standard and test for all to whom it comes. For those who live and die utterly ignorant of its very existence, God *may* have other standards and other tests. He is sovereign in government, infinite in wisdom and in mercy; we can safely leave all such issues in his divine hands; amid such perplexities one may indulge a hope, but he cannot exercise a faith.

Indeed, we can go further than this: wherever the Scriptures refer to the condition of such persons they seem invariably to suggest the hopelessness of that condition without the gospel; whenever the Jew and the Gentile are in any respect compared, the uniform conclusion is that there is "no difference"¹—no difference in the ruin, no difference in the remedy, no difference in the condition of salvation or the method. We would have been glad to read from our author some comment on Rom. x. 12–15 in this connection.

Moreover, such speculation is far-reaching; it starts one inevitably to questioning the *necessity* of the atonement; and so this very benevolent, somewhat popular theory, harmless as it may seem to many, enters into the very vitals of the Christian system, and reaches even to the character of God, his justice, his wisdom, his mercy.

5. Dr. Briggs has some things to say about the virgin birth of our Lord which seem to be inconsistent with the very clear and explicit historical statements made in the New Testament narrative, and altogether out of accord with the creeds of Christendom. His statements² appear to us inconsistent with the *Confession of Faith*, Chap. VIII., 2, *Larger Catechism*, Quest. 37, *Shorter Catechism*, Quest. 22.

6. There is, as has been already intimated, a great obscurity attending all the references to Christ's atoning sacrifice, a uniform absence of the terms commonly used by writers, from Turretin to Hodge. In a writer less candid than Dr. Briggs such

¹ See Rom. i. 18–21; iii. 23; ii. 7–11; iii. 29, 30.

² See pp. 251, 523.

uniform avoidance of the natural and familiar phraseology would infallibly suggest a suspicion of evasion.¹ We think that a critic should be very slow to insinuate such a charge against any writer, particularly against one as independent and outspoken as the author of this work; but whatever may be the reason for it, the fact remains that there is not in the whole book, from beginning to end, one clear, simple, satisfactory statement of the real nature of Christ's sacrifice as interpreted in the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. References and allusions to the atonement there are innumerable, as a matter of course, but there is a certain vagueness and indefiniteness invariably attending them all. This lack of definiteness in statement may proceed from a lack of definiteness in belief. Our explanation of the case is, that Dr. Briggs is obscure in expression because he is obscure in thought; he says nothing more definite because he has nothing more definite to say. He is in a state of transition, and his views of the atonement are, consciously or unconsciously, in suspense. Whether he is himself aware of it yet or not, he has, in our judgment, dragged his anchor from the moorings of the *Westminster Confession*, and is now drifting in some uncertainty, but his general course is Andover-wards. In the initial number of this QUARTERLY we published a somewhat extended review of the "Andover Renaissance." There is much in this work of Dr. Briggs that revives reminiscences of our study of that movement.

From what has been said, the reader will perceive that the grounds of the criticism must necessarily be very subtle, the defect being negative rather than positive. To vindicate our criticism would require an extent of citation and comment out of all proportion to the limits of this paper; we would be compelled to give pages of quotation, followed by comment even more extended and minutely critical. If the reader will consult the references below,² he will be in a position to judge the justice of our criticism.

¹ For an illustration of the same thing in a different connection, note carefully the phraseology on page 189; the avoidance here is something unique in *Presbyterian* literature.

² See pp. 216; 247, 263, 266; 253, 265; 526, 529, 486, note.

In addition to the foregoing, there are occasional statements made by the author which have impressed us as at least questionable; some of them, in themselves alone considered, may be regarded as very trivial, some perhaps more serious, but all are blemishes, affecting, more or less, the value of the volume, possibly the trustworthiness of the author in the matter of accuracy or care. As instances of questionable statements, we note the following:

Discussing the First Epistle of Peter, he says: "The writer nowhere mentions the church or church officers." A writer making such a statement as this owes to his readers some explanation of 1 Pet. v. 1-4; to omit it assumes a knowledge which many of them do not possess. On page 106 he says that in Paul's usage the phrase *church of God* does not refer to local congregations, but to the whole body of Christians, and adds that this is in accordance with the use of church in the Gospel of Matthew. The use of the word in Matt. xviii. 17 leaves room to doubt the statement. Commenting on John iii. 16-21, he says:¹ "This section is evidently a comment upon the words of Jesus." There is something very dogmatic in the positiveness of this "evidently," in view of the fact that such critical scholars as Calvin, Meyer, Alford, Godet, and others, with all their study of the passage, failed utterly to see it.

In his final summation (p. 525) he says: "It is evident, therefore, that the historical events of the life of Christ on earth are of small importance in the doctrine of the apostles." We are at a loss to understand either the motive or the grounds for just such a statement. That there is very little *narrative* in the writings of the apostles goes without saying; there is no call for it. That the teaching of the apostles presupposes a great familiarity with the life of Christ on earth is perfectly evident. The reader will recall innumerable references and allusions which assume this familiarity. Without such knowledge the doctrine of the apostles would be simply a puzzling enigma; so that our author's assertion above is much like stating that the rules of arithmetic are of small importance in the teaching of algebra.

On page 527 we read: "The law became itself accursed when

¹ Page 515.

it crucified the holy Jesus, and lost its authority forever with respect to believers in him."

We cannot recall a single scriptural statement to justify such an assertion; it is nowhere asserted or implied that the law became accursed. The law, on the contrary, is magnified, made honorable, established and fulfilled by Christ. It loses its authority over believers in him just as a note loses its claim when it is paid; and it became accursed just as a note is accursed by the payment thereof.¹

On page 537: "It is evident, therefore, that apart from the Epistles of John, the resurrection and enthronement of the Messiah is the most important Christian doctrine, upon which Peter and Paul dwell most frequently and most fully."

If the apostles dwell most frequently and most fully on the resurrection and enthronement, it is because the resurrection and the enthronement are the attestation and the consummation of Christ's mediatorial work. The importance of these two great doctrines is derived from their necessary relation to this work. Apart from the cross they are as seals sundered from the document they attest, or like conclusions without premises. This is so patent that citation is superfluous.²

Our author says, on page 540, that "the kingdom to Paul is always eschatological," that he "nowhere uses kingdom in the soteriological sense."

Of course, this is a matter of interpretation. We are compelled to record our dissent from such a statement. It must be left to each reader to judge for himself between us.

On page 152, discussing Rom. v. 12-21:

"By one act of trespass the many, all the race of men, were constituted sinful men. By one act of righteous obedience to God, even unto the death of the cross, the many, the same race of men, are constituted righteous men. As Dr. Forbes well says: 'Thus, in Adam, humanity fell; in Christ, humanity rose again. All are involved in the ruin of the first man; all are equally interested in the salvation by "him that was to come."'"

This paragraph needs more explanation than the context affords. Much depends upon the exact reference and meaning of the word

¹ See Rom. iii. 31; vii. 12-14.

² As specimens of Paul's teaching, see Acts xvii. 31; Rom. i. 4; Phil. ii. 9.

“equally” in the last clause. Taken just as it stands, we cannot regard it as a satisfactory statement.

On page 486 (note), referring to 1 John iii. 16, he remarks: “The very fact that laying down of the life for others is what every Christian should do, shows that the conception here is not of a victim of the ritual of a sacrificial system.”

We cannot appreciate the point made here. The *fact* of the self-sacrifice is all that is in issue; the precise circumstances, nature, method of it, do not enter into the apostle’s application at all. It is the spirit of Christ here, as elsewhere, held up for his followers’ imitation. Our author’s comment is irrelevant and useless. There is, perhaps, no single instance in which our Lord is held up to us as an example which, if construed literally and in every detail with exact correspondence, would not be ruled out as impossible for his followers. Such a method of interpretation would play havoc with all illustration and argument from analogy throughout the whole compass of literature.

In his discussion of 1 John v. 6–13, he says: ¹

“There are those who think that this passage excludes from eternal salvation all who have not this life from God. Such persons do not understand the writer. He does not exclude from salvation the heroes of faith in the Old Testament, who did not know Christ and confess him, and receive eternal life in him; for the time had not yet come for the manifestation of the Messiah. No more, then, are the pious heathen excluded, who fear God in the form of religion they profess, but have no knowledge of the Messiah. No more does it exclude those of any age who have not been brought to a knowledge of him, and who have not rejected him.”

This paragraph introduces a needless confusion, unless the writer is prepared to place the Old Testament heroes of faith and the heathen upon the same platform. As to the former, our Lord’s reference to Abraham may have some bearing: “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.” (John viii. 56.) As to the latter, “pious heathen, who fear God in the form of religion they profess,” have thus far been found only in the hypotheses of kind-hearted theorists. Such heathen and such forms of heathen religion are not historical realities; the real heathen, unfortunately, is not pious, and his religion is not a form to fear God in.

¹ Page 492, note.

About one-third of the whole volume is devoted to the Apocalypse of John, and to this discussion attaches the greatest interest of the treatise. As late as January, 1888, our author published an article in the *Presbyterian Review* (predecessor to the present *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*), of which he was then the chief managing editor. This article was a somewhat brief, but exceedingly vigorous, attack upon Vischer's theory, supported by Harnack and others, that the Apocalypse was a composite document, and showed the traces of two hands in its present form. This theory Dr. Briggs very ably opposed for the following reasons, in brief:

1. If the Apocalypse is to be divided between two authors, these ought to show *differences of language*.

2. The new theory was bound to show differences in *style and methods of composition* between the two authors.

3. Vischer does not present any differences in *historical situation* to justify two different authors.

4. The argument from *citation and use of other writings* counts against the new theory, so far as any evidence has yet been presented on this subject.

5. The argument from *difference of doctrine* in favor of the new hypothesis does not sustain the theory.

Our author then added, most forcibly, we think:

“Furthermore, the title of the Apocalypse ought to have been explained. How could the Christian author embrace a Jewish apocalypse and his own additions to it under the title, Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς δεῖξαι τοῖς δοῦλοις αὐτοῦ? It was also necessary to consider xxii. 18, 19. Vischer assigns xxii. 6-21 in general to the Christian author, but leaves out of consideration the objections that spring therefrom against his theory. Verses 18, 19 pronounce a curse upon any one who adds to the book or takes from it. If this belonged to the Jewish original, the Christian editor would hardly have retained this curse upon him for everything he had done. If they belong to the Christian author, what sort of conscience must he have had to pronounce a curse upon any one else who should do with his work precisely what he himself had done with the work of another?”

After some very keen discussion of the difficulties confronting the theory in the twelfth chapter, the article concludes with the following decisive paragraph:

“The new theory does not bear serious examination. The principles of the Higher Criticism are against it. It is a premature birth. If the authors had re-

tained it longer for critical examination they might possibly have strengthened it. It is probable that they would have abandoned it. It will call to a fresh study of the Apocalypse in its historical relations, and will therefore be of service to Christian scholarship. But in its present form it certainly does little credit to the critical judgment of Harnack, and impairs his reputation for scientific criticism."

Such was the position maintained in the article published in 1888. Referring in the present volume to the view he then entertained, he says: ¹

"I was withheld from accepting the documentary theory of the Apocalypse by the unity which I have always found in the book. In adopting the documentary hypothesis, I hold it in entire consistency with that unity. The unity is the work of the final editor. The author of the Apocalypse of John has transposed parts of the different original apocalypses, has pushed the beginning of some of them into the midst of others of them, and so rearranged the whole material as best to suit the symmetry he was aiming to produce. It is impracticable, in a volume like this, which has to do with the Messianic idea of the Apocalypse rather than with its literary forms, to go deeply into the subject of its analysis and composition. I can only state the results which I have reached, and some of the reasons therefor."

It would have been exceedingly gratifying if our author *could* have found space somewhere in his one hundred and seventy-eight pages devoted to the Apocalypse to answer his own seven-page criticism of the theory he now upholds, particularly as to the *honesty* and *conscience* of the alleged Christian editor and "the real core of the problem" contained in chapter xii. These latter points are not even alluded to; and as to the unity, it was surely just as explicable by the work of an editor in 1888 as in 1895. This decisive change of view gives an interesting gauge of Dr. Briggs' rapid progress.² In 1888 the theory of *two* hands concerned in the Apocalypse does not "bear serious criticism"; in 1895 he sees not *two* hands merely, but *four* editions, with the omnipresent redactor, a most marvellous rearrangement, transposition, etc., of material, the beginning of some thrust into the midst of others, numerous editorial seams, and all ingeniously combined into such symmetry that one of the foremost Higher Critics of the age could say confidently in 1888 that the theory of

¹ Page 289.

² It may be well to state here, also, that Dr. Briggs regards the prologue to the Gospel of John as an addition made to the original by some later hand. This and several other passages of the same Gospel were passed over in the volume, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, being reserved for treatment in the present work.

even *two* hands in its composition impairs one's reputation for scientific criticism.

This transposition and rearrangement is so interesting that we will gratify the natural curiosity of our readers by presenting here the scheme according to our author's own readjustment:

TABLE OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

IV. EDITION.						
III. EDITION.						REDACTOR.
II. EDITION.				5. BEASTS.	6. DRAGON.	
I. EDITION.			4. BOWLS.			
1. EPISTLES.	2. SEALS.	3. TRUMPETS.				
i. 9. i. 10—iii.	i. 4-6. iv.—vi. viii. 1. xi. 15b-18.	i. 7, 8. vii. 1-8. viii. 2—ix. x. 1a. x. 3-7. xi. 14-15a. xi. 19.				and many notes throughout.
	xiv. 1-5. vii. 9 17.	xiv. 6, 7. xiv. 14-20.	xv.—xvii. xix. 1-8.	xviii. xix. 11-21.	xii. 1-17. xii. 18. xiii. xiv. 8-13.	
			xxi. 9-15. xxi. 16b, 17. xxi. 22-27. xxii. 1, 2.			
xxi. 5b, 7a. xxii. 16, 17.	xxii. 21.	xxi. 6, 7b, 8. xxii. 10-15.	(xix. 9, 10.) xxii. 6-9.		xx. . xxi. 1, 2. xxi. 16a, c. xxi. 18-21. xxii. 3-5. xxi. 3-5a.	
					xxii. 18, 20.	

The author's concluding word in offering this volume to the public is:

"This third volume of the series is now given to those who have read and studied the previous volumes, in confidence that they will see in it the crown of the biblical Messianic idea. It is a birth from many years of severe study and discipline. It expresses my matured convictions. It may be regarded as a confession of my faith."

This solemn statement justifies the title we have prefixed to our paper. Concerning it we have two remarks to make before laying down the pen:

1. Dr. Briggs' confession of faith seems to us in several important particulars to differ from that of the Westminster divines and from their catechisms, concerning which venerable documents it may not be irrelevant in this connection to add that "there are doubtless many still living" who regard these antiquarian symbols as the standards of the Presbyterian Church.

2. While according our author all sincerity in claiming that this volume expresses his "matured convictions," we feel sure that he will find himself mistaken. They are his convictions, of this we have not the slightest doubt; that they are *not* mature, we have as little. We confidently predict that Dr. Briggs will sooner or later put forth another confession of his faith, one which may possibly astonish some of his readers.

If we are not greatly at fault, his convictions are yet far from *ripe*.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C.

III. SOME RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.¹

THERE is a philosophy of religion which is the peculiar province of the specialist. It thrives best in the stillness of the study, or the class-room. Its results are embodied in elaborate treatises and comprehensive systems. Its influence is concentrated upon a select coterie of students, who are freed from the cares of our common life. Of that philosophy it would be presumptuous for me to speak.

There is, however, another philosophy of religion. It is no man's specialty, but the serious concern of every one who would stand for himself in a right mental attitude, and who would help his fellow-men to attain that attitude. Every man who thinks has a philosophy, and if he thinks upon religion, he has a philosophy of religion. The so-called religious difficulties are not altogether due to the hardness of men's hearts. In an appreciable degree these arise out of a false philosophy, and he that watches for men's souls as one that must give account will correct the philosophy while he inculcates the religion. There is need, then, of a philosophy which is both sound and simple, which imbibes as much of the more thorough philosophy as it can apply to the relief of the average man, which can be used not only in the quiet of the study, but in the whirl of an active ministry, and face to face with the practical necessities of perplexed and bewildered men. Of this philosophy I count it no presumption to speak to those who share with me this ministry.

The contributions I have in mind relate to the theory of belief and to its function in religion. I think that the weakest point in our philosophy is just here. We all believe in belief. We urge upon men its importance in their lives, and marshal with great labor the evidence supporting our particular beliefs, and rejoice in

¹ Read before the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Chicago on November 18, 1895.

the results which these bring about. But do we not touch very lightly upon such questions as the authority of our primary beliefs, the relations which these sustain to our reasoned conclusions, the function of belief in the formation of character, and the point at which Christian belief necessarily diverges from all other forms of religious belief? Yet no apologetic, however vigorous, can overcome the weakness of a philosophy which is weak here. This will explain why, in the midst of results which the world never before has seen equalled, our modern Christianity fails to tell as it ought. It also prepares us to hail with gladness any movement in the world of philosophic thought which even seems to promise well for the theory of belief.

It is perhaps venturesome to claim for any thesis in the philosophy of religion the honorable title of a "contribution," for the claim is certain to be challenged at once. Any one who is at all familiar with that perennial controversy in which we employ the terms "reason and revelation," "the natural and the supernatural," "the sacred and the secular," "liberty and authority," "creed and conduct," will recognize the unsettled condition of opinion with which we are face to face. Yet since men will continue to philosophize, there must be no surcease in our efforts to harmonize into one consistent system the truths whose fragments we seem to have laid hold of, and to approximate that unity which we must believe will ultimately be made clear to our expectant eyes.

The contributions I have in mind are to be found in two books of recent appearance. One is *Social Evolution*, by Mr. Benjamin Kidd, a clerk in the service of the British government, and the other is *The Foundations of Belief*, by the Right Honorable Arthur James Balfour, a member of the present British Cabinet, and a nephew of Lord Salisbury, the premier. Mr. Kidd's book is his first venture; Mr. Balfour is the author of *A Defense of Philosophic Doubt*, published several years ago.

These books illustrate the distinction between the two philosophies of religion which I pointed out at the beginning. They are written from standpoints quite far apart. Mr. Kidd is an evolutionist, eager to apply his philosophy to society as the highest

form of life. He passes heedlessly over the metaphysical problems which he touches, and sorely exasperates those who see nothing beyond these problems. Mr. Balfour is a critic. His book is a keen analysis of naturalism, and a provisional unification of those truths which naturalism has so intolerably perverted. I am not all sure that either of these authors would relish the conjunction of their names and their books, but I hope to show that they are so far at one that they throw the same fresh light upon some of the problems which are perplexing the men of to-day.

Mr. Kidd believes that evolution is the law of life, and finds fault with his brother-evolutionists because they have not applied that law to society, which ought to be the highest department of biology. He criticises severely their avoidance of social problems, and the obscurantism which withholds them from confronting these problems. Human progress, he says, is the result of rivalry; it involves strain and stress; it proceeds according to the law of selection, which implies rejection, and necessitates competition. This rivalry is the keenest among the progressive peoples of the earth, and whenever it is suspended the process of degeneration sets in. This is the law of human progress and of biology applied at its highest point. This progress is made at a sacrifice, however. The interests of any individual or of any generation would best be served by the suspension of that rivalry and an equal division, or, at least, an equal share for all. Socialism is not unreasonable when it asks that competition cease and combination take its place, and that men who are born equal have a more nearly equal share. Temperately stated, the programme of socialism commends itself to common sense, in that it seeks to enable men to make for themselves the most out of the present time, rather than deny themselves for the sake of generations yet unborn. Yet, reasonable as this suspension appears, it has never taken, and it will never take place. Socialism is reasonable, but it is unattainable, and, if it were to be attained, human progress would instantly cease. The fact is, that man continues to subject himself to strenuous conditions which he might suspend. His progress increases the rivalry of life, and intensifies his competitions. This is the meaning of the abolition of slavery, of the

gradual enfranchisement of the masses, of the remedial measures for the laboring classes, and of the growing respect for the rights of minorities. The power-holding classes have acted continually against their own interests, which are the dictates of reason or of common sense, and have given to others what they might, with a good show of reason, have continued to hold for themselves. What is that strange power which has carried the race onward along this path of individual self-sacrifice for the sake of peoples who have no claim upon them, and of generations yet unborn? Evidently, it is a power which has sanctions strong enough to overcome innate selfishness, and to induce to certain actions against which reason, in the ordinary acceptation of that term, protests vigorously. That power Mr. Kidd finds in religion. The course of modern progress has been religious and ethical, not rational and individual, and its results are seen, not in an increasing intellectual grasp, but in the deepening and sweetening of human character.

Modern progress, according to Mr. Kidd, dates from a period which began eighteen centuries ago, when the Christian doctrines of immediate salvation and human brotherhood were first preached. The violent opposition which these doctrines encountered arose rather from those who were wedded to existing social conditions than from those of contrary theological opinions. The ethical influence of these doctrines was sufficiently strong to bring about the gradual weakening of the military conception of life which prevailed in the Roman empire, and to bring men into the struggle for existence on terms more and more nearly equal. That ethical influence, however, was gradually lost sight of, and Christianity became occupied in perpetuating and enforcing, through all departments of mediæval life, its supernatural sanctions, until, at the time of the Reformation, the ethical was completely obscured by the supernatural. Reason was extinguished, and the right of private judgment was lost, in an all-prevailing ecclesiastical authority. The Reformation was the release of those ethical or altruistic forces which for sixteen centuries had been denied their play, and which are the source of our modern progress, political, social, and industrial. That progress is marked by the

steady retreat of the power-holding classes from their vested rights, and by the gradual elevation, by these classes, of the people as a whole to privileges which the people never before enjoyed. The supernatural sanctions which are found in Christianity of the evangelical type are the source of modern progress, in that they alone have been strong enough to induce men to forego their own interests and to bring their fellow-men into the struggle for existence upon terms of equality with themselves; and these sanctions bind many who are unconscious of their source, and some who openly repudiate the religion from which they spring. The future of social progress will be along the lines of its past, and consistent with it. The nations which lack these supernatural sanctions in their religious life will disappear beneath the surface in the struggle for existence, while those nations in which these sanctions have the freest and fullest development will be in the future, as they now are, the dominant nations of the world.

As will be seen from this outline, Mr. Kidd's argument invites criticism from every side. The anti-Christian regards it as "the recrudescence of supernaturalism"; the champion of human reason is astounded at this daring assault upon the prerogatives of his ideal; the metaphysician is annoyed by the conspicuous neglect of his favorite problems; the socialist is not satisfied by Mr. Kidd's concession to the rationality of his programme, because that programme is said to be practically unattainable in that it follows intellectual rather than ethical lines; and ritualistic Christianity is indignant at the assertion that it is a chief obstacle in the path of human progress. Yet, in spite of this formidable body of critics, and this formidable mass of criticism, there are some principles in Mr. Kidd's philosophy which are worthy of our very hearty approval.

Mr. Balfour disclaims any right to speak on theological questions, and restricts himself to the philosophical presuppositions which are involved in any adequate theology. On the threshold of religion he encounters naturalism, which is apparently fatal to religion. It assumes a scientific garb, and in its thrusts at religion creates the impression that it speaks for science; but, as a fact,

naturalism is not science, but only one interpretation of scientific facts, and a mood or temper in which a very respectable class of men has approached the study of scientific problems. It sometimes calls itself agnosticism, sometimes empiricism, and sometimes positivism. These are alike in that they teach that all we know is phenomena—things which appear—and the laws by which these things are connected. The only world we know, says naturalism, is that revealed to us through perception, and this is the subject-matter of the natural sciences. It is here only that we may exercise our reason and gather the fruits of wisdom. Pleasure and pain, appetite and disgust, courage and heroism, are all upon one plane—sensations produced by experience. Life is a petty episode in the history of the world. Of living things but a small proportion has feeling, and a still smaller proportion of things that have feeling are endowed with moral feelings. If these were destroyed, man, indeed, would be the loser, but there would be no sensible diminution in the sum of realities and no change in the organic world.

“If naturalism be true, or rather if it be the whole truth, then is morality but a bare catalogue of utilitarian precepts; beauty but the chance occasion of a passing pleasure; reason but the dim passage from one state of unthinking habits to another. All that gives dignity to life, all that gives value to effort, shrinks and fades under the pitiless glare of a creed like this.”

Mr. Balfour criticises our ordinary apologetic because it has made no serious inquiry into the principles of naturalism, or into the adequacy of that positive knowledge on which naturalism prides itself; but has been content with insisting upon the insufficiency of that positive knowledge and its need of some theological supplement. In his inquiry into this so-called positive knowledge, Mr. Balfour shows that science conceives of a world of objects which are ordered and related, independent of the presence or absence of the observer, and which are governed in their behavior by rigid laws. Whence comes this conception of the world? The professed premise of naturalism is experience, which includes observation and experiment. These are the raw material of hypothesis and inference, and are based upon the evidence of the senses. Are these sufficient to give us positive knowledge of

a world outside of ourselves? When we observe an object, as a tree, we experience a certain sensation. If knowledge be limited to experience, we, of course, know only our sensations and feelings, and know nothing of a world or even of an object outside of the observing self. This is the inevitable result of empiricism; and yet scientific men speak of material things as real. They claim a definite and positive knowledge of them. They do not hesitate to make the leap from their own sensations to a real external world. How is this leap to be justified if positive knowledge be limited by personal experience? How can we squeeze a trustworthy knowledge of a permanent and independent material universe out of sensations which are but transient, evanescent effects? If we begin to argue, we at once go beyond the limits of naturalism. The conviction that sensations and feelings must have a cause, that the hypothesis of a material world suggests a cause agreeable to our natural beliefs, and that as a hypothesis it enables us to anticipate the order and the character of our perceptions, carries us beyond the range of experience into those fundamental principles which Hume and the naturalistic school deny. The principle of causation cannot be extracted out of a succession of individual experiences of sensations and feelings. The world described by science is not congruous with our natural beliefs, and on naturalistic principles we cannot legitimately reason from effect to cause. Naturalism, therefore, like every other philosophy, rests upon our primary beliefs; and, like supernaturalism, is an inference from them, and not the irresistible conclusion of ultimate scientific facts.

This argument Mr. Balfour applies to ethics, to æsthetic, and to reason. His essay follows a clear line, which leads him to hold—

First, That any system which, with our present knowledge, we are able to construct must suffer from obscurities, from defects of proof, and from incoherences. This is true, even if it be narrowed down to bare science.

Second, No unification of belief of the slightest theoretic value can take place on the basis of inductions from particular experiences, whether external or internal.

Third, No philosophy can be satisfactory which does not find

room for the fact that, so far as empirical science can tell us anything about the matter, most of the proximate causes of belief, and all of its ultimate causes, are non-rational in their character.

Fourth, No unification of belief is practically adequate which fails to include ethical as well as scientific beliefs, or which excludes from ethical beliefs those which contain our moral sentiments, ideals, and aspirations, and which satisfy our ethical needs. The spirit of man can rest in no permanent habitation which fails to provide satisfaction for these needs.

I may now indicate the particular contributions to our philosophy of religion which are made by these two authors.

I. THE SPHERE OF REASON.

This is large or small, according to the sense in which we take the word. The double sense is justly chargeable with much of the confusion which surrounds the question, and which is very apparent in much of the criticism called out by these books. In the broader sense, of course, reason includes all that distinguishes man from the brute, as when we speak of man as a rational animal, and all that links him to the eternal or essential reason. In the latter sense it is narrowed down to the faculty of reasoning, or to those intellectual processes, the product of which is represented in the conclusions of our arguments and the results of our examination of evidence. It is easy to identify the fruit of our reasonings with the eternal and essential reason, and to imagine that the one is the necessary product of the other; but in doing this we commit a grave philosophical fault and open the way for hopeless confusion. This fault is accountable for the popular notion that the ideal of humanity is intellectual, and the truth lies like a pot of gold just under the rainbow of our reasonings; that the rational proof of our opinions is the plain duty of thinking men, and that ultimately we will be able to reach and act upon conclusions by the judicial investigation of and decision between the various reasons which are on one side and the other. This notion has infected even our Christian teachers, and has led them into various devices to commend to men the truth we hold on

rational grounds, and to prove it by argument and by evidence.

We are indebted to Mr. Balfour for his emphasis on both senses of this term. He maintains the essential rationality of the universe, and views the eternal reason as the ground of all existence; and he characterizes the common notion that the difficult and perplexing work connected with the maintenance of life is performed by intellect as a great delusion. He holds that the management of the humblest organ would be infinitely beyond our mental capacities, and that, as a matter of fact, it is only in the simplest "jobs" that discursive reason is permitted to have a hand at all, and that our tendency to take a different view is one arising out of our self-importance, which is like that of a child who, because he is allowed to stamp the letters, imagines that he conducts the correspondence. The notion that reason, and reason alone, can be safely permitted to mould the convictions of mankind is not only erroneous, but scientifically absurd. What would be the chance in the struggle for existence of a community in which each member set himself to the task of throwing off all prejudices due to education, and of examining critically the grounds on which rest every positive enactment and every moral precept? Such a community could never begin to be; and if it once began, it would immediately be resolved into its constituent elements.

Mr. Kidd points out that in intellectual power the world has made no progress in over eighteen hundred years, and that the brain capacity of the ancient Greeks was larger than that of the Anglo-Saxon of to-day. He shows that the intellectual classes, as such, have always stood athwart the line of modern progress, and that this progress has been made despite their most furious opposition and their most relentless persecution. Intellectual processes, as these are represented in what we call common sense, teach each man to make for himself the most of life, they develop the self-regarding instincts and cultivate a narrow individualism. The altruistic feelings out of which progress springs are not only beyond intellectual demonstration, but are in conflict with what men call rational conclusions. The ideal of a rational religion, that is, a religion which begins in and justifies itself to our intellectual

processes, may be attained as an ideal of rationality; but in proportion as it grows in rationality, it loses in that force which is essential in all religion.

These limitations of the sphere of reason have provoked very loud protests, but the protests are of small avail. Reason—that is, our reasonings—has its place, but it is not the place which some of its champions have claimed for it. That place, although indispensable, is subordinate. Its function is to state the contents of our primary beliefs, which are so far reasonable that they yield to intelligent statement, and are subject to confirmation by evidence; but these reasonings do not give to our primary beliefs their authority, nor can they retain for those beliefs that authority after it is once lost.

II. THE AUTHORITY OF PRIMARY BELIEFS.

Religious beliefs differ in no essential way from other primary beliefs, and all beliefs ought to be considered, not in arbitrary divisions, but in their unity. As such, these deep-seated instincts or spiritual intuitions have, according to Mr. Kidd, a truer basis than scientific investigation. They are the complement of reason in its narrow sense. The fond hope cherished by many who called themselves rational, that these beliefs will some day be displaced by reason, is doomed, as it always has been, to a bitter disappointment. Arguments may vary and the grounds on which each individual and each generation rests his belief may change, but the beliefs abide unchanged, surviving the changes in the rational statement or proof of them. These beliefs, with their supernatural sanctions, lie at the foundation of all religion. The so-called religions which repudiate the supernatural are not in any real sense religions, because they have never laid hold of mankind with any ethical power; and the strength even of Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and the religions of the Greeks and the Romans, as well as those religions which are more conspicuously supernatural, lies in the appeal which they make to influences which are beyond rational demonstration.

Mr. Balfour, as I have shown above, points out that naturalism as well as supernaturalism invokes these primary beliefs, in that it

appeals to the doctrine of causation and to the principle of the uniformity of nature, neither of which is a matter of experience or the product of reasoning, and yet without which naturalism would be perfectly helpless in its efforts to infer an external world from sensation and feeling. He points out that faith, by which he means a conviction apart from and in excess of rational demonstration, is the ground of our axioms of daily life as well as of our loftiest ends and our most far-reaching discoveries. Certitude is not the product of reason, but of these beliefs; and if we are less perplexed about beliefs on which we act every hour than we are about others, it is only because we are the less inclined to ask questions about them.

These views give new light upon rationalism. This, according to its disciples, is the unprejudiced examination of every question in the dry light of emancipated reason; specifically, it is a reaction against dogmatic theology which arose at the Renaissance. Doubtless it achieved much good, but, like other good things, it was carried entirely too far, when it was made a test of truth. If a belief squared with the view of the universe which was based upon the prevalent mode of interpreting sense-perception, it was rational. If it clashed, it was superstition. With amazing assurance Mr. Balfour coolly describes rationalists not as philosophers, but as "men of the world who are reluctant to criticise methods which succeed, or to admit that other methods are needed." And naturalism is only the application of rationalizing methods to the whole circuit of belief, and involves the surrender of religion, virtue and beauty. These primary beliefs, which in authority are independent of our reasonings, impel us, amid many difficulties, to infer a rational being, who made the world intelligible, and at the same time made us to understand it. If our confidence in these primary beliefs is to be justified, there must be a God, and if this confidence cannot be justified we are the victims of a skepticism which cannot be sure even of itself. From this fundamental position the arguments for an intelligent Creator, for divine inspiration, in at least the broad sense, and for the incarnation, proceed by easy stages.

III. THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF UPON CONDUCT.

Conduct is the product not so much of our reasoned conclusions as of our beliefs, and specially of our religious beliefs. These have a motive power which is lacking in our rational conclusions. Mr. Kidd shows the enormous influence of religious belief throughout the whole world, not only in churches and temples, but in customs, laws and institutions. He wonders that science, which is so eager for facts, should overlook the outstanding facts of religion. He holds that religious belief, by which is meant the belief in persons and influences beyond the reach of rational proof, is not only powerful in the individual life, but is the source of all social progress. It has furnished the motive power which has induced men to submit to the onerous conditions of progress and to sacrifice self for the good of others. If progress were intellectual, the men of to-day would show a retrogression, for the Greek intellect of eighteen centuries ago was as much superior to the Anglo-Saxon of to-day as the Anglo-Saxon is to the African intellect of to-day. That there has been progress in the face of a decreasing intellectuality shows that progress is not intellectual, but ethical in character; that is, it arises out of religious or ultra-rational rather than out of rational sources. This is true even of those who repudiate religion and religious influences. Fortunately for themselves they cannot escape "the psychological climate" in which they live, even though they inhabit that climate as "spiritual parasites."

It is certainly an immense gain to our philosophy if we can clearly see that character is not a mere by-product in an intellectual process, but the index of all real progress; that awe and reverence are not obstacles in the path of human development, but ethical forces, the value of which is beyond that of intellectual facility or scientific research; that moral impotency is chargeable, not to religious beliefs, but to that rationalism which ever assails those beliefs; that even the poorest religious belief, held amid much obscurity and many superstitions, is a more effective force in human life than the most brilliant intellectual product which has within it no link to bind it to the unseen and eternal. The extravasation of the supernatural is a hopeless ideal. Our

fundamental beliefs will be influencing human life and conduct long after every intellectual refutation of them has been forgotten. In these days of modernized empiricism, thinly veiled under theological phrases, we do well to give heed to this fundamental teaching of a sound philosophy.

IV.—THE ETHICAL POWER OF CHRISTIANITY.

Christian belief diverges from other forms of religious belief at the point of its efficiency to produce results in character and in civilization which indicate progress. It embodies an ethical force, which, so far as it is distinctive, arises out of its distinctive beliefs. Western civilization, according to Mr. Kidd, is limited to no one race, but marks all of those races which accepted Christianity at a time when the religion of Rome had lost what supernatural authority it possessed. It sprang into being, unnoticed and even scorned by the intellectual classes, yet endowed with a stern, aggressive, undisciplined enthusiasm which was unlike any other. The controversies it started only covered its vigor as a social movement. The Reformation had its chief significance, not in its theological, but in its social aspect. It preserved the supernatural sanctions, which were expressed in a present salvation and a human brotherhood, and at the same time it liberated that immense fund of altruistic sentiment which for centuries had been accumulating. The selfishness of modern life, which is the product of rational individualism, is counterbalanced by the humanitarianism of modern life, which is essentially super-rational. The abolition of slavery; the relief of the aged poor, of the orphan and of the epileptic; the advance of popular education; the reforms in the industrial world which affect child-labor, sweat-shops, and the hours of work, are all the product of that altruistic sentiment which is generated by Christianity.

The future will follow the lines of the past. The upheaval of society, so sorely dreaded, is already in progress, but the strata which have been upturned assure us that those which are yet to be upturned will bring not disaster, but indefinite improvement. Political enfranchisement will be followed by the relief of social conditions, until all are brought into the struggle for existence on

terms of equality, and the fittest will survive. The course of empire is indicated by the course of a living Christianity. Nations held under the spell of a formal Christianity are in decay, and the hope of such nations is in the dominance of peoples who are not only distinctively religious, not only distinctively Christian, but who are Christians in the Reformed, as distinguished from the Roman sense, and Evangelical, as distinguished both from Ritualistic and Humanitarian.

I need not pause even to hint the significance of this last contribution to the philosophy of religion. It would be a great pity if in any dogmatic or sectarian spirit the students of modern progress should close their eyes to the facts developed by a careful study of the history of western civilization. It would be a boon if in our day men could see for themselves, that now, as in the past, civilization is the product of religion, and that the irreligious tendencies of large sections of modern civilization are fraught with the greatest danger. It would be a still greater boon, if from their crude philosophies men could escape far enough to see that social progress springs not only from religion, but from those religions which are marked by supernatural sanction, and that the effort to tamper with those sanctions is portentous of evil for mankind. But the greatest boon which a sound philosophy can confer is to lead men from those various types of Christianity, whether Rationalistic or Ritualistic, which have the form of godliness, but deny the power thereof, to that Spiritual or Evangelical Christianity, which, as the seat of ethical energy, is the source of all modern progress.

W. S. PLUMER BRYAN.

The Church of the Covenant, Chicago.

IV. CHRISTIANITY, INSISTENT, UNCOMPROMISING AND CATHOLIC.

MANY in the Israel of our day, as in that of King Ahab, halt between two opinions. They have not certainly decided whether the God of the Bible alone is God, and therefore to be exclusively followed, or whether the idols of the court and of the grove may not also be divine, and so be also followed. They go after the Baal of free thought and unrestricted opinion. They admire literary taste more than historic truth, give higher credit to the modern critic than to the ancient prophet, yield a readier assent to the affirmations of physical science than to the words of divine revelation, trust to the intuitions of reason more than to the authority of faith, and claim equal rights and manifest equal regard for every form of religion. They want a comprehensive religion—one that will include all the good and all that is good, and will not cast the bad away. A religion broad as that of the African neophyte, who, on strongly affirming his conversion, being asked on what ground his confidence of the change rested, replied, “because I used to care for neither God nor devil, but now I like them both.” Though the moral difference between these beings is as wide apart as the poles, there are too many who have little moral preference for the one over the other. It must, nevertheless, be ever true, that those who love God, hate evil, and that men cannot serve God and mammon, that even a “woe” falls on those who confound moral distinctions. Thus says the prophet Isaiah, “Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.” The difference between good and evil, between sin and righteousness, between truth and falsehood, is founded in the moral nature of God, and is, therefore, eternal as his being.

The eager seekers after new things in our time turn coldly away from the ancient and exclusive altars of the living God,

from the simple but stately worship our fathers learned to love, from the well-trying doctrines of the Reformation in which our modern life began. They not only do not valiantly defend the honored faith of the great Protestant household, though it renewed and vitalized both the civilization and religion of Christendom, but they sometimes openly condemn it as negative, narrow, restrictive, and uncatholic. They would even level to the ground those walls and bulwarks which for centuries have encircled and defended the city of our God.

I wish in this paper to point out *some of the features of Christianity which at first brought it into inevitable conflict with false religions and forms of unbelief, Judaism and heathenism, while it maintained an attitude of insistence, exclusiveness and catholicity to all*; and to show that since neither the substance nor work of Christianity has changed, so neither does its attitude towards false religions and to unbelief in our own or in other times. It is ever insistent, uncompromising, and catholic.

Now, the first postulate of revealed religion is belief in a supreme personal God, who created and governs the world, and to whom all moral creatures are accountable. In the epitomized expression of St. Mark, "There is one God, and there is none other but he." Belief in this one supreme God was the primary demand of the law given from Sinai. After the lawgiver had proclaimed himself "the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious," he commanded the people, saying, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." So Moses, when reiterating the law before his death, charged the people, saying, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord." The great Teacher urged the same precept, and designated it the first commandment in his code of moral duties. This one Lord dwelt symbolically among the people in the Shekinah, while the ark of the covenant remained to them. But when, for their idolatry, they were carried captives into Babylon, the symbol ceased to represent him. But from the exile the people gave up the practice of idolatry, and henceforth a higher and more spiritual type of religious life obtained among them. They exhibited, after their restoration, the peculiar and pleasing spectacle of a ceremonial worship maintained in a national sanctuary

in which was no visible representation of deity. For in the second temple there was neither Urim nor Thummim, Shekinah nor sacred fire. The Roman historian Tacitus observes that when Pompey the Great entered the temple, after the city of Jerusalem had been taken by the Romans, "he was much surprised to find that its most sacred place was empty, having neither statue nor image of the God to whom it belonged." Thus did the people recognize the exclusive claim of Jehovah to their undivided homage, renouncing even the dangerous rivalry of images, whether of God himself, or of any being or creature in the universe.

The New Testament makes equally distinct demands on behalf of Jesus Christ, our divine Saviour. The angel who announced his nativity to the shepherds of Bethlehem said, "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord," *i. e.*, a Saviour who is the long-expected Messiah, the Jehovah or Lord of Israel. The same angel, Gabriel, instructed Joseph as to the personal name to be given the infant Saviour, saying, "Thou shalt call his name JESUS," *i. e.*, salvation of Jehovah, "For he shall save his people from their sins." At Pentecost the boldest of the apostles charged the rulers of the Jews with the crucifixion of his Master, and pressed on them his exclusive claim to be the Saviour of the world; said he, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." So the Samaritans, who were led to faith through their country-woman, at Jacob's well, recognized it. They declare, "We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is, indeed, the Christ, the Saviour of the world." In like spirit the Apostle Paul, writing to the Romans, declares with joyful confidence the all-sufficiency of the gospel of Christ to save. "It is," says he, "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Hence he made the offer of salvation to all men without distinction of race or nation, rank or condition in life. Christianity thus has the principle of universality both emblazoned on its escutcheons and inhering in its nature. Unlike the Jewish religion, it was not restricted to one nation, race or city, nor was admission to its

privileges to a single repellant rite, nor its public worship to a single city. The new religion indeed demanded an equally exclusive belief in the unity of God, in the divine origin of the Mosaic economy, and in the authority of the prophets, as did the old. But by his one expiatory offering, the Messiah, whose advent had long been foretold and expected, both consummated and abolished the imperfect sacrifices, types and ceremonies of the old; and admitted and invited all the family of man to the high honor and special privilege of salvation through the gospel. Christ also commissioned apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; and to ensure their success he promised that his perpetual presence and supernatural power should accompany them. He described the boundless extent of his kingdom in his last interview with them before his ascension. When they asked, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" he replied, not to their lingering hopes of an earthly kingdom, but pointed them to the source of divine power by which they should build up for him a more enduring kingdom, one that would not be secular, but spiritual; not temporal, but everlasting; not restricted, but catholic. He made them the founders of a kingdom suited to the wants of the world and adequate to its renovation and restoration. Hence he could say to the whole revolted race, "whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved"; but whosoever refuseth to believe shall be condemned. The conception of his apostles constantly enlarged as the work opened before them. Their horizon was ever receding and widening. They willingly became his witnesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and to the uttermost part of the earth." They realized at length that their Master's kingdom, though not of this world, was in it, and was limited only by the extent of the human race. Their mission and that of their successors was to offer and make the gospel known to all men in every part of the world. The last verse of the Gospel of St. Mark informs us of the success with which they incepted their work; says the evangelist, "They went forth and preached everywhere; the Lord working with them and confirming his word with signs following."

Their expectations were exceeded on the day of Pentecost, when great numbers of the seed of Abraham were converted and became followers of Christ. The ancient promise, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," was fulfilled in a new and higher sense than they had expected. While a great wave of spiritual awakening and life swept outward from Jerusalem over Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, and rolled onward into the regions of the Gentiles, the door of faith was laid open to men of every race and nation. Christianity stood forth freely offering life and salvation to mankind on the sole condition of faith in Jesus Christ. Besides, it had first proclaimed itself the religion—not of one race or nation, but of the world. It alone sought the renovation and recovery of the world. It alone admitted on equal terms men of all ranks and races, of all countries and conditions, into its fold. It alone recognized in all the tribes and families of the earth one brotherhood, who were called, through a common Redeemer, into the household and family of one Father, God. It called first on the Jew to surrender his trust in legal and ceremonial observances, and rest on Jesus, the true Messiah; then on the heathen to turn from idolatry and its pollutions to the service of the true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven to deliver them from the wrath to come. St. Paul reminded the Corinthians, whom he had won from idolatry to Christ, that "though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth, as there are gods many and lords many, to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we in him." He also proclaimed to the inquisitive Athenians the doctrine of "Jesus and the resurrection"; and showed them, standing on Mars Hill, in the very heart of the most enlightened heathenism of the world, what these new things meant. Looking around on thousands of false gods, he pointed his polytheistic hearers to the living God, whom they did not know, and to his works of creation and providence, which were manifest to them all; also to his Son Jesus Christ, of whom he had given assurance to all men, by raising him from the dead, that he would by him one day judge the world in righteousness. He called them, and all to whom this knowledge comes, to repent-

ance and a new life, that they might have a share in the divine favor and clemency.

From such features of Christianity we may now turn to set forth some of the outstanding aspects of the religions with which it came into unavoidable conflict. It will be observed how Christianity maintained from the first, whether confronted by its nearest of kin, Judaism, or by its natural adversaries, Roman polytheism or Oriental pantheism, an attitude of uncompromising independence and exclusiveness, while it never rudely antagonized any of them. It remembered that its mission, always and everywhere, was to ameliorate and elevate the condition of men. In affirming that Christianity is exclusive we do not, of course, mean that it assumes an air of moral or spiritual superiority, and looks with admiring approval on the select, but narrow, circle which bears its name, and with contempt and scorn on all outside that circle, as persons of the baser sort, to whom it has no mission of love and kindness. Far otherwise. This would have been in contravention of its spirit, and would have defeated its design. We mean that it bore a message of truth and life to the world, which it dare not compromise. Its message was good tidings of divine favor and hope to mankind, which no messenger might mix or minimize without falsifying it. It proceeded from him who is the truth. Its end was the triumph of truth among men. Its principles, like the laws or forces of nature, were exclusive and uncompromising, because they were true. Such laws and principles can never be compromised. The law or force of gravitation makes no compromise with those that deny it, but vindicates itself in the certain overthrow of whomsoever resists it. Nor does the force of magnetism or electricity make any compromise with those who deny its power, but promptly vindicates its claim to be, and to be recognized as, the great power that it is. Nevertheless, these forces, which no one can safely ignore or resist, may be made, by those who understand and put themselves in harmony with them, mighty and beneficent, yea, most obedient, servants. Thus it is with those who accept Christianity, receiving it into their hearts and lives. They thereby place themselves in accord with the will of God, and array on their side the powers of

the world to come; while those who refuse to hearken to its call, and place themselves in hostility to the powers of the heavens, can never prosper or prevail.

Christianity can no more compromise its distinctive doctrines than it can the separateness of life to which it calls. It cannot, for the sake of argument with the philosophic Brahman or Buddhist, deny that God is the Creator of all things, and admit that all things have been evolved from an uncreated nomad. It cannot, without denying itself, compromise its belief in a personal God and admit the pantheism of the zealous Hindu¹ who vaunts the flexibility of his ancient faith in such words as these: "A Hindu would not condemn any man for his religion, for he has well laid to heart the celebrated couplet, 'Worship in whatever form, rendered to whatever god, reaches the Supreme, as rivers, rising from whatever source, all flow into the ocean.'" Christianity replies emphatically: "There is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, and no man can come to the Father but through him." And when he further asserts that "God is universal intelligence," "he is the soul of nature," "the aggregate of all that is," Christianity replies, "The Lord, our God, is one Lord, and there is none but he." Or, when again the same voice informs us that it is a reproach to man to call him a *sinner*, Christianity again replies, in harmony with all experience, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." It is, then, exclusive and non-compromising, because it has a message of divine truth and life to the world, and its mission is not accomplished till it has fearlessly, but lovingly, made it known to men everywhere. It could not be the channel and method of life and salvation to mankind if it made compromise with the falsehood, ignorance and sin from which it came to rescue men.

Christianity, therefore, began by simply sowing the good seed of the kingdom in a field already largely occupied with tares. It called the people from their debasing, superstitious and degrading idol worship to faith in Jesus Christ and the service of the living God. This work the apostles and their immediate successors strove to accomplish by noiselessly, but persistently, scattering the

¹ d'Vivedi at Parliament of Religions.

life-giving truths of the gospel, deterred neither by perils, hardships, nor opposition. They made no wanton attacks on the institutions established in the communities where they labored. St. Paul, in his epistles, charges Christians to be subject to the civil powers, and to offer prayers and supplications for kings and all that are in authority. He also charges servants to be obedient to their masters according to the flesh. He enjoins Christians not to be brawlers or disturbers of the peace, but to live quiet and peaceable lives. Thus, while the precepts and spirit of the gospel proscribed the debasing rites and worship of idolatry, they demanded dutiful regard for the laws and customs of civil society; for Christianity could not but look with horror on the false worship, deceptive shrines, dumb idols, stupid oracles, bloody rites, ignorant priests, and blind augurs which it encountered everywhere. It shrank from their ostentatious processions, cruel games, gladiatorial contests, brutal and gory sports, all of which were hailed by the populace as the very essence and glory of the religion of the empire. Christianity set but one God as the object of supreme worship before men, while heathenism set many. The former demanded neither imposing temples, initiated priests, bloody sacrifices, nor altars for its worship, while the latter had, without them, no religion at all. The former pointed to one divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, who, by the sacrifice of himself once for all, made a propitiation for the sins of men, so opening for them a way of access to God; the latter seeks to appease offended deities by numerous sacrifices offered by fanatical priests, which could neither cancel guilt, sanctify the conscience, nor give the offerer access to God.

The original religion of the human race was, no doubt, monotheistic. So the Vedas of the Hindu, the Zendavesta of the Parsee, and the Pentateuch of the Jew, which are the most ancient sacred writings in the world, agree in attesting. But when men multiplied and were dispersed upon the earth, they forgot the God whom they did not see and whose memorials they had left behind. As, however, they came into contact with the physical elements and powers of nature, they soon discovered the many beneficent influences which they exerted on their lives and inter-

ests. Thus fire, air, water, the sun, moon, and stars became familiar objects of veneration. The operations of nature and the attributes of man also attracted their admiration. These they personified, and under certain circumstances invoked and worshipped. The conviction took possession of their minds, that a personal being or spirit presided over each of these elements, forces, operations or attributes of nature. Then when they needed the benefits which any of them could bestow, they propitiated him and invoked his aid. Hence came nature-worship and belief in the existence of many gods. This, in fact, is the *rationale* of polytheism. The Romans were polytheists when Christianity entered on its career of conquest in the empire. Every family, tribe, and race had its own duties. The number of gods multiplied, as did the new provinces brought by conquest, into the empire. For the gods of the vanquished nations were not degraded or abolished, but transferred to the hierarchy of deities, already recognized, by the conquerors. Besides Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, and the great gods of Rome, many foreign gods were added in the days of the Cæsars. In her earlier days Rome personified and deified many of her people's virtues. She built at different times temples to Faith, Modesty, Concord, Hope and Peace. Before deifying, she admired and practiced those virtues; she also cherished her Penates, which were supposed to preside over her domestic and family interests and happiness. While she venerated these impersonations, the moral tone,—the life and conduct—of her citizens was immeasurably higher than when, in later times, she bowed down to the new gods of luxury, ambition, power, and glory.

The restraining power of the old religion had already lost its hold on the minds of the more enlightened of the people when Christianity made its advent. Decay and loss of moral force marked it. Sentiments of superstition and policy alone sustained it. The ruling classes maintained and encouraged it, as a means of retaining power over the masses. Says one of the ablest of modern ecclesiastical writers¹: "Polytheism seemed, as it were, to await the death-blow, and to be ready to surrender its ancient

¹ Milman—*History of Christianity*, Vol. I., p. 36.

honors to the conqueror whom divine Providence should endow with sufficient authority over the human mind to seize upon the abdicated supremacy." Let us here bring more distinctly to view some of the dogmas of pantheism, the religion which, at and long before the advent of Christ, enthralled, and which still enslaves, the millions of India and the East. It denies the existence of a supreme personal God, apart from the world; and holds that God exists in everything, is the soul of the universe, and is as widely diffused as matter. He has many modes of manifesting himself, but has no personal attributes, because he has no personal existence. He manifests himself in the succession of the seasons, and in all the changes of the material world. All that is and all that transpires are manifestations of God, whether it be the appearance of a rare plant, a remarkable man, or a new planet in the heavens. This being, infinite and incomprehensible, reveals himself in many varying aspects. To the Hindu he appears in one of his aspects as Brahma, the creator; in another, as Vishnu, the preserver; and in yet another, as Shiva, or Siva, the destroyer. These are not properly three different persons, nor, indeed, persons at all; but different aspects of the one essence of the universal deity. When he manifests himself among men in any of these aspects, it is called an incarnation. It may occur ever so frequently. Brahma has been incarnate, so have Vishnu and Shiva or Siva. This does not mean that the same divine personal essence or being is incarnate as before, but that the same aspect or function of deity is manifested as before. It is something like the blush of a new rose, on the same rose bush which last year bore others of the same size, color, and fragrance. The blush of this year's rose, its size and color, its form and appearance, proceed from the same life, are determined by the same causes, yet are not identical. Nor are all the manifestations of deity confined to pure and good beings. They may as readily be vicious or evil. Because virtue, which is an attribute of personal life, does not inhere in, or necessarily belong to, an incarnation which is impersonal. Hence we find the fruits of this ancient and most widely-spread religion in India and the East have been evil, stultifying and debasing to the masses of the people. For

there, as everywhere, men's moral virtues resemble and are the outcome of their practical beliefs. If men do not believe in a personal everliving God, possessed of moral excellencies, they have neither a standard of, nor a motive to, moral virtues, beyond what society may require or consider necessary.

The primary or fundamental idea of the Brahman and Buddhist religions, which dominate half the human race, is, therefore, pantheistic. It has held these large masses of people in densest superstition, and arrested spiritual growth, for whole ages. The people of high caste, the scholars and chief of the priests, cultivate a philosophy which is subtle and entangling, but has no touch of compassion towards, or hope for, the masses. Their life is not much more progressive than that of the bee or insect, which is guided by instinct rather than reason. Their domestic life, their personal habits and social customs, are now about the same as one or two thousand years ago. There is no hope of improvement or accelerated progress through the aid of Brahmanism or Buddhism. If Christianity does not shed more of its light upon the mind, and of its life and grace on the heart, their elevation is impossible. Among these masses of people there is, however, little of the Athenian inquisitiveness which ever wants "to tell or to hear some new thing." Theirs is a state of torpidity, which neither longs for, nor seeks after, more light. In the last half-century some rays of intellectual and evangelical truth have been breaking through the hard crust of pantheism which envelopes the mind and resists its free entrance.

But the first conflicts of Christianity were not with heathenism but with Judaism. It was confronted with Judaism in the temple, the Sanhedrim, and the synagogue. Its contest was with authority, animated by intolerance. Christianity stood firm in a conscientious faith, which claimed the right to exercise the liberty with which Christ had made it free. It even dared, at the peril of life, to maintain its rights. The fanatical intolerance of the Jews, which cried when our Lord was before Pilate, "away with him, crucify him," was as fierce in the council before which the able apologist Stephen stood, when with fury the mob rushed on him, and with bitter execrations stoned him to death. A few

years later Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, at the instigation of the Jews, without process of law, killed the Apostle James, the brother of John, with the sword. And seeing this pleased the Jews, he arrested and imprisoned Peter also, with the intention, no doubt, of putting him also to death. But by a supernatural interposition, in answer to the earnest prayers of the church, he was delivered out of their hands. In their wide dispersion throughout the towns and cities of Asia Minor and the empire, the Jews with a like bitterness opposed the gospel. This was the constant experience of the chief of the apostles, as we learn from the record of the Acts, in Thessalonica, Corinth, Ephesus, Rome, and elsewhere. The conflict with Judaism, until the downfall of the nation and destruction of the temple, was both civil and religious. It resembled the struggle of the Huguenots of France, in the sixteenth century, with the unreformed church of that country. The opposing parties were in race, nationality, and in most points of faith, identical. The Jews were one in faith in, and reverence for, God with the Christians, but differed only in regard to the Messsiaship of Jesus of Nazareth, who had been crucified by their rulers.

But by its very nature, in all its teachings, Christianity was opposed to the whole system of pagan worship and religion. For paganism had wrought its sombre colors into the character, and set its debasing mark on life and all its social relations; its abominations in one form or another pressed themselves on every eye. It had countless imposing temples, sacred groves, awe-inspiring shrines, hallowed fountains, and revered idols. It had gods of war and of peace, gods of the seas, the rivers and the fountains, gods of the woods and of the fields, gods of the barn-floor and of the wine-press. These deities were graven in every style of the sculptor's art, from the beautiful creations of Praxiteles, down to the shapeless block of wood or stone. The Christian apostle, or missionary, had to contest every inch of ground he held, in every town or city he entered, both with the tutelary gods of the place, and the great gods of the prevailing polytheism. With firm and uncompromising spirit, he introduced and proclaimed the way of life through the crucified and risen Saviour.

He commended the doctrines he taught by the works he performed, and by the power of a blameless life. He and those who accepted the gospel were cut off from free intercourse with the life around them. For if a Christian entered any social circle, attended any public assembly, or participated in any civil duty, he was thereby brought into contact with some aspect of the idolatry which he had renounced or opposed. In proportion to the loyalty with which he followed Christ was he sure to incur the suspicion and dislike of his heathen associates. Indeed, a conscientious avoidance of prevailing customs, or want of enthusiasm in observing them, was sure to create suspicions and lead to enmity. Thus when St. Paul and his co-laborer, Barnabas, came to Lystra in Lycaonia, and healed a life-long cripple there, the capricious barbarians, full of pagan superstition, astonished at the cure the apostle had made, at once ascribed divine power to the missionaries, and naming Barnabas, Jupiter, and Paul, Mercury, prepared to offer sacrifice to them. Paul promptly interposed and forbade the proposed act of idolatry, assuring the people that he and his companion were men like themselves. He improved the occasion to exhort them to turn from these vanities to the living God, who made and ruled the world and all therein. Then, soon as the illusion was dispelled, the fickle savages as quickly rushed to the opposite extreme, and united with unfriendly Jews in the savage work of beating and stoning the apostle, till they supposed he was dead. The same apostle found a more refined, but equally hostile paganism in Ephesus, the chief commercial city of Asia Minor. This great city was the centre of Asiatic polytheism. For in it was the world-renowned temple of the great goddess Diana. Its architectural beauty and magnificence attracted multitudes of visitors to the city. It had an extensive trade in silver shrines, which were manufactured there. Visitors carried away these little images of the great temple and its goddess as charms or amulets. Ephesus was also the centre of magic and the occult arts; great was the expenditure of money and of study connected with their practice. For two whole years the apostle labored incessantly and with wonderful success, though beset with peril, opposition, and danger. Through his influence the books of the

magicians, which were of great value, were voluntarily destroyed by their owners. The worship of the great goddess fell off, while a prosperous Christian church, of which we hear often afterwards, was successfully founded. The men whose craft was the making of shrines, finding their business had declined and was in danger of being destroyed, raised a great tumult. The apostle's life was in peril. He withdrew from the scene of trouble for a time; but not till he had revolutionized the religion of Ephesus, and enthroned Christ in the hearts of many, where before the goddess Diana had stood.

The first manifestation of imperial hostility towards the primitive Christians was in Rome, during the year 64, just one year after the close of Saint Paul's first imprisonment in the capital. Charges of incendiarism were laid against them by the Emperor Nero, and were supported by the suborned populace, who conceived a cruel hatred to the Christians. The circumstances were these: In the summer of 64 A. D. a destructive conflagration broke out on the Palatine Hill, which raged furiously for nine days, and consumed a large portion of the city. The terror and excitement of the people were incredible. A rumor rapidly spread that this was the work of an incendiary, and suspicion pointed pretty clearly to Nero, the reckless emperor, as himself the originator of the calamity. He was accustomed to gratify, at any expense, each of his foolish whims or wild caprices. He had a delirious fondness for magnificence, which he meant to indulge by rebuilding in greater splendor that portion of the city in which the fire originated. In order to escape the odium universally entertained against him, he indulged the people with sports and amusements; but, as these did not prove sufficient to win them, Nero determined to turn their hatred of the Christians to account by converting them into an exciting pastime for the people. He at once formally charged the Christians with causing the conflagration. The populace regarded them as a faction of the hated Jewish race, whom, ten years before, "Claudius had commanded to depart from Rome," and as themselves haters of the human race. It was easy to secure evidence sufficient to sustain the charge so wantonly made. The Roman historian Tacitus¹ says:

¹*Annals*, XV., 44.

“Nero found wretches who were induced to confess what they were, and on evidence a great multitude of Christians were convicted; not, indeed, on clear proof of their having set the city on fire, but rather on account of their hatred of the human race. They were put to death amidst insults and derision.” The same impartial pen describes the varied and brutal cruelties with which the death-sentence was executed. Some were crucified with every mark of indignity. Others were sewed up in the skins of wild beasts and given to the dogs to be torn to pieces. Others, again, were bound to posts, covered with pitch and other inflammable materials, which at night were kindled as torches to illuminate the emperor’s gardens, while to this savage entertainment the populace were freely admitted. But soon the burning of the city was very much forgotten in this new and horrid addition to the amusements of circus and theatre. Though the first outbreak in the Neronic persecution was probably confined to the city of Rome, yet the impression that it made was deep and widespread. It is said that by-and-by a touch of compassion began to awake in the hearts of the people towards the Christians, who were sacrificed, not for the public good, but to the malignity of the emperor. The persecution was renewed, nevertheless, under a new charge, one often thereafter made against the Christians, that is, not incendiarism, but hatred of the human race; on this charge, and because it was alleged that they used magic to induce their victims to forsake the customs of their fathers. It was true then, as now, that to cleave to Christ and to follow him implied a renouncing of the world. This, in the Christian’s experience, as in that of his Master, was to excite the hostility of the world. As Christ had suffered the hatred of the world, so did these early Christians; the servant did not feel himself better than his Master. The word and Spirit of God touched the hearts of many so that they believed, and turned to the Lord. This change, which the unbelieving heathen did not understand, they ascribed to magic. This new charge was as easily sustained, by the same sort of testimony, as the other. Besides, when a Christian was arraigned at the imperial tribunal, if he confessed the name, as every true Christian did, no more was needed. He was adjudged

worthy of death. To make and to stand fast in this confession was, in the time of Nero, and for more than two centuries thereafter, considered sufficient ground for condemnation. The same Roman historian already quoted says: "Those who acknowledged were hurried to trial," which means that all the crimes laid to the Christians' charge were included in this one, which was taken as proved. For it was assumed now, and on till the advent to power of Constantine, that Christianity was a crime deserving of death.

The Neronian persecution raged more or less fiercely from 64 to 68 A. D. In this last year, the reign of the imperial tyrant closed. It is most probable that the Apostle Paul was put to death in the year 66, during this persecution. Sacred history furnishes no details of his martyrdom. Tradition assures us that he was beheaded in Rome. Sure we may be, that he well illustrated the words he wrote in his last letter to his beloved Timothy, not long before his execution. Said he: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." The faith, patience, and courage with which the early Christians endured the barbarous sufferings unjustly inflicted upon them, fills us with admiration for them. The effect was profound, often irresistible, on their adversaries. "The blood of the martyrs," as said the great Latin father, Tertullian, in one of his Apologies, "was the seed of the church. It is our honest seed. That very obstinacy with which you upbraid us," said he, "is a teacher. For who is not incited by the contemplation of it to inquire what there is in the religion?"

We refer to the persecutions of the early Christians, not with the design of traversing the subject, but simply to illustrate the fierce and varied conflicts through which Christianity passed in gaining a firm footing in the world. We wish further to observe, that after the death of Nero, the most hostile of the Flavian

family to the Christians was Domitian, in whose day St. John was banished to Patmos, and whose reign closed in the year 98 A. D. His successors on the imperial throne—Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines—for nearly a hundred years ruled the empire with a wisdom and justice not surpassed in all Rome's annals. Though Trajan persecuted the Christians in Asia Minor 112 A. D.; though the venerable Polycarp suffered under the first of the philosophic Antonines, 166 A. D., yet Christianity acquired strength and spread widely in the empire. This was due, in great measure, to the humane temper of these emperors, who, while they at times sharply persecuted the Christians, were driven thereto rather by an unwise policy, and by the fact that Christianity was not yet an allowed religion in the empire. The growth of Christianity also excited hostility, in that it drew away many from the rites and worship of the established religion. While it remained in comparative obscurity, having neither temples, priests, nor peculiar rites, the state did not regard it as dangerous. By-and-by its persistent progress began to sap, in some provinces and cities, the strength of the old religion. On this account bitter complaints were raised against it. The first came from the province of Bythinia, where the fair-minded administrator, Pliny, was pro-consul. The cry raised by the old adherents of the temples was that the new superstition was drawing off so many of the people from the temples that they were almost deserted, and few sacrifices were provided by the people. The pro-consul had power, which he sometimes used, to compel conformity to the established religion. Complaint was made against so many that he thought it best, rather than act on his own judgment in each case, to seek and follow the will of the emperor. He therefore sought instructions how to deal with this new, and, as he designated it, "obstinate superstition," whose adherents refused, when brought before him, to conform to the established religion. The correspondence between the pro-consul and the emperor on this matter forms the most reliable and valuable of the remains of early church history. The former informs the latter that nothing in the informations laid against the Christians revealed anything against them, save an obstinate attachment to a

“culpable and extravagant superstition”; that, when examined, they acknowledged they had a custom of meeting before dawn on a certain day (the Lord’s, no doubt) to sing hymns to Christ as God; that they were bound by no unlawful oath, but solemnly promised to refrain from theft, robbery, adultery, and fraud. After this, at a second meeting in the evening, they partook together of a simple meal (most likely the Lord’s supper). Many, he continued, of every rank, and of both sexes, were involved in the superstition, for the contagion had seized not only cities, but villages, and even the open country. The temples were deserted. The ordinary rites of worship had long ceased to be celebrated, and victims for sacrifice were rarely purchased. Besides, no form of compulsion availed to induce the Christians to abjure their religion. “In all cases in which,” said he, “I have tried to compel them, they preferred to die.”

In reply, Trajan approves the conduct of the pro-consul; charges him to exercise his power to compel uniformity with discretion; not to make search for the Christians, nor to condemn any on anonymous information, but on just evidence in open court. Trajan seems to have issued no new rescripts against the Christians; nor to have given any new power to his administrator. His language clearly implies that the practice of Christianity was an offence, which made those who persisted in it liable to capital punishment, and their assemblies for worship unlawful. The open persecution of the Christians during the reign of Trajan, and the more humane of the emperors, it should be remembered, was not due so much to the hostility of the rulers as to ancient customs, the passions and caprices of the excitable multitudes. For when any public calamity or adversity fell suddenly upon them, they were disposed to attribute it to the Christians. If disaster came on the army, if fires destroyed their property, if pestilence wasted, or famine prevailed in any of their towns or cities; or if destructive floods, such as the overflow of the Tiber, carried alarm and desolation along their course, they rushed in terror to their temples to ascertain why the gods were at war with them. They usually returned with the answer, the gods are offended because so many have deserted their altars and ceased to

honor them with gifts and offerings. When they sought to appease these offended deities, instead of looking within and correcting their own guilty conduct, they looked outward for some visible object of offence, by the immolation of which they might propitiate them. When they found the temples forsaken, the altars deserted, the theatres and games neglected, and the shrines and oracles silent, they cast the blame on the Christians. Then to satisfy the fierceness of their own fanaticism, if not to appease their insulted gods, the inflamed and fickle mob raised the cry, *Christianos ad leones*, the Christians to the lions!! This cry, says Tertullian, in one of his incisive Apologies, is raised, "If the Tiber rises, if the Nile does not rise, if the heavens give no rain, if there is an earthquake, famine or pestilence, straight the cry is, the Christians to the lions." And so to satisfy the fury of the rushing mob, rather than to gratify the administrators of the law, the Christians were often hurried without the forms of legal process to a sudden and cruel death. At this period, Christianity had not gained a legal standing,¹ nor was recognized as an allowed religion in the empire; though Rome tolerated and even naturalized the gods and religions of all the peoples she gathered into her vast empire.

It may be here inquired, Why did the state which tolerated other religions,² even the Jewish, oppose and persecute the Christian? Was it supposed to be less favorable to virtue, or less consistent with reason, or less likely to promote human happiness, than they? It was for none of these reasons. For wherever Christianity had hitherto been received, it had changed men and society for the better. How, then, was it that other religions, even the Jewish, which was always detested by the Romans, were recognized, while Christianity was prohibited? We answer, The Jewish religion was tolerated because it was the religion of an

¹ Prof. Ramsay's *Church of the Roman Empire*, in loco.

² "The various forms of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosophers as equally false; and by the magistrates as equally useful. And this toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord. . . The devout polytheist, though fondly attached to his national rites, admitted with implicit faith the different religions of the earth." (*Gibbon*, Vol. I., p. 34.)

ancient, if not powerful, nation, and had its recognized rites and ceremonies, which had for centuries been observed in the country of the Jews. It was allowed to practice the same worship as in Palestine, so far as the scattered Jewish people chose to. But Christianity had never been the religion of any race or nation. There was no country in which it could claim to have been the recognized religion. It was a new organization and had a new name. It was, therefore, regarded by the Romans as a new faction, or sect, which had no claim to regard, and would, if repressed, soon pass away. But it lived and increased in strength and numbers, though treated by the state for nearly three hundred years as an obstinate superstition. Rome, it is true, was tolerant of foreign religions and deities. She adopted at different times Egyptian gods, as Isis, Serapis, and others. She also domesticated the rites and mysteries of Cybele, Mithra and others. But these had been previously recognized by nations afterwards incorporated in the Roman empire. The gods of the nations conquered by Rome were brought into her Pantheon, even as the countries in which they had been worshipped were incorporated in the Roman state. This point is well stated by the learned Milman.¹ Says he, "Rome aspired to enslave the minds of those nations which had been prostrated by her arms. The gods of the subject nations were treated with every mark of respect; sometimes they were admitted within the walls of the conqueror, as though to render their allegiance and rank themselves in peaceful subordination under the supreme Grodivus or the Jupiter of the capitol, till at length they all met in the amicable synod of the Pantheon, a representative assembly, as it were, of the presiding deities of all nations, in Rome, the religious as well as the civil capital of the world."

Besides, Christianity was disliked because its teachings and practice were opposed to idolatry and the prevailing polytheism, and led the Christians to withdraw from its rites and worship. Christianity believed there was but one God, and hence all idols were false and their worship an empty delusion. The state, however, maintained, for its own purposes, the ancient gods and

¹ *History of Christianity*, p. 22.

established religion, and would not suffer the people to abandon the temples or condemn their deities; notwithstanding, it was found that gradually large numbers of the people in certain cities and provinces were attracted to Christianity, and so neglected the established religion. When persons ceased to participate in the public worship and rites in which religion was believed to consist, their former associates looked upon them with suspicion, and charged them with being downright atheists, and so regarded them with that coldness and abhorrence which Rome ever showed to impiety. In this the minions of the temples—the priests, soothsayers, augurs, sculptors, shrine-makers, keepers of the victims, all who derived their livelihood from the rites and services of the temples—ceased not to defame and denounce the Christians and to arouse public hostility or inform against them. The roots of this dislike lived in that they held aloof from the amusements, the games, processions, and sports in which the people loved to indulge. They charged that the Christians were unsocial, self-secluding, and unpatriotic, and on this account declined to take part in the rites, ceremonies, and sacrifices of the temples. They also absented themselves from the excitements of the theatre, the bloody contests, the fierce and noisy sports of the amphitheatre. They would not applaud the brutal and deadly struggles of men with wild beasts, or the murderous conflicts of the gladiators in the arena. These the Romans regarded as services both of religion and patriotism. Then to abstain either to be present or applaud was to incur suspicion of being Christians; so if, on a holiday, the sports were thinly attended, it was proof that Christians were numerous, and danger was, therefore, multiplied.

Notwithstanding the various forms of suffering and numerous obstacles to its progress, Christianity diffused itself widely and rapidly in the Roman empire. During many of the years of its greatest trials it achieved many of its most glorious triumphs. It never lowered its flag to, nor made compromise with, the enemy. The efforts of Oriental and Grecian philosophy to assimilate or absorb Christianity checked and weakened its progress more than all the opposition and hostility it encountered in the West. While it faithfully kept, courageously defended, and fearlessly

proclaimed the riches of the gospel it prospered and prevailed. In the year 312 it rose, for good or evil, to the highest place of temporal power in Rome. In that year Constantine, afterwards called Constantine the Great, having been proclaimed emperor at York by the legions of Gaul, and having defeated his rival, Maxentius, at the Mulvian Bridge, at the very gates of Rome, ascended the throne of the Cæsars. He professed the religion of the cross, which was the religion of his mother, Helena, and soon thereafter proclaimed Christianity the religion of the empire and of the world.

JAMES LITTLE.

Richmond, Va.

V. LIFE AND IMMORTALITY.

LIFE is more than existence. The earth exists and is full of life, but the earth itself does not live. Where there is life there must be a being that lives. We see living things and know that there is life in them, but life itself we cannot see. The vital spark is a subtle something that is beyond the sight of the eye and the reach of the finger. We see its manifestations, but itself eludes the penetration of the most powerful microscope. We can trace it up to its fountain and find what the scientists call bioplasm—a transparent, colorless, and glue-like substance which, under the highest powers of the microscope, appears to be absolutely structureless. This bioplasm is not life itself, but the primordial substance in which it is first manifested. There life is seen absorbing nutrient elements, and instantaneously changing dead matter into living matter, by a process which no human science can imitate or explain. A power in microscopically invisible life spins the structureless substance of the bioplasm into vital threads, and weaves the threads into complicated webs of living organisms. From this observation Dr. Joseph Cook, of Boston, justly says: “We affirm that we have, under the microscope, ocular demonstration that it is *life that causes organization, and not organization that causes life.*”

Life exists in the bioplasmic mass prior to organization. But this does not prove anything concerning the origin of life. It shows that, so far as human research has gone, life begins in a bioplasmic mass, and is manifested in a vital organism which it weaves around itself. From this we see that life is more than existence; it is a vitalizing and organizing power in an existence that lives. When life departs out of the vital organism its substance becomes a mass of dead matter.

We see such varied manifestations in life that we are forced to the conviction that there are different kinds of life. There is in plants an unconscious life, in beasts a conscious but non-rational life, and in men a conscious, rational, and morally responsible life.

We begin with the lowest form, and find that vegetable life is something more than a chemical condition in vegetable substances. No chemical processes can originate the germ of vegetable life, or even imitate the processes of its development. The vital force in vegetables counteracts and neutralizes chemical forces, or controls and utilizes them in its superior processes. When the vital force exhausts itself and departs out of the plant, then chemical forces assert themselves and a process of decomposition generally ensues. Clearly, then, vegetable life is a realm of existence impassably elevated above the kingdom of dead inorganic matter.

In the animal kingdom we find a realm of life as much elevated above vegetable life as the vegetable kingdom is above the mineral. Here we find life inhering in sensitive matter, conscious of its own existence. The animal kingdom rests upon the vegetable, and, directly or indirectly, absorbs its sustenance from it; but between animal and vegetable life there is an impassable gulf, just as there is between the vegetable life and the mineral kingdom on which it rests and feeds.

If we concede the physical possibility of sensitive matter, then we find nothing in the sensations and activities of animals that may not be the effects of physical causation. Animals feel and move and express themselves under the impulses of physical impressions. They have inward appetites and instincts, and are sensible to external impressions on their organs of sensation. They cannot respond to motives addressed to reason. They are influenced by sensations through physical pain or pleasure. Thus they may be trained to repeat and imitate performances that seem to superficial observation to be the results of reasoning. They cannot be educated in the proper sense of the word. They cannot train themselves, nor train one another. Apart from the influence of man that thinks, beasts are absolutely non-progressive. The wild monkeys of to-day know no more than the wild monkeys of the same species knew five thousand years ago.

When we come to life as manifested in men, we find two things not observed in mere animal life—the discourse of reason and the self-directed action of free will. Man is conscious that his actions are not necessitated links in an unbroken concatenation of

physical causes and effects. He reasons, and he is progressive. He increases his information, and he utilizes the information inherited from preceding generations. He knows that he chooses his own course in life, and that, since his actions are voluntary, he is responsible for his conduct and character. These facts force us into the conviction that human life belongs to a realm in which physical causation does not reign supreme. Therefore we must infer another entity, different from and above matter, in which the higher form of human life inheres. We have already seen that for every form of life there must be a corresponding something that lives. If there be life above the realm of the physical world, then there must be a something that is non-physical which lives. Here we find a life that is above the law of physical causation, and are therefore compelled to postulate a non-physical entity as the living essence in which this life inheres. We call this non-material entity mind, and the life it lives, mental life.

We now pass out of the realm of physical into the realm of psychical life. In mere animal life there is, through the physical senses of the flesh which beasts possess in common with men, a perception of things; but in real mental life there is, through the psychical faculties of mind which beasts do not possess, a cognition of the relation of things to one another. This cognition of things in their logical order and relations is rational knowledge, and nothing short of it is real knowledge. Real and rational knowledge belongs to the realm of mind and reason, a realm into which beasts, limited within the range of physical causation and perception, can never enter.

The plant is a thing of life, and the beast is a living thing, but man is a person that lives. The unconscious vegetable life is a harp without strings, deaf and dumb; conscious animal life is a harp with strings, but without a harper to play upon them—an Æolian harp hung in the air that gives forth music only when its strings are shaken by the winds of ever changing circumstances that blow upon them; but, when we pass out of the physical into the psychical realm and find the rational and moral life, we find a harper with the harp of a thousand strings, all the complicated organisms of a dual nature, from which he brings forth the ever-

varying and never-ending music of human life. This harper is the human soul, a psychical person in the midst of a physical environment, living a conscious and self-directed life of thought, emotion, and volition. But how do I know that I am such a person as I have just described? I am conscious of being such, and the testimony of my consciousness is the end of all controversy. I know that I am, because I think; and I know that I am more than a lump of matter imprisoned in the links of physical causation, because I am conscious of my freedom and personal responsibility. As certainly as I know that I am an animal, I know that I am more than an animal. I am conscious of a double life, a life in which I live and die in common with the beasts that perish, and a life of reason and free will by which I am elevated into a realm that is separated from mere animal life by an impassable gulf. I am more than a physical entity—I am a psychical essence, and, as such, a free and responsible person who thinks about God and a world to come, and about a future destiny dependent on the character that I now form, having power in myself to make that character good or bad.

Consciousness is to mind what space is to matter. Mind without consciousness of its own existence is as inconceivable as matter without extension in space. This is not a new doctrine, but its importance has been overlooked. Nothing short of absolute annihilation can destroy the self-consciousness of mind. Locke, the father of modern sensational philosophy, must, of necessity, deny this law of mental existence; but Kant and Sir William Hamilton stand by it, as all must who hold the doctrine of the immateriality of mind.

Sleep is not mental unconsciousness. It is a depression of physical perception, but not a suppression of psychical consciousness. If, in sleep, the mind is unconscious, how could it ever arouse the body again to wakefulness? Consciousness in the sleeping man at night is no more extinct than life in the leafless tree in winter. Dr. George Moore, of the Royal College of Physicians in London, testifies that even in apoplectic sleep, which is the most perfect impediment to the functions of life short of death itself, the mind is not unconscious. Absolute unconsciousness in mind would be

mental annihilation. Annihilation is absolutely unknown in nature. Then, as mind cannot exist without consciousness any more than matter without extension, it follows that all men, both good and bad, are, in their psychical personalities, naturally immortal. The personal immortality of man is inherent in the indestructible self-consciousness of the psychical essence in which real and distinctive human life is rooted. Man dies physically, but the soul, which is a psychical essence, never dies, and can never lose its self-consciousness.

Above the physical world there is the realm of psychical life, and into that realm death, as cessation of personal consciousness, can never enter. Physical science can never discover the secrets of that life. The nature of the psychical essence and the mode of its life are beyond the reach of the crucibles, the microscopes and telescopes of physical science.

The psychical life, which is the real human life, can not spring from, nor inhere in, a physical bioplasm. We must, if we carry the analogy of the physical into the psychical world, infer the existence of a psychical bioplasm; but the physical eye, however aided by the microscope, can never discover this psychical bioplasm, nor study the modes of its development, because they are not physically discernible. The search for the evidence of man's immortality along the lines of the physical sciences can never be successful, because it is a search on the wrong road. The physical sciences can never prove, nor disprove, man's psychical immortality.

In this present mortal existence man lives a double life, one physical and the other psychical; and these lives are mysteriously interlapped and interlaced into one another, and each very materially modifies the other. Man is at once a mortal animal and an immortal soul. Physical death will disunite these two lives, and the resurrection, revealed in Scripture, will reunite them. The psychical is the superior life, and it should dominate the physical, even in the present existence. When the psychical is in the ascendancy the life is uplifted and made noble; but when the physical overmasters man's finer nature, his life is debased and tends towards that which is brutal.

It is through his physical nature that man is, in his present mortal life, brought into touch and communication with the material world. The real man—the immortal soul—is the harper that plays upon his dual nature and brings forth the music of human life. This harp has a double set of strings, one physical, connecting man with this lower world, and the other psychical, connecting him with the supernal world. These strings are not always at-tuned in accord, and hence the music of human life is oftentimes jarring and discordant.

Physical death snaps asunder the physical cords and breaks up man's connection and communication with this mundane world and its life. Then man departs into the psychical world where he continues to live in that life that is naturally and indestructibly immortal. At the resurrection, promised in Scripture, a new physical body shall be given to man, through which he will be brought back into communication with the material universe and its physical life. But what evidence have we as a basis of facts on which to rest our theory of life and immortality? None whatsoever from physical science as to man's immortality except that, when physical science has said its last word concerning man's physical life, it confesses that it stands on the border-line of another world which it cannot enter and explore. At death the psychical man—the immortal soul—is cut off from all communication with physical life, because all vital connection with it is broken. The physical senses of sight, sound, touch, taste, and smell can operate only through a physical organism, and it is only by the vital connection of these senses that the psychical can communicate with the physical. The question is often urged, if men live on in conscious thought after physical death why do they not find a way to force themselves into communication with men in this mortal life? If our dead are still alive why do they never speak to us? Why is it that the land of the dead is

"The undiscovered country, from whose bourne
No traveller returns"?

It is because physical death breaks asunder that inexplicable nexus between the physical and psychical worlds that exists in the compound life of man while his psychical soul inhabits a live

physical organism. The resurrection will reestablish the interrupted communication, because it will restore to man a vital physical organism. It is only in the new body of the resurrection that departed spirits can ever again make themselves visible, audible, and tangible to physical perception. The physical eye can only see that which is physical. We now turn to the Bible, and find that, in all its epiphanies, the saints and angels, and even God himself, were clothed in bodies in order to become visible and audible and tangible to men. It was only after his resurrection that Christ appeared to his disciples. It was the ascended Elijah and the God-buried Moses that were seen with Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration. It is true that Saul at Endor saw the form of Samuel, but that was a vision of the night. The angels that visited Abraham at Mamre were clothed in physical bodies, and talked and ate and walked as men. In every epiphany there was the manifestation of a physical form. The resurrection, as revealed in Scripture, is a necessity, in order to the reestablishment of communication between departed spirits and the physical universe and its life.

We have seen that consciousness is to psychical life what extension is to physical existence; and, therefore, there can be no psychical death in the sense of the cessation of consciousness. The human soul, being a psychical essence, is in its very nature immortal. But is there not such a thing as spiritual death? In the face of this question we must open our Bibles, or close our inquiry. We open our Bibles, and find that the human race is spiritually dead in the midst of its physical and psychical life. How can there be an endless death, unless death can exist in the midst of endless consciousness? We read at the beginning, "*in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*" Man did eat of the forbidden fruit, and *in that day he died*, not physically or psychically, but *spiritually*.

In the fall of the first man the whole race fell into this spiritual death. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon *all men*, for that all have sinned." This is spiritual death. "To be carnally-minded is death; but to be spiritually-minded is life." Spiritual death is not physical

dissolution nor unconsciousness of mind, but a condition in a conscious mind. It is carnal-mindedness, a condition at once carnal and mental. All men, while alive in body and soul, "are dead in trespasses and sin." Sin, then, is the cause of spiritual death; the removal of sin will restore spiritual life. "The wages (penalty) of sin is death." Take away sin from man, and thereby you restore to him spiritual life. This is what Jesus came into our world to do. "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." This is what Christ does for every man that believes on him. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." This is the gospel, God's word to man, which is good news to all men. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This is the "life and immortality" which Jesus has brought to light. Science could not discover it. It is a revelation from heaven. Above the mineral kingdom we find vegetable life; above the vegetable kingdom we find animal life; above the animal kingdom we find mental life, and above the mental kingdom we find spiritual life. This last, the realm of spiritual life, is the kingdom of heaven come down to earth, concerning which Christ said, when he began to preach on earth, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and concerning which he now saith to every man, as he said to Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Life can spring only from life, and life can generate life only of its own kind. Vegetable life can generate only vegetable life; animal life, only animal life; mental life, only mental life; and it is only spiritual life that can generate spiritual life. Hence our Saviour has said, "Ye must be born of the Spirit," as well as of water. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Ye must be born from above. The man thus born of the Spirit is endowed with a new sense, the sense of spiritual discernment. "The natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither doth he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." There are three realms of life in which man may live *simultaneously*: the animal kingdom, in

which he lives and dies physically with the beasts that perish; the realm of mental life, in which he is elevated into a world of activities and enjoyments of which beasts cannot even dream; and last, the kingdom of heaven, begun on earth, the realm of spiritual life in which those born of the Spirit see and enjoy realities and felicities of which unregenerate and unspiritual men can form no adequate conception. This is the "life and immortality" which is the gift of God, through Christ Jesus, our Lord.

J. M. P. OTTS.

Greensboro, Ala.

VI. THE OFFICE OF DEACON.

As late as the time of Jerome, who is the author of the Latin translation of the Scriptures called the Vulgate, and who lived in the latter part of the fourth and the early part of the fifth centuries, the office of deacon remained substantially as constituted by the apostles, for he writes of them as "*ministers (or servants) of the tables, and of widows.*"

They came afterwards to assist in the administration of the Lord's Supper, their special duty being to serve the bread. The Roman Pontifical, or Directory for vestments and rites, prepared under direction of Pope Clement VIII., and published in 1596, declares that "to the deacon pertains to minister at the altar, to baptize, and to preach." This, of course, was an entire abrogation of the deacon's original office, and the substitution in place thereof of some of the functions of the priest, making it one of the grades of the Roman priesthood. We need, therefore, look no further in that direction for light on this subject.

In the Church of England, and Episcopal churches generally, the diaconate is merely a stepping-stone to the ministry, corresponding largely to our licentiate.

In the Lutheran Church the deacon is merely an assistant clergyman, or subordinate chaplain, though Luther desired that deacons should simply have care of the poor and of the church property.

In the Reformed (Presbyterian) churches the primitive diaconate was revived with various approximations towards the Scripture model. In the Reformed Church of Hessa it was ordered in 1526 that each pastor should have at least three deacons to assist in caring for the poor. The Church of Basle adopted the same rule in 1529. Calvin held that the diaconate was one of the fundamental offices of the church, and that the proper duty of these officers was the care of the poor. The French and Belgian confessions set forth the duties of a deacon according to Calvin's

view. In the German and Dutch Reformed churches of the United States the deacons are appointed to "collect and distribute alms and other contributions for the relief of the poor, or the necessities of the congregation, and to provide for the support of the ministry of the gospel."

In the Methodist churches, as in the Church of England, a deacon is merely a licentiate. In Congregational and Baptist churches he is substantially the same as our ruling elder.

In the Reformed Church (Dutch) in America the deacons are members, with the elders, of the consistory, or church session, and they and the elders vote together on temporal matters, the deacons having no vote on questions of purely spiritual import.

THE DEACONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

According to Lightfoot, the office of deacon had a precedent in the old synagogues before the Christian era, in each of which it was customary to have three men appointed to have special care of the poor. This officer in the synagogue is not to be confounded with the chazzan, who was properly a sexton, or beadle.

The office of deacon was instituted under the apostles in Jerusalem (Acts vi.) in order to relieve the apostles of the labor of distributing the alms of the church, especially to the widows. It grew out of a complaint on the part of the Hellenists that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Moreover, judging from the names of the seven deacons elected by the people, and ordained by the apostles, they themselves were Hellenistic Jewish Christians. Though the deacons were appointed to minister to a particular class of poor, it seems logical to commit to them the care of any and all classes of indigent persons.

That the office of deacon was not intended to be confined to the church at Jerusalem is plain from the Apostle Paul's declaration in 1st Timothy iii. 8, of their qualifications for this function, for he was writing to the pastor of a church in another city and country.

The office of deacon was not primarily for the collection, but for the distribution, of alms, and this is clear from the fact that the offerings of the people were brought by the people themselves and

laid at the feet of the apostles ; and also that when Barnabas and Paul brought the alms of the Christians at Antioch for the poor saints at Jerusalem, they delivered them to the elders. (Acts xi. 30.)

It is also clear, from the whole history, from the meaning of the word *diakonos*, and from the passages just cited, that the deacons had no authority except to distribute alms under the direction of the elders.

But there is, strictly speaking, and can be, no purely temporal office in a spiritual commonwealth, so the deacons distributed alms as a religious act, and in connection therewith administered spiritual instruction and consolation. So we find Stephen and Philip expounding and defending the gospel to men, and in the particular cases recorded, not to the objects of charity, Stephen to the cultivated Hellenists, and the council of Jerusalem, and Philip to the minister of finance of the kingdom of Ethiopia. After Philip's work on the Ethiopian was completed, we read that he went on an evangelistic tour through all the cities, from Azotus to Cæsarea.

However, it is probable that Philip had been promoted to the ministry before these events, and was no longer a deacon, because we read that he administered the sacrament of baptism to the Ethiopian. We are bound to suppose this, unless we concede that others than ministers of the word were authorized to administer the sacraments of the church. There is no special reason, however, to suppose that Stephen had been elevated to the ministry, nor do we read of his preaching, but of his "disputing" with certain opponents of the gospel, and his speech before the Sanhedrim was not so much a sermon as a defence made in the presence of a court which was trying him for an alleged capital offence against the Mosaic law.

Not to go beyond the word of God, we must define the original office of deacon to be that of a distributor of alms to the poor. Whether it is scripturally logical to go further and commit to them also the management of the temporal affairs of the church, or not, is a matter which may be debated. We think it is warrantable. And so our *Book of Church Order* states that

“to them also *may* properly be committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church.”

It is a question whether it would not have been better to have left the deacons unincumbered in the discharge of their original function of distributing alms to the poor. In point of fact, this great function has been largely abandoned by deacons, and has come to fall upon the session, or more frequently upon the pastor, or upon committees, or women's societies, of the church, or upon individuals who may devote themselves to works of charity. It is certain, however, that by whomsoever this work is done in the church now, it is not as well done as it should be, and pastors are harrassed beyond measure by the constant calls upon them by the poor, and, in fact, the usual method is for the pastors to be the first ones called upon. The poor have come to look to them, and rather than take the trouble to get the matters of this kind done by church officers, pastors give, out of their own resources, to supply the wants of the needy; or, if this is beyond their means, they frequently go about and collect the money to relieve suffering, or, in case of death, to bury the indigent person.

It is a fact worthy of mention, that in the management of the moneys given for the general work of the denomination, the deacons have never been called into service. The General Assembly's committees of home and foreign work always have been composed of elders, teaching and ruling, and the secretary is usually a preacher. Under the Bible and the *Book of Church Order* this is right, because the administration of these funds is a very important branch of the government of the church, and deacons have no power of government.

The further we go in this inquiry, the more we find ourselves driven to the position that deacons were intended purely and simply as distributors of the church's gifts to the poor, or some such office as is so efficiently discharged by the Roman Catholic Sisters of Charity. It is probable, too, that had the deacons been left to do this, and not been encumbered with all sorts of financial business, our church would have been helped in its work among the poor, as the Roman Church is by its Sisters and Brothers, and that the charities of the church would have been made a far

greater power in its life and work than they have been. I confess to a feeling of shame when, as is sometimes the case, our own poor go for shelter to the homes afforded by the Roman Catholic Sisters of Charity.

I would not suggest that the deaconess is an office in the church, for the sufficient reason that whereas we have a distinct account of the election and ordination of deacons, we have no such warrant for deaconesses. No woman holds office in the regular government of the New Testament church. Our *Book of Church Order* puts that matter where the Scripture does, when it states that the session may appoint godly women to care for the sick, for prisoners and poor widows and orphans. The word deacon, used in the New Testament in connection with women helpers, does not seem to imply an office, for no account is given of the institution of such an office, but simply to mean servant or helper in the work of caring for the poor. There is a peculiar propriety in the gentle ministrations of woman being called into requisition by the church in behalf of the suffering and distressed.

Friction and misunderstanding between the deacons and the session are now not uncommon in our churches; and they usually arise from a misunderstanding of the provinces of these officers, and hence a confusion of jurisdiction and conflict of action.

It is clear that there cannot be two governing bodies in one church without conflict; and it is also clear that it is impossible to separate, in all cases, matters temporal from spiritual matters; as, for example, in the election of an organist and the fixing of his salary, and as in many other things.

Dr. Peck, in his *Ecclesiology*, says: "In reference to all funds other than those contributed for specific purposes, as for Home and Foreign Missions, they are under the direction and control of the session." "To give the deacons, who are not rulers, power to dispose of the revenues as against the elders, would virtually be to create an *imperium in imperio*; for the power goes with the purse. Hence, we find the contributions in the primitive church laid 'at the feet of the apostles.'"

Hence, we conclude that the whole power of the government of the individual church is vested in the session. The minister, of course, has an authority of his own in the preaching of the

gospel, and is responsible for the proper discharge of it to the Presbytery which ordains and installs him. So the deacons are responsible to the session which ordains and installs them, for a deacon is not ordained and installed by the laying on of the hands of deacons, but of elders.

Unless some fuller statement of authority and duty shall be made by our highest court, or, better still, be imbedded in the constitution itself, we shall, from time to time, hear of friction between sessions and deacons.

The session is the only governing body in the individual church, and has a right to elect all choir members, sexton, etc., and to fix their salaries, though they ought to consult the deacons and to ascertain whether the treasury does at any particular time contain the money needed for these and other purposes.

The session has control of the church building, and to it must be referred all questions as to what purposes it may be used for. If any extension of the church building be contemplated, or any unusual and very extensive repairs, the proper method is for the session to direct the deacons to inquire into the feasibility and cost of what is proposed, or, if the matter originate with the deacons, for them to ask permission of the session, laying their plans before that body; and if the changes proposed be of a very important or expensive character, the session ought to ask the consent of the congregation in which they rule as representatives.

The General Assembly of 1877, in reply to an overture from the Synod of Alabama, adopted the following: "The duties of the deacons, as servants (ministers) of the church, are to execute the orders of the session (or parochial presbytery) as rulers of the church. Therefore, it is the duty of the deacons to collect and appropriate all funds for church purposes, whether for local purposes, support of a pastor, aid to the poor and expenses of the church, or for objects of Christian benevolence recognized in the action of the courts of the church, under the direction of the church session." It is plain that the *Book of Church Order* and the decision of the General Assembly, whether right or wrong, lay the whole responsibility of the executive government of the church upon the session.

ROBERT P. KERR.

Richmond, Va.

VII. SOKRATES ON DEATH AND JUDGMENT,

AS SET FORTH IN PLATO'S GORGIAS.

GORGAS, after whom this dialogue is named, was a celebrated rhetorician from Leontini, in Sicily. Some years before the death of Sokrates, which occurred B. C. 399, Gorgias made a visit to Athens, and on the morning of the day on which Plato represents the dialogue as having taken place, he had been giving an exhibition of his art to a small company at the house of an Athenian named Kallikles. Sokrates arrives too late to hear him, but at once enters into conversation with him, and tries to draw from him a clear statement of what Gorgias regards as the nature, aims, and tendency of rhetoric, and especially desires to know its *use*. He plies Gorgias with questions, but the answers do not satisfy him, and at length Sokrates shows Gorgias that he has not been consistent in his answers, and at this point the conversation between them is dropped.

Sokrates is now taken to task by Polos,¹ a disciple of Gorgias, and these two are the speakers for a long time. In the course of the discussion, Sokrates lays down the doctrine that, "to do wrong is the greatest of all evils."

"What!" says Polos. "Isn't it a greater evil to suffer wrong?"

"By no means," replies Sokrates.

"You would rather suffer wrong, then, than commit it?"

"For my part," says Sokrates, "I should prefer neither; but if it should be necessary to do or else to suffer wrong, I should choose the latter in preference to the former."

After a while Sokrates declares further, that "the honorable and good man is happy, whereas the unjust and bad man is miserable."

"I suppose, then," says Polos, "that Archelaus, king of Macedonia, is miserable."

"Yes," is the reply; "that is, if he is unjust."

¹ His name means Colt.

“Why, of course he is unjust, as he had no claim at all to the government he now holds, being the son of a woman who was the slave of Alketas, the brother of Perdikkas, and by rights he was, therefore, the slave of Alketas; and if he had wished to do what was right, he would have served him, and would be happy, according to your doctrine. As it is, he must be wonderfully miserable, as he has committed the greatest injustice. In the first place, he sent for this very master and uncle with the avowed intention of restoring to him the government Perdikkas had robbed him of; but after entertaining and completely intoxicating both Alketas and his son Alexander—his own cousin and about his own age—he had them both carried off by night and killed. And in spite of having committed this wrong, he was entirely unconscious of the fact that he had become extremely miserable, and did not repent; but shortly afterwards he refused to become happy by bringing up his brother—the legitimate son of Perdikkas, a boy of about seventeen years who was lawful heir to the throne—and by delivering the government to him; but he threw the boy into a well and drowned him, and told the boy’s mother that he had fallen in and been killed while chasing a goose! So now, you see, inasmuch as he has committed the greatest crimes of any man in Macedonia, he is the most wretched of all the Macedonians, instead of being the happiest.”

The discussion about rhetoric is now dropped, and Sokrates prepares to establish his point, assuring Polos that he himself shall testify to its truth; and he adds: “The subjects now in dispute are not insignificant ones, but precisely those about which it is most honorable to know and most disgraceful not to know; for the sum and substance of them is, either to know or not know who is happy and who is not. For example, as to the point now before us, you hold that it is possible for a man to be happy while he is a wrong-doer and unjust, if you really hold that Archelaus is unjust and yet happy. This is your view, is it not?”

“Certainly,” says Polos.

“I, on the contrary, declare that it is impossible. This is the one point in dispute. Very well. But now, will a wrong-doer be happy if he receives his deserts and is punished?”

“By no means, since that would be the very thing to make him most miserable.”

“But suppose the wrong-doer does *not* receive his deserts; according to your doctrine, he will be happy, will he?”

“He will.”

“According to *my* notion, however, the wrong-doer and the unjust man is, in any event, miserable; more so, however, if he does not satisfy justice and get punished for his wrong-doing, and less miserable if he satisfies justice and receives his deserts both from gods and men.”

“Why, Sokrates, you are undertaking to discuss things perfectly ridiculous.”

“But I shall try to make you say the same things that I do. Now, then, the points on which we differ are these: I said just now, I believe, that doing wrong was worse than suffering wrong.”

“Certainly.”

“While you said suffering wrong was worse.”

“Yes”

“And I asserted that they who do wrong are miserable, and was refuted by you.”

“You were, indeed,” answers Polos, glad to see that Sokrates seems to admit the fact.

“That is, in your opinion I was, Polos.”

“Yes, and perhaps my opinion is correct, too.”

“You, on the contrary, asserted that they who do wrong are happy, provided they escape punishment.”

“To be sure I did.”

“And I declare that they are the most miserable; more so, in fact, than the ones who suffer punishment. Do you wish to refute this also, Polos?”

“Why, Sokrates,” Polos replies, ironically, “this is even harder to refute than the other view.”

“No, indeed, Polos; it is impossible to do so, for **THE TRUTH IS NEVER REFUTED.**”

“What do you say?” Polos eagerly asks. “If a man is caught unjustly conspiring against an absolute government; if, after being caught, he is stretched on the rack and has his eyes burnt

out; if he suffers many other severe and varied forms of outrageous treatment, and sees his wife and children enduring the same; and if he is then finally crucified, or covered over with pitch and burnt, this man, do you say, will be happier than if he escapes entirely, becomes absolute ruler, and, by virtue of his authority in the state, passes through life, doing whatever he wants to, envied and congratulated both by citizens and strangers? Do you say it is impossible to refute such a proposition as this?"

"Now you are trying to scare me, Polos. However, just aid my memory a little. If he is caught *unjustly* conspiring, did you say?"

"Yes."

"*Happier*, then, neither of them will ever be; neither the one who has seized the government, nor the one who was caught and punished; for of two wretched men there cannot be a happier. *More wretched*, however, is he who escapes and becomes absolute ruler. What is this, Polos? Are you laughing? Is this still another kind of refutation, when any one says anything, to laugh it down instead of refuting it?"

"Don't you think you have been refuted, Sokrates, when you say such things as no one else would? Just ask any one of the present company what *he* thinks."

"I am not a politician, Polos; and last year it fell to my lot to be a Senator, and when my tribe was presiding and I had to put the vote, I caused laughter, because I did not know how to do it. So don't ask me to take the votes of those who are present; but if you have no better argument than what you have already tried, turn it over to me, and see whether you will be willing to submit your views to the test by answering my questions; for I think that both you and I and the rest of mankind believe that doing wrong *is* worse than suffering wrong, and that escaping punishment is worse than enduring it."

"I, on the contrary," Polos rejoins, "think that neither I nor any other man would believe it. Would you choose to suffer wrong rather than commit it?"

"Yes; and so would you and every one else. But, as you say you would not, will you not answer my questions?"

"Certainly I will, and the more readily, as I have my heart set on knowing what in the world you will say."

"Tell me, then, just as if I were asking you from the beginning: Which seems to you, Polos, to be worse, to do or to suffer wrong?"

"To suffer it seems so to me."

"But which is more disgraceful? Answer."

"To do wrong."

By this admission Sokrates gains an entrance for his wedge, and by a series of blows in the shape of questions drives it home and splits Polos's doctrine all to pieces.

After a brief pause the second point is taken up, namely, that it is a greater evil to a criminal to escape punishment than to endure it. The combatants fall to once more, and once more Polos finds himself unable to cope with the great master of the dialectic art. The relentless questions are showered thick upon him, and, after he has answered about sixty-seven of them, this final one is addressed to him: "Hasn't it been proved, therefore, that I spoke the truth?" "It seems so," is the grudgingly-given reply.

Here Kallikles breaks in with the question, "Tell me, Chairephon, is Sokrates in earnest, or is he jesting?" "To me," replies Chairephon, "he seems to be tremendously in earnest. However, there is nothing like asking him himself." Kallikles does ask him, and from here to the end the conversation is carried on between these two. Kallikles blames Sokrates for his pursuit of philosophy, which, he says, it is well enough for a man to amuse himself with for a while, when he is young, provided he leaves it off as he grows older; and he exhorts Sokrates to engage in politics, addressing him as follows:

"And now, my dear Sokrates—and do not be vexed with me, for I shall speak from good will to you—does it not seem to you to be disgraceful to be in the situation in which I think you and the others are who are constantly driving far on into philosophy? For now, if any one were to arrest you and lead you away to prison, declaring that you had done wrong when you had not, you know that you would be completely at a loss what to do with yourself, and you would be bewildered, not knowing what to say;

and after going up to a court of justice, perhaps with a very worthless and wretched sort of a man as your accuser, you would be put to death if he chose to fix death as the penalty. How can it be wise, Sokrates, for any profession to take a man endowed by nature with good parts and to make him worse, unable either to help himself, or to rescue from the greatest perils either himself or any one else, but liable to be stripped by his enemies of all his property, and to live deprived of all civil rights? Why, such a man as this—though it is rather rude to say it—one may even slap in the face without being punished for it. But, my good friend, be persuaded by me; stop this everlasting business of refuting people, and engage in the noble profession of politics, one that will cause you to be regarded as a man of sense, leaving to others these refinements, that are nothing more than trifles and nonsense anyhow.”

It would be strange if Sokrates was not stung by these words, and they certainly sank into his memory, for at the close of his long talk with Kallikles he uses, in a number of places, almost the identical expressions that had been applied to himself. However this may be, he advances at once against this new foe, and, like the others, Kallikles soon finds himself unable to maintain his ground against a man who bristles with close pointed questions that are launched with bewildering rapidity. He retreats from one position to another, and at last is actually afraid to answer Sokrates at all, not knowing how his replies might be used against him. Further on, as he feels the close grip of Sokrates tightening, he loses patience and says: “I don’t know what you mean, and don’t care, and only answered these questions to please Gorgias, anyhow. Ask somebody else; or can’t you finish the discussion alone, asking your questions to yourself, and answering them yourself?”

Sokrates obeys him, as Gorgias expresses a strong desire to hear him, and proceeds to set forth at some length his views as to the nature of happiness, reasserting his position, that if he should *unjustly* suffer the treatment spoken of by Kallikles, it would be worse for the wrong-doer than for him; and he declares that as long as he can avoid the greatest of all evils—doing wrong—he is able to render the very best sort of help to himself.

Gradually Kallikles is drawn into the discussion again, and begins once more to show Sokrates what will be the consequence of following out his theory, when Sokrates interrupts him. From this point on, the conclusion of the *Gorgias* is given very nearly in full, and is commonly regarded as one of the finest things Plato ever wrote.

S.—Do not repeat what you have said so often, that whoever wants to will kill me, in order that I in my turn may not say: “Yes, but it will be a bad man killing a good one.” And do not tell me that he will take away any property I may possess, that I may not rejoin: “Well, if he does, he will not know what use to make of it; but just as he robbed me unjustly, so also, after he has got it, he will use it unjustly; and if unjustly, disgracefully; and if disgracefully it will be an injury to him.”

K.—How confident, Sokrates, you seem to me to feel that you could not suffer any of these things, as if you lived apart from everybody and could not be brought before a court of justice, possibly by a very wretched and worthless fellow.

S.—I am indeed foolish, if I do not think that in Athens a man may suffer almost anything. Of this, however, I am well aware, that if I *am* brought before a court of justice, it will be some bad man that impeaches me; for no good man could impeach one who had done no wrong. And yet it would be nothing strange if I should be put to death. Shall I tell you why I expect this?

K.—Yes, do.

S.—I think that I in company with only a few Athenians—not to say all alone—attempt the science of true politics, and that I, alone of my contemporaries, act for the real interests of the state. Therefore, as I do not speak the words I utter on different occasions with a view to please, but with a view to that which is best, instead of most pleasant; and as I refuse to do what you now advise, namely, learn your rhetorical elegancies, I shall not know what to say in court; for I shall be tried as a physician would be tried among a set of children, if he had a cook for his accuser. Why just think: what defence could a physician make under such circumstances, in case a cook should accuse him saying: “Children,

this man has inflicted many evils upon you; the youngest of you he tries to destroy by cutting and burning them; and he makes you thin and chokes you until you do not know what to do with yourselves, giving you the bitterest drinks and compelling you to endure hunger and thirst—very unlike the way *I* used to feast you abundantly on all sorts of sweet things.” What do you think a physician taken in this evil case would be able to say? Or, if he were to tell the truth and say: “All these things, children, I did for your health,” what sort of an outcry do you think such judges as these would raise against him? Would it not be a great one?

K.—Perhaps. Yes, I am bound to think it would be a great one.

S.—Don’t you think, then, that he would be involved in endless perplexity to know what he ought to say?

K.—I do indeed.

S.—Now, I know, that I, too, should suffer just such a fate if I were to be brought before a court of justice. For I shall not be able to tell of any pleasures I have procured for the Athenians, and it is only these that they look upon as advantages and benefits; though I must say that I do not envy either those who procure them, or those for whom they are procured. And if any one asserts that I either exert a bad influence upon the young by perplexing them, or that I speak ill of the old, and make bitter speeches about them, either in public or in private, I shall not be able to tell the judges what is really the truth, namely: “All these things, gentlemen, I say justly, and I do this for your good,” nor, in fact, anything else. So that I may perhaps suffer there’s no telling what.

K.—Do you think, then, Socrates, that it is well for a man in the city to be thus situated and to be unable to aid himself?

S.—Yes, Kallikles; that is, if he had in his favor that which you have frequently admitted to be such a strong point; if he could aid himself by showing that he had never either done or said anything wrong either about men or gods; since *this* sort of help for one’s self has frequently been admitted by us to be the best. If, therefore, anyone should convict me of being unable to render this aid to myself, I should be ashamed, and that too, whether I

were convicted before many persons or before few, or even if no one were present but myself and the person convicting me; and if I should be put to death on account of this inability, I should complain; but if I should die through want of rhetorical flattery, I am sure you would see me meet my death with composure. For no one who is not altogether unreasoning and unmanly fears the mere thing of death itself, but he fears to do wrong; for to go to hades with a soul full of many crimes is the worst of all evils; and to prove that this is so, I will tell you a story if you wish it.

K.—Well, since you have finished with the other things, finish this also.

S.—Listen, then, to a very beautiful story, which you will regard, I think, as a myth, though I do not; for I shall assume that what I am going to relate is true.

As Homer informs us, Zeus and Poseidon and Pluto divided the government among themselves after they had received it from their father. Now, there was this law in regard to men in the time of Kronos, and it has always prevailed among the gods, and holds good even at the present day, namely, that a man who had led a just and holy life should, after death, go to the Islands of the Blessed and dwell in endless happiness unmixed with evil; whereas a man who had led an unjust and godless life should go to the prison house of Justice to be punished; and this place, as you know, is called Tartarus. But in the time of Kronos, and even more recently when Zeus held the government, these persons being yet alive, had living men as their judges, who judged them the day on which they were to die. Consequently the sentences pronounced upon them were bad. Therefore both Pluto and the commissioners from the Islands of the Blessed came and told Zeus that persons were constantly coming to them at each place who did not deserve to. To which Zeus replied: "Then I will put a stop to it; for now the sentences pronounced are bad because those on trial are tried while still clothed, as they are still alive. For many persons," said he, "although they have wicked souls, are clothed with beautiful bodies and noble pedigrees and with riches; and when their trial is at hand, numbers come to testify in their

behalf that they have led upright lives. The judges, therefore, are intimidated by this means, and at the same time they judge while they themselves are clothed, having, as a veil before their own souls, eyes and ears and the whole body, all of which things of course are a hindrance to them, both their own vesture and that of the individuals on trial. In the first place, then," said he, "they must cease knowing about their death beforehand, as they now do; and this circumstance in regard to them has been communicated to Prometheus, that he may put a stop to it. In the next place, they must be tried naked of all these things, for they must be tried when they are dead. And the judge must be naked and dead, examining with merely his soul nothing but the soul of each individual directly he dies, deprived of all his kindred and having left behind on the earth all those adornments I spoke of, in order that the trial may be fair. Now, I knew these things before you did, and therefore I have made my own sons judges, Minos and Rhadamanthys, from Asia, and Aiakos from Europe. These, then, after their death, shall judge in the meadow where the three roads meet, two of which roads lead, one to the Islands of the Blessed, the other to Tartarus. And those who come from Asia, Rhadamanthys shall judge, and those from Europe, Aiakos; and to Minos I will give the privilege of making the final decision in case the others are undecided, in order that there may be as fair a decision as possible regarding the road men shall take."

These are the things, Kallikles, which I have heard and believe to be true, and from them I draw some such conclusion as the following: Death, as it appears to me, is nothing else than a separation of two things, the soul and the body, from each other; and after they have been separated from one another, each of them retains pretty much the very same constitution that the man had when he was alive, the body retaining its own nature with all the evidences of care bestowed upon it, or sufferings experienced, clearly visible on it. And this same thing, I take it, applies to the soul also. All the characteristics that the man had in his soul as the results of his mode of acting in the separate events of his life, are clearly evident in the soul after it has been stripped of the body,

and this holds true both of the inherent qualities of its nature and of its subsequent experiences.

When, therefore, they reach the judge—those from Asia going to Rhadamanthys—Rhadamanthys stops them, and looks at each man's soul without knowing whose it is; and frequently, having arrested the great king, or some other king or sovereign, he observes that there is nothing healthful in his soul, but that it is scourged through and through, and full of scars made by perjury and crime—marks which each action of his stamped upon the soul—and that all its parts are crooked from falsehood and deceit, and that no part is straight, because of its having been reared without truth; and the judge sees that, as the result of license and luxury and lust, and want of self-control in the man's actions, the soul is devoid of symmetry and full of ugliness; and when he sees it he sends it off in disgrace straight to Tartarus, where, upon its arrival, it is to fill up the measure of the sufferings due.

Now, the proper end of all punishment, when rightly inflicted, is either that the offender may be benefited and become better, or else that he may become an example to the rest, that they, seeing his sufferings, may be made to fear and to become better. And those who are benefited by being punished, either by gods or by men, are those who have committed offences capable of being atoned for; nevertheless, only through pains and distresses is the benefit received by them, either here or in Hades; for it is impossible to be freed from crime in any other way. On the other hand, those who have committed the extremest crimes, and on account of such crimes have become incurable, are the ones who become examples to others; and though this class of persons is no longer benefited individually, inasmuch as they are incurable, others are improved by seeing them enduring, on account of their crimes, the greatest, and most painful, and most frightful, and unending sufferings, suspended there in the prison in Hades, as sheer examples, to serve as exhibitions and warnings to the wicked who come there from time to time. And I maintain that Archelaus will be one of these, if he was such a man as Polos describes him; and any other such tyrant as he was. I think, too, that

most of these examples have been taken from tyrants, and kings, and sovereigns, and those who have managed the affairs of states, for these have it in their power to commit the most grievous and wicked crimes. Homer, too, bears testimony to these views, for he has represented those undergoing eternal punishment [*τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον τιμωρομένους*] in Hades to be kings and sovereigns, as Tantalus and Sisyphus; while as for Thersites and any one else who was wicked in a private capacity merely, no one has represented him to be afflicted with great punishments, as being incurable, for it was not in his power to commit such crimes as the others did.

Well, as I was saying, when Rhadamanthys gets hold of anybody like this, he knows nothing at all about him, neither who he is nor from whom he is descended, except that he is some bad man; and, observing this, he sends him off to Tartarus, having set a mark upon him, both if he seems to be curable and if incurable; and the culprit, on his arrival there, receives the due reward of his crimes. Sometimes, too, he looks into another soul that has lived righteously and truthfully, belonging to some private man or some one else; generally, say I, Kallikles, belonging to a philosopher who has minded his own business, and not meddled during his lifetime with other people's concerns, and the judge admires it and sends it off to the Islands of the Blessed. These very same things are done by Aiakos also, and each of these holds a staff while he judges; but Minos sits there looking on, he alone having a golden sceptre. You know Homer's Odysseus says he saw Minos "having a golden sceptre and laying down the law for the dead." I, for my part, Kallikles, have been persuaded by these narratives, and I make it my aim to have as healthful a soul as possible to show to my judge. Accordingly, casting to the winds the honors most men covet, and searching for the truth, I shall earnestly endeavor both to live, and when I die, to die, being just as good as I possibly can; and I summon all the rest of mankind, too, as far as I am able. And so, in return for your appeal to me, I call upon you also to engage in this life and this contest, which I declare to be worth more than all the contests here; and I reproach you, because you will not be able to aid yourself when

the trial and the sentence of which I was just now speaking comes to you. But when you go to your judge, and he arrests you and leads you away, *you* will be bewildered *there* as much as *I* shall be *here*; and perhaps some one will even slap you in the face shamefully and maltreat you in every way.

Possibly all this may seem to you to be a myth or like old wives' fables, and it may be that you despise them; and, indeed, it would be nothing wonderful to despise them if we were able, by searching anywhere, to find things better and truer than these. As it is, you see that, although there are three of you, you and Polos and Gorgias, who are the wisest of the Greeks of to-day, you are not able to prove that we ought to live any other life than this one, any, at least, that appears beneficial in the other world also. But although in so many discussions other doctrines are refuted, this one alone stands unmoved: that we must beware of doing wrong rather than of suffering wrong; that, above all, a man must make it his care not to *seem* to be good merely, but to **BE** so, both in public and in private; and if any one becomes wicked in any particular, he must be punished; and this is the next best thing to being good, namely, to become so by being punished, and thereby making atonement; and he must avoid all flattery, both as regards himself and others, whether they be few or many, and he must employ rhetoric and everything else with a view to promote justice always. Be persuaded by me, therefore, and follow me thither, where, on your arrival, you will be happy both during life and after death, as your own argument shows. And *let* a man despise you for being foolish, and let him abuse you if he wants to; nay, even have the courage to let him strike that blow that you thought would be so dishonorable; for you will suffer nothing terrible, provided that, by the practice of virtue, you are really a perfect man. And then, after practising it together in this manner, then at length, if it shall seem to be necessary, we will attack politics, or whatever else you choose; then we will form plans, being better able than now; for it is disgraceful for men in the situation in which we appear to be at present to give themselves airs as if they were something, seeing that they never hold to the same views about the same things, and

that, too, about things of the greatest importance; so completely has our education been neglected. Therefore, just as if it were a guide, let us use the doctrine now set forth, which shows us that this is the best kind of existence, to live and to die in the practice of justice and every other virtue. Let us, therefore, follow this doctrine, and let us exhort others to do the same, and let us *not* follow the one you believe in, and to which you summon me, for it is a worthless one, Kallikles.

ADDISON HOGUE.

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

VIII. NOTES.

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL CAUSE AND THE QUESTION OF A GENERAL SECRETARY.

THE movement for a general secretary of Sabbath-schools began in the Assembly of 1894 at Nashville. In view of the unsatisfactory Sabbath-school reports sent up by the Presbyteries, and also in view of the fact that this cause apparently had made no progress for several years, the committee on Sabbath-schools offered the following resolution in its report to the Assembly, which was adopted:

“That an *ad interim* committee be appointed by this General Assembly, consisting of three ministers and two ruling elders, to consider and report to the next General Assembly on the following questions:

“(1), Whether or not the time has come to appoint an agent or secretary of Sabbath-schools.

“(2), The subject-matter of the overture from Albemarle Presbytery.

“(3), The conditions and needs of the Sabbath-school cause in our bounds.”—*Minutes of Assembly*, 1894, p. 225.

The *ad interim* committee was appointed, and sent up a carefully prepared report to the Assembly at Dallas covering the points referred to in the above resolution. The action of the Assembly on this report was as follows:

“(1), That so much of the *ad interim* committee’s report as includes the four statistical tables, with the conclusions deduced therefrom, be printed in the Appendix of the Minutes of the Assembly.

“(2), That the Assembly overtures the Presbyteries to express themselves as to whether in their judgment the time has not arrived for the Assembly to employ a general secretary of Sabbath-schools.

“(3), That the General Assembly appoint a committee of five, which shall include our Secretary of Publication, to prepare a scheme of

graded lessons for use in our Sabbath-schools, which shall be supplemental to the International Lessons, and which shall develop more fully our denominational doctrines and principles of government, said committee to be continued from year to year at the will of subsequent Assemblies."—*Minutes of the Assembly*, 1895, p. 419.

The question, then, of the appointment of a general secretary of Sabbath-schools is before the church, and certainly deserves the most careful and prayerful consideration. This question, however, is so closely connected with the general cause of Sabbath-schools, that it cannot be intelligently considered apart from the whole subject. The demand for the secretary should grow out of the condition and needs of the cause. It is, therefore, the design of this paper to consider the two subjects together.

I.

THE MISSION OF THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

This embraces the following objects:

1. *To gather into the Sabbath-school all the children and young people within the bounds of each particular congregation.* By this it is not meant that the membership of the school should be confined to the children and young people. The membership should include *all* the congregation. But it is meant that the special mission of the Sabbath-school is to reach the young.

2. *To teach them the word of God.* This statement is a very full and important one. It means that the whole word of God should be taught; that the lessons should be graded so as to be adapted to the scholars; that the Bible should be taught systematically in the very best method and by the most efficient teachers; and that it should be taught as understood and held by our church.

3. *To be the nursery of the church.* It is the object of the nursery to train the scion and prepare it for being transplanted into the orchard. The orchard is pruned and replenished largely from the nursery; and the nurseryman determines the kind of trees and the kind of fruit to be found in the orchard. It is not claimed that this illustration applies strictly to the Sabbath-school and the church. God uses other instrumentalities besides the Sabbath-school in the salvation and training of souls. The family, the preaching of the word, the open Bible, and religious literature are all used by the Holy Spirit. And yet it is claimed that the Sabbath-school in a very large measure is the nursery of the church. As bearing upon this point it is exceed-

ingly significant to note that of the 13,598 added to the church during last year by examination, 5,404 are reported as coming from the Sabbath-school.

4. *To train them in the service of God.* The training which it is the mission of the Sabbath-school to give, in part at least, is manifold: to train in the doctrines and government of our church; to train in sacred song; to train in proper decorum in the house of God; to train in all the departments of church work; to train in giving. What a great means of grace can the Sabbath-school be made! What a powerful adjunct to all the work of the church!

5. *To be a great evangelistic agency.* That there is a legitimate and proper work for the Sabbath-school to do outside of the organized church will scarcely be denied. This part of its mission is to gather the children and young people in destitute districts and communities, and do for them what the church Sabbath-school strives to do for the children and young people within its bounds. Thus the Sabbath-school will prepare the way for the evangelist, and in time for the organization of the church. In this way it may become one of the most efficient means of extending and strengthening the church of Christ.

How great and important the mission of the Sabbath-school! Important when we consider that its work is largely with and for the children and young people—the hope of the church and the country. Important when we consider that its mission is to teach them the word of God. Important when we consider the large number it leads to Christ, and then helps to train in the service of God. Important when we consider what it has done and is capable of doing in the extension of the church.

II.

HAS THE SABBATH-SCHOOL SATISFACTORILY FULFILLED ITS MISSION IN OUR CHURCH?

That it has done a great work is freely admitted; and for all that has been done we thank and praise God. But has it *satisfactorily* fulfilled its great mission? To answer this question we take advantage of the investigation made by the *ad interim* committee on Sabbath-schools, appointed by the Nashville Assembly, and embodied in its report to the Dallas Assembly. In this report the condition of the Sabbath-school work in the bounds of our Assembly was presented in a series of tables and explanations or deductions, as follows:

TABLE 1.

The condition of our Sabbath-school cause, as shown from the Minutes of the General Assembly:

Minutes of 1889.

Number of churches reported,-----	2,321
Number of churches not reporting a Sabbath-school, about -----	875
Church membership,-----	161,742
Sabbath-school membership,-----	122,241

Minutes of 1894, five years later.

Number of churches reported,-----	2,713
Number of churches not reporting a Sabbath-school, about -----	900
Church membership,-----	199,167
Sabbath-school membership,-----	152,604

The above table shows:

(1), That while the proportion of churches apparently without a Sabbath-school is less in 1894 than it was in 1889, yet the *number* remains nearly the same.

(2), That the disparity between the church membership and Sabbath-school membership was greater in 1894 than in 1889. In 1889 the Sabbath-school membership was 39,502 less than the church membership; while in 1894 the Sabbath-school membership was 46,563 less than the church membership.

It may be said that the minutes do not fairly represent the condition of the Sabbath-school cause. This may be true. And yet if we cannot rely upon *official* statistics, what can we find that is reliable? Now, in view of the facts revealed by the above table has the Sabbath-school work of our church been satisfactory?

TABLE 2.

The condition of the Sabbath-school cause as shown from answers to inquiries sent to stated clerks of the Presbyteries.

The inquiries given below were sent by the chairman of the *ad interim* committee to all the stated clerks of the Presbyteries. The clerks of course had no opportunity of making an investigation of their Presbyteries before replying. The information was given from their general knowledge of their Presbyteries. The blanks were filled and returned by twenty-five clerks from almost every part of our territory—from Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Texas,

Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, and Mississippi. These replies may then be taken as somewhat representative.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(1), How many churches in your Presbytery have no Sabbath-school?

Answer. Nineteen clerks report a total of 162. This would make an average of over $8\frac{1}{2}$ churches in each Presbytery without a Sabbath-school. If this average for the 19 Presbyteries holds good for the 72 white Presbyteries in the Assembly, then the total number of churches not having a Sabbath-school would be 612.

(2), How many mission Sabbath-schools in your Presbytery?

Answer. Seventeen clerks report a total of 92. This an average of not quite $5\frac{1}{2}$ to each of the 17 Presbyteries. If this average is maintained in the 72 Presbyteries, then the total number of mission Sabbath-schools in the Assembly would be 396.

(3), How many Sabbath-schools in your Presbytery hold teachers' meetings?

Answer. Ten clerks report a total of 28. This would be an average of about three to the ten Presbyteries; and for the 72 Presbyteries, 216. On this point, however, the clerks speak with great reserve for lack of definite information. Some say a few, or several; others say they cannot answer.

(4), Is your Presbytery, *as a Presbytery*, doing anything to awaken interest in Sabbath-school work and to improve the Sabbath-school; if so, what?

The following are the answers: The usual Sabbath-school reports 4; conventions, 4; nothing special, 5; nothing, 5; discussion at one meeting of Presbytery, 6; normal classes to be formed, 1.

(5), Is your Presbytery, *as a Presbytery*, making any use of the Sabbath-school as a missionary or evangelical agency? If so, what?

One answers, Yes. Another says, "We are trying to get Sabbath-schools in our small country churches." Others speak of mission schools of particular churches. Only one Presbytery, as a Presbytery, seems to be doing anything in this direction.

The above table *apparently* shows:

(1), That while the number of churches having no Sabbath-school is less than appears from the *Minutes of the Assembly*, yet the number is large—over one-fifth of all our churches!

(2), That *comparatively* little is being done for the improvement of the Sabbath-school, either by the churches or the Presbyteries.

(3), That comparatively little use is being made of the Sabbath-school as a missionary or evangelistic agency, either by the churches or the Presbyteries. The churches are doing something, the Presbyteries almost nothing.

(4), That very little is being done to awaken interest in the Sabbath-school cause.

TABLE 3.

Showing the relation which the number of Sabbath-schools should bear to the number of churches, and the Sabbath-school membership to the church membership.

The design of this table is to help us to answer two questions suggested by the two preceding tables, viz. :

(1), What proportion should the number of Sabbath-schools sustain to the number of churches ?

(2), What proportion should the Sabbath-school membership sustain to the church membership ?

In order that we may obtain some satisfactory answer to these questions our church is compared with the Northern Presbyterian Church. This church is chosen as the one with which to compare our own, because the two churches have the same form of government, the same doctrinal symbols and practically the same church organization.

	Churches.	S. Schools.	Ch. M'b's'p.	S. S. M'b's'p.
Northern Assembly,-----	7,387	7,283	895,997	977,822
Southern "-----	2,713	1,822	199,167	152,604

This comparison shows :

(1), That of 7,387 churches in the Northern Assembly, only 104 are reported as having no Sabbath-school ; while out of 2,713 in the Southern Assembly about 900 are so reported, *i. e.*, the *Minutes of the Northern Assembly* ('92) report less than two per cent. of their churches as having no Sabbath-school, whereas the *Minutes of the Southern Assembly* for the same year report over thirty-three per cent as having no Sabbath-school.

(2), That the Sabbath-school membership in the Northern Assembly is 81,825 *in excess* of their church membership, whereas in the Southern Assembly the Sabbath-school membership is 46,563 *less* than the church membership.

TABLE 4,

showing approximately the field for Sabbath-school extension in the bounds of our Assembly :

STATES.	White Popula- tion between the ages of 5 and 20.*	Scholars in Evangelical Sab.-schools.†	Not Reported as being in any Protest't Sab.-school.
Alabama,	342,741	203,207	139,534
Arkansas,	342,695	100,198	242,497
Florida,	85,967	94,844
Georgia,	396,475	310,612	85,863
Kentucky,	620,144	192,744	427,400
Louisiana,	221,301	37,024	184,277
Maryland,	288,237	240,001	48,236
Mississippi,	227,064	84,677	142,387
Missouri,	950,879	479,584	471,295
North Carolina,	420,897	392,706	27,191
South Carolina,	188,144	207,206
Tennessee,	538,361	302,016	236,345
Texas,	707,828	240,993	466,835
Virginia,	394,332	283,336	110,996
West Virginia,	292,820	132,093	160,727
District of Columbia,	47,557	44,970	2,587
	<u>6,065,442</u>	<u>3,346,211</u>	<u>2,746,170</u>

* U. S. Census Report of 1890.

† Sunday-school statistics compiled for the Seventh international Sabbath-School Con-
vention, at St. Louis, August 31 to Sept. 2, 1893.

From the above table it appears :

(1), That there are five great States in the bounds of our General Assembly in which over one-half of the children and young people are not in any evangelical Sabbath-school, viz. : Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas.

(2), That there are four States in the bounds of our Assembly in which over one-third of the children and young people are not in any

evangelical Sabbath-school, viz.: Alabama, Missouri, Tennessee and West Virginia.

(3), That in the entire bounds of the Assembly there are 2,746,170 children and young people not in any evangelical Sabbath-school! This is considerably over two-fifths of the total number of young people between the ages of five and twenty in our entire bounds.

Let this other fact be noted, that those not in the Sabbath-school are the very ones who probably need it most—the children, either of irreligious or careless parents, who give little or no family instruction, and who would not be faithful in bringing their children to church.

With this review of the condition and work of the Sabbath-school cause of our church before us, can any say that it has satisfactorily fulfilled its mission? Can this be so while there are from six hundred to nine hundred of our churches apparently without a Sabbath-school; while our Sabbath-school membership is 46,563 less than our church membership: while comparatively little use is being made of the Sabbath-school as a missionary agency in a field having 2,746,170 children and young people not in any evangelical Sabbath-school; while comparatively so little is being done to improve the Sabbath-school, or to extend its blessings to the destitute? If, then, this branch of our church work has not satisfactorily fulfilled its mission, we ought not to rest satisfied until we ascertain the reasons, and also endeavor to find a remedy.

III.

WHAT IS NEEDED IN ORDER THAT THE SABBATH-SCHOOL CAUSE MAY, TO THE FULLEST EXTENT POSSIBLE, ACCOMPLISH ITS GREAT MISSION?

1. *Organization.* The necessity of the most perfect organization of each particular school, in order to the best results, all will admit. But is there not also a need of the organization of the Sabbath-school work in the Presbyteries, Synods, and Assembly? The advantages of such an organization, if judicious, would be manifold. It would bring the Sabbath-school workers into closer sympathy. It would be the means through which the life and enthusiasm of one part might stimulate and encourage the other parts. It would be the means through which the best methods could be communicated to all the schools. It would enable the Presbyteries, Synods, and Assembly to co-operate in the improvement of the Sabbath-schools, and in making the wisest and fullest use of the Sabbath-school as an evangelistic agency. It would seem to offer the best means of enlisting in church extension the great body of our younger and more active church members.

2. *Efficient Superintendents.* The office of superintendent is one of very great importance and responsibility. The success of any school will depend largely upon the superintendent. He should be a man sound in the faith, thoroughly informed as to methods, a good organizer, prompt, faithful, wide awake, a leader, and thoroughly consecrated. Inasmuch, then, as so much depends on the superintendent, and the qualifications needed are of a high order and not easily attained, should there not be some means of training them, in some measure at least, for their work? If all the superintendents of the Presbytery could meet annually that they might confer and consult, compare methods and discuss difficult problems, much might be done in securing greater efficiency. Surely there is need for something to be done in this direction.

3. *Trained Teachers.* One of the greatest difficulties found everywhere is to secure trained and efficient teachers. Teachers are needed who are orthodox and safe interpreters of Scripture, who understand how to teach, who are in thorough sympathy with the truth, who are truly pious, who appreciate the responsibility resting upon them, and who will prayerfully and conscientiously endeavor to discharge it. There never was a time when the question of safe and efficient Sabbath-school teachers was more important. The problem is, how to secure them. Shall it be by normal classes in the churches; or Presbyterian Sabbath-school institutes held for a month during the summer, or by teachers meetings, or by all?

4. *A scheme of graded Sabbath-school lessons best adapted to give a systematic and thorough knowledge of the Bible.* That the International Sabbath-School Lessons have accomplished much and possess merit will not be questioned. *But are they satisfactory?* Those who answer this question in the negative urge that they are not adapted to give a connected view of Biblical history, skipping from place to place in the Bible, and leaving wide gaps; that it is not possible successfully to adapt the same lesson to all the grades in the school; that there can be no provision by which one grade can lead up to and prepare for a higher; that it is not adapted to present, in any systematic way, the doctrines of religion. But whether the validity of these reasons be admitted or not, none will deny the necessity of having a system of Sabbath-school lessons best adapted to give a systematic and thorough knowledge of the Bible, in order that the Sabbath-school may successfully fulfil its mission.

5. *The introduction into the schools of the best Sabbath-school*

literature and appliances. Under this head may be included lesson helps, the best periodicals, catechisms, a well-selected library, maps, etc. In order that the Sabbath-school may do its best work, it must be equipped in the best way for that work.

6. *The more extended use of the Sabbath-school as a missionary agency.* At present the work of the Sabbath-school as a missionary agency is confined to a small number of churches comparatively, and to very few Presbyteries; and yet Table 4, above, shows that there are probably 2,746,170 children and young people in the territory covered by our General Assembly not in any evangelical Sabbath-school. Here is a field for missionary effort, of great extent and promise, in which our church is doing comparatively little. That this work is practicable is proven by the following extract from the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1894:

“The commendable progress in the work of the Sabbath-school and Missionary Department continues to justify the wisdom exhibited in the reorganization of the Board seven years ago. One hundred and fifty-eight missionaries have been employed during this year, of whom 86 are permanently engaged, and 72 were temporarily engaged as student missionaries. We call attention to the fact that they have organized 870 new schools, to which must be added 82 schools organized under the special offer of the Board, giving a total of 952 new schools, with 45,174 scholars. Out of such schools 32 Presbyterian churches have been organized during the year; so that it appears that the Sabbath-school missionary is the forerunner of the Home missionary, adequately and beautifully complementing his labors and preparing his way. We find, also, that our Sabbath-school missionaries have personally visited 70,411 families, and that not in a perfunctory or incidental way, as we learn on careful examination, but with systematic care, and the distinct design of carrying the hope of the gospel into neglected and scattered households.”

In view, then, of the large destitution in our own territory, and of the demonstrated practicability and usefulness of this work by the Sabbath-school, is there not a very great need for the development of our Sabbath-school work in this direction?

7. *A general revival of interest in the Sabbath-school.* There are a number of things which indicate that the interest in Sabbath-school work is not what it should be, *e. g.*, the large number of churches not reporting a Sabbath-school; the small number of teachers' meetings; the fact that so few Presbyteries are doing anything to improve the Sabbath-school; the fact that so little use is being made of it as a missionary agency. Is there not great need for a general revival of interest in the Sabbath-school in very many churches, in nearly all of

our Presbyteries, and in all of our Synods? There must be a deep, intelligent and general interest in this cause before it can successfully fulfil its great mission.

IV.

WILL THE APPOINTMENT OF A GENERAL SECRETARY SO MEET THE GREAT NEEDS OF THE SABBATH-SCHOOL CAUSE AS TO ENABLE IT MORE SUCCESSFULLY TO FULFIL ITS MISSION?

It will scarcely be claimed by any one that the appointment of a general secretary would at once meet *all* the needs of the Sabbath-school work, nor that it would enable it *perfectly* to fulfil its mission; but it is believed that the right man in this position would do very much to meet these needs, and so enable the Sabbath-school far more successfully to fulfil its great mission. The following are some of the ways in which it is believed he could do this:

1. *He could effect an organization of the Sabbath-school work.* If an organization of this work is needed, then there must be some one to plan and effect the organization, to be at the head of it, to be the means of infusing life into it, to be the medium of communication in it, and to work it.

2. *He could devote himself to devising means for the improvement of Sabbath-school superintendents and teachers.* He might either hold, or cause to be held, Presbyterian Sabbath-school institutes, in different Synods, once a year, for superintendents and teachers, so arranging the programme as to make such meetings instructive and practical. He might do much by promoting the organization of teachers' meetings and normal classes in the churches, and giving to them suggestions for making their meetings profitable. He might do much by suggesting the best methods of conducting the Sabbath school and of teaching a class. There is a large field here for doing an important work, and a man of tact and ability could be immensely useful in it.

3. *He could do much to encourage and facilitate the circulation of the best Sabbath-school literature.* Many Sabbath-schools are inadequately equipped and poorly supplied with helps and libraries. Many of them scarcely know what they need or how to procure it. And how greatly may a Sabbath-school be improved and how much its efficiency increased and the interest developed by a wise and adequate equipment! It is believed that there is a great work needed in this direction, and a work which would aid very much our Publication cause.

4. *He could do much in securing the organization of Sabbath-*

schools in those churches in the bounds of the Assembly in which there are at present no Sabbath-schools. According to the best information procurable there are from six hundred to nine hundred churches in the bounds of our Assembly without Sabbath-schools. It is sometimes brought forward as an excuse that the churches without Sabbath-schools are weak or vacant. But is not this the very reason why they should have a Sabbath-school, and the most efficient Sabbath-school possible? The Sabbath-school is the great hope of these churches. It is a question of very grave importance what is to become of these six hundred to nine hundred churches not having a Sabbath-school. Is there not need for some one to devise measures for organizing a Sabbath-school in every church not having one?

5. *He could formulate and help to execute plans for making a larger use of the Sabbath-school as an evangelistic agency.* As already shown, three great facts confront us: (1), The need of Sabbath-school extension. Two and three-quarter millions of children and young people in the bounds of our Assembly not in any evangelical Sabbath-school! (2), The practicability of Sabbath-school extension as shown by the work of the American Sabbath-school Union and the Northern Presbyterian Church. (3), The great value of the Sabbath-school as an evangelistic agency. In the light of these facts must not our church go forward and help to overtake the destitution? But in order to do this is there not need for an able and practical man carefully to study the field and the problem presented by the work, and then formulate and present to our church courts plans for doing this great work, and help to execute these plans? This step the Northern Presbyterian Church took eight years ago; the Baptist Church about five years ago took similar action, and the M. E. Church (South) has its general Sabbath-school board and secretary; and these are among the most aggressive evangelical churches in America.

6. *He could carefully investigate and consider the best system of Sabbath-school lessons.* This is a question of the greatest importance, and one which is now being agitated among Sabbath-school workers. The last General Assembly at Dallas went so far as to appoint a committee "to prepare a scheme of graded lessons for use in our Sabbath-schools, which shall be supplemental to the International Lessons, and which shall develop more fully our denominational doctrines and principles of government."—*Minutes*, p. 419. Already some of our large and leading church schools are using Blakeslee's graded lessons. The question, then, of the best system of lessons is before us, and

must be considered. But the question is one of great difficulty, and requires extended study and the most patient and careful consideration by an able and practical Sabbath-school man and biblical scholar. For working out a satisfactory solution of this question a busy pastor has not the time, and but few the special qualifications. He must be a specialist, and able to give to it his time and thought.

7. *He could visit our Theological Seminaries, and, if opportunity offered, address the students on Sabbath-school work.* There does not seem to be any provision in our seminaries at present for giving special instruction on this important branch of church work. A wise and practical Sabbath-school man could do much to prepare our young ministers for this part of their work by giving them the best methods and impressing upon them the importance of the Sabbath-school.

8. *He could do much to promote a general revival of interest in the Sabbath-school cause.* The need for such a revival has been already referred to, and, in view of the facts, can scarcely be questioned. What could a secretary do to promote this revival? He could visit the Presbyteries and Synods, and with the aid of pastor and Sabbath-school committee, arrange for a special meeting in the interest of this cause, and with such a programme as would present it in the clearest and most effective way. Such a meeting could be made both helpful and inspiring. It would emphasize the importance of the Sabbath-school; it could give much valuable information on the general subject, it could give new ideas and methods. Such a meeting in the hands of an enthusiastic, able, and practical Sabbath school man could be made one of the most interesting features of the church court to the local church, to the eldership, and to many pastors. Nor is this all the secretary could do. He could visit the cities where the Sabbath-school work might be languishing, gather together the Sabbath school officers and teachers of the different Presbyterian churches, and by such a presentation of the Sabbath-school cause as the right man would be able to make, awaken fresh interest, and give a new impetus to the work. These are some of the ways in which he could awaken interest in this work. Is there not good reason to believe he could accomplish much?

V.

THE OBJECTIONS TO THE APPOINTMENT OF A SECRETARY.

To every new movement in the church there are found objectors. These are often among the best and most conscientious men, and their objections are entitled to honest and thorough consideration. Let us now hear and weigh the objections to this step.

First Objection. *The secretary is not needed.*

Answer (1), Facts conclusively show that the Sabbath-school cause in our church is not satisfactorily accomplishing its mission; something is evidently needed; (2), It has also been shown that the appointment of a secretary gives reasonable promise of meeting the needs of the Sabbath-school cause, at least, to a good degree; (3), It has already been tried by the Northern Presbyterian Church, by the Methodist and Baptist Churches, and after several years trial these churches still continue to have these officers.

Second Objection. *There is too much work for one man.*

Answer. This objection is the very opposite of the one last considered; and yet it is far more reasonable. No one can carefully reflect upon the work mapped out for the secretary under the last head and not see the force of this objection. But the very magnitude of the work, connected with its crying need, proves that something should be done, and one man devoting his whole time to it would be a very great advance on the present state of things. Besides, one able and consecrated man could do much, and if the necessity for further expansion should be made perfectly clear, the way would doubtless open.

Third Objection. *The expense.*

Answer. This is perhaps the greatest difficulty in the minds of many. The following answer is suggested: (1), If the need for the secretary is demonstrated, the wisdom of the Assembly is surely adequate to provide for the expense. (2), Could not the expense of this work for the first year be borne jointly by Publication and Home Missions? The work of this secretary would be in the line of both these causes. One of the leading features of the Publication cause is the preparation of Sabbath-school helps and books. And might not a part of the revenue which the Publication Committee derives from Sabbath-school support be applied to Sabbath-school work? Again, the work of this secretary would partake of the nature of home missionary work, inasmuch as he would seek to make a large use of the Sabbath-school as an evangelistic agency. Might he not be as useful to the Home Missionary cause as any evangelist? (3), After the first year the Sabbath-schools, if the matter was properly presented to them, would provide for the expense of the secretary. If some day in the year were set apart for all the Sabbath-schools to make an offering to this cause, and this work laid upon them as their work, it is believed they would more than meet the expense.

Fourth Objection. *It would interfere with the other causes.*

Answer. This is a very short-sighted objection. A moment's reflection will show that it would eventually help all the causes if it proves successful. Whatever will increase the efficiency of the Sabbath-schools, whatever will increase the number of the Sabbath-schools, whatever will awaken a deeper and wide-spread interest in the Sabbath-schools, must prove helpful to all the causes. One of the duties, too, of this secretary would be to interest the Sabbath-schools in all these departments of church work. Thus he would be a valuable assistant to every other secretary.

Fifth Objection. *The church courts are already overrun with secretaries.*

Answer. (1), It is the settled policy, not only of our church, but of the leading denominations of the country, to have the different causes presented by specialist, and it has worked well. (2), If the importance and needs of the Sabbath-school cause demands the services of a specialist, why depart from the settled policy of the church in this case? (3), It is believed that the time and manner of the presentation of this cause could be so arranged as not to be a burden but a delight. (4), Ought not our church courts to be willing to give the extra time required for the consideration of a cause so vital to the Redeemer's kingdom?

It only remains to make a single suggestion to all objectors, viz.: *The Sabbath-school cause is of vital importance. The condition of this cause in our church demands that something be done. If the appointment of a general secretary does not, in your judgment, meet the needs, then SUGGEST SOMETHING BETTER.*

Decatur, Ga., 1896.

F. H. GAINES.

THE CLAIMS OF THE HOME MISSION WORK ON OUR YOUNG MINISTERS.

THAT was an encouraging piece of information given in the last PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY to the effect that provision has been made in several of our institutions for instruction in regard to the Home Mission work of our Church. While none too much attention has been given to foreign missions, far too little has been given to home missions. Now that attention has been turned to this important department of church work, it is well that the claims of this cause be

presented to the minds and consciences of our young men, especially to such as have not yet been assigned work in the Lord's vineyard.

Among the motives which should lead young men to engage in this work should not be the desire for worldly gain, either in the way of money or honor, for besides the fact that such a motive is not of the right type, it is doomed to disappointment, for nothing more than a bare support and a very small degree of honor at the hands of men can be expected. The average salary of our ministers, even in our wealthiest Synods, is so low that no one who is familiar with the facts need be tempted to enter the ministry with the hope of earning more than a support, much less so if he is to become a home missionary, the poorest paid class in our ranks, and the class which receives least of honor at the hands of the church and the world.

One of the facts which should lead our young men into this work is the *great need* for this class of laborers. Only those who have given special thought to this subject appreciate this statement, for only they know how very few of our young men are giving themselves to this work, and at the same time how great is the demand for such workers. The majority of our young men want either to go as foreign missionaries or to take charge of well-organized churches. The subject of foreign missions has heretofore been more strongly urged upon their attention by our secretaries and others, and calls from organized churches come to most young men before they leave the seminary. In both these classes of work the salaries offered are larger and more certain, and the opportunities for study better, and hence most young men accept calls to one or the other of these departments of work. This result follows in part from the fact that the needs of the home field have not been fully presented to our young men, many of whom would have been found ready to respond, even in the face of all the difficulties and discouragements which surround it. The truth is, few of those of us who have been in the ministry for some years have anything like all adequate knowledge of the need at home, even in our older Synods. Take, for example, the Synod of Nashville, in which our Church was organized more than a hundred years ago, and what are the facts? Out of a population of about 1,250,000 only 250,000 are in Sabbath-school, and only 300,000 in the church, leaving 1,000,000 out of Sabbath-school and 950,000 out of the church. In the entire State of Tennessee there are 1,400,000 people out of Sabbath-school, and 1,300,000 people out of the church. The combined forces of Christianity have, in about one hundred years, gathered less than one-

fifth of the people into the Sabbath-school, and less than one-fourth into the church. There are 400,000 children in the State not in any Sabbath-school. In a hundred years our Church has grown to 135 churches, 13,075 members, and 10,431 Sabbath-school pupils and teachers. We have churches in forty-four counties in the Synod, and no churches in thirty-three counties. In the Cumberland Mountain country, out of twenty-seven counties we have churches in only six, and that in a section rich in mineral wealth and being rapidly developed. This is only a specimen of what is true of other Synods. It is estimated that the population of the Southeast of the Mississippi is 15,000,000. Of this population, 5,000,000 are negroes and 3,000,000 poor white people, so that more than half of our population are "proper subjects of home mission enterprise." The need west of the Mississippi is more familiar to our people than that on this side, yet none the less real. In many sections of our most highly favored States there are extensive communities where the people have no Sabbath-schools, no churches, and no clear and definite idea of the plan of salvation. They perish for the lack of the bread of life. This extensive and real need among people who are our neighbors, who speak our language and are bound to us by ties of country, race and blood, should appeal to the hearts and consciences of those who are entering the service of him whose heart was moved with compassion when he saw the people scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd.

There are other motives which should lead our young men to enter this work, but they must be mentioned in the briefest manner possible to keep this note within the limits prescribed for articles for this department of our Review.

Gratitude for the gift of Christ, the blessings of the gospel, the ordinances of the church, the honor of having been introduced into the ministry, and the hopes of salvation and the joys and rewards of winning souls, should prompt our young men to enlist in this cause.

Pity for lost sinners should lead them to listen to the appeal of these people. A father living in the mountain section, where he had no Sabbath-school for his children, no regular preaching, and where there were large families in which there was not a member of the church, said to me, while holding a meeting there, "This is Macedonia; you Presbyterians must come over and help us. Why have you not come sooner?"

Patriotism should fire the hearts of our young men with a desire to extend the blessings of the gospel to all parts of our country.

The gospel is the cheapest and most efficient means of civilization and refinement. It promotes the reign of law and justice, of peace and prosperity, and does more than all human agencies to protect men in the enjoyment of "life, liberty, and property." The example of Breathitt county, Ky., presents a striking illustration of the civilizing influence of the gospel. There, a few years ago, the law was openly defied. There a feud had arisen and spread until the people burned down the courthouse, and swore no more courts should be held. The State troops were called out and by force and at the expense of money and blood, restored temporary order, which was succeeded by a renewal of the tribal war on the withdrawal of the troops. The county won for itself the name of "Bloody Breathitt." At that time there were no churches in the county. Soon afterwards three Presbyterian churches were organized. Gradually peace and order were restored, and the civil authorities bore testimony to the fact that Christianity had done more than all other agencies to bring about a change for the better, to promote the reign of law and justice, of peace and order. As true patriots we should desire to give to all parts of our native land the blessings of the gospel of Christ.

The interests of foreign missions demand that we cultivate well and thoroughly the home field. "No home missions; no foreign missions." Every army must have a "base of supplies," and a territory from which to recruit. Such a base of supplies and such a field for recruiting is the home field. Here the means must be raised and here the recruits enlisted for the foreign field. Just in proportion as we expand or contract the work at home, we increase or diminish the supply of men and means for the foreign work. If instead of about 3,000 churches and 200,000 members, we had 15,000 churches and 1,000,000 members, we could do five times as much for foreign missions. Especially if we would push our work in the country where the greater per cent. of population is, would we increase the number of our candidates for the ministry, and so of the number who would volunteer to go as foreign missionaries. The secretary of foreign missions tells us that eleven hundred of our churches give nothing to foreign missions. Nine hundred of these churches have no pastors; six or seven hundred no regular preaching. Now, if these churches were properly grouped and assisted in securing and sustaining pastors, they would almost, without exception, contribute to the cause of foreign missions.

Loyalty to Christ demands that we take this land for him. It belongs to him; but Satan has a large part of the territory under

his sway. Christ bids us go in and possess the entire land. We cannot refuse nor neglect to obey the command without being guilty of disloyalty to our king. He has assured us of victory, and confirmed this assurance in every Synod where the work has been undertaken. Witness Kentucky, Alabama, Virginia, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Tennessee. In the face of a need so great, motives so strong, commands so plain, assurances so cheering, and rewards so precious, we dare not neglect this work which lies at our very doors, stares us in the face, and speaks aloud right in our ears. "We do not well; this is a day of good tidings, and we hold our peace; if we tarry till the morning light, some mischief will come upon us; now, therefore, come, that we may go and tell the king's household."

Shelbyville, Tenn.

W. C. CLARK.

OUR OWN BOOK OF PRAISE.

IN the January number of the QUARTERLY appears a call to our beloved church to do what is of great importance in preparing a single standard collection, arrangement and composition of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" suited to our Southern Church. As I was one of the *ad interim* committee appointed to report on this subject to the Assembly at Macon in 1893, and as our committee did not meet, and therefore made only a tentative report, it may not be amiss for me, honored in this capacity, to represent the Synod of North Carolina in an unsought distinction and undeserved selection, to add something by way of explanation and disclaimer of what appears in this call.

1. The Assembly which called our committee to perform so important a duty made no provision for travelling or incidental expenses. As the members lived far apart, our only resort was to correspondence. Our chairman used all possible diligence, and each member replied as promptly as possible. It was not possible for us even to initiate a movement to prepare a new book. Our Committee of Publication was issuing one of the books of Rev. Charles S. Robinson, D. D., by the authority of a former Assembly. Another of his books, with an Appendix by the late Rev. Stuart Robinson, D. D., was much in use. As Rev. Robert P. Kerr, D. D., with the counsel and co-operation of several other distinguished ministers of our church and the critical review of a musical expert, had prepared a book, *Hymns of the Ages*,

nearer in likeness to our *Psalms and Hymns* than any other, the committee agreed to submerge all different desires in the report recommending the adoption of Dr. Kerr's book. After discussion, the Assembly approved the acceptance of the terms of the author as modified in discussion, and recommended its use by our churches. This left us with more than one approved book of sacred song for our churches, a state to be deplored. The need still is to prepare and adopt one book for all our churches. This is the more felt from the fact that many churches still hold on to our own old book with good reason until we get one better, and others use books without the endorsement of our Assembly; while the success of sister churches, notably and last of our sister church of the United States of America, point the way for us to follow to have a book of praise distinctively *our own*.

2. This is not meant to depreciate the several series prepared by Dr. Robinson, which have merited all the praise they have received, or the book prepared by Dr. Kerr; nor need we agree wholly with the apparent depreciation often found of the several numbers of *Gospel Hymns*. Some of the hymns of these numbers have only limited value and temporary usefulness and incidental merit, but when the occasion of their origin or use and their history are fully written, they will not need defence. Inferior imitations or unworthy rivals are not to be defended. It should be borne in mind that the most of these hymns have been the outburst of the religious revival work which they largely express and assist and embody. Many of the best of them have found permanent place in the hymn-book of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which has found such favor in that church, and has justly reminded us to do likewise. These *Gospel Hymns* are not faultless. They lack the law element. They call rather to loving service and earnest devotion than to repentance. But those who use them have not been the feeblest ministers of law as well as of love, of repentance as well as of faith. They have also served to give the gospel in song as well as in sermon, as the angels did that night when Christ came. They have been the messengers of this Christ to win many to him, to cheer and comfort many more, and to teach the truth they sing. There is a distinct method and purpose of the composers of the music for these songs which should be understood when we come to estimate their value. The composers and leaders give cogent reasons for the method and principles involved in their use. The hymns give prominence to faith in Christ, the power of the Holy

Ghost, the peace of God, and the life of victory and joy so sweetly sung by the best of our older sacred poets. We will understand that this dissent from some in a general casting out of use of most of the *Gospel Hymns* is only an earnest plea of one, who has given considerable time to their study and use, not to reject or condemn them hastily or without full and impartial investigation of their claims.

3. In this understanding we cannot urge too earnestly the call to our church to provide a book of praise distinctively our own. Even the name should be carefully chosen. It should bind us back to our *Psalms and Hymns*. The contents should include the best of the hymns and tunes of our historic faith and conservatism, founded on the inerrant Scriptures as inspired of God and in use among us. Even the awkwardly-arranged hymn and tune edition was not so much deficient in itself as in the failure of our people to use it. Other selections, such as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has adopted, as sound scriptural, mellifluous, edifying, praiseful and worshipful, should have a place. The words and tunes which our fathers and mothers used, and whose every note has a meaning and an association, should be carefully preserved. There are many of these particularly suited to our Southern Presbyterian Church, while many more link us with the church universal. Good and suitable as the new book for the Northern Presbyterian Church is for our dear brethren of that sister church, it is not exactly the book we need for our traditions, customs and usages. The books of Dr. Robinson are very good, but they are from a colder climate and a more critical culture. Other books, so far as importing strange tunes, dissociating familiar words from familiar music, and adopting harmonies, however desirable in their foreign homes, yet unsuited to our tastes, are not the books we need. They will not rest and rejoice the heart and satisfy the ear of the generation now in middle life and of those who are passing away. They will not train the rising generations in full and exact sympathy with the justifiable past. They will rob our children of that body of divinity in song and that storehouse of harmony and praise from which our orthodox conservatism has been so happily drawn and so largely taught. We little realize how much our songs in the sanctuary have to do in making the worshippers strong, their tempers true, their characters conservative, and their lives courageous. On many a battle-field and in many a camp these songs have nerved strong men to fight, and their associations have made them humane and tender. On many a moral mission and in many a spiritual struggle these have re-

called a mother's cradle-crooning or a father's lullaby that first melted to tears and then aroused to conquer. Doubtless we would do well to test this when in depression, halting or gloom over the dark day, or under temptation, or before the enemy. By all this blessed ministry of song which has had so large a part in moulding our characters and forming our principles, and in sustaining us in holy living and happy dying, we should be aroused to one earnest effort to prepare and publish our own book of praise, of psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, and including such songs of real merit and melody as our later days have furnished with a power to live and a ministry to move. The collection should not be too large. Let a committee be raised representing all parts of our church, having sufficient knowledge of music and acquaintance with our hymnology, and knowledge of what is good and useful from other sources, and having full sympathy with our past and hopeful of our future. Then let sufficient time be given and means provided to warrant the labor necessary, and to secure a result commensurate with the importance of the cause. We should leave nothing undone or unprovided to secure *our own book of praise*.

Wilmington, N. C.

A. D. McCLURE.

OUR BOOK OF PRAISE: HYMNS OF THE AGES.

IN the last QUARTERLY, under the above heading, appeared an article in which the writer says of the hymnology of the church, that "to a plain observer and a practical man it seems that our church is all at sea in this respect." Then a kindly criticism is made upon the committee of the General Assembly that recommended the adoption of *Hymns of the Ages*. Let me say that the *Hymns of the Ages*, the name of which was retained by request of many members of the General Assembly at Macon, is practically the hymn-book of the church, for acting under the authority of the Assembly the Committee of Publication assumed the entire control of its publication and sale for twenty years, which is about the life-time of a hymn-book. It is going into use rapidly in our churches, and about eighteen thousand copies have been taken. It was not prepared with a view to making money by the compiler, and he has not yet gotten back what he invested. The Committee gets thirty-three and one-third cents on every dollar's worth sold, and is not at any expense for the stereotype plates, the purchase of copyrights, or the manufacturing of the books.

Before *Hymns of the Ages* was published the Committee of Publication had repeatedly declined to prepare a new book, because of the

great expense; and then Dr. Kerr at his own cost prepared the collection, giving it the labor of several years, assisted by Rev. Drs. M. D. Hoge, W. A. Campbell, W. S. Lacy, T. D. Witherspoon, J. P. Smith, and Professor N. B. Clapp, one of the most eminent musicians in the United States, with a view to giving the work to the General Assembly. This he offered to do, only asking that he be paid for the cost of the stereotype plates. The Committee on Hymn-books recommended the Assembly to accept this offer. Dr. Hazen, who was present at the Assembly, advised against this plan, on the ground that the Committee of Publication could not then afford the money required for the purchase of the plates. So the Assembly authorized Dr. Hazen and the Committee of Publication to make the best business arrangement possible for the sale of the book. The arrangement made, and now standing, is that the compiler should own the plates, and furnish all the books required for the committee in Richmond, and that the committee should have thirty-three and one-third per cent. of all sales. Furthermore, it was agreed that the committee should have the exclusive right to sell the book. So the church controls *Hymns of the Ages* for twenty years, and that is as long as a hymn-book will stand without revision, in order to keep up with the progress of hymnology. It would be difficult to suggest an arrangement more advantageous to the church, especially in view of the fact that critics and pastors using *Hymns of the Ages* declare that it is not only gotten up in the highest style of the printer's art, but also that it contains about every good hymn extant, set to tunes which are the cream of all musical literature of America and Europe.

For the General Assembly to get up a new hymn-book now would hardly be fair, for at their request Dr. Kerr had prepared a set of plates for the word edition, and cancelled his contract with A. D. F. Randolph & Co., of New York, his publisher, cutting off all sales in the North, and turned over the whole business to the Richmond Committee of Publication of the General Assembly, under contract that no other concern should be allowed to publish or sell the books for ten years; with the privilege, on part of the committee, of an extension of the contract for ten years additional. Dr. Kerr is still willing to sell to the Committee of Publication the plates and copyright at cost, less such an amount as may be deemed just, for the use already made of the plates in printing the several editions.

I take the liberty of setting these facts before the church. They are true, being compiled from written statements.

J. CALVIN STEWART.

HAVING read with interest the article in the January number of the QUARTERLY on "Our Book of Praise," and also been privileged to peruse the foregoing in the present number, it occurs to me that while the writers have brought to notice an important matter, they have not struck the chief difficulty in regard to the several hymnals now used in our church, nor those to be met in the preparation of a new one which they suggest. To my mind, the trouble lies in another and more serious direction.

It is hard to understand the objections made by a few to the old *Psalms and Hymns*, and when it is remembered that that collection still holds its own and serves its purpose in so many of our churches, it seems evident that it has not yet lost its suitability for general use; and had it not been that a few of our more restless spirits in some of our stronger churches, forgetting the loyalty that was due to church authority, of their own motion laid aside the recognized hymnal of the church, and adopted those of outside and independent publishers, it might have occupied the place of honor until reverently laid aside, when another edition, revised and improved, had been made ready authoritatively to take its place. Afterwards the same spirit of unrest was brought to bear on the Assembly, and led to the authorizing of the Robinson Series, thereby ratifying and making lawful what was at first a defection in church loyalty. That any of our congregations should have cast off conformity with what the church had provided and authorized for use in worship, without first receiving the sanction of our church courts, and that the church herself, by her highest court, should have recognized this lack of loyalty, is to my mind more seriously to be regarded than the attainment of a fancied perfection in the church hymnal. But the fact that the new hymnals had their origin in quarters beyond church authority, notwithstanding that they had been authorized, and were possessed of much merit, was sufficient to hinder their universal approval; and besides, another element of discord was introduced in that, if one foreigner was welcomed why may not others? and when one of our esteemed and most popular pastors, acknowledged to be well fitted to perform the service, was found to have devoted his time, talents and means to research in the direction desired, and with the help of several able co-workers had produced a work worthy of the church's adoption, and which was presented to her as a labor of love, it was most natural that it also should have been received with favor and accepted. But the church, by this further action of her Assembly, gave rise to a spirit of independency which it will find difficult to exorcise, and which crops out in other directions.

It is most desirable that the church should endeavor to foster a spirit of fidelity in her membership, which we confess with regret is to be seen in a way much more pronounced in other denominations. A sense of the superiority of our church in every way—in her worship, her doctrines, her ministry, and even her hymnals for praise—should be instilled into the hearts of her people. They ought to be to them the best, because they come nearest to our ideals of what the church of God ought to be—most scriptural; but also they ought to take pride in all her interests, because she is *our* church, which we desire to hand down to our children pure, strong and vigorous in the work of the Master.

But both the writer of the first article and Mr. McCluer suggest another committee to compile yet another hymn-book! Without first securing the fidelity of the people and their willingness to adopt it, this would only be perpetuating the trouble by enlarging the field of choice. The Assembly might authorize a new book, but it has no power to enforce its acceptance, and the only hope of its being successfully introduced must lie in bringing the people back to a higher sense of the allegiance they owe to the church and its authorized courts. But is it probable that any compilation of hymns, by even the most talented of our ministry, will meet with approval in all quarters, or be generally approved? “Many men, many minds,” and with two hundred thousand to please it is far from probable. And in what respect would such a compilation be better than the church already has in the *Hymns of the Ages*? It is the work of our own men, the result of years of labor, the cream drawn from every source, ancient and modern, and very widely—universally is more than can be expected—acknowledged as excellent in its doctrinal arrangement, its poetic sentiment, and its musical setting. Besides, being already in the hands of many of our best churches, and issued at as cheap a rate as the church could possibly procure another, it will be the best of wisdom for the church to foster its adoption, to the exclusion of all others. But to this end, and for the good of the church in all its departments of beneficence, it is essential that the Assembly find means of enforcing its enactments, and the people encouraged to take a patriotic pride in their acceptance of them.

R. W.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

FOSTER'S CREATION, ETC.

CREATION: GOD IN TIME AND SPACE. *By Randolph S. Foster, D. D., LL. D., a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1895. Pp. xiii. 365. Price, \$3.00.

Bishop Foster does not here appear as possessing the "happy 'vantage of a kneeling knee." He tells us, in his preface, that every reader, whether learned or unlearned, "will find here a profitable and fascinating study"; as he turns page after page, he will feel himself filling up with wonder until "he cannot fail to be entranced and lifted"; he will find himself and all things transfigured into a new significance; "no reader," he affirms, "will find himself troubled to understand any sentence, even where the subject is obscure." He almost demands that every minister shall hasten to read his book. "It will take them out of their accustomed ruts;" "it will supply them with the richest illustrations of great themes;" "it will impart zest and variety to their ministrations;" "it will broaden their view of the divine method and operations;" "it will put them into possession of the highest proofs of the infinite greatness of the almighty Being;" "it will enable them to meet the demands of the hungry and often distracted people to whom they preach;" "it will save them from the crudities into which all must fall who are uninformed on points which more and more engage educated thought." The author has left little in the way of praise to be said by the reviewer. We invite the Bishop to reflect upon a line from *Troilus and Cressida*: "Whatever praises itself but in the deed devours the deed in the praise."

As a specimen of the Bishop's clearness and simplicity of sentence, take the following definition of sin, which he pronounces to be a superior one:

"Sin is any self-determination or purpose of a free being or person to do an act, or any indulgence of a feeling, or any gratification of a natural passion which he knows or believes to be wrong, or any inexcusable neglect to show kindness to persons in distress where the opportunity offers, or any intentional unkindness, or any want of love unfeigned toward God or man—any violation of the law of God in thought, word, or deed, or in failure to keep it, of which the person is aware at the time when the intention exists or the neglect takes place." (P. 248.)

As a specimen of his rhetoric, and also of his theological views as to man's primitive state, take the following description of Adam in Eden. After telling us that, when Adam appeared, he had nothing but his body and his personal powers, absolutely naked, no knowledge, no tools, no food, and no provision for health and comfort, the Bishop writes:

"Thus poor and seemingly poorly equipped, he commenced a lonely stranger in the universe and on the earth, which was to be his temporary home. The elements were unfriendly, and much of the abounding life about him hostile and eager to make him a prey. He was unequal to cope with them, and without

means of self-protection. They were fleeter and stronger than he. If his first consciousness was not one of surprise and terror, it could only be because of some strange inner support which ministered to his helpless need. What was his first thought and feeling; who can surmise? He had no clothes, but was not ashamed. There were two of them, as after results show. They became acquainted and set up housekeeping in an empty world. We cannot think of them without being moved to sympathy. How lonely they must have felt, and frightened, too, when the sun went down, and night came on, and the stars came out! The earth was their bed, and that wonderful sky of Middle Asia their canopy. No doubt wearied and anxious nature slept sweetly that first night under that brilliant sky; we may hope it was calm and peaceful. Next morning there were urgent needs of food. . . . They go out in the great world to make a home. How helpless they look!" (P. 236.)

This is the fourth volume of a series of *Studies in Theology*. *Prolegomena*, *Theism*, *The Supernatural Book* are the titles of the volumes which have preceded it. There are more to follow. The author has written more than half a dozen volumes besides the ones mentioned. In the volume before us, the author discusses "The Method of the Eternal Cause," "Space Measures of the Universe," "The Inorganic Universe," "Masses of Matter," "The Solar System," "Economies of the Inorganic Universe," "Beyond the Solar System," "Time Measures of the Universe," "Dawn of the Life System," "The Organic Universe," "Man," "Other Worlds Inhabited." These topics are discussed not so much scientifically and philosophically as rhetorically.

Our author's main purpose is to impress the imagination of his reader. For example, he tells us that it would take an express train, running at the rate of thirty-eight miles an hour, 8,000 years to cross the outer orbit of Neptune, 60,000 years to reach our nearest solar neighbor, and 1,080,000,000 years to reach the outer boundary of the visible universe. Again, he illustrates by the telegraph: A message would go around the earth seven times in one second, from the earth to the moon in little more than one second, to the sun in eight minutes, to Alpha Centauri in three years. Here, then, we have the main value of our author's book; it serves to impress the imagination with the vastness of space, and with the duration of time, and with the wonders of creation. He almost passionately commends his book to preachers.

We discover one piece of speculation. The author says it is "novel." We agree with him, and then go beyond him and say it is absurd. Concerning it he writes the following nervous and fretful paragraph:

"Scientists and speculative developmentists and evolutionists reject it because it is out of harmony with their theories. All materialists reject it on the same ground. Popular theology will be disturbed by it, because it will require some new constructions of long regnant notions. Dualists and trichotomists will rise up against it as out of harmony with their conclusions. Philosophical idealists will be offended because it gives reality to the body and accords it actual existence. Literalists and verbalists will hurl texts and creeds against it, and will scent heresy. None of these things alarm us. We have but one solicitude, that is, to get at the truth." (P. 225.)

It will take the "space-measures" of the universe to compass the egotism of our author, but the "time-measures" of his own mortal life will be ample to explode his "novel" theory. Science, metaphysics, theology, materialism, idealism, dualism, the words and creeds of Christendom are all confessedly against the novelty, but none of these things "alarm" the unterrified propounder and ex-

pounder. What is this revolutionizing novelty? It can be put into a single sentence. So stated, it will be offensive to the author, but it will be true, not a caricature. The very statement will uncover its absurdity. Here it is: *Man is a spirit incarcerated in an animal.* We are not explicitly told how he got into the animal; but we are told that he is greatly restricted and degraded by such an imprisonment; and we are told that death will be his emancipation, and that he and that animal will then be parted from each other forever.

Let us quote the Bishop: "Man is a spirit, as to essence or substance of his being." (P. 219.) That is very explicit. The Bishop means what he says, that man is but one substance, and that one substance is immaterial. "The organism (the body)," he says again, "is no part of him, but is simply a temporary home in which he begins his existence and by means of which he is initiated into his proper self-hood." (P. 219.) This language is also explicit. The Bishop contends for its face meaning. Man's physical organism, strictly and literally, is no part of him. Again, the Bishop defines by saying, "The life of the organism, whatever that may be, is not essentially different from that of any other animal organism." (P. 220.) Again the language is explicit. The human body, he explains, is composed of material elements, and in that body there dwells an animal soul, "animal pure and simple." He goes on with his novelty by saying, "This marks the differentiation between man and all animal existences." (P. 220.) What then is precisely the difference between a man and a cow? The cow is an animal which has no man living in its body and using its legs, eyes, ears, horns, and so on. A man, on the contrary, is an animal inhabited by a human spirit, and that spirit is the only thing which can be properly denominated *human*. But the Bishop advances his hypothesis a little further: "It is our contention that the immortal spirit is man, and that the physical organism and the animal soul which are made with it and for it are both and alike but temporary adjuncts to him, serving an end and then disappearing forever." (P. 221.) This is plain. It says that the physical organism and the animal soul, when they have served their purpose, "disappear forever." This "compound of the inorganic elements vitalized," called a body, is "simply a transient accident," "an external thing to which for a time and a purpose he sustains certain relations." But what is the bearing of this hypothesis upon the doctrine of the resurrection? Let the Bishop answer in his own words: "The cessation by death of its functions, and of the animal soul which used it as an instrument to certain earthly ends, probably does not leave the man without the need of a body" in the future life. (P. 227.) In the next world man can "probably" get on without a body—without the animal which was indispensable to his earthly life. But suppose the fact is contrary to the probability, and man must have a body, or some animal companionship? The Bishop answers: God "now provides another tenement suited to the higher sphere to which the immortal tenant is advanced." (P. 227.) At the most the resurrection is not probable. If it is necessary for man to have a body, or to live in some animal, God will not raise the old body, or animal, but will make a new one that will serve the purpose.

The author has already pronounced upon his novelty, that it would be regarded as against all science, philosophy, and theology, and would emit the "scent of heresy." We agree with him upon this point.

Although we have found a few faults with the Bishop for a too free indulgence in laudatory language about his book, for his overwrought declamation upon the subjects he handles, and for his ridiculous piece of speculation about the body of man, yet we have found his book entertaining reading. The title leads us to expect some severe form of discussion, but the volume turns out to be a pleasant, illustrative and declamatory address to the reader's imagination, and to appeal successfully to the imagination is neither easy nor profitless.

The last number of the *Methodist Review* contains a declamatory notice of this book in which the writer's sentences have spasms as he lashes them beyond their strength. He cries out, "Without exaggeration a sublime book, a tremendous book! . . . The amount of cerebral phosphorus consumed in making this blazing book would almost turn a midnight ocean into a sea of fire. The nebula in Orion is not more dense with crowded light-centres than is this radiant volume with its aggregation of shining facts, making to the mind an immeasurable but ordered splendor. In its chapters one sees the stupendous magnitude of the universe; sees also that the human intellect is a giant able to pick up worlds as playthings and spin them on the finger tip, or bowl them as arguments along the course of its reasoning; one hears them roll and rumble from preface to conclusion of this large, long book." Is this sarcasm? or is it a "sublime" review, a "tremendous" review?

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

BAIRD'S THE HUGUENOTS AND REVOCATION, ETC.

THE HUGUENOTS AND THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES. *By Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York; Author of the Rise of the Huguenots in France, etc.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Two Vols. 8vo, pp. xxviii., 566, and xx., 604. \$7.50.

These volumes form the conclusion of a series of works by the same author relating to the history of the Huguenots from the beginning of the Protestant Reformation in France down to the establishment of religious liberty under the consulate of Napoleon A. D., 1802. The first two volumes of this series relate the story of the *Rise of the Huguenots* and their varied fortunes until they become identified with the interests of Henry of Navarre. It is remarkable with what rapidity Protestantism spread in France during this period, even in the midst of persecution and civil war. As early as the close of the reign of Henry II., the bitter enemy of the Huguenots, their adherents are estimated to have numbered four hundred thousand. The venerable and heroic figure of Admiral Coligny towers above all others during this period. The massacre of Saint Bartholomew is its most tragic event.

The next two volumes of this series are entitled, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*. On the failure of the house of Francis I., by the death of Francis II., Charles IX., and Henry III., without heirs, Henry the young king of Navarre became the heir to the French throne, through his father the head of the Bourbon family. He was a Protestant by education and by profession, and it was by the aid of the Huguenots that he secure the crown. He was a gallant soldier, and an energetic ruler, but licentious in life, and, probably, destitute of any sincere, or at any rate, profound religious convictions. It is not surprising, therefore, that.

led by considerations of personal and political expediency, he abandoned the Protestant for the Catholic connection. He claimed, and no doubt honestly, that he believed this to be essential to the peace of the kingdoms, and that he would thus be enabled better to promote the interests of his former co-religionists. It was then that he issued the celebrated Edict of Nantes, granting religious toleration to the Huguenots, A. D. 1598.

The present volumes, *The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, continue the history from the death of Henry IV., and the accession of his son, Louis XIII., to the beginning of this century. They "constitute an independent history, intended to be complete in itself, of the causes and effects, proximate and remote, of the repeal of the Edict of Nantes." Arranging the whole period covered by this work into subdivisions corresponding to the political history it would naturally fall into three: *First*, The Huguenots during the reign of Louis XIII., from 1610 to 1643. *Second*, During the reign of Louis XIV., from 1643 to 1715. *Third*, From the death of Louis XIV., to the supremacy of Napoleon. But our author, with a genuine historical instinct, preserves more thoroughly the unity of his narrative by drawing his divisions from the subject itself, and comprises the whole in six books:

1. The Huguenot wars and the reduction of La Rochelle, the great stronghold of the Huguenots, 1610-1629.

2. Quiet under the Edict of Nantes, 1629-1660. It was during this period that the government of France was administered by Cardinal Richelieu and his successor Cardinal Mazarin, who, though ecclesiastics of the highest rank in the Roman church, resisted the clamors of the French clergy for the destruction of the religious rights of the Huguenots.

3. The Edict Undermined, 1660-1685, when Louis XIV., while professing to maintain the Edict of Nantes, set himself systematically, persistently, and remorselessly to rob the Huguenots of the rights which had been secured to them by the *Edict*, and thus to prepare the way for its repeal.

4. The Revocation and the Sequel 1685-1702. The revocation was preceded and followed by the Dragonnades and other violent forms of compulsion in the effort to make France all Catholic. The consequence was that a great migration set in by which France was robbed of perhaps half a million of its best citizens. At the same time those who remained resorted to secret conventicles, by which Protestantism was preserved from utter extinction.

5. The fifth book relates the armed uprising of the Camisards, and the war of the Cevennes, which was finally put down in 1710. The heroic and romantic adventures of Jean Cavalier belong to this period.

6. Book six is entitled *The Desert and the Re-establishment of Protestantism*. (1715-1802.)

Louis XIV., died in 1715 in the seventy-seventh year of his age, having occupied the throne of the greatest kingdom in Europe for more than seventy years. The amount of good that he might have done during a reign so long and so absolute passes comprehension; the evil that he actually did is equally incalculable. His ambition had deluged Europe in blood; his selfish bigotry had filled his own kingdom with lamentation and woe. His cruel efforts to extirpate Protestantism and make France all Catholic had been as signal a failure as those of Charles V., in Germany. In the more secluded districts churches were secretly but systematically organized on

the Presbyterian plan, such as had prevailed before the repeal of the Edict of Nantes, under such noble leaders as Antoine Court and Paul Rabaut. The sufferings which they endured, the gradual cessation of persecution through the weariness of the persecutors, the influence of Voltaire in behalf of religious liberty, are all graphically told; and the history comes to a fitting close in the full recognition of Protestantism during the French Revolution, and under the influence of Napoleon.

The period of Huguenot history covered by these two volumes, is perhaps, less familiar to the general reader than its earlier periods. It is not, however, less interesting or important. It is one long, dark, and bloody tragedy, characterized by remorseless persecutions and heroic endurance, almost unexampled in the history of the Protestant church. The story is told by our author with sufficient fullness, and yet without that minuteness of detail which might render it wearisome. The due proportion of events is preserved, the arrangement admirable, the style clear and animated, and above all there is a tone of moderation pervading the narrative which compels our confidence in the judicial fairness of the writer. The works of Professor Baird are justly entitled to rank with those of Prescott and Motley.

ROBERT PRICE.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE. *Edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D., editor of "The Expositor."*

THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH. Chapters xxi.-lii. *By W. H. Bennett, M. A.* Crown 8vo., pp. xx., 372. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1895. \$1.50. *Special terms to subscribers to a series of six.*

THE SONG OF SOLOMON AND THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH. *By Walter F. Adeney, M. A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Church History, New College, London.* Crown 8vo., pp. viii., 346. *The same publishers and price.*

This volume on JEREMIAH is a supplement to that already given in the *Expositor's Bible*. It deals with that portion of the prophecy beginning at chapter xxii. 10, and embraces the prophet's personal utterances and narratives, the prophecies concerning foreign nations, the teaching concerning Israel and Judah, and an epilogue setting forth the relations of Jeremiah and Christ. The expositor tries to reduce the utterances found in this part of Jeremiah to chronological order. His conjectures are interesting, but are only conjectures. The several chapters are suggestive and helpful. Critical questions are not considered. The chapter on the Rechabites is of special practical value in the application made by the author.

Professor Adeney's work on THE SONG OF SOLOMON is quite brief, covering only fifty-nine pages, of which more than half are devoted to the consideration of the structure, mystical interpretations and canonicity of the book. As to its structure, he is unwilling to regard it as made up of incongruous fragments, at the same time that he sees great difficulty in maintaining its structural unity. Herder's theory, that it is a string of independent lyrics, is too easy a way in which to cut the knot. The continuity of style, the uniform richness of language, abundance of imagery, picturesqueness and vivacity, the same recurring features of dialogue, but

especially the unity of the plot, are urged to prove that the book is one composition. As to the form of the book, he regards it as a drama rather than an idyl, though, at the same time, he regards the debate as to this point as rather pedantic, especially as critics can hardly apply to Hebrew poetry the sharply divided orders of European poetry. As to the characters, he accepts the theory of the two lovers, the king and the shepherd whom he, the king, is seeking to displace in the affections of the Shulammitte, and endeavors to show how, on the theory that Solomon is the accepted lover, the beloved bridegroom, he could not have appeared to "shrink from her pure, cold gaze," call her "terrible as an army with banners," pray her "to turn away her eyes from him," etc. In the same way the author argues from the difference which he thinks is to be detected in the bearing of the maiden towards the rivals. Having adopted "the shepherd hypothesis," the author thinks that the book is designed to celebrate and praise the true love of husband and wife in contrast to the degradation of a corrupt court, and to be applicable now in the fact that Christian civilization has not yet progressed beyond the condition in which the consideration of such a lesson may be resorted to as a wholesome corrective. As to the authorship of the book, Professor Adeney says he can give only a negative answer. He claims that historical considerations cannot apply to such an imaginative work as this, that Solomon could not have thus praised the love and fidelity of a country lass and her swain, and the simplicity of their rustic life, and especially as his own so conspicuously illustrated the very opposite. It may have been written *at* Solomon, even, the author thinks. The date, he thinks, from the mention of Tirzah, the royal residence of Jeroboam, may have been about fifty years after Solomon's death. Of the Aramaisms, and perhaps words of Greek extraction, this expositor does not make as much, in respect to a later date for the book, as the majority of his school. He thinks they may have crept in under the influence of revisers. From this mention of Tirzah, together with the allusions to Shunem, Lebanon and Hermon, Professor Adeney also draws the conclusion that in this poem we have a picture of Solomon and his court from the not too friendly hand of a citizen of the revolted provinces, that it is a northern view of Solomon in all his glory. He thus finds in it a secondary political meaning. Of the canonicity of the Song, he grants that there is no question of its possession of a place in the Hebrew Scriptures, and that the only possibility now is that of the expulsion of a book already in the canon, and there from the earliest formation of the canon. The attempt to disturb such a volume as the Old Testament is not one to be undertaken, he says, lightly and without adequate reason. He then proceeds to show what would justify such a radical measure, and what would not be a sufficient ground, leaving us with the feeling that while he does say "we can learn to appreciate it on its own merits, and in so doing perceive that there is something in it to justify its right to a niche in the glorious temple of Scripture," he says it with a reluctance which every reader must perceive. The chapter on Mystical Interpretation is a resumé of the history of allegorical interpretation. He rejects the allegorical method here on the ground, as he claims, that this was not in the original intention of the author, that it was an after-thought born of a spirit of allegory which was in the air, that the book is not once mentioned or alluded to by Christ or any of the New Testament writers, to all of whom it was undoubtedly known. He also char-

acterizes the effort to so interpret the book as mischievous. His entire discussion on this phase of the subject is, perhaps, more mischievous than most of even the most fanciful interpretations of the book.

The author's commentary on LAMENTATIONS discusses first, the general subject of Hebrew elegies. Then he studies the origin of the five poems which constitute the book. He makes them contemporary with the prophet whose name they bear, but after a full presentation of the arguments pro and con seems to think that some other than Jeremiah, though a contemporary, may have written them. The evidence for a diversity of authorship he regards as feeble. The rest of the volume is a series of expository discourses upon the contents of the poems.

DRIVER'S DEUTERONOMY.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON DEUTERONOMY. *By the Rev. S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford.* 8vo, pp. xcvi., 434. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. \$3.00 net.

This volume is the first in a series of commentaries designed to apply to exegesis the assumptions of modern advanced criticism, and to furnish a commentary that will be abreast of modern biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van. Dr. Driver's opening words are that his aim is to supply the reader with a commentary on Deuteronomy which may be abreast of the best scholarship and knowledge of the day. Thus, in the first words of his preface, he manifests the usual spirit of this critical school. They are the scholars, and scholarship will die with them. All who oppose them are mere traffickers in other men's wares, mere "traditionalists," without knowledge, conscience, or learning, of no respectable standing in the world of letters or the region of thought. No wonder that one of the school represented in this series boldly went so far as to say that even Christ himself may have been ignorant of the fact that he, along with others, was wrongly attributing the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses, perhaps because he did not know better, not having enjoyed the advantage of the modern historico-critical methods!

From the standpoint of the advanced critic, and for the specific purpose of this series, no better selection could have been made for the initial work than Dr. Driver for the author and the Book of Deuteronomy for the subject. No one will question the scholarship of the author; it is to the application of his studies that conservative thinkers object. Nor are his seriousness of mind and spirituality of purpose to be criticised, beyond the fact that the reverence for the word which he feels only makes the evils of his destructive principles and methods the more insidious. He is most careful in this work to unfold the spiritual significance of the book interpreted, and to endeavor to impress its many spiritual and practical lessons. The difficulty to us, however, lies in the fact that all these lessons are utterly vitiated and made worse than useless by the fact, as claimed by this school of critics, that the book is not to be accepted as truthful in the statements which itself makes in several places (not to speak of Paul's testimony, Romans x. 6, 8, 19, and xv. 10), that it, or certainly a large part of it, was given by divine authority, and, as such, was repeated by Moses and placed on record by

him. The rejection of such statements impairs the validity of all else that the book contains, and breaks the moral force of every part of its testimony to truth and righteousness. And we add that the spiritual and other factors which Deuteronomy presupposes, and the spiritual and other influences which either originated with it or received from it a fresh impulse, must have been very low and impotent, and thoroughly unworthy of imitation, if they could allow this book to obtain currency as the product of Moses' pen when the Deuteronomist knew that it was not, and that, so far as Moses was concerned with at least the form of the book, it was a fabrication out of the whole cloth. On this subject our author, in defending the Deuteronomist, says that "The new element in Deuteronomy is not the laws, but their *parenetic setting*. The author did not seek, by the fraudulent use of a great name, either to gain reputation for himself, or to obtain recognition for enactments of his own creation; his aim was to win obedience to laws or truths which were already known, but were in danger of being forgotten. . . . Deuteronomy may be described as the *prophetic reformulation, and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation*." Should we see fit one of these days to publish a text-book on the *Hebrew Tenses*, we doubt not that, if we could persuade men to believe that it came from Professor Driver's pen, its sales and influence would be multiplied. The substance of Hebrew philology and grammar is the same for all intelligent works on the subject, but to secure attention to our form of presenting the subject, and to our hortation, we will boldly publish it as Professor Driver's. We will call this merely our "parenetic setting" and "reformulation." Professor Driver would be apt to call it "stealing." The "much freedom" which our author asserts the ancients permitted themselves in ascribing to historical characters speeches which they could not have actually delivered in the shape in which they are now assigned to them, is a very thin disguise for pure and unadulterated forgery.

Our author devotes nearly one hundred pages to his Introduction. He here gives first an outline of the Book of Deuteronomy. He next discusses its relation to the preceding books of the Pentateuch, postulating that these books are not homogeneous, but composed of different documents, known as J, JE, and P, with their distinct Codes. This relation he summarizes by the conclusion that Deuteronomy is an expansion of the laws in JE; that it is in several features parallel to the Code of H., or Law of Holiness; that it contains allusions to laws . . . similar to the ceremonial institutions and observances codified in the rest of P. He regards the discourses as comprising three elements, a historical, a legislative, and a parenetic, of which the latter is the most characteristic and most important. In discussing the authorship, he starts with the assumption that the "traditional" view as to the authorship of the four preceding books is correct, and proceeds to show wherein the author of this book must have lived at a period very much later, the lines of proof being the asserted difference in or modification of the laws, various passages which seem to show that the author lived at a distance from the period which he describes, the use of the phrase "beyond Jordan," and the law respecting the place of sacrifice, which Deuteronomy, with great emphasis, demands shall be at but one sanctuary. The date which the author fixes upon is either in the reign of Manasseh or the early years of Josiah. The argumentation for this date, from historical and critical grounds, is quite full and elaborate. No part of

the Introduction is more carefully prepared than that which deals with the subject of the language and style of the book. This is natural, as, in the critical method, so much turns upon critical analysis.

That Professor Driver is learned and painstaking, none can question. That this work is abreast of "modern" scholarship, no one who studies it carefully will doubt. But we could wish that this learning and care were devoted to a worthier cause. At the same time, no respectable scholar can afford to be without it. He must be familiar with the positions of the school which he combats, if he would commend himself in teaching and preaching to intelligent people. The book is intended for students and not for the masses, though the author does, in a measure, seek to accommodate his work to the needs of those who are not conversant with the Hebrew.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY SERIES.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY SERIES. A HISTORY OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES. *By Williston Walker, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary.* A HISTORY OF THE UNITARIANS. *By Joseph Henry Allen, D. D.* A HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSALISTS. *By Richard Eddy, D. D.* A HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, DUTCH; THE REFORMED CHURCH, GERMAN; AND THE MORAVIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. *By E. T. Corwin, D. D., Professor J. H. Dubbs, D. D., and Professor J. T. Hamilton.* New York: Christian Literature Co.

These three volumes are among the late additions to the American Church History Series. Like those which have preceded them, they are well prepared, brief, and readable. They can scarcely be called histories, for they are historical sketches. The scope of the work prevents much elaboration of the early history or historical principles of the several denominations. They are, therefore, rather a view of the various churches as they appear at present, in their men, measures, and views. In his history of the Congregationalists, Dr. Walker traces the history of that people from the rise of Congregationalism in the days of Elizabeth, through the events leading to their appearing in New England, to the present time. The doctrinal conflicts of early days and of recent years are fairly presented. The work of the church is fully described, and special attention is given to the period immediately following the Revolution and to the early interest shown in the establishment of churches and schools on the frontier. He evinces special skill in handling the relations of his church to the Unitarian faith, and in tracing the history of theological education.

In the *History of the Unitarians*, Dr. Allen carries us back to the past more than into anything worth thought in the present. He, of course, justifies his faith from the fathers, classing Origen among those who held it. So far as its history in this land is concerned, it is of the day and influence of Channing that we find most to be said. So far as that body has had any glory, it has departed. It lives now only to speculate, not to bless. Organized ecclesiastical Unitarianism pushing itself among men is impossible, for it has no evangel to carry with it.

Dr. Eddy's account of the Universalists is able and readable. It is largely a defence of their faith, especially in the array of the opinions and work of emi-

ment men. In this faith, too, we can trace through its history the lack of forcefulness and aggressiveness, the absence of that power which is born of positive conviction, and which can never be found in a system whose cardinal principles or methods are those of negation.

A better subject is approached in Dr. Corwin's sympathetic history of the Dutch Reformed people, the American inheritors of the glory of the church of the Netherlands. A full bibliography of the subject is given. The early history of the Dutch churches cannot be given as fully as the author could wish. The Introduction describes the rise of the Reformed Church in Europe. The author studies the history of his church in four periods, the first, 1614-1664, being that in which the New Netherlands was a British province; the second, 1664-1708, that in which the church was sharing with others the misfortune of being under rulers favoring the Catholic faith; the third, 1708-1792, that in which the church became independent of the mother-church; and the fourth, 1792-1895, the modern life of the denomination, with its growth, divisions, and enterprises.

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE SHORTER BIBLE: Chronologically Arranged. Being the Holy Bible Abridged and with its Writings Synchronized for Popular Reading. *Lucy Rider Meyer, A. M., M. D., Editor, author of "Deaconesses," "Fairy Land of Chemistry," "The Jewish Offerings," etc.* With an Introduction by Bishop John H. Vincent. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1895. 8vo, pp. xxxiv., 963. \$2.50.

The title of this volume fully describes its nature and purpose. It is not an attempt to mutilate the sacred word or to lessen that reverence which all should have for a book every word of which is inspired and is profitable; but, like all that class of books in which parts of the Bible are published, or in which, as in the case of the synoptic Gospels, a "combined" portion is given, in the exact words of Scripture, this book is an attempt to weave together the Bible narratives in such a way as, by avoiding the repetitions and those parts of the Bible which need special help from commentaries, to bring into short compass all the facts and words recorded. It is, therefore, simply a biblical history, with the Bible's prophecies, etc., expressed in the words of the Bible itself. The utterances of psalmist, king, prophet and apostle are given in their chronological place. The compiler's purpose is not to divert from, but to attract toward the Bible as a whole; not to ignore the more difficult things, but to prepare the way, and especially for the young and ignorant, for their more intelligent study. The spirit in which the work is done is admirable. It is both intelligent and reverent. The task was a delicate and difficult one. The compiler evidently had the guiding hand of a conservative scholar or is herself a pronounced conservative. She puts all Isaiah's chapters, and Ecclesiastes, and Daniel, *et al.*, where the reverent student of the word who accepts it as of plenary inspiration instinctively places them.

THE JOHANNEAN PROBLEM. A Resumé for English Readers. *By Rev. George W. Gilmore, A. M., Professor of English Biblical Exegesis and Criticism in Bangor Theological Seminary.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895. 12mo, pp. 124.

The two questions with which the author of this comprehensive little treatise deals are the antiquity and the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The result of his studies and investigation in all the attainable literature of the subject and in the critical examination of that Gospel is that no hypothesis which excludes the Apostle John from the authorship will satisfy the conditions and accord with the testimony. The argument is given with great clearness and directness, and places within reach of English readers an admirable summary of the best testimony on a subject which has been perhaps the most prominent of all the questions of debate between conservative and advanced critics of the New Testament writings.

THE TWO ST. JOHNS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By James Stalker, D. D., author of "Imago Christi," "The Life of St. Paul," etc.* New York: American Tract Society. 1895. 12mo, pp. 271. \$1.00.

In characteristic clearness and beauty of style, so well known to all our readers, Dr. Stalker here recounts the lives of John the Apostle and John the Baptist. It is not a study of these lives side by side, as one would infer from the title, but separately, as the first and last witnesses to Christ. The method of treatment is a happy blending of the devotional and suggestive with the practical and biographical. The several chapters could readily and appropriately be used for reading by elders in the church service in the absence of the pastor.

A HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL: According to the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles. *By Rev. Frank J. Goodwin.* New York: American Tract Society. 1895. 8vo, pp. 240. \$1 75.

Taking Luke's history of Paul, in the Acts, as a basis, and printing it entire, the author has added to it, in the usual form in which a "Harmony" is prepared, such passages from Paul's letters as are parallel or supplementary to the record of Luke. Only the historical and autobiographical allusions in the Epistles are inserted, as it is the author's purpose not to give Paul's theology so much as his career. The work then practically forms a Life of Paul in the words of the Scripture. Notes are constantly given, bearing chiefly on the arrangement of the passages in the text, and relating to Paul's companions, and the chronology of his life. A full appendix treats more in detail of the apostle's conversion, visit to Arabia, visions, manual labor, the several epistles, etc. Maps and indices make the material of the book more useful and available. The plan of the author enabled him to avoid critical and doctrinal questions to a large extent. The student will find the book a most valuable one.

THE MESSAGES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA. Being the Inaugural of the Enthroned King, a Beacon on Oriental Shores. *By Rev. Thomas Murphy, D. D., LL. D.* 8vo, pp. x., 675. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895.

The distinguished pastor and author, in the introduction to this work, gives the principles upon which he interprets the portion of Scripture under consideration. First expressing the belief that the epistles or messages to the churches are not an integral part of the Book of Revelation, he looks for their design, and concludes that in these messages there are made known to us the germs of all church life, good and bad, and that these germs, fully developed, form the whole body of the Apocalypse. This church life in its influence upon individuals and communities, as well as tested by the first period of its history, is also set up as a warning and guiding beacon for the people of God in all ages. Thus the author is led to the title which he gives these messages collectively—The Inaugural of the Enthroned King of the Church. He regards the fact that here we have to do with the first contact of Christianity with what was virtually unmixed Paganism as the vital point in the study of the subject. He shows the marvellous significance and importance of this part of Scripture. He recognizes its difficulties. He does not

intend his work so much as a commentary on the passage, as an analysis of the entire passage, with a view to bringing out distinctly God's providential purposes concerning his newly-founded kingdom. In accordance with this, he pursues three lines of investigation, viz. : The purpose of God in sending the messages, a detailed description of the cities of the seven churches, and an analysis and classification of those elements which are similar in all the messages. The entire work indicates painstaking and faithful study. It will be most useful in its practical views and statements, rather than in its scholarship. By this statement we do not mean to disparage the latter, but to indicate wherein the greatest value of the book will be found.

TALES OF THE WARRIOR-KING—Life and Times of David, King of Israel. *By J. R. McDuff, D. D., author of "Tales of the Warrior Judges," "Prophet of Fire,"* etc. New York: American Tract Society. 1895. 12mo, pp. vi., 356. \$2.00.

This beautiful edition of the last work of its author, who passed away while its earliest proof-sheets were going through the press, will be a welcome volume to add to "Morning and Night Watches," and other well-known writings from his pen. It is a captivating account of the career of David. One will not feel like laying it down until it is read through. It should be in every well-appointed Sabbath-school library, as well as in the hands of older readers.

THE HIGHER CRITICS CRITICISED. A Study of the Pentateuch for Popular Reading, being an Inquiry into the Age of the So-called Books of Moses, with an Introductory Examination of Dr. Kuenen's "Religion of Israel." *By Rufus P. Stebbins, D. D.,* with Preliminary Chapters on the Higher Criticism, and an Appendix concerning the Wonderful Law. *By H. L. Hastings, editor of "The Christian," Boston.* Boston and London: H. L. Hastings. 1895. 12mo, pp. xevi., 354. \$1.50.

After so full a title we need lose no time in describing the nature and purpose of this book. The main part of it is a second edition of a work published some years ago by Dr. Stebbins, under the title of *A Study of the Pentateuch for Popular Reading*, in which he showed the errors of the theory of Kuenen in a manner well adapted to the ordinary reader. In the preface to this new edition one will find a review of the first edition by Dr. Charles H. Toy, together with the author's comments upon the review. To the body of the book are added Dr. Hastings' papers on the Higher Criticism and The Wonderful Law, both of them popular studies, from the conservative side of the subjects considered. The whole forms an exceedingly readable, healthful volume, and is truly, as Dr. Stebbins puts it, an appeal "to the sound sense and sober thought of the people."

AN INTRODUCTION TO DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. *By Revere Franklin Weidner, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary; author of Biblical Theology of the Old Testament and of the New Testament, etc.* New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1895. 12mo, pp. 287. \$2.00.

This is a second edition of the work published in 1888, revised and in parts rewritten. As before, the author declares systematic theology to be the highest form of theological science, and in defining biblical theology as a purely historical

discipline, sets forth dogmatic theology as the unifying and systematizing of the results of historical exegesis and as the sum of the truths embraced in the Christian faith in their organic connection with the facts of religious truth. He deplores the seeming disrepute into which dogmatic theology has fallen, as compared with the modern biblical theology. This work is, as it claims, simply an introduction to dogmatic theology. It treats of the definition, contents, method and history of dogmatics. The author bases his work upon that of Christoph Ernst Luthardt, the distinguished professor of theology at Leipsic, and a representative of the conservative party in the church of Germany.

MISCELLANIES OF REV. THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. Complete in Three Volumes. Volume I. Containing his more Popular Writings and Lectures. *Selected and arranged by Rev. T. C. Johnson, D. D.* Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1895. 8vo, pp. 384. \$2.00.

The larger number of our readers know who and what Dr. Peck was, how he exalted the word of God, how he regarded the authority and powers of the church as a divine institution, how strictly he construed the divine constitution and expounded and defended the principles embodied in it, how loyally and courageously he stood for the truth in every aspect in which it presented itself, and how he regarded all departures from it, or from its principles and methods, for what man might think more expedient as born of unbelief. It has been universally regretted that he did not leave more of his thoughts in written form, for their permanent benefit to the church. The compiler of these *Miscellanies* is doing service to all in gathering up what he can find and thus presenting it to the church. In the volume now published he has placed those writings which are of special interest to the popular mind, to the intelligent "lay" reader. These writings are chiefly articles from Dr. Peck's pen appearing in various magazines and reviews, as *The Critic*, *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, and this *QUARTERLY*. The papers are given in four groups, the first embracing those treating of the relations of the gospel to the poor, and Christian living; the second embracing those which discuss the worship of the church; the third embracing those which set forth the debased idea of worship prevailing in the paganized church, or Romanism, the last embracing biographical lectures on Luther, Pascal, and Stuart Robinson. The relief of the poor, the moral obligation of the tithe, observance of the Sabbath, revivals of religion, systematic beneficence, the worship of the church, liturgies, instrumental music, etc., are among the topics discussed. The editor is due the thanks of the church for collecting these grand papers and placing them before the church in this form, and we trust that he will be successful in providing for the publication of the remaining volumes. The publisher's work is admirably executed.

THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM.—Its Characteristics, Authority, and Obligation. *By the Rev. William Henry Roberts, D. D., LL. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895. 16mo, pp. 51.

This is a clear and concise treatise on the characteristics, authority, and obligation of our church system. The doctrine of the divine sovereignty is shown to be the controlling idea of the system, theoretically and practically. The word of

God, as the norm and rule of faith and practice, is its organizing principle. The rights of private judgment and voluntary association are the means to the attainment of the ends of the church. Out of these features comes the development of the church in theology, duty, worship, and government, and those views on these subjects which are inseparately linked with the Presbyterian system. This monograph is worthy to be put in the hands of all inquirers as to what Presbyterians believe, and on what principles their church is founded. It is very clear and judicious.

CHRISTIANITY VINDICATED BY ITS ENEMIES. *By Daniel Dorchester, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 187. 75 cents. New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1896.

In an introduction and seven chapters, the author gives us the testimony which skeptics and free-thinkers have given in their better moods to the support of the doctrine of God and immortality, the genuine historic basis of Christianity, the transcendent character of Christianity as a religious system, the divinity of Christianity, the leading vital doctrines of Christ's divinity, expiatory atonement, experimental religion, and future rewards and punishments, and the soul-satisfying power of Christianity. He rightly maintains that while infidelity is often largely speculative, it nevertheless has its mainspring in alienation of the unregenerate heart from God. Men, however, have moral natures, with moral intuitions, and at times under the influence of these they betray the real convictions of their hearts. It is the author's effort, in this volume, to gather up many of these testimonies, and thus to show that "Their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."

CHRISTIAN TEACHING AND LIFE. *By Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.* Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1895. 12mo., pp. 286. \$1.25.

The author does not preface this work with any statement of its aim or method, but takes us at once to an introduction, in which he shows whence we obtain our knowledge of Christ's teaching. Here he maintains the basal character of his teaching, the literalness of the four Gospels, and their early authorship, and the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. Then follows Part First, in which we have the teaching of Jesus Christ in respect to God, to men, to himself, to the Holy Spirit, to his own work, to his kingdom and its laws, order, co-operation, progress, and outcome. Part Second gives us the development of Christian teaching by the apostles in respect to the Triune God, man, the work of Christ, his kingdom. Part Third deals with the formation and use of creeds, discussing the question of creeds, the creeds of the early and eastern and western and Protestant churches, special denominational tenets, and the position of Baptists. The Fourth Part tells of the relation of Christian teaching to life, in its molding power. The Fifth Part is the application of Christian teaching to life, in love to God and to man, in social, business, and civil life. The Sixth Part is the improvement in Christian teaching. In treating of creeds, Dr. Hovey says that no denomination can be a harmonious body for any length of time without the help of a sound creed. His position is that of an immersionist, but he is fair in presenting the views of others. He is sound and evangelical throughout. The special feature of the book is that while it comes from one of the profoundest scholars of his church, and one whose business calls him to deal with the profoundest problems of the word in a

scientific manner, he has here avoided all technical words except such as are borrowed from the Bible itself. The entire book is within the comprehension of the plainest reader.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE QUARTER-CENTURY ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLD AND NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. Published by order of the General Assembly. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895. 12mo, pp. 94.

The addresses on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Reunion, the Basis of Reunion, an account of the Reunion Convention of 1869, and the action of the Assembly in 1895 in connection with the anniversary, form the contents of this little book. The addresses are on "The Fundamental Doctrines of the Presbyterian Church," by President Patton, of Princeton; on "The Influence of the Presbyterian Church upon Other Churches," by President Booth, of Auburn; and on "The Growth and Future of the Reunited Church," by Dr. Roberts, the stated clerk of the General Assembly.

THE LIFE OF PRIVILEGE, POSSESSION, PEACE, AND POWER. *By the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, London.* Introduction by D. L. Moody. Edited by Delavan L. Pierson. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1896. 12mo, pp. 202. \$1.00.

The thirteen addresses delivered by Prebendary Webb-Peploe before the Northfield Bible Conference in August, 1895. Their object is to arouse ministers and church members to a sense of their privileges and responsibilities as "co-workers with Christ," and to call them from the hindrances of the world. Among the topics presented are: "Man's Reasonable Service," "The Curse of Compromise," "The Divine Purpose," "Fellowship with Jesus," "Separation and Satisfaction," "Deliverance and Service."

ASPECTS OF HEAVEN. *By Rev. Burdett Hart, D. D.* New York: American Tract Society. 1896. 16mo, pp. 256. 75 cts.

Fourteen chapters or discourses on heaven in the various aspects in which it is presented to us in the Scriptures: as a holy city, as a home, as to its degrees of reward, recognition, super-angelic life, etc. While he admits that we can, perhaps, more readily estimate heaven in the negative aspects in which it is presented to us, he shows that it is positive as well; that it is a place, a home; a place of reunion, of spiritual life, of recognition, of knowledge; a world of light and purity, of power, of rest; above all, a place where there is the presence of Christ.

DEMON POSSESSION AND ALLIED THEMES; Being an Inductive Study of Phenomena of Our Own Times. *By Rev. John L. Nevius, D. D.* With an Introduction by Rev. F. F. Ellinwood, D. D., Secretary, etc. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co.

In this work, completed in the last days of the lamented author, one will find an exceedingly practical study of the question of demoniacal possession. In his forty years' residence among a heathen people, he was from the first confronted

with the belief of that people in certain forms of possession, and in many instances was persuaded of the reality of the facts, and of the similarity of the possessions to those recorded in the New Testament. In this way he was led to a firm belief in the literalness of the accounts in the New Testament, and to the conviction of the existence of the same facts in this day.

MEMORIALS OF FOREIGN MISSIONARIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, U. S. A. *By William Rankin, Late Treasurer of the Board of Foreign Missions.* Philadelphia: Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1895. 12mo, pp. 468.

A necrological record of the foreign field. It contains a brief account of the two hundred and fifty missionaries of the Presbyterian Board who have passed to their reward, and of five deceased corresponding secretaries, together with a narrative of the events at Futtehghurh in the Sepoy revolt of 1857 relating to the eight martyred missionaries. These necrological records are not written by the compiler but gathered from the periodicals or archives of the board with which he was for so long a time connected. The names are arranged alphabetically. The book is thus a useful book of reference and information. An introduction by Dr. John C. Lowrie, setting forth the origin, authority, example, promise, need and results of missionary work adds to the value of the volume.

METHODIST YEAR BOOK. *A. B. Sandford, D. D., Editor.* New York: Hunt & Eaton. 1896. 12mo, pp. 128. 10 cents.

This year book gives first the calendar, with much valuable information on the subject of the making of the calendar, leap-year, standards of time, seasons, eclipses, etc. Its second chapter is a condensed history of the Methodist Church, from its first organized church in America, in 1766, to the present time, with a resumé of the acts of the quadrennial general conferences, and with a list of the secretaries, conferences, statistics, and other summaries. The subsequent chapters describe the work of the church in its publication department, official benevolences, institutions and organizations. The last chapter is one of general information on matters of an interdenominational or general character. The whole compact volume is full of information of a most valuable kind and will be of great interest to intelligent students of church life in other bodies no less than to those who belong to this mighty division of the Lord's host.

THE SCHOOL OF LIFE; Divine Providence in the Light of Modern Science; The Law of Development Applied to Christian Thinking and Christian Living. *By Theodore F. Seward.* New York: James Pott & Co. \$1.50.

In this volume we find an attempt to show that the principle of development, or evolution in the sense of the divine immanence, makes the doctrine of God's government and guidance of the universe more reasonable and credible. It is an attempt to adjust many of our beliefs to the modern scientific theories. The author has signally illustrated, in his own case, the result of such an effort, showing how it will strip a man of the last vestige of soundness. His scheme makes of foreordination "simply the law of growth with an extension of the principle into

the future world"; of the Trinity, only the different aspects of One Divine Being; and he finds no place for a mediatorial plan. The book is unsafe from beginning to end.

THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES. *By Charles W. Shields, D. D., Professor in Princeton University.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

In this volume one will find collected and put into permanent form many papers contributed during recent years by the author to various periodicals, on the subject of the union of the churches. Dr. Shields has become widely known as the advocate of measures looking to very much closer relations between the churches. In these collected papers one will find the best obtainable presentation of that side of the question.

THE FORUM. The Forum Publishing Co., New York. \$3.00 a year.

The March number of this popular magazine contains the following articles: Family Life in America, by Thomas Bentzon; The Nicaragua Canal an Impracticable Scheme, by Joseph Nimmo, Jr.; The Army as a Career, by Gen. Oliver O. Howard; The Best Thing College Does for a Man, by President Charles F. Thwing; Some Municipal Problems, by Prof. E. W. Bemis; The Manitoba School Questions, by Prof. Goldwin Smith; The Cost of an Anglo-American War, by Edward Atkinson; An Alliance with England the Basis of a Rational Foreign Policy, by Prof. Sidney Sherwood; The European Situation, by F. H. Geffcken; Spirit of Racing in America, by John Gilmer Speed; and Manners and Customs of the Boers, by T. Loraine White. A more timely collection of papers could hardly have been made, while the discussions are able and interesting.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 37.—JULY, 1896

I. THEOLOGY THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION.¹

THERE are some things relating to the supply of ministers of the gospel about which the leading Christian denominations are substantially agreed. It would be strange if any serious difference existed as to the first and great question of the source of the supply. It is written, "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. . . . And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Ministers are gifts to the church from her triumphant and ascended Lord. As the first verse cited from the Epistle to the Ephesians is a quotation from the sixty-eighth Psalm, the import of the statement of the apostle is that God has never left the church to its own resources in the matter of providing ministers, but has reserved to himself, under every dispensation, the prerogative of furnishing them. This divine arrangement keeps the church dependent on God in a matter upon which her very existence, as well as her growth and prosperity, depends; but it is a wise and gracious one, in that it secures with infallible certainty to the church, in answer to her prayers, an adequate supply of the right kind of ministers, and at the same time enables them to speak as the ambassadors of Christ. The second feature of the divine plan relates to the agency given to the church in the word

¹ Delivered as an inaugural address in Columbia Seminary, May, 1896.

of God in providing a supply of ministers. On this point the Scriptures are as clear as on the first. He has organized his people with reference to the work he has given them to do in this world. The church is not a mass of isolated individuals working separately under the impulses of the renewed nature, but a body of believers having a divine constitution and an organic life. God's people are required to pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest. But to his church as represented in its courts, he has entrusted the high responsibility of judging of the divine call of candidates for the holy office, and of authorizing them in his name to preach the everlasting gospel. Moses was commanded to go and show his commission unto the elders of Israel. The Apostle Paul, though informed at the time of his commission that he was chosen of God to bear the gospel unto the Gentiles, was not at liberty to enter upon the work until the authorities of the church at Antioch, by direction of the Holy Ghost, fasted and prayed and laid hands on him. Nothing can be plainer than that ordination in the apostolic church was by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery and by prayer. The church has no right to commission any to preach but those who were first called of God, and none had any right to preach until they were commissioned by the church. On these vital points of order the churches are sound; but they have not been faithful. Something that looks very much like a church, lacking courts and ordination and sacraments, has been allowed to grow up and to spread all over the earth. It provides for the young and the mature. It has preachers, schools, and missions. It has, too, its system of training for the ministry. These things admonish us that there is need for the doctrine of the church to be emphasized in this age. There is a third feature of the work of providing ministers as to which the churches are approaching agreement. The plan of training candidates in seminaries of sacred learning, long familiar to Presbyterians, is receiving favor in the eyes of all the great denominations. It seems to have the right to claim the schools of the prophets under the law, and the company who waited on the teachings of our Lord as precedents. That the plan is not free from serious dangers all must admit;

but its manifold advantages commend it to the adoption of the church.

Among the many advantages which belong to a theological seminary, not the least is the opportunity for broad discipline furnished by a judicious distribution of the work of instruction. You have called me to give instruction in didactic and polemic theology in the Theological Seminary of South Carolina and Georgia, and you expect of me on this occasion some indication of my conception of the nature of the work given me to do, and of the method by which it can be done. In an effort to meet this expectation, your attention will be invited to a consideration of the definition of theology adopted in this seminary, and its implications.

Dr. Thornwell says (Lect. I., page 36): "I accept the definition now generally given, that theology is the science of religion; that is, it is the system of doctrine in its logical connection and dependence, which, when spiritually discerned, produces piety. There is a twofold cognition of divine truth: one natural, resulting from the ordinary exercise of our faculties of knowledge, and the other supernatural or spiritual, resulting from the gracious illumination of the Holy Ghost. The habit which corresponds to the first, like every other habit of science, is mere speculative knowledge. The habit which corresponds to the other is true religion. The doctrine, to use the expressive analogy of St. Paul, is the mould, and religion the image that it leaves upon the heart, which the spirit has softened to receive the impression. There is, first, the truth, and that is theology; there is, next, the cordial and spiritual apprehension of it, and that is the obedience of faith, which is synonymous with true religion. In other words, the truth objectively considered is theology; subjectively received, under divine illumination, it is religion. In relation to religion, therefore, theology is a science only in the objective sense. It denotes the system of doctrine, but not the mode of its apprehension."

Dr. Thornwell was a logician by nature and by severe discipline. Those who came under his instruction sometimes felt that he must be right in his conclusions when they could not follow with his clear vision all the steps that led to them. The embar-

rassment we feel in accepting the definition that theology is the science of religion is that natural cognition of divine truth does not produce piety; and yet natural cognition is the only basis of science. Dr. Thornwell reconciles the difficulty with the remark that "natural knowledge is the instrument of spiritual cognition. It is the seed which the Holy Spirit quickens into vital godliness. We must first know as *men* before we can know as *renewed* men." Dr. Dabney says: "Theology has come to be used commonly to describe the whole science of God's being and nature, and relations to the creature. The name is appropriate: Science of God." Dr. Dabney speaks with recognized authority. And I have reason for saying that, like Dr. Thornwell, he is good as well as great. But to my feeble powers this definition is attended with two serious difficulties. In the first place, it suggests the question of Zophar, the Naamathite: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do?" The best definition of God we have is the one contained in the *Shorter Catechism*: "God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth." Here the genus to which the substance of God is referred is spirit. So far there is no embarrassment in the thought that our knowledge may be reduced to science. But the difference is made up of those qualities which belong to spirit in its full and normal development, heightened beyond all bounds of conception by terms which are borrowed from God as an object of faith. Infinite, eternal, unchangeable, represent to our minds only negations, and yet they pervade and qualify the remaining terms of the difference—his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. So that while we follow the Scriptures in attributing to God the personal qualities which we find in ourselves, we do so only by way of analogy. God is not simply man upon a larger scale. And here arises our difficulty in defining theology as the science of God. The positive element which enters into our definition of God transcends the capacity of human speculation. Besides this, however, there is another consideration that makes me hesitate to accept the definition. It does not bring out with sufficient distinct-

ness the practical character of theological truth. Religion may be involved in God's relations to the creature, and yet the relations may continue and religion vanish. Or, if by relations be meant those that are superinduced by grace as well as those that are essential, then there is nothing in the definition that indicates the end contemplated. Dr. Hodge says: "Theology is the exhibition of the facts of Scripture in their proper order and relation, with the principles or general truths involved in the facts themselves, and which pervade and harmonize the whole." (Vol. I., page 19.) After reviewing the various definitions which have been given, he says: "We have, therefore, to restrict theology to its true sphere, as the science of the facts of divine revelation, so far as those facts concern the nature of God and our relation to him, as his creatures as sinners, and the subject of redemption." (Vol. I., page 21.) This definition limits the view to divine revelation, the medium of the knowledge of God. It would hardly be considered a precise definition of astronomy to say that it was the exhibition of the facts of the telescope in their proper order and relation, with the principles or general truths involved in the facts themselves, and which pervade and harmonize the whole. This limiting the view to the medium of obtaining a knowledge of God appears again in the division of theology into Natural and Revealed. The kind of theology is determined by the source from which it is derived. Dr. Hodge himself, while recognizing the old distinction and approving it, is careful to say, "The Scriptures contain all the facts of theology." (Vol. I., page 15.) "This is true," he adds, "because everything revealed in nature, and in the constitution of man concerning God and our relation to him, is contained and authenticated in Scripture. It is in this sense that 'the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants.'" (Vol. I., page 11.) The more important consideration, however, in this connection, seems to be that the knowledge of God communicated to man has varied as man has stood in different relations to him. As long as man was holy, the communications made to him, both naturally and supernaturally, were of God as Creator and Moral Ruler, and the rule of life was personal obedience. When sin had changed man's condition from inno-

cence to condemnation, then the knowledge of God as a Redeemer was revealed to him, and the source of life was the obedience of another. This historical fact indicates that the end contemplated by God in making himself known, either naturally or supernaturally, is intimately associated with the things revealed, and consequently not to be omitted from any adequate definition of theology.

I would not be understood as venturing to criticise these masters in Israel. Dr. Dabney is regarded with reverence and gratitude by our whole Southern church because of what he is and what he has done for the cause of Christ. Dr. Hodge's great work on Systematic Theology is used in this seminary to supplement the Lectures of Dr. Thornwell. My sole purpose in referring to them has been to indicate why I shall adhere to the definition of theology adopted by Dr. Thornwell, and confirmed in its place in our seminary by my illustrious predecessor, the Rev. Dr. Girardeau. It is preferred, *First*, because it includes all the terms of theology—God, man, and the God-man; *Secondly*, because it covers all the relations involved in theology—Creator, Ruler, Redeemer; *Thirdly*, because it enables us to make a true distinction between the natural and the supernatural in religion; *Fourthly*, because it has the elements of a real definition—knowledge is the genus, and religion the specific difference; in the last place, because it is suggested by the use of the covenants as a mode of revelation. The opening paragraph of Chapter VII. of *The Confession of Faith* says: "The distance between God and the creature is so great, that, although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which he hath been pleased to express by way of covenant."

Having indicated the definition of theology, it remains to consider its bearing on the matter to be taught, the method of instruction, the end to be sought, and the means necessary to attain it.

As to the first point, the force of the definition in determining the matter of instruction, we remark: The possibility of religion

depends upon the existence of a personal God. Religion consists essentially in affections, such as love, fear, veneration, and reverence. Its highest expression is that of communion with God. We speak to him in the language of prayer, penitence, faith, and thanksgiving. He speaks to us in his word, his providence, and in the communications of his grace. As such, religion implies an object, and an object of a peculiar kind. An abstract principle, a blind force, a stern and irresistible necessity, might be an object of dread and terror, but it would be absurd to pray to it, to trust in it, or to love it. Man was made in the image of God, and he must find in that image a reflection of those qualities necessary to the Being with whom he communes, to whom he gives his reverence, and in whom he finds his blessedness. The distinguishing characteristic of man as man may be summed up in the attributes of reason, conscience, and will. These are not material, but spiritual, properties, and they distinguish man as a person. All other creatures upon this earth are things. Man is like God in that he is a personal spirit. The Scriptures seem to use the expression "the image of God" in a looser sense to denote personal qualities. What it is to be a person we are not able to say. We can only mark the conditions on which the belief of it, as the unknown cause of obvious phenomena, is developed in consciousness. The first circumstance that distinguishes this notion is that of individuality. Every instance of knowledge is the affirmation of a self, on the one hand, and a something that is not self, on the other. There is the subject knowing and the object known. But there may be individuals that are not persons. There are other conditions essential to the development of the notion, which may be summed up in intelligence, conscience, and will. Self is affirmed only in consciousness, and consciousness is the property only of intelligence. It is the prerogative of man in distinction from the brutes to attribute his thoughts and impressions to himself—to say, "I think," or "I feel." It is, however, in the sphere of morals, where man is regarded as the subject of rights, and held to be the responsible author of his own acts—the sphere in which conscience and will are involved—that the notion is most distinctly developed. The power and liberty

of choice, the power of originating motion, the sense of responsibility and assertion of right, carry in them the notion of personal being. When, therefore, we affirm the personality of God, we mean to assert that he is distinct from all other objects; that he is not the universe, either in its matter or its form, its seminal principle or its final development. We mean to say that he is a pure spirit, possessed of consciousness and will, who acts from purpose and from choice. As such, he can enter into communion with our spirits. Mind does hold communion with mind. He can make known to men his attitude in relation to them. He can enter into their souls and warm and irradiate them with the tokens of his favor. He can hear their prayers and receive their praises. He can be to them the source of blessedness. Let us not forget, however, in the enthusiasm this thought inspires, that the image of God consists essentially in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness. Personal spirit is necessary on the part of man to the possession of the divine image; but, strictly speaking, it is not the image. The Bible is clear as to the moral character of the image of God. God made man holy, and in this he resembled the character of his Maker. His holiness manifested itself in spiritual discernment and a disposition to universal obedience. And so, while the knowledge of God makes religion possible by affording an object to which worship may be addressed, the holy nature of God—his infinite and glorious perfections, of which it is the summary expression—gives an object worthy to be revered and trusted, and competent to engage all the powers of man, as well as to meet every craving and aspiration of his immortal spirit.

Our definition, however, is not satisfied with an object of worship. It involves relations as well. Theology has to do, not only with the being and nature of God, but also with the relations on which he bases his intercourse with man. Here our attention is arrested by the fact that the work of creation was finished, and some interval allowed, before mention is made of any special act of providence toward man. The mind is allowed to dwell for a moment at least upon the natural relations subsisting betwixt God and the creature. All orders of created existence sustained

one common relation to God. They were his servants. As the property of him who made them, they were subject to his control. But man was distinguished, as a rational creature, by the imposition of a moral law as the rule of his life. The holy law was not something added by revelation after his creation, but was written upon his heart in the very act of creation. It belonged to his constitution as a moral creature, so that man came into existence as a servant under moral government. It is not difficult to gather from these data the features of the situation. The characteristic principle of moral government is distributive justice. When rewards and punishments are distributed according to the personal good or ill desert of every subject, the government is moral. This precludes the representative principle; it conditions the favor of God on perpetual obedience; and it leaves no room for recovery from ruin, if it comes at any stage of man's immortal career. What liberty of approach to God was allowed under the relation of a servant under pure moral government, we are not told. As long as man remained innocent he was not restrained by guilty fear. But there is, in the nature of things, a marked difference between the intercourse of a father with a son and that of a master with a servant. Under such a relation religion must necessarily have been of the legal type, and access to God restrained. The goodness of God was manifested in the lofty endowments he bestowed on man, and in the headship he gave him over the new creation. The righteousness of the relation has been demonstrated, *first*, by the fact that obedience to the law has, in two conspicuous instances, been made necessary to man's elevation to the position of sonship; and *secondly*, by the further fact that in the second probation the conditions were severe. But, righteous and honorable as the position under pure moral government was, it is evident that the divine goodness contemplated from the first a nearer and tenderer relationship for man. It was always God's purpose to turn the servant into a son. The first special act of providence God exercised toward man in the estate wherein he was created was the institution of the covenant of works. In this covenant the principles of moral government were modified in two important particulars. Probation was limited both as

to time and as to persons. Adam, the mature man, endowed with spiritual discernment and a will inclined to the law of God, was made the representative of his race. As such, the question of destiny must be settled before any of his descendants should come into being. A temporary obedience was made equivalent to perpetual innocence. The gracious purpose sought by the arrangement was the justification and adoption of Adam and his race. That the gracious purpose failed, and failed so disastrously, was not the fault of the covenant and the principles employed. Nor was the goodness of God exhausted by the one effort which had been so signally frustrated by the sin of man. Before the guilty pair were banished from Paradise an intimation was given, in the first promise, of that amazing scheme of grace which we call the covenant of redemption, the full development of which spans the history of time. In this glorious covenant there is no failure. The principles employed are the same, but the representative is the eternal Son of God. On the ground of his obedience his people are justified. Being justified, their trial necessarily ceases; and the moment trial ceases in this way, the position of a servant also ceases. A new relation must supervene, in which the sentiments of the heart correspond to the changed relations. Adoption is grounded in justification. "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." What is implied in sonship we may not be able fully to conceive. Yet there are some features of the relation with which we are familiar. The ground of the son's right to the blessing he enjoys is the father's love, and the principle on which he possesses it is that of inheritance and not of debt. The faults of a son are chastened in love, whereas the transgressions of a servant are punished judicially. The standing of a son is secure, because his relation to the law is changed. He is forever free from its condemnation, and its holy principles are wrought by grace into the texture of his soul. The son has free access to the father's presence. The communion of a son with his father is full and unconstrained. Surely we have in this relation all that religion, viewed as communion with God, demands. When I see how persistently divine goodness has sought to estab-

lish this relation, I cannot escape the conviction that theology should be so taught as to promote fellowship with God. And when I see how divine wisdom has used the covenant as a scheme for the justification and adoption of man, both in his condition of innocence and of sin, I cannot resist the belief that what may be called the federal theology lies at the foundation of vital godliness.

The bearing of our definition on the method to be employed in theology will next engage our attention. This may be dispatched in a few words. It was not an accident that the great expounder of the inductive method in philosophy was a citizen of Protestant England. With Protestants the Bible is the rule of faith. The Bible opens with an account of the creation of the heavens and the earth. In the six days God reduced the chaos to order, and adapted the laws of nature to the physical, intellectual, and religious condition of man. As he made the world, so he continues to uphold it by his power, and to govern it consistently with the constitution he originally gave it. The world is separate from God, and yet dependent upon him. Creation and providence are the methods by which God executes his eternal decrees. The universe is the effect of the divine will. It is an effect that might or might not have been. Its nature and constitution are alike contingent. This is a very different doctrine of the universe from Pantheism, and it leads to a very different method of inquiry in philosophy. Any system that identifies God with his works must involve an *a priori* or deductive method in science. Given the principle of being as God, and all things can be deduced from him with as rigorous certainty as the propositions of geometry from the definitions of the science. He is necessary cause, they are necessary effect. He is necessary substance, they are necessary affections. But on the supposition of an intelligent Creator, who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will, the problem of philosophy is different. It becomes an inquiry into the nature and attributes of God as these are manifested in his works. We know what he is by what he does. The process is inductive. And what is true of nature is equally true of his word. What nature is to the man of science, the Bible is to the theologian. It is a storehouse of revealed

facts. The truths of revelation are scattered over the pages of the Bible like the facts of science over the face of nature. When gathered, they are found to arrange themselves into a harmonious system of truth. The house that Solomon built for the Lord, "when it was building, was built of stone made ready before it was brought thither; so that there was neither hammer, nor axe, nor any tool of iron, heard in the house while it was in building." The more candidly and thoroughly the induction is made, and the more the facts are allowed to arrange themselves according to their inherent laws, the more successful will be the effort of the theologian. It is a demonstration of the Augustinian system that it is the only one consistent with all the facts or truths taught in the Bible. Let it not be said that this gives a tame view of the work of the theologian. It was no disparagement to the genius and skill of the builders of Solomon that they sought to realize the pattern showed to Moses in the Mount. Nor do Bacon and Newton suffer because they refused to follow the barren method of more ambitious philosophers. The ablest theologians of the Reformed Church, from Calvin down to our day, have wrought with material drawn fresh from the word of God.

In the third place, our definition indicates the purpose to be kept in view in teaching theology. We speak here of the teacher in his work with his classes. Theological seminaries ought to be fountains of religious literature. They ought to elevate the general intelligence of the church. And they should aid in settling the perplexing problems the church has to encounter in every generation. But the chief business of these sacred institutions is to train candidates for the ministry. What, then, should be the ruling purpose in the department of systematic theology? Should it be to make accomplished theologians, or to prepare able and successful preachers? It cannot be doubted that the former end may be secured without the latter. The human mind is logical. Some books in the Bible state divine truth in systematic form. The whole Bible contains a system of truth. It is possible by diligence to construct from the Scriptures a theology, to state and defend it. All this may be done as a mere intellectual exercise. The truth may neither sanctify the heart of the student, nor move

him to compassion for lost men. No one will advocate this process. Every one will say, it is one of the dangers that should be carefully avoided. It does not follow, however, because it is possible to be scientific theologians, and at the same time be very dry and unfruitful preachers, that men can be able and successful preachers without being theologians. This is a serious mistake. Great preachers like Chalmers and Edwards were also great theologians. Groups of great preachers are found in periods when the church is called in the providence of God to contend earnestly for the faith. The preaching of our Lord's apostles gives no countenance to the opinion that ignorance of divine truth is a condition of success in the ministry. The instances of superior success on the part of ignorant preachers are deceptive. Some are really ignorant, and only appear to be greatly successful. The illusion is dispelled when time has tested the nature of the results. There are, however, really great results from apparently ignorant men. Here the mistake is as to the intelligence of the preacher. John Bunyan was put in prison by the Duke of Bedford of his day. The Duke of Bedford of our generation erects a monument to his memory. It will be found, wherever a great work of permanent value has been accomplished by a rude and uncultivated man, that he had a well-digested system of divine truth. While uninformed in many directions, the word of God was as a "burning fire shut up in his bones." There is a growing impatience on the part of the churches with doctrinal preaching. The test of a minister now is rather *how* he preaches than *what* he preaches. It is not a healthy symptom. And yet it has had the effect in some quarters to disparage the chair of systematic theology. With us the influence has not been felt. And I am hopeful enough to believe that theology can be so taught that preachers will still go forth who can say with David and Paul, "I believed, and therefore have I spoken."

We come now to the last suggestion contained in the definition. This relates to the means necessary to accomplish the purpose of which we have spoken. Here the involuntary exclamation breaks forth, Who is sufficient for these things? I suppose there never lived a man who would not shudder if called upon to under-

take such a work. After all, however, sufficiency does not lie in man. Some men, by reason of special gifts, are more suitable instruments than others; but it is not by might nor by power. The promise of the Holy Spirit, to teacher and pupils alike, is the only ground of hope in so vast an undertaking. He alone can give spiritual discernment. He alone can soften the heart to receive the impression of revealed truth. The first discourse of our Lord was preached from the text, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel." Our Lord's disciples were but bruised reeds and smoking flax until they received the Holy Ghost. Let it be the earnest prayer of every lover of this seminary that the Holy Spirit will abide here, and lead us into all truth. Then shall her old men dream dreams, and her young men shall see visions. Then every scribe, instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, will bring forth out of his treasures things new and old.

W. T. HALL.

Columbia, S. C.

II. DR. BAVINCK ON THE PRINCIPIUM EXTERNUM.¹

IN DR. Bavinck's *Reformed Dogmatics*, theological literature is being enriched with one of the most scholarly and scientific recent expositions of Protestant theology. The first volume, which of necessity treats of introduction only, causes us to look forward with keenest expectancy to the coming two volumes, which will treat of theology proper.

The tone of the work is so modest and moderate, the evidence of wide reading, which has apparently swept the whole field, is so manifest, and the treatment of friend and foe is so courteous, that the reader of this first volume is inspired with profound respect for this rising Dutch theologian, already widely known in America.

According to the author's preface, far more attention has been paid to patristic theology than is commonly the case in works of this kind.

The author professes himself a Calvinist by conviction, since he considers this system of doctrine relatively the purest expression of truth; but he deplors the fact that the development of Calvinistic theology has so soon been replaced by deformatory movements, which have checked its growth, both on the Continent and in America. He prefers the older Reformed theologians to the later, "since in freshness and originality they far surpass the others." He rectifies, however, all false impressions by saying that "to praise the old simply because it is old is neither Reformed nor Christian." "A system of dogmatics does not treat of what has obtained, but of what must obtain."

The preface tells us that the author has considered the many tendencies which cross and recross each other in the field of theology, and has taken position among them all; and his promise to appreciate the good, wherever it is found, is fully reclaimed in the work itself.

¹*Gereformeerde Dogmatick*, door Dr. H. Bavinck, Eerste Deel. Inleiding. Principia. Kampen: J. H. Bos., 1895.

There are certain dogmas which till this day have not been fully formulated, and on these points, especially, it is that we seek for further light from every prominent new theologian. And of these, none is possessed of greater and more practical interest than the doctrine of the Scriptures, which has been considerably influenced by the work of the historical critics. It is the aim of this paper to give a rapid sketch of the position which Dr. Bavinck has assumed on the doctrine of the Scriptures, and especially on the question of inspiration.

The task, however, is formidable, since in giving this necessarily incomplete outline, the greater part of the first volume before us had to be condensed in this brief paper. For one cannot appreciate Bavinck's *theory of inspiration* without a review of his *theory of revelation*, both general and special.

It will be necessary, therefore, first broadly to inquire (I.), What is Dr. Bavinck's idea of *revelation*; and (II.), What is his idea of *inspiration*.

I.—AS TO REVELATION.

According to the author, revelation is the necessary correlative of all religion, and as such it is not within the province of science or philosophy to define its meaning and contents.

Both lack the necessary data to do so. Religion presupposes a distinction between God and man, and it consists of a "relation of man to God, not the reverse." Religion and revelation are, therefore, essentially different. In revelation God is active towards man in behalf of that relation which we call religion.

Revelation is, therefore, a voluntary divine act. It is inseparably linked to supranaturalism, and both of them together stand or fall with religion.

Revelation has a wide scope, it embraces both nature and grace. Its exalted aim is to transform humanity, as a unit, into the kingdom of God, and its consummation is only reached when this result has been achieved.

We distinguish this revelation as *general* and *special*.

This distinction dates from the days of patristic and scholastic theology. In the latter, it developed into a complete antithesis,

making reason and faith antipodes, and this complete separation survives in the dualism of Romish theology. For Rome holds that God might be known by the light of natural reason, but that, of his own good pleasure, he has revealed himself by a super-added supranatural revelation. The Reformation removed this dualism, but as the reaction ran into extremes, natural religion, which had first been made a part of Christian doctrine, lost all significance, and man, in his natural state, lost all responsibility. But from this position another reaction took place, for neither Lutheranism nor Calvinism had completely escaped the toils of scholasticism, and thus, first in sectarian and later on in orthodox circles, rationalism lifted its head.

But the rationalistic position destroyed itself; its untenability was proved alike by philosophy, by the comparative history of religion, and by general and Biblical criticism, and in our day the value of the so-called *theologia naturalis* is in the ascendant again.

The Scriptures convey the idea that all revelation, even that of nature, is supranatural. For revelation is God's self-manifestation, in any sphere whatever, and thus the Scriptures inseparably link religion to a supranatural revelation; the first is destroyed by the destruction of the latter. There is, therefore, no question of a *religio naturalis*, for the antithesis is not between supranaturalism and rationalism, but between supranaturalism and naturalism.

The idea of revelation is involved in that of God.

And yet we must distinguish between *supranatural* and *immediate* revelations. Great confusion was created by a wrong use of the terms *mediate* and *immediate*. Strictly speaking, there is no room for immediate revelation, for *Finitum non est capax infiniti*. Both in the supranatural and in the natural revelation God comes to us mediately. In the *status integritatis* both therefore go hand in hand. From the very first God revealed himself by appearance, word, and deed, and sin did not change this.

God's witness of himself, in nature and in the human conscience, is universal and is appreciable by every man and this universal revelation has ever been accepted by Christian theology.

But, according to the Scriptures, this natural revelation contains supranatural elements; the history of fallen humanity bears witness to it. God wrought miracles before the eyes of the heathen, and *a priori* the working of supranatural powers among those heathen is neither impossible nor improbable. There seems to be a stratum of revelation common to all religions. Whole periods of sacred history, of the utmost importance to the *historia revelationis*, are devoid of any supranatural manifestation.

Natural and *supranatural* revelation must, therefore, not be identified with *general* and *special* revelation.

The testimony of the church as to the insufficiency of general revelation is practically unanimous. It is but a partial revelation, and lacks the very thing which sinful man needs—*redemption*. Philosophy, in its limitations, could never offer an authoritative religion. What is called *religio naturalis* has never satisfied any people, and the sober historical sense of our nineteenth century has utterly discarded it.

All heathen religions, however, are founded on general revelation. Two theories now present themselves: (1), That of the Scriptures, which considers all heathen religions darkness and ignorance, vain wisdom, sin and unrighteousness, hence a process of degeneracy; and (2), That of science, which beholds in all religions a succession of evolutionary steps. The latter theory is far more improbable than the former, and, after all, it has no higher rank than that of a *questionable hypothesis*.

By the general revelation, which the Scriptures teach, we are enabled to appreciate the elements of truth which we find in all false religions; and especially the Reformed doctrine of *common grace* enables us to value them aright. The ideas of God, guilt, need of pardon, sacrifice, priesthood, temple, cultus—all these, in whatever distorted form, are found in all religions. But Christianity is the highest and purest religion, because it is the true one. It is the original of many caricatures, the reality of many semblances.

Thus the *revelatio generalis* is of importance to the Christian. By its aid he is kept from feeling himself a stranger in the world. *Subjectively* the Christian beholds God in nature only by what

he knows of God from the Scriptures, but *objectively* nature precedes grace, the general revelation precedes the special. The *revelatio generalis* offers problems for solution which disquiet the souls of men, and which philosophy vainly endeavors to solve. Thus man is kept from sinking to the animal level; his higher destiny is kept before him, and indirectly it contains the prophecy of man's restoration in Christ.

Thus nature and grace, creation and regeneration, are kept inseparably connected. Without the general revelation the special would lose its connection with the Kosmos.

Religion is organically connected with man's nature, general and special revelation join hands; God, who does not leave himself without a witness in the first, reveals himself in the second as a God of mercy and grace. Special revelation, in all its forms, seems reducible to the following three means:

1. All religious faith desires a near and not a distant God. Hence the theophany.

2. All religious faith expects a revelation of the divine will. Hence the diviner, the magician, the oracle, the prophet.

3. They all expect divine interposition in the hour of need. Hence the miracle.

Now, superstition is a bastard form of true religion. Spiritism and hypnotism prove that, on the darker side of the spirit's life, forces lie hidden which may establish a closer contact with the unseen world. The Scriptures, however, unequivocally condemn all such things. Here is precisely the difference between true and false religion. In the latter, man seeks God; in the former, God seeks man. What is a caricature among the heathen, and a shadow among Israel, has, in the Christian religion, become a veritable and spiritual reality.

Jehovah reveals himself as a personal *theophany* till the giving of the law; thenceforth he withdraws into the holy of holies till in Christ the theophany is fully realized. Through him and through the Spirit, whom he sends, the indwelling of God among his people becomes a true spiritual reality, and finally its complete consummation is reached in the New Jerusalem. *Prophecy* brings the special revelation to us as a direct communication of

the divine thought. It always places the divine truth over against the human lie. It may appear in higher and lower forms, and usually comes directly, without any vision. Prophecy proceeds from the indwelling Spirit of God. In itself imperfect, it looks forward to the day of perfect things, to him of whom Moses prophesied, to him who does not *receive revelations*, but who *reveals*, and who imparts his Spirit to his disciples and to his church.

The *miracle* also belongs to the special revelation. The Old Testament teems with them. But Israel does not understand their import. On this account the prophets begin to point to the *יום יהוה*, the day of the Lord, which, according to the Scriptures, comes in the New Testament revelation. With Christ a new cycle of miracles begins, which for a time survives his departure, and then gradually merges in the spiritual miracle, until at last, in the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, the miracle will become nature, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of God.

Dr. Bavinck now proceeds to the *idea* of a special revelation. He shows how the scriptural system of revelation has been neglected and ignored in Christian theology. The theologians have not given themselves sufficient pains to truly appreciate this idea. Both rationalism and supranaturalism saw in it only an *external communication of doctrine*. This position was deservedly demolished by rationalistic criticism. But the intimate relation between religion and revelation remained, and efforts at reconstruction are made by more recent theologians.

German philosophy unduly extended the idea of revelation, or adopted the Schleiermacherian theory, which follows somewhat the following line of thought: Revelation is to be distinguished from theopneusty or from the Scriptures, which are only the record of revelation, not revelation itself. Revelation is a religious, or, rather, a soteriological, idea, a correlative of religion. Proceeding from God as Saviour, its contents are religio-ethical truths. It is rather *natural* and *human* than supranatural, and it presents a double aspect, the *external* (manifestation) and the *internal* (inspiration).

Ritschl takes a different position, and lays special stress on the positive historical character of all revelation, which in Christian-

ity centres in Christ. But till this day Dogmatics lacks a pure and clear conception of revelation. "The theologians are not agreed on anything which is of importance in this idea." (Dr. Bavinck, p. 267.)¹

Dr. Bavinck now attempts to define the scriptural idea of revelation. He tells us that the revelation which the Scriptures teach is a historical and organic whole, revealing itself in theophany, prophecy, and miracle. God seeks man in this special revelation. It begins at the fall, and reaches out to the incarnation. It enters history, and completely identifies itself therewith. It uses every type of character and talent and individuality. It assumes the shape of types and shadows, imagery and symbol, art and poetry, epistle and chronicle. It borrows from other religions. It even utilizes the lot, the dream, and the vision. In it the divine and the human completely coöperate. The correct view of this revelation is, therefore, a *central* and *organic* one, whose focus is the incarnation of God; for under both the Old and New Testaments the *Logos* is the subject of special revelation. The dispensation of the Spirit begins when God has fully revealed himself in Christ. Then the *αἶων οὐτος* is changed into the *αἶων μέλλων*, in which everything looks back to and is deduced from Christ.

Miracles and prophecy, in a specific sense, may have ceased in this dispensation, but the church itself is from moment to moment the product of that special revelation, which is continued, in a spiritual sense, and looks forward to heaven. Scriptural revelation is, therefore, a historical process, an organic system. God triumphs in it over everything outside of himself. Revelation is soteriological, not in a religio-ethical sense, much less in a merely intellectual sense, but in a scriptural sense; so that the contents of revelation are not doctrine, or life, or emotion, but all of these combined, a divine work, a world of thoughts and acts, an *ordo gratiæ*, which battles with and conquers the *ordo peccati*. Its aim is not intellectual enlightenment (rationalism), nor morality (moralism), nor religious sensibility (mysticism); but its aim is to

¹ Compare Dr. Geo. Vos' criticism in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April, 1896, p. 359.

snatch man, the world, the whole κόσμος from the power of sin; so broad is the scope of divine revelation.

Dr. Bavinck now proceeds to point out the relation between this special revelation and supranaturalism, on the one hand, and naturalism, on the other. Both have ignored the organic conception of revelation. These terms, though unscriptural, are yet founded on the Scriptures. But both theologians and philosophers have, on the one hand, understood these terms in a modified sense, identifying the supranatural with the suprasensual, and, on the other hand, this idea has been unduly restricted. It has been separated by some from created things in general, and by others from the spiritual miracles of regeneration, since it was claimed that both, looked at from the divine standpoint, were not supranatural at all. Thus special revelation was severed, on the one hand, from nature, and, on the other, from the works of grace which characterize the life of the church. The historical and organic character of special revelation was ignored, it was made to soar above nature and humanity, instead of entering into it.

This dualistic and supranaturalistic system found its fullest exposition in Romish Catholic theology, but there also its manifest inconsistency aroused great opposition. Protestant theology occupies a different position, inasmuch as it establishes an antithesis, not between *nature and revelation*, but between *sin and revelation*. The qualitative relation between natural and supranatural religion has taken the place of the quantitative one.

As regards the relation between revelation and naturalism, the rationalists may be divided into four groups, which vary between that conception of the relation between reason and faith which makes the former the arbiter of the claims of supranatural revelation, and that other and radical conception of this relation which denies supranaturalism altogether, and deems natural religion sufficient for all purposes. Here the very possibility of a supranatural revelation is denied, both on the divine and human side; for even if it did exist, it is claimed, the data for its appreciation by man would still be lacking. All faith is built on human authority, and reason determines it.

But the task of rationalism was not as easy as was at first sup-

posed. The facts of revelation must be explained, a theory for its miracles must be propounded. In endless ways this task was attempted, only to end in an acknowledged and complete failure. Word and fact in revelation are inseparable. Our view of life and of the world ultimately decides our belief or unbelief in supernaturalism. What we believe is determined by what we are. The supernaturalist may only know in part, he may fail to assign to each several act or word its specific place, but he is in conscious harmony with revelation as a whole. He retains his grasp on religion, for religion and revelation—the religion of the Scriptures and the revelation of the Scriptures—are inseparable.

In a rapid sketch Dr. Bavinck now points out the failure of monistic naturalism, both in its pantheistic and its materialistic aspect, to solve the riddles which are embodied in the laws which govern mind and matter. Theism finds "their key in God."

The author shows how science and faith can stand side by side if they will only respect their own boundary lines. Miracles are a matter of history, not of experiment, they rest on testimony. The *κόσμος* is still in a process of teleological development which brings her to her divine destiny, that is, according to the Scriptures, to her complete recreation and riddance of sin.

Revelation, therefore, occupies a definite teleological position in God's plan with the world. Even without the fall, there would have been room for prophecy and miracles. Supernaturalism is not necessitated by the fall. Not revelation itself, but its soteriological character, was made necessary by sin. Though not a product of nature, revelation is, therefore, perfectly natural.

This revelation is an organic whole, a world by itself, distinct from nature, and yet perfectly adapted to it. In it there are many things which we now but partly understand; but this does not discourage us.

Faith in this supernatural revelation reconciles us to the things that are, in the hope of what they will become. All other systems offer us an outlook on barren vistas; revelation reveals to us the coming of God to humanity, forever to dwell with it. The *status peccati*, changed into a *status gratiae* for the believer, will yonder be changed into a *status gloriae*.

This brings the author to the consideration of the Holy Scriptures. He begins by pointing out the close relation between revelation and religion. The Chinese, Indian, Buddhist, Persian, Mohammedan, Jewish, and Christian religions are called *book-religions* by Max Müller, because they have holy writings.

Thought and word, the idea and its expression, are inseparably connected. Of all writing it may be said that it is the ἐνσάρκωσις of the word.

The idea of the Scriptures is historic, revelation consists of acts and facts, which are transient, nay, from one aspect all revelation may be considered an *actus transiens*, temporary, even momentary. It shares this transitoriness with all earthly things. Christ is the centre of revelation, but Christ is a historic person, the facts in his life cannot be repeated. All revelation, not as doctrine, but as incarnation, must be historic; it is destined for humanity, not considered as an aggregate of individuals, but as an organic whole, living and moving in history.

Writing is the σῆμα of all language. The central fact of revelation, viz., the incarnation, leads to the Scriptures, for in a certain sense the Scriptures are the incarnation of revelation. But since revelation is an *actus transiens*, the Scriptures themselves must be the same.

Formerly the theologians identified revelation and theopneusty, this has changed. A larger conception of revelation, as a historic process, has taken its place; for the past and its inspired record may lie ages apart; *e. g.*, the history of creation, of the patriarchs, etc.

Modern theology, so far from identifying revelation and theopneusty, has gone to the other extreme, and has denied the inseparable connection between revelation and the Scriptures. But since revelation is historic, the only way of knowing it is by testimony. The rejection of the Scriptures is, therefore, the rejection of this attestation, the denial of a special divine act of revelation, and, therefore, in principle, the denial of all revelation. Both tendencies are, therefore, equally dangerous.

Revelation divides itself into two great dispensations, of both of which Christ is the object. The first is, at it were, the prepara-

tion of a tabernacle for the coming Christ; the second is the record and testimony of this tabernacling. In both dispensations revelation and its record go hand in hand. The Scriptures develop as revelation proceeds, till the latter, in a specific sense, is closed, and the dispensation of the Spirit begins. *Objective revelation* now changes into *subjective appropriation*. In Christ an organic centre of a new life has been created. The Holy Spirit now takes everything from Christ, nothing further is added to revelation, and yet in another sense revelation proceeds. Its final aim is not Christ, but *the new man*, the indwelling of God with his people. Again, we find the theophany, prophecy, and the miracle, but in a new and higher sense.

The miracles are those of God's grace in Christ; prophecy lives on in the illumination of the believer by the Holy Spirit; the theophany is now the conscious indwelling of the life of Christ in his church.

Revelation in its continuation is now, therefore, both doctrine and life. The Scriptures are the light of the church; the church is the life of the Scriptures. The Scriptures explain the church; the church understands the Scriptures. Hence these organically developed Scriptures are vital to the church of all ages. They are the *viva vox Dei Omnipotentis ad suam creaturam*. The Scriptures are, therefore, not only inspired, they inspire. Thus the consummation of all things is prepared, in which the Scriptures will fall away, and all believers will be directly inspired of God. There prophecy and miracle have become nature, for God dwells with his people.

II.—INSPIRATION.

No dogma has been so generally received as that of the Holy Scriptures. The Jewish and Christian church alike received them as the word of God, and have quoted them as such. The church fathers, as early as Irenæus, recognized the inspiration of both Testaments, their divine origin was acknowledged on all sides. The idea of inspiration was conceived as a "driving," a "leading," or especially a "dictating" by the Holy Spirit. As God's word the Scriptures had final authority. But in those early days

the true conception of inspiration occupied the mind of the church less than the establishment of the canon.

The theology of the Middle Ages added nothing to the dogma of the Scriptures, since their authority was fixed and recognized by all. The Council of Trent accepted the scholastic idea of the Scriptures, but extended it to tradition also.

Strange to say, the first avowed opposition to the doctrine of inspiration came from the Jesuits, of Louvain, in 1586 (312), who rejected verbal inspiration, and denied the necessity of an immediate revelation. Erasmus limited inspiration to the dogmatical and ethical contents of the Scriptures. This idea survived, and was reproduced by many Catholic theologians, who ascribed to the other portions of the Bible a common divine assistance and supervision instead of inspiration.

Most of the post-reformatory Catholic theologians, however, reject both the negative and verbal inspiration, and cling to the theory of an *inspiratio realis*, which may be either true revelation or mere assistance (314). But the Catholic Church *symbolically* maintains the Tridentine position, and considers inspiration as a positive activity of God's Spirit, which produces an infallible word.

Luther may have attacked the canon, but he strenuously defended the old faith of the church in regard to inspiration; hence the Lutheran symbols possess no separate article on the Scriptures. The erratic Zwingli admits the inerrancy of the Scriptures, but extends inspiration also to heathen literature. Calvin admits the canonicity of the whole Bible, and considers it fully and literally the word of God.

Almost all the reformed symbols have an article on the Scriptures. Their views of inspiration, however, are largely mechanical; they considered the sacred writers merely as *scriptores*, *amanuenses*, *notarii*, etc., but inspiration was held to be *plenary*, in the fullest sense. Then came the reaction. All the old attacks of the early Christian ages against the Scriptures were renewed by rationalism and deism, and by the historical criticism of the day. These attacks caused a revision of the old doctrine of inspiration. Thus arose the dualistic conception of inspiration, which once more separated doctrine and history, ethics and chronology, in the Scriptures.

As a further reaction from this view, Schleiermacher's dynamic theory of inspiration originated, which makes it a *habitual characteristic* of the sacred writers, differing in degree only from that common to all believers. The Scriptures are not infallible, for they are not revelation itself, but only its record. This theory, therefore, makes inspiration a *quality of the writers*, rather than of the *Scriptures*. It is a *habitual* instead of an *evanescent* quality; it is dynamical, and, therefore, does not exclude the possibility of error.

This theory has almost entirely supplanted the earlier doctrine, and yet it is manifestly unsatisfactory both to faith and science.

The rationalistic theologians have, therefore, entirely discarded inspiration, whilst they uphold the Scriptures for their historical value, as a means of grace and as an aid to the religious and moral life. The radicals among them alone have openly ridiculed the sacred Scriptures.

Dr. Bavinck now proceeds to give us the scriptural data for the doctrine of inspiration. The Old Testament affords the following data :

1. The prophets are conscious of a divine calling.
2. They speak what Jehovah revealed to them.
3. They know *when* and *where* he spoke to them, and are conscious of these inspired moments as special occasions.
4. They distinguish between their own knowledge and divine revelation.
5. Whether speaking or writing, they know themselves to be divine oracles.
6. They affix the same authority to their written and to their spoken word.
7. The prophets recognized the existence of the thora, and stand on this basis together with their opponents. Their religion is not different from that of the people, as modern criticism avers.
8. It is *a priori* probable that the written law existed long before the time of the prophets. This thora was from the beginning authoritative as God's word.
9. The historical books are all written by prophets, and in a prophetic spirit.

10. The poetical books of the Scriptures have a religio-ethical character. *

11. The Jewish Scriptures obtained authoritative force as they became known to Israel. The canons of Philo and Josephus are like our own.

That this canon had divine authority for Christ and the apostles appears from the following considerations—

1. The formula of citation proves it.
2. The fact itself is expressed and taught.
3. Christ and the apostles, so far from assuming a critical attitude towards the Scriptures, always accept them without question.
4. Dogmatically, the Old Testament is both for Christ and the apostles the *sedes doctrinæ*.
5. Yet the Old Testament is usually cited in the New Testament from the Septuagint.
6. There is great difference in the material use made of the Old Testament in the New Testament.

As to the inspiration of the New Testament the following data present themselves:

1. The testimony of Jesus is considered infallible in the whole New Testament.
2. This infallible testimony of Jesus is communicated through his apostles, who are appointed witnesses of his life and doctrine, through the operation of the Holy Spirit.
3. The apostles fulfil this divine mission.
4. The witness of Paul stands by itself.
5. The writings of the apostles were from the beginning authoritative in the church. Their canonization is not an arbitrary act of the church, met in council. It is rooted in their very existence. *Suo jure*, they possess authority.
6. It is impossible to settle the question of the principles which have guided the church in fixing the canon. The Spirit, who inspired them, led the church to recognize them.

Of all this revelation Christ is the centre, it cannot be separated from him. Revelation exists, because he is the *λόγος*. *What, then, is the Biblical idea of inspiration?*

The Scriptures nowhere give us a clearly formulated dogma of

inspiration. And yet the Scriptures teach it, but just as they do the dogmas of the Trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, etc. It is quite universally admitted that Christ maintained the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures. Rothe, however, is one of the few who doubt it, and he severs the testimony of Christ from that of the apostles, thus unintentionally undermining Christ's own authority, for it was he who appointed the apostles as witnesses of the truth.

The position of the critics who allow only such a theory of inspiration as is consistent with their view of the phenomena of the Scriptures is wholly untenable; for these phenomena cannot set aside the testimony of the Scriptures concerning themselves. The critic, therefore, virtually places his scientific estimate of the Scriptures over against and above this testimony.

Historical criticism may be valuable within its own sphere, but it is manifestly unable to give us a dogma of the Scriptures, for the reason that the methods of the critics place over against the doctrinal *self-witness* of the Scriptures the dogmas, which result from the scientific treatment of isolated facts. This can never be. When, therefore, the contention is raised that our doctrine of inspiration must correspond with the phenomena of the Scriptures, we announce the principle that the phenomena of the Scriptures, not as they appear to the critics, but as they are in themselves, are *consistent* with the self-witness of the Scriptures.

Θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. iii. 16) may have an active or a passive sense; it may mean *God-breathing* or *God-breathed*. The latter sense seems preferable, because it best harmonizes with the extra-scriptural use of the word. The classical meaning of the word was much wider. All great acts were due, according to the Romans and the Greeks, to a divine afflatus or inspiration. To this cause the greatest geniuses have ascribed their happiest thoughts. It is a patent fact that the human spirit is able, by its own operation upon the souls of others, to change the thoughts of millions and to entirely alter the complexion of their consciousness. Now, according to the Scriptures, God's Spirit is immanent in all created things, and this immanence is the basis of all theopneusty. All life is inspired by the Spirit, and he is the source of all wis-

dom and understanding. In the church, he regenerates and renews, and all prophecy comes through him. Thus, also, in the Scriptures. He is the Spirit of inspiration. His activity in this regard, however, does not stand by itself, but is closely related to this immanent work in the world and in the church.

On the other hand, inspiration may never be identified, as is done by some modern theologians, with heroic, poetic, and religious enthusiasm, for the gift of theopneusty is only given within the circle of revelation. These two, however, again, are to be sharply distinguished, for the one is the work of the *Logos*, the other of the Spirit. Inspiration is founded in revelation, but rises above it. Neither must inspiration be identified with regeneration, as has been done by ethical theologians, although it stands vitally connected with it, for regeneration touches the whole man, inspiration only the consciousness. The one sanctifies and renews, the other enlightens and teaches. Regeneration is a *habitus permanens*, inspiration an *actus transiens*.

What, then, is inspiration? God speaks by the mouth of the prophets. Of him, the true subject, alone the preposition *ὑπό* is used; of the prophets, *δία* with the genitive. The Holy Ghost is, therefore, the true speaker. Our conception of the process of inspiration, according to the Scriptures, should be as organic as possible. There is a difference between the inspiration of prophets and apostles, and of both classes again amongst themselves. The inspiration of the prophets is momentary, that of the apostles is permanent; in them the Holy Spirit dwells immanently and leads and enlightens and teaches them. Different, however, as the character of the inspiration in various persons may be, we must not conceive of it as something mechanical, but as something organic. Just as the *Logos*, through his incarnation, has entered into humanity and has organically united himself therewith, so also the Holy Spirit in inspiration. He speaks through inspired men, and yet they speak themselves. The Holy Spirit has prepared these men, with their various characteristics and antecedents, and uses them, such as they are, in character, inclination, intellectual attainment, etc. They are but rarely *impelled* to write, but naturally the act leads to the recital, and the

recital to the written record; and on this very account, that the writings of prophets and apostles have originated *in* and not *outside* of the sphere of history, there is room for the science of biblical criticism. Thus, also, the difference between the various authors can be explained. Entering into the man, the Holy Spirit entered into his style and language and intellectual equipment. This also explains why Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek were used as the vehicles of divine truth. In the latter, in the marriage between pure Hebrew and pure Attic Greek, lies the thought of the universality of that salvation which was from the Jews. This organic inspiration alone does justice to the Scriptures. In the doctrine of the Scriptures it is the application of the central fact of revelation, the incarnation of the Word. These two run parallel. What the *λόγος* became in his incarnation, the revelation of God inspired in the hearts of men became when it was reduced to writing. It entered into the sphere of creation, into the lives and history of the nations, in every possible human form, even into the weak and despicable; and, as a written word, it subjected itself to the common lot of all Scripture. As every human thought and act is due alike to the action of God, and is at the same time wholly the fruit of human activity, so, also, are the Scriptures a product of the Spirit of God, and yet at the same time wholly a product of the activity of the writer. "*θεία πάντα και ανθρώπινα πάντα.*" This organic conception has often, though wrongly, been used to minimize the authorship of the Spirit. Just as the doctrine of the incarnation demands that we follow it in all its implied weakness and shame, so, also, in the doctrine of inspiration. There, also, we must recognize weakness and poverty, and the servant attitude; but so that, as in the incarnation, here, also, the idea remains of the immaculate conception of the Scriptures.

The history of the doctrine of inspiration is very suggestive. Up to the seventeenth century the idea of inspiration was always further extended, until it reached the *vowels* and *pointing* of the Scriptures (*inspiratio punctualis*). Since then it has shrunk back, first, to the *words* (*inspiratio verbalis*), then to the mere *thought* (*inspiratio realis*), then to the *religio-ethical contents* of the Scrip-

tures (*inspiratio fundamentalis*, or *religiosa*), thence to that of the person (*inspiratio personalis*), and finally to a complete denial.

Now the doctrine of the Scriptures has nothing sectarian in it. It is a fundamental article of faith for the whole church. This dogma has fought its way back again from a place among the *media gratiæ* to its legitimate position in the introduction to dogmatics. The position of the mediation school, which denied the inspiration *theoretically* and *scientifically*, and yet used it *practically* from the pulpit, has been relinquished. The radicals even now acknowledge that the Scriptures *teach inspiration*, and that this dogma stands or falls with the Scriptures themselves. The doctrine of inspiration has survived all assaults on it, like that of the Trinity, the incarnation, etc. It is accepted by the church, not because it is fully understood, but because God has so revealed it.

The scriptural dogma of inspiration is inconsistent with the *inspiratio fundamentalis* and *personalis*. It is admitted that the Holy Spirit has made use of different persons and talents, and that all books of the Bible are not of equal value; but this conception of inspiration is scientific rather than scriptural.

It wipes out the boundary lines between inspiration and illumination, or regeneration; between the intellectual and the ethical life; between the Scriptures and edifying literature. Moreover, it makes the church dependent on critical science, to tell her *what is* and *what is not* Scripture. In vain does this theory appeal to Christ as the source and authority of all dogmatics; for the writings of the apostles give us the Christ of the Scriptures, and if that Christ be authoritative, his testimony must settle the doctrine of the Scriptures, and that of inspiration must be accepted on his authority.

The *inspiratio fundamentalis* goes still further and accepts inspiration only for some portions of the Scriptures. This dualistic and deistic theory does not commend itself to reason. Facts and words, the historical and the ethical, are so interwoven in the Scriptures as to be inseparable. Neither of the above theories is a whit more scientific than the strictest *inspiratio verbalis*.

The remaining theories of inspiration are virtually identical.

For the fact remains, that the Holy Spirit, availing himself of all the antecedents, and of the present environment of the sacred writers, awoke in them the consciousness, the thoughts, and the words, which expressed his ideas. The thoughts call for words, the words for vowel points. This, however, does not oblige us to accept the inspiration of the vowel points, as we possess them from the Masoretic text. The Scriptures may never be viewed atomistically, its parts do not stand by themselves with an individual and infinite meaning.

Our conception of inspiration should be organic, thus assigning a meaning to the smallest thing, though not of equal importance with all the rest. Nothing in the Scriptures is accidental, yet some things lie nearer the centre, others on the far distant periphery, yet these things are one and all the thoughts of God. *Grades of inspiration, therefore, do not exist.*

There is one life, one under all its aspects, *tota est in toto corpore et in omnibus partibus.* It is one Spirit from which the entire Scriptures proceed, through the consciousness of various and different writers. In the Scriptures, also, there is a difference of gifts, but the same Spirit.

Many objections have been raised against the doctrine of inspiration. They originate in historical criticism, in the discrepancies of the Scriptures, in the citations of the Old Testament in the New Testament, in secular history, in the fixedness of natural laws, in religion and ethics, etc. We should not wonder at this. Since the Scriptures describe God's revelation in Christ, the world cannot treat them differently than it treated him. Its attitude to the Scriptures has been the same throughout the history of the church.

The Scriptures demand that every thought of man shall be brought into obedience under Christ; the world refuses to do so. This battle is fought by the simplest and the wisest alike, the believer shares this conflict with the unbeliever. In nature, in history, in all science, the same difficulty has to be faced, and the same law of faith is imposed. By the organic conception of inspiration, however, many of the difficulties vanish.

It shows that the human, in all its weakness, can become the

organ of the divine, it explains the difference between different authors. *Gratia non tollit sed perficit naturam.* This organic conception of inspiration does not exclude the common, human, and natural life, but it makes it subservient to the thoughts of God.

The picture needs the shadow as well as the light. To draw a correct picture of Christ, human sin and Satan's lie must be portrayed in all their nakedness. Christianity and humanity are not antitheses, the first is the restoration and renewal of the latter. Moreover, the aim of the Scriptures is a religio-ethical one, the Scriptures are not a manual of science, only a source of theology, and as such they should be *read theologically.*

They mistake, who imagine that the Scriptures offer us a complete history of Israel, or that it is possible to construct a life of Christ from the four Gospels. The Holy Spirit never intended such a thing. Inspiration is no notarial record. Hitherto all attempts at a harmony of the Gospels have failed. Exact knowledge, like that imparted by mathematics, astronomy, etc., the Scriptures do not afford. It is wrong to make such demands on them, and for this very reason the autographs are lost; the text of the Scriptures is corrupt, however slightly it may be, and for this reason the church (and not the laymen only) possesses the Scriptures only in poor and fallible translations. These are undeniable facts, and they teach us that the sole aim of the Scriptures is to make us wise unto salvation. And yet these Scriptures, although not a manual for art and science, affect and influence man in all his relations. Sin is not wider than God's grace in Christ, and the Scriptures are God's word unto salvation, but also on that very account, a word for the family, for society, for science, and art. Without entering into scientific details and using the language of common life, that of intuitions and first impressions, this word will abide forever, side by side with sciences and schools of philosophy. It is forever young and fresh. *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum.*

I have been able to touch only on the salient points of this masterly discussion. As has been seen, the great thought of the entire mental process on the doctrine of revelation is the necessi-

ty of its *supranatural and historic character*; and as regards inspiration, its *organic character*.

The author has the courage of his convictions, a peculiarly transparent style, a wide reach of information, and is, unquestionably, master of his subject. It may be desirable to recapitulate all that has been said in the following theses, which, I think, fairly represent the author's process of reasoning:

1. Revelation is a voluntary divine act, and is to be distinguished as *general* and *special*.

2. This distinction dates from the days of patristic and scholastic theology, and, notwithstanding all attacks, survives till this day.

3. According to the Scriptures, all revelation, even that of nature, is *supranatural*.

4. The idea of "natural theology" must be discarded.

5. Supranaturalism must be distinguished from immediate revelation.

6. General revelation is the common basis of all religion. By its aid Christianity can appreciate what is good in all other religions. Itself is the true, and, therefore, the highest form of religion. Thus the great importance of general revelation becomes apparent. Nature and grace are, by its aid, kept inseparably connected.

7. The means of special revelation are indicated by all religious faiths. The false and the true are like the caricature and its original.

8. Special revelation is characterized by the theophany, prophecy, and the miracle.

9. Christian theology, till this day, has never given itself pains to truly appreciate the idea of special revelation.

10. This special revelation is a historic and organic whole, completely identifying itself with humanity, and having for its aim the destruction of the power of sin.

11. This organic conception has been ignored by supranaturalism and naturalism alike.

12. Naturalism fails to explain the facts of revelation; supranaturalism finds the key of the mystery in God, and retains its hold on religion.

13. Revelation occupies a definite teleological position in God's plan with the world.

14. Supranaturalism was not necessitated by the fall, but is inherent in the very plan of creation. Sin caused, not revelation itself, but its *soteriological character*.

15. Revelation is incarnated in the Scriptures, and is destined for humanity as an organic whole.

16. Revelation and theopneusty must not be identified; nor must revelation be separated from the Scriptures.

17. Revelation divides itself into two dispensations, alike centering in Christ. It is only fully and really closed when humanity is renewed in Christ.

18. The church has been practically unanimous on the dogma of the Scriptures. Patristic theology concerns itself but little with the technical idea of inspiration. Scholastic and Catholic theology hold to plenary inspiration with a largely mechanical aspect.

19. Schleiermacher's dynamic theory has almost entirely supplanted this older view, but it satisfies neither faith nor science.

20. The Scriptures both of the Old and the New Testament afford abundant data for the doctrine of inspiration. Christ, their centre, is also their very life.

21. The scriptural idea of inspiration is utterly at variance with that which severs the testimony of Christ from that of the apostles, and also with that of the Higher Critics, which makes the doctrine of inspiration dependent on the scientific treatment of isolated scriptural facts.

22. Inspiration differs from the heroic inflatus of the heathen, and it cannot be identified with either revelation or regeneration.

23. The scriptural idea of inspiration is *thoroughly organic*, and thus the differences between the inspired books are explained.

24. The incarnation of the *Logos* runs parallel with the reduction of revelation to writing.

25. The inspired record is the product of the Spirit of God, and yet wholly the product of the inspired writer.

26. Like the doctrine of the incarnation, that of inspiration implies weakness and shame, and at the same time immaculacy.

27. It has survived all assaults, and is received by the church on God's own authority.

28. The scriptural doctrine of inspiration is incompatible with the theory of *fundamental* and *personal* inspiration. Neither of them is more scientific than the baldest *verbal* theory.

29. The latter (*inspiratio verbalis*) commends itself to reason, although it does not prove the inspiration of the words and points as we now have them.

30. There are *no grades* of inspiration, but *one* inspiration under various aspects.

31. The objections raised against this doctrine arise from the innate enmity of man against God and his revelation in Christ.

32. The organic theory of inspiration disposes of many of these objections, since it shows us the true relation between God's revelation in Christ and humanity.

33. It is the aim of the Scriptures to make us wise to salvation, not to impart knowledge after the manner of the exact sciences. They give us neither a complete history of Israel nor of Christ. All efforts at harmonizing the Gospels have failed.

34. The Holy Spirit allowed the *autographa* to be lost, and left to the church only a text which is corrupt, however slightly it may be, and poor and fallible translations.

35. As God's word unto salvation, as "the voice of life," however, the Scriptures will abide forever, and will endure all assaults and all tests.

I close by expressing the fervent hope that this system of "reformed dogmatics" may be made accessible to English readers by a competent translation.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

Holland, Michigan.

III. THE FOREIGN EVANGELIST: AN INQUIRY.

SUCH an inquiry as is suggested above seems to be timely. At least, it seems so in our own, the Southern Presbyterian, Church, and this for several reasons.

First, The subject is a new one, comparatively speaking, to our church; for, although Presbyterianism in America has had, ever since its beginning, men who have, in an irregular way, exercised the functions of the evangelist in their own land, yet neither the nature nor the importance of the office seems clearly or adequately to have been understood. He who enters upon the investigation of the subject is struck at once with the extreme meagreness of the information upon it. Our *Confession of Faith* does not mention it, while the old *Form of Government* gives it but little more than a recognition. Chapter XV. recognizes the evangelist as an officer set apart by the Presbytery to a separate and special work, but in the chapter on "Bishops," giving the various titles of the bishops, there is a noticeable omission of the title "evangelist"; and in the chapter on "Presbytery and its Powers" nothing is said about its power to set apart evangelists to their work. Our present *Form of Government* is much more satisfactory on these points than the old one, yet it, too, is still insufficient in its statements, as the perplexity and uncertainty in the church's mind on the subject still attest.

The various theological books say but little about the evangelist. I have been unable to find any special treatise on the subject except a few articles in *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, written within the last eighteen or twenty years.

These facts show that the subject is a comparatively new one. One reason for this is, probably, the same reason why foreign missions are comparatively new. We all know that the foreign mission work dates back, as a general and modern movement, only about one hundred years. We all remember the opposition there was to it at the start, even in the Presbyterian Church and among Presbyterian divines. The church had not then aroused

to its grand and distinctive duty of "preaching the gospel to every creature." Doubtless the instinct which informed John Wesley, which prompted him and his coadjutors to break away from the Judaic conservatism and exclusiveness of the church as it then was, and to go forth to the perishing poor, the home heathen dying in multitudes at her very doors, was the same instinct that prompted eventually to the foreign work. It was the awakening of the church to mission work; it was her putting on the new, or, rather, long-neglected, spirit of aggressiveness.

And this spirit of aggressiveness was what brought forth the evangelist. For what was John Wesley's movement but an evangelistic movement? And what is the foreign mission movement but an evangelistic movement? And what are the foreign missionaries that Presbyterianism, along with others, has ever since been sending forth, but foreign evangelists? The modern evangelist, therefore, is but the offspring of the revival of the missionary spirit in the church. The two are related to each other as parent and child, as cause and effect.

Second. Again, this inquiry is timely because the mind of our church seems to be changing in regard to the evangelist. The old doctrine, once widely, if not universally, held, and found in many old Presbyterian writers, was that the evangelistic office no longer exists. They held that the evangelist was an "extraordinary and temporary" officer, like the apostles, raised up by the Head of the church for a special purpose, and that it has long since passed away. The "officers of the church" were divided by these old writers into "extraordinary and temporary" and "ordinary and perpetual." This distinction still remains in our symbols. But the old custom was to class the evangelist along with the apostles and prophets, who no longer exist. Calvin, the old *Form of Government* of the Kirk of Scotland, the compiler of *Matthew Henry on Ephesians*, John M. Mason, Dr. Dick, and all the old writers I have examined, all speak thus. Indeed, this view is still, to some extent, taught. You will find it taught, for instance, by Addison Alexander, by some teachers in the Scotch Church, and by Principal Chalmers, of the Presbytery of London. In a letter published a few years ago by the latter gentle-

man, on "The Status of Evangelists," he declares that the office of the evangelist was an extraordinary one, and could not now be revived.

Perhaps the reason for this view is, that it was thought necessary to the defence of the doctrine of "the parity of the ministry." "The parity of the ministry" has been the great historic contention of the Presbyterian Church against Episcopacy, and one of the foundation pillars of her polity in every age, just as the ruling eldership has been her great historic contention against Congregationalism, and another foundation pillar of her polity. The "parity of the ministry" is in no danger whatever from the revival of the office of evangelist; still, that office, it will be noted, has been revived. Nor does prelacy seem to be at all involved in that revival, nor the doctrine of "joint power," soberly and scripturally stated, to be imperilled thereby.

But was this old view of the evangelist the true one? The church has revived the office. The question is, Was she right in doing so, and were our fathers wrong?

All feel, no doubt, that it is an indecorous as well as an unwise thing to remove the old landmarks, even of uninspired writers, without good reason. Yet that is precisely what our church has done. Without considering just at this point whether she was justifiable or not, allow me for the present simply to emphasize the fact that she has revived the office, and to emphasize it as a reason for the timeliness of this inquiry.

First, It is worthy of notice that the church has already committed herself to the revival of the evangelistic office. It is not a question whether she will do so; she has already done it. She has restored the office to a distinct place in her standards and to a distinct place in her actual activities. Her aggressive work, both at home and abroad, is carried on by the evangelist. For what is every missionary preacher, either home or foreign, but an evangelist? The simple fact is, the church has been committed against the old doctrine ever since she sent her first missionary to foreign lands. She has been forced to change her mind by the irresistible pressure of the modern spirit of aggressiveness; and all must see in the widespread and increasing prevalence of volun-

tary lay evangelism, both in a sporadic and organized form, both at home and abroad, that, if the church does not do this evangelistic work herself, there is danger of its being done without her, and by irresponsible hands.

Second. But more than this. The church has not only committed herself regarding the revival of the evangelistic office, she is doing all she can to increase her use of it. She has not only revived the office, she has magnified it, and is magnifying it daily, more and more. And this, too, with an unanimity, an enthusiasm, never before known within her borders. Pressure is brought to bear upon her heart, stronger and stronger, to send forth more missionaries, that is, evangelists. And her heart is responding to this pressure more and more. Who can blame her; who that looks with steady eyes at the horrors and destitutions revealed, as the curtain is lifted higher and higher from before the heathen world? The time is not far distant when she will count her evangelists by the hundreds in the foreign field alone. Nay, and if it is by thousands, will any one reading these lines say, "God forbid"? I hope not. And this suggests another overpowering conviction. It is that the church's conscience would not allow a reversal of her policy, a return to the old attitude. All will feel, I am sure, that it would be a terrible thing; a mistake that would amount to wickedness for her to reverse her policy, recall her missionaries, and draw in all of her activities to the domain of the mere pastorate. If the General Assembly and other church courts combined would agree to do this thing, the whole church would be up in one universal protest. Her conscience has been trained too faithfully already; she has been taught already, and rightly taught, to regard the last command of her Lord as the great command; and she also sees that the great and appropriate instrumentality which has been used in her name for the execution of that command has been the office of evangelist.

The church, then, has changed her mind; she has abandoned the old view; she has revived the office of evangelist, and revived it permanently, until at last her aggressive work is done. And yet her *policy* as to the evangelist still remains unsettled!

Third. And this suggests a third reason why an inquiry as to

the foreign evangelist is at this moment timely. The mind of the church is changed upon this subject, but her policy still remains unsettled. She has raised up an office, but she seems not to know as yet what it is, or what to do with it. A sufficient proof of this is found in her conduct during the last twenty years. To illustrate: In 1876 a report defining fully and clearly "The Office and Powers of the Evangelist" was adopted by the General Assembly of our church. But the matter was reopened by the presentation of another case in 1879. Again a committee was appointed to bring in a report. They took two years, and in 1881 brought in a paper presenting substantially the same views on "the office and powers of the evangelist" as the paper of 1876. This, too, was adopted. From 1882 to and through 1887 the matter was kept open, however, and the church, through its courts, plainly presented the spectacle of a mind perplexed and undecided. And yet during that period a paper was brought into the General Assembly (in 1885) defining "the powers" of the evangelist practically the same way as the papers of 1879 and 1881. This, too, was adopted. In 1887 the matter was dropped, with the statement that it could not then be settled. But events showed that it would not remain unsettled. The question arose once more, in 1893, on a petition from the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions itself that the General Assembly would devise some way by which an unordained missionary could be ordained without having to come back across the seas to his own home Presbytery. Once more for two or three years the mind of the church tossed to and fro in perplexity and uncertainty. Finally the matter was dropped a second time, unsettled, the Assembly "declining at this time to attempt any further legislation on the subject of ordination by evangelists in foreign fields." This was last May (1895). The question remains unsettled, therefore, to this day. After twenty years of agitation we are no nearer the solution of it than we were at first. Note, however, that the reports of 1876 (the *original report*) and 1881 on "The Office and Powers of the Evangelist" have never been rescinded. We will revert to this again.

Seeing, then, that the mind of the church still remains unset-

tled as to her policy on this great question, is not an inquiry, a search for the truth, timely at this juncture? Is it wise, is it safe, thus to leave it open? Consider three things just here:

First, It has already been left open for more than twenty years, during which time repeated petitions, overtures, etc., have been made that it might be settled.

Second, The longer we put off the settlement, the more will the occasions for trouble multiply just in proportion to the number of evangelists we send to the foreign field.

Third, Just as certainly as individual evangelists, white and colored, "may be marked by ignorance of our true church polity, by rashness or over-confidence of disposition, by hastiness, by love of rule, by lack of a proper and high sense of loyalty, and other individual idiosyncrasies, just so certainly will there be danger of practical prelacy in the working of our foreign polity."

Such, then, are some of the considerations which force the writer of this article to feel that an inquiry as to the foreign evangelist, at this juncture, is most timely.

II. THE FOREIGN EVANGELIST.

The aim, therefore, of the rest of this paper will be to search sincerely and dispassionately for the truth upon this subject.

The inquiry will be directed to the settlement of two questions:

1. *What was the evangelist of the apostolic church, what his office, what his powers?*

2. *Are we justified in reviving this office of the evangelist?*

Let us, then, betake ourselves to the sacred Scriptures, draw from them all the facts that bear upon the subject, arrange them with reference to the two points above mentioned, and then endeavor to draw from them such conclusions as will justly follow. The aim will be to give results rather than theories, and to treat the office with reference to the foreign rather than with reference to the home field.

1. *What, then, was the evangelist of the apostolic church, what his office, what his powers?*

(1), We turn to Ephesians iv. 11, 12: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some,

pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ"! Here, among other things, we see, *First, the origin of offices in the church.* "He gave"! that is, the Lord Jesus, who "ascended up on high." (Vs. 8.) They are divine gifts, among the Lord's ascension gifts to his church. And among these offices we find mentioned the "evangelist." *Second,* We note one thing common to all of the officers here specified, namely, the function of teaching. All of these officers here mentioned were given for one and the same purpose: "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." And that these terms are but expansive of the teaching function is seen from the end aimed at, namely, "till we all come in the unity of *the faith*, and of the *knowledge of the Son of God*," etc.; "that we henceforth be no more children, . . . carried about with every wind of *doctrine*" ("teaching"), etc., etc. (Vs. 13, 14.) Of course, each one of these officers had that which distinguished him from the rest, but they all had one thing in common, namely, the teaching function; and this bound them together in one class. They were all teachers or preachers. *Third,* We see here that the evangelistic office is emphatically *an office*, just as truly so as the office of "apostle," or "prophet," or "pastor." It follows, therefore, that those who do not hold "office" in the church at all—"lay evangelists," "temperance evangelists," "woman evangelists"—have no scriptural proof that they are "given" or "sent" to the church by her ascended Lord. The evangelistic office is "an office." It is not a mere momentary contrivance, irregular and irresponsible, born of expediency, to meet special emergencies; but it is one of the regular offices of the church, bequeathed by her great Head as one of his "ascension gifts." Whether temporary or perpetual, however, remains to be seen.

(2), Now let us look abroad over the face of the church as it was at its first planting, and as it is put before us in the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of the New Testament. Let us look at the preachers who are mentioned by name, the corps of workers who were engaged in "the work of the ministry" at that day. Can we find among them any who are exercising the functions of

the "evangelist"? Are "evangelists" spoken of as actually engaged in work? and, if so, who were they, and what did they do?

The answer to this is, that we find, on investigation, quite a number of men, some of whom are plainly spoken of as "evangelists," and all of whom seem to be engaged in evangelistic work. Let us note each one of these men in turn, and see what he was and what he did.

(*a*), The first we find is Philip. The accounts we have of his office are meagre, but he is distinctly referred to in his later life as "the evangelist." No doubt he is the same as Philip the deacon, "set apart to serve tables," but this did not prevent him from going afterwards into the "ministry of the word." The truth is, that shortly after he was elected deacon persecution began in Jerusalem, the disciples were scattered abroad, and he, probably, was prevented thereby from exercising his diaconal functions. He then became an "evangelist." He preached and he baptized. He was a travelling preacher of the gospel, confined to no particular charge, for we find him moving about, preaching in several places at about the same period of time.

(*b*), We come next to Barnabas. Considering only his official career, we find him first as he is sent forth by the church at Jerusalem to Antioch. The occasion and the language of the narrative suggest that he was sent there to organize a church "if the way was clear." (See Acts xi. 19-26.) Some of the Jerusalem disciples, after the persecution already referred to, went as far as Antioch "preaching the word." "The hand of the Lord was with them," and "a great number," we are told, "turned unto the Lord." Then the church sent Barnabas to them, "who, when he . . . had seen the grace of God, was glad"; and then, it is said, "much people were added unto the Lord." And after that, he, with Saul, whom he had gone for, remained "a whole year . . . with the church, and taught much people." We can readily believe that, under the circumstances mentioned, there was much crudity, much need of organization and instruction, much danger of disorders, factions, etc. We find Barnabas next sent forth with Saul, sent by this new "church" (vs. 26) at Antioch "to the elders" of the church at Jerusalem. Then we meet

him again with Saul as a "teacher" in this Antioch church; then set apart (Acts xiii. 1-5) by "certain prophets and teachers" of this church at Antioch, and under the direction of "the Holy Ghost," to the foreign mission work. Next we see him in the foreign mission field with Saul, now called Paul, "ordaining elders in every church" that they had organized, and "confirming the souls of the disciples," that is, strengthening and establishing them in the faith. After this he, with Paul, returned to Antioch, "and abode a long time with the disciples," evidently returning to their old post and work as "teachers" in that "church." (See, for all this, Acts xiv.) Barnabas appears before us again in the fifteenth chapter, sent by the Antioch church as a delegate, with Paul, to the Jerusalem church a second time, to defend the truth against the heresy concerning circumcision. Then we see him, after remaining in Antioch some time "teaching and preaching," starting forth a second time into the foreign mission field, but separating from Paul, and going forth independently! and alone, except that he "took Mark" with him. (Acts xv. 35-41.) This is the last time that Barnabas appears before us in the Acts of the Apostles. In Galatians ii. 13, Paul speaks of him as at Antioch, and in such a way as to lead one to suppose that he had given up the foreign mission work, and had returned to his old place as one of the "pastors and teachers" of that church.

Here, then, is a brief summary of his movements: Barnabas seems to have acted both as a "pastor and teacher" in a home church, and as an extra or special worker in the foreign field, just according as "the church" would assign him to work. Two or three questions arise just here: In what capacity did he do this extra or special work in new fields? Was he, like Paul, an "apostle," or was he acting as an "evangelist"? True, he is once called an "apostle," but he was not so in the special sense that Paul or Peter and the rest of "the twelve" were "apostles." He was an apostle in the primary sense of the word, that is, one "sent forth" to preach the gospel, just as all preachers are apostles; but officially he was an "evangelist." Again, his rank was in nowise different from that of a teacher or pastor. On the contrary, he seems to have been a teacher or pastor, delegated to the

special evangelistic work, just as he was, on other occasions, delegated to go to Jerusalem on other business for the church. But how "delegated," or by whom? The answer is, By the Presbytery of Antioch. The answer seems reasonable. It does not appear to be a mere accommodation of language to a preconceived theory to call the "prophets and teachers" who set him and Paul apart to the foreign mission work the "Presbytery of Antioch"—not the "session of Antioch," mark you. All the indications point to the "believers" in that community being entirely too numerous to have been gathered into one church organization. "A great number" of people were added at the first organization, and we know that Antioch soon became the powerful and prosperous seat of the "new religion." The "church at Antioch," even then, was, no doubt, made up of many organizations. This "Presbytery," it is true, presents to our eye no "ruling elder," but that does not invalidate its act, however much some now might think that it made their act "irregular"! The first Presbytery on the American continent, that which started Presbyterianism in this country, had no ruling elder present. Yet we would hardly call its action null and void; and, if so, then neither will we call the action of this Presbytery "null and void," especially as it was distinctly dictated by "the Holy Ghost"!

Barnabas, then, was a "pastor and teacher" of Antioch, set apart to the work of an evangelist by the Presbytery of that place.

As to his "powers," he seems to have preached the gospel, organized churches, and ordained elders.

In regard to this last point, the ordination of elders, it may be noted, *First*, that the language used is in the plural: "And when *they* ordained them elders in every church" (Acts xiv. 23); that is, Barnabas as well as Paul. *Second*, It does not necessarily follow that they suppressed the suffrages of the people in this matter, although they may, indeed, have directed those suffrages to the proper men, just as is often done by the sessions of churches at the present day. But after the men were elected, then Barnabas and Paul "ordained" them, set apart the elders to their office "with prayer and fasting." *Third*, Note that the word is simply

“elders,” without saying whether they were all “ruling elders,” all “teaching elders,” or both. There is absolutely no way of deciding this matter, but it is certainly a reasonable supposition that they were, at least, both; that there were “teaching elders” as well as “ruling elders.”

(c), We come now to Apollos. Turning to the records (Acts xviii. 24–28; xix. 1; 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 4–22; iv. 1–6; and xvi. 12), we find Apollos coming to Ephesus in the absence of Paul, and preaching there; then going to Achaia, having the hearty endorsement of the church at Ephesus, and their commendation of him to the churches of Achaia. We next meet with him at Corinth, one of the churches of Achaia, where he becomes exceedingly popular, and is the innocent cause of a schism; and, finally, Paul speaks of him as being with him, wherever he was when he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 12), and as not having the will “to come at all to them [*i. e.*, at Corinth] at this time.” Thus we find him moving about from place to place. He seems, therefore, to have been a travelling preacher, that is, an evangelist. As to his “powers,” he “preached” and he “baptized.” (1 Cor. i. 12, etc.)

(d), Timothy and Titus. We have next two men commonly associated together for certain reasons, both of them conspicuous workers in the early church. They are Timothy and Titus. The references to them are too numerous for citation, but the following facts are gleaned. As to Timothy, we find him first at his home in Lystra, after his conversion; then accompanying Paul in his journey to Macedonia; then remaining in Berea with Silas, evidently to establish the gospel more strongly there, while Paul went on to Athens; then joining Paul at Athens; then sent back by Paul to Thessalonica and other portions of Macedonia; then rejoining Paul, and going before him to Troas in Asia. Again, we find Timothy sent by Paul to the Corinthians; then in company with that apostle, a year or so later, when he wrote to the Romans; also with him when he wrote the second letter to the Corinthians; and at a still later period, when Paul wrote to the Philippians, and also to the Colossians. He leaves the apostle to go on a special mission to the Philippians, and on still another

occasion he is separated from Paul and left at Ephesus to "charge some that they teach no other doctrine" than the gospel received from Paul.

As to Titus, the references are not so numerous as they are to Timothy. He does not appear in the Book of Acts at all. Nevertheless, there are frequent allusions to him in the epistles. Paul expected to find him at Troas on one occasion, but was disappointed; was more successful in meeting him at another time in Macedonia, whither Titus had gone from Corinth. To this latter place Paul evidently sent him a second time, with strong recommendations. We find him with Paul at Jerusalem; also, sent by that apostle to Dalmatia, and at another time to Crete. He is to leave Crete as soon as the apostle sends "Artemas or Tychicus" to take his place, and is to go "diligently" to Nicopolis, where Paul had "determined to winter." And here we take our leave of Titus.

What, then, were these two men? Summing up briefly what we have found as to their movements, we note, *First*, That they show no marks of having been prelatical bishops; for, although they at one time were directed to stay for a period at certain points—the one at Ephesus and the other at Crete—to regulate some disorders there, yet we find, as a matter of fact, that they were travelling preachers. Timothy is found at Berea, Ephesus, Athens, Rome, Troas, Corinth and other portions of Achaia and Macedonia; Titus, in Macedonia, Corinth, Jerusalem, Dalmatia, Crete, and Nicopolis. If they were "prelates," their "dioceses" must have been exceedingly extensive, exceedingly eccentric in boundary lines, and must have overlapped each other badly. Besides, they must have taken "turn about" at being prelates with other brethren, for we find Paul directing Titus to leave Crete and come to him at Nicopolis as soon as "I send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus." Yet, if not prelates, what were they? They were not "pastors" over settled congregations, but travelling preachers. What, then? Doubtless they were "evangelists," and, indeed, one of them, Timothy, is expressly charged to "do the work of an evangelist."

And as to their "powers," what? Searching the records again,

we find that when they were sent by the apostle to various churches, they seem, in some instances, to have been given discretionary powers to do all that he himself would do, were he there, that was needful in the way of establishing the gospel; that is, they were to preach, baptize, organize churches, instruct, discipline, and ordain officers, even to teaching elders. In some of the churches the needs seem to have been less, in others greater. For instance, when Paul sent Timothy to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17) it was merely to keep them steadfast, at a certain critical juncture, in the apostle's teaching. But when Paul "left" Titus in Crete it is "that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting," or "left undone"; that is, he was given full power, in the apostle's stead, to do everything needful to the equipment and establishment of the church. To see how sweeping was the power thus delegated, we have but to note the illustration given in the very next sentence. Titus was given power to "*ordain elders in every city*"! and that these—some of them, at least—were "teaching elders" is seen from two considerations: *First*, The instructions which immediately follow as to the proper qualifications of "the elder" are applicable, and from time immemorial have been held to be applicable, only to the "teaching elder," or "minister of the word." (Titus i. 6-12.) *Second*, The direction is, to "ordain elders in *every city*"! Not "every church," but "every city"! "In every church" would itself be ambiguous, for "church," in the Scriptures, does not always, or even as a rule, mean a local church organization (see, for instance, the "church at Antioch," "church at Jerusalem"), and, therefore, the ordaining that he did would not necessarily have been the ordaining of the "elders" of a local church session. But the language here is, "ordain elders in *every city*," and that language is much more in keeping with the interpretation that these were "teaching elders." Titus, in short, seems to have been given the general superintendency of the Island of Crete, to complete the work the apostle had begun, namely, its evangelization; and to this end the most practical step that he could take at the start would be to "ordain elders in every city," that is, to raise up from the converts already made a corps of fellow-workers in the ministry of the word to assist him in the

establishing and the strengthening of the gospel and the church in that island.

But we have by no means exhausted the list of the men who appear in the apostolic church as "doing the work of the evangelist." In reading the Acts and the Epistles we are constantly coming across other men, associated, most of them, with the Apostle Paul, who, from the way in which they are spoken of, were evidently preachers of the gospel. Of such were Silas, John Mark, Demas, Erastus, Tychicus, Artemas, Aristarchus, Justus, Epaphras, Crescens, Trophimus, Secundus, Sôpater, Gaius, Andronicas, Junia, and Sylvanus. Now, to what class of preachers did these men belong? They were not "pastors and teachers," for the record presents them as moving about from place to place, generally under the direction of the Apostle Paul. They were not apostles nor prophets, although, for that matter, some of them, perhaps all, may have had the prophetic gift. What were they? The record would indicate that they were evangelists.

Let us now sum up what we have done. We have found a place in the New Testament Scriptures where the origin of office in the New Testament church is mentioned, and a list of officers is given who have among them the one common function of teaching. Among these teaching officers we found the "evangelist." We have looked over the face of the early church, and we have found quite a number of men who were evidently engaged in "the work of the ministry," yet were neither settled "pastors and teachers," on the one hand, nor apostles or prophets, on the other. Some of them are expressly called "evangelists," and the distinctive mark common to all of them is, that they were "travelling preachers," sent forth to preach in and to develop new and unoccupied fields. The case of Barnabas would seem to indicate that they were teaching elders or pastors, set apart to this special work, and that, this being done, their extra functions ceased, and they resumed the work and functions of pastor. From this, one would judge that the evangelist did not belong to a separate and superior "order." He was simply, like all the other preachers, "called to the work of the ministry," and then set apart to this special branch of it. In this sense, the office was, and is still, both "ex-

traordinary and temporary," although not so in the old sense, as in the case of the "apostles and prophets." The evangelist is an "extraordinary" officer in that he is a teacher, or "ordinary" minister, of the word, invested with "extraordinary" functions. He is a "temporary" officer in that, the occasion for the exercise of his extra functions in any particular field having ceased, his powers there cease also, and he passes on to other unoccupied fields; and yet, using this term in the old sense, he is an "ordinary and perpetual" officer; ordinary, because he is not, like the apostles and prophets, of an "extra order"; and perpetual, because, just so long as the church has before it an evangelistic work, just that long, no doubt, does he who gave the work and created the office intend for us to exercise it. The old view, that the evangelistic office had ceased, was defended on the ground that such office was only suited to a "formative period," a "period of organization and formation." But does not "the formative period" of the church exist now all along the borders of her domain, that is to say, in the foreign mission field? And will not "the period of organization and formation" last until the whole world is evangelized? If so, then the office is unquestionably suited to the present time and is practically "perpetual."

Recurring again to the case of Barnabas, we find that as to the "powers" of the evangelist, he seems to have had power to organize churches and to ordain elders—probably teaching as well as ruling elders. Passing on to Timothy and Titus, we find them exercising, when necessary, all the powers which the apostle himself exercised in the way of establishing and strengthening the gospel and the church in a community. Of each it is added that he ordained teaching elders. (2 Tim. ii. 2; Titus i. 5.) We find no other extra functions actually specified in the records, but those already mentioned, namely, the power to organize churches, to ordain, and possibly to discipline, teaching elders, are, it will be noticed, *presbyterial powers!*

And now, just here springs up another question of much importance. These extra powers wielded by the evangelist were not inherent. They were delegated powers, vested in him by an authority higher than himself. Whose were those powers? Were

they delegated to him by the church or Presbytery, or were they conferred upon him by the apostles? And here we meet with what seems at first to be confusion in the practice of the early church, for the evangelists of the New Testament got their authority from both! The information, indeed, upon this point is scant; but, on the one hand, we see the Apostle Paul, in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, plainly investing them with evangelistic authority, telling them to organize churches, administer discipline, commit the preaching of the gospel to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also, ordain elders in every city, etc. Again, we note that those other men, Silas, Erastus, Sylvanus, *et al.*, were evidently under his apostolic supervision. They formed a corps of workers who attended him in his travels and who stood ready at his command to go to any evangelistic work or field to which he might assign them. We find the apostle writing frequently to the churches to receive these men and obey them because they came in his name. Hence, the evangelist of the New Testament would seem from this to have been a kind of deputy of the apostles, although not a successor. Yet, on the other hand, we read that Barnabas was set apart to his evangelistic work by the joint action of the "laying on of the hands" of the Presbytery of Antioch; and Paul speaks expressly of Timothy being set apart by the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Thus we see men exercising what we esteem "presbyterial powers," but getting them both from the Presbytery and from the apostles.

But the question now arises, Is there anything in this really irreconcilable with our Presbyterian system? It seems to me that there is not. No Presbyterian will deny that the apostles did wield, and had a right to wield, and also to confer, presbyterial powers, for the apostles were superior to Presbytery. If it was a supposable thing, which it is not, for the church to have apostles now, they would still be superior to Presbytery. The apostle was, indeed, not only in the old sense, but in the highest sense of the words, an "extraordinary and temporary" officer. The "marks" of an apostle were such as could not possibly be found in a man at the present day. The mention of two of these marks, to say nothing of others, will make this sufficiently clear. They

must be witnesses to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and they must be the inspired vehicles for the revelation of his will as found in the New Testament canon. The apostolic office, therefore, from the nature of the case, has passed away, and has left no successor; but the Presbytery still remains; and now, if these powers were wielded by it even in apostolic times, and were delegated by it to evangelists, as we see they were, then, of course, the Presbytery is the proper authority, and has the right, to delegate these powers now.

What, then, is the "evangelist"? Making up the definition from what has gone before, I would say that the evangelist is one of the regular, ordinary, and perpetual officers of the church, a teaching elder, set apart to work in new and unoccupied fields, and invested with presbyterial powers, just such and so much as may be necessary to establish the gospel and pave the way for the Presbytery itself, but no more. His sphere of labor is in new fields; he wields there just such presbyterial powers as are necessary, and no more. In some fields these may be less, in others, greater; but he does what is needful, and what the Presbytery itself would do were it on the ground and were it necessary to be done. This being done, these extra, delegated, presbyterial powers cease as to that particular field, and he passes on to regions beyond. Such, then, would seem to be "the evangelist."

The writer of this article would present the above result of his studies in the Scriptures on the subject of the evangelist with much hesitation and diffidence, were it not that, on investigation, he finds these views held substantially by many of the most eminent men in the Presbyterian Church. These men are found on both sides of the Atlantic, and both among the old and among the more recent writers on the subject. Indeed, as far as "the powers" of the evangelist are concerned—which is, in reality, the only phase of the subject practically before our church just now—the whole mass of the advocates of the "old view" concerning the evangelist describe those powers to have been substantially what are mentioned in this article. Take, for instance, two representative men of this class, one from Scotland and one from America, namely, the Rev. Dr. George Campbell, author of that

standard work on Presbyterianism, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, and the Rev. Dr. John M. Mason, of New York, author of that other standard work, *The Church of God*. Says Dr. Campbell, in his *Lectures*, p. 89: "That some of the churches to which Paul's epistles were directed had no fixed ministry is evident from the tenor of the epistles themselves, particularly from those given to the Corinthians. Now, the directions given to both Timothy and Titus show that they relate to the planting of churches by supplying for the first time with stated pastors those converts who had none before. This must have been done by the extraordinary ministers, if it was ever to be done at all! . . . Accordingly, the execution of the charge which Paul gave to Timothy, whereof the planting of churches by supplying them with pastors was a principal part, he denominates doing the work, not of a bishop, but of an evangelist"! And so Dr. Mason, Volume II., page 189, of his works: "That Timothy and Titus were superior to presbyters? Who denies it? [!] What? Do you allow that they had, severally, the power of ordaining to the ministry by their sole authority? Yes, we do! That they had power to inquire into the doctrine taught by presbyters? Yes! To coerce the unruly? Yes! To expel the heretical? Yes! We never thought of disputing it! Then, certainly, they were diocesan bishops! That is another point! . . . An evangelist, as Timothy, and consequently Titus, undoubtedly was, could do them in virtue of his office as an evangelist"! "To infer that Timothy and Titus were bishops in the prelatical sense of the term, because they enjoyed a preëminence and an authority which they might enjoy without being such bishops at all, is to abuse the understanding of the reader"—*Essays on Episcopacy*.

Such were the views of the old school of Presbyterian writers on this subject in regard to the "powers" of the evangelist.

But not only do we find representative men, honored teachers of the Presbyterian faith, holding these views as to the powers of the evangelist, but we also find many belonging to the last generation and to the present, who teach that the evangelist is still an officer in the church. They hold, too, that the "powers" of that officer are as above described. For instance, Dr. Samuel

Miller, *Christian Ministry*, page 108: "What is an evangelist? 'He was an officer,' says Eusebius, 'appointed to lay the foundations of the faith in barbarous nations, to constitute them pastors, and, having committed to them the cultivation of those new plantations, to pass on to other countries and nations.' I will add, the word 'evangelist' is still used in the Presbyterian Church, and with the same sense attached to it as in the days of Eusebius. Among us, an ordained minister who has no pastoral charge, and who itinerates to preach the gospel in regions which are destitute of it, is called an evangelist." Again, pages 112, 113: "Do not the judicatories of our church every year send out evangelists (precisely what Timothy was) into remote parts of the country, empowering and directing them to plant churches, to ordain elders and deacons in every church, and to 'set in order whatever may be wanting' in every organization? . . . True, the evangelists whom we send forth are empowered to ordain ruling elders and deacons only, and not teaching elders; but this is only a peculiar ecclesiastical regulation, which might have been ordered otherwise without an essential invasion of scriptural principle"!

And so, to the same effect, Dr. McGill, in his book, recently published, on *Church Government*: "Beyond the supplementary help rendered to the apostles—which, of course, must be extraordinary—there is nothing special in the functions of these evangelists that is at all above the prerogatives of a pastor." "To say that these evangelists, in transmitting office on such a level, were individual men, and, therefore, not a Presbytery or elders, in so acting, but diocesan bishops, is—begging the question. We deny the premise that any officer is to be considered superior to another merely because he is alone at his duty. . . . We affirm that the ordaining elder may be alone as a committee and representative of his Presbytery, either at home or abroad, in home or foreign missionary fields, just as Timothy and Titus were each alone, as charged by the Apostle Paul"! (Pp. 273, 275.)

Coming now to our own church, and to our own Dr. Thornwell, we read as follows (Vol. IV., p. 18, *Collected Writings*): "It deserves to be remarked that, according to the American standards,

all extraordinary offices are not necessarily temporary. The evangelist is an extraordinary officer and yet is to be continued in the world as long as there are frontier and destitute settlements in which churches are to be planted and the gospel established. This peculiarity is essential to the perfection of the Presbyterian system, and makes it, what, it strikes us, no other system of church government is, an adequate institute for gathering churches as well as governing those already gathered." "The evangelist is the only officer who is set apart for the express purpose of making aggressive attacks on the world. He goes where there cannot be bishops and pastors, etc. It is this feature of our system which makes ours so preëminently a missionary church." It is true that Dr. Thornwell does not speak here directly of the "powers" of the evangelist, but inasmuch as he states distinctly that the office is an "extraordinary" one, it is reasonable to suppose that his "powers" were "extraordinary" also. Just what would be the extent of these "extraordinary powers" in the judgment of Dr. Thornwell, whether they would extend to the ordaining of teaching elders, for instance, we have no means of knowing, but surely the strong language he uses here does not discourage the idea that he would give him all power needful for the proper planting of the church. Let us, however, come closer to our own times and consult the opinions of some of the leaders of our own church of the present day. We turn again to the two reports on the subject of the evangelist, already referred to, and made to the General Assemblies of 1876 and 1881.

The report of 1876 is as follows (I quote only from that portion of the report defining the office of the evangelist and his powers): "The Presbyterian system, as it is set before us in the Scriptures, recognizes evangelists or missionaries, extraordinary officers, endued by presbyteries with extraordinary powers, and sent abroad outside the bounds of the settled church-state which the courts of the church directly rule over. They are sent to found new churches and to ordain pastors and teachers over them," etc. Again: "We here encounter necessarily the question, what are the powers of the true evangelist, and what his relations to the courts of the church." It is comparatively a new question, and it is a difficult one because

new. It may be said that foreign missions—modern Protestant missions, the glory of the age—were not yet born when our constitution (*i. e.*, the old *Form of Government*) “was drawn up.” It contains, therefore, nothing like a full presentation or exact statement of the duties and powers of the evangelist, etc. “In like manner when we ascend beyond the period of the formation of our own constitution we find in older Presbyterian formularies little or nothing on the subject of missions. We are, therefore, compelled to betake ourselves directly to the Scriptures, and we have to consider what the fundamental principles of the church government therein revealed involve, and what the examples of apostolic missionary work authorize,” etc. “According to the best judgment your committee have been able to form on the subject, the evangelist or missionary is the minister of the word, commissioned by the Presbytery to go into foreign or frontier parts with powers which he could not be allowed to wield within the settled church-state. He is invested, not merely with the ‘several powers’ of preaching the word and administering the sacraments, which belong by virtue of his ordination to every ‘teaching elder,’ but he carries also with him in his single hand what belongs to no minister at home, but only to courts (what Gillespie calls ‘the power of jurisdiction’), being commissioned by his Presbytery to organize churches, to ordain church officers, to admit, suspend, excommunicate, and to receive again church members. He is not an apostle—the primitive evangelists were not apostles. On the other hand, he is not a prelatical bishop; for he has been sent to the ‘regions beyond,’ where there are no churches and no presbyteries for the one-man power to dominate over; where there is not even perhaps a single brother to aid him in his work, so that he must act singly and rule by himself; or, what is necessary to be done by the church remain undone, because the divine system of church government possesses, as we might expect, all needful elasticity,” etc.

Here, then, in these strong and unmistakable words, we have the fullest and most explicit statement of the “office and powers of the evangelist” that our church, nay, that Presbyterianism itself, has, in the whole course of its existence, ever received.

This statement comes from our own honored leaders, the Revs. John B. Adger, D. D., John Leighton Wilson, D. D., and Thomas E. Peck, D. D., men, who, if I mistake not, all took prominent part in moulding the revised *Book of Church Order*, which is part of our church constitution to this day. But the report brought in to the General Assembly of 1881, although briefer, is, if possible, fully as striking for the strength and explicitness of its language as to the "office and powers of the evangelist." The committee took two years for deliberation and then brought in the following paper, viz.: "The only feature that distinguishes the evangelist from the ordinary 'minister of the word' is that he labors to plant the gospel and the institutions of the church in places where they do not exist. As the *Form of Government* (Chap. V., Sec. 4, Art. VI., and Chap. VI., Sec. 2., Art. I.) (that is of the 'New Book,' adopted since the report of 1876, quoted from above) assigns the power of forming new churches and of ordaining to office to a court, these extraordinary functions of the evangelist can be exercised only when expressly delegated by the court to him as their agent. When his field lies beyond the territory which the church occupies his powers are necessarily enlarged. There being no court to discharge these functions, the constitution* recognizes as inhering in his office all the powers necessary to constitute the church. He may organize churches and ordain to all the offices required to make them complete; and, also, with a view to the extension of the church, he has the power to ordain other evangelists, both native and foreigners, provided that the latter be not under the jurisdiction of a Presbytery at home, in which case the concurrence of said Presbytery shall first be obtained. As soon, however, as a court is created, even the lowest, his extraordinary powers cease within its jurisdiction, and can only be resumed in the region that is beyond; the guiding principle being that the powers of an evangelist cannot supersede nor impair those which pertain to a court either at home or abroad."

Here, then, five years after, we have the teachings of the first report of 1876, reiterated after a deliberation of two years, and even more explicitly and emphatically, if anything, than before.

And this is done by men universally recognized as men we have always delighted to follow, the leading exponents of our own Southern Presbyterianism, viz., the Rev. Drs. J. A. Lefevre, J. Leighton Wilson, John B. Adger, Thomas E. Peck, James Woodrow, B. M. Palmer, and Stuart Robinson. Nay, more, both of these reports were adopted by the General Assembly, and the writer has been unable to find any record of their being rescinded. They stand, therefore, as the twice-recorded deliverances of the highest court of our church on the "office and powers of the evangelist."

The writer has not quoted these long and numerous testimonials and expressions of the wisdom of men upon this subject because he thinks that the wisdom of men can, or ought to, settle the matter; but he has done it, *First*, To justify his act in thus obtruding the results of his own studies upon the attention of the church; and *Second*, Because such a consensus of opinion upon "the office and powers of the evangelist," gathered, not merely from one quarter or from one age of the Presbyterian Church, but from both sides of the Atlantic, and from the utterances of both the living and the dead, not merely from distant sources, but from representative men of our own church, ought to have much weight. The review has greatly strengthened his own heart in the belief that, in his search for the truth, he has been guided to it by the Holy Spirit; and the hope is entertained that it may have the same effect upon his readers.

2. Having, then, come to a conclusion as to what the evangelist is and what he can do, the question still remains, *Are we justified in reviving this office?*

The answer comes from many voices, "Yes, by all means, yes." And the considerations urged seem, indeed, well-nigh irresistible. And yet there are some in the church who seem to feel that she is not justified in reviving this office, and that in doing so she has imperilled some of the most essential features of her system. It will be well, then, to face this question, too, fully and frankly.

(1), And *First*, The answer is, that it seems as if necessity is laid upon us, that there is nothing else left for us to do. Granting, for the sake of argument, that the office ought not to have

been revived, yet, as a simple matter of fact, the office is revived, it exists, and is in active and ever-increasing use. "All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient." The practical question is, Are we justified in abolishing it? Will it not be more perilous to endeavor to kill it than it will be to keep it, but endeavor to control it? To root it up now out of our practical polity would be like trying to separate the Siamese twins; it might be the death of both the office and the church.

If it be said that the office is inconsistent with the fundamental principle of Presbyterianism, that the power of rule, of jurisdiction, is never "several," but always "joint," then the answer is, to point to our own *Book of Church Order*, adopted within the last twenty years, and expressing the latest mind of our church upon the subject, and thereby show that we are already committed to the view that there are exceptions to that rule. For the evangelist has already been given, as an evangelist and as an individual, the "power of rule."

Again, necessity seems to be laid upon us because of the demands and exigencies of the times in which we live. We live in an age when the work of the church, especially her aggressive work, is being done by agencies outside of her almost as much as by herself; agencies not only external to her, but entirely beyond her control; by independent societies and independent individuals, responsible to no one but themselves. They have not only invaded, but have occupied, and are occupying more and more, her home mission field; and they have already invaded, both as societies and as individuals, her foreign mission field. They are bound to bring, eventually, tremendous disaster and dishonor upon the cause of gospel truth; and that means upon the church of God, because we must not separate the church of God from the truth of God. We may say, indeed, that these irregular movements are bound to spring up anyhow; that they would spring up even though our church were fully supplied with evangelists; that other denominations have their evangelists, and yet they spring up; that the age is a loose one, infected with the spirit of revolt against all law and order, religious, civil, social, and otherwise. Be it so. Yet every one, no doubt, feels that

such answers are not satisfactory; and the reason is, that they do not settle the question. The conviction is irrepressible that there is something wanting in a church that has not the suitable agency herself for doing this aggressive work; and that suitable agency is the evangelist.

(2.) But, what is more to the purpose, *it seems to be our duty to revive this office.*

All such considerations as the foregoing, drawn from necessity or expediency, must, of course, be dismissed, no matter what the cost, if it can be shown that they are clearly contrary to the sacred Scriptures, either in its letter or in its spirit. But are they? And, if not, then are they not evidence in themselves—presumptive only, it is true, but powerful—that it is the Lord's will for us to revive this office in his church; nay, rather, that it ought never to have been dropped? And therefore these considerations have been mentioned.

But now let it be noted further:

(1), That we have no word or hint whatever, direct or indirect, that this office was ever to be dropped. Such was not the case with the offices of apostle and prophet. Each of these bore in its very nature the seeds of dissolution; but this office, on the contrary, bears in its very nature the marks of perpetuity. From the very nature of the case, as Dr. Thornwell says, it "is to be continued in the world as long as there are frontier and destitute settlements in which churches are to be planted and the gospel established." The only argument which the advocates of the old view of the evangelist had for dropping the office was, as we have seen, that it was suited only to "a formative period of the church"; but this argument, of course, has now lost all of its force.

(2), Again, it is a noticeable fact that the only formal letters of instruction to the ministry, found in the New Testament Scriptures, were given, not to pastors, but to evangelists, viz., to Timothy and Titus. They have been the source from which the church to this day draws her counsels to her preachers. Surely the church has been right. Surely these letters were given to her ministry for all time. Would God leave the ministry of all future ages without instructions as to their duties? Or

did the Holy Ghost make a mistake in embodying these incomparable epistles in the canon? And yet, how incongruous if the office itself of the men to whom these instructions first were written is abolished?

(3), Once more, this office of evangelist, as we see it in the Scriptures, seems necessary to the doing of the aggressive work of the church. In other words, it seems to be a *sine qua non* to the carrying out of the church's chief commission for all time, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations."

It is difficult for the writer to see how this great, this preëminent commission, resting now so heavily upon the awakened conscience of the church, could ever be successfully and extensively accomplished, if she were to rely solely upon her pastoral arm; how this work of aggressiveness, this command, "Go" ye, is ever to be met by an agency, the whole spirit of which has been, and of necessity is, "Stay" ye! The very words "pastor" and "evangelist" define the work and sphere appropriate to them. The one is to "feed" a flock, and that implies a flock already "gathered"; it implies permanency of residency and work, and hence the immemorial conception of the "pastoral office" in the mind of our church, embodied in her standards, in every call to that office, and, until recently, universally in her practice and custom. But "evangelist" means "a bearer of glad tidings," *i. e.*, to those who have not heard, or, as our *Book of Church Order* has it, "to the ignorant and destitute." It implies movement, passage from place to place, a moving ever onward to new fields; hence an aggressive work. "Topsy," when asked where she came from, said she "just growed up." But churches cannot be accounted for in that way. Churches will not "just grow up" on heathen soil; for "how can they believe on him of whom they have not heard?" The "preacher" is the first factor in aggressive work on heathen soil, and not the "church" or "flock," and that means that the "evangelist" is the proper and necessary agent for the execution of the church's great commission and not the "pastor." And this is confirmed, overwhelmingly confirmed, and abundantly illustrated, by the church's own conduct in every great emergency calling for aggressive work. For, in every great emergency de-

manding her aggressive energies, she has relied upon the evangelistic arm! Take, for instance, her first response to her Lord's command as put before us in the New Testament Scriptures. The arm she relied on, as we have seen, was not the pastorate, but the evangelistic arm. How was it at the Protestant reformation even, when the field she worked was not a virgin field, as it was at the start, and as it is now in heathen lands, and therefore the conditions were different? and yet a vast portion of the work done then was done, not by the pastorate, but by travelling preachers, *i. e.*, evangelists. How was American Presbyterianism itself started? Not by the pastorate; not by waiting until enough church members found each other out in the then trackless wilds of this country, drew together and sent a petition to the mother country for a pastor; but by individual ministers acting as evangelists and travelling hundreds of miles, gathering the people together and organizing them into churches when the way was clear. And what shall I say of the testimony afforded by the church's own conduct at the present day in foreign fields? Our church has been from her very birth as a separate denomination, a missionary church. At her first General Assembly, in 1861, at Augusta, Ga., she proclaimed herself formally, and emphatically, a missionary church, and organized a permanent agency for a foreign mission work. She has not only continued but increased this aggressive work ever since, until now she has one hundred and thirty-five missionaries in the foreign field, aside from native workers. But how has she carried on this work? Not by the pastorate, but by the evangelistic arm. Every one of our ordained ministers in those fields started to his work as an evangelist. The work is still going on, nay, increasing, more and more. What are the men the church is sending forth? They are not pastors; they are evangelists. And so, without doubt, will it be to the end; that is, as to its aggressive work, its occupancy of new fields. Thus we see that this office of the evangelist seems to be a necessity, a *sine qua non*, to the aggressive work of the church—an office without which she cannot truly and adequately obey her Master's greatest command, "Go ye, teach all nations."

There is another phase of this question, showing the necessity

of this office, as we find it in the Scriptures, to the true and proper carrying out of the church's chief command; and it is found in the recognition of the fact that that command is a twofold command. It is not only "Go," but "Teach"; and teach, too, "all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

It is, then, not only an "aggressive" work, but a "teaching" work; it is not only a "planting" work, but a "supplanting" work, a work of supplanting error with truth. Mere "aggressiveness," then, is not the only characteristic of the office of evangelist. The mere "going" is nothing—nay, is worse than nothing, if unaccompanied by the teaching of "the truth." The heathen must "know the truth," if they are ever to be "free." The bearing of this fact upon the necessity of the evangelistic office is obvious. It is necessary both for the proper dissemination and the conservation of the truth; that is, in heathen lands. It is not thus necessary in the home church, where all the normal agencies exist, but it is thus necessary in heathen lands. There is need, absolute need, for some adequate, responsible, and properly-equipped power to be present in order not only properly to sow, but to protect and preserve the precious seed of God's truth after it is sown. It is necessary, for instance, as against the converts themselves, coming up as they do, the merest babes in Christ, out of the unspeakable pollution, blindness of mind, error, and treacherous duplicity of centuries of false religion; it is necessary as against false teachers of the gospel, who, taking the bit in their mouths and claiming to be called of God, are apt to spring up at any time, "subverting whole households" and whole communities. These are the very difficulties the apostles and evangelists of the New Testament had to contend with in the first foreign missionary effort. Why should it not be so now? As a matter of fact, it is so now. And the way to meet these things now is to meet them in the way in which they were met then. It is necessary, again, to offset the influence of the ever-increasing hosts of "lay workers," who, ordained by no church, and responsible to no church, with but little preparation and with crude and often erroneous ideas of the work which they have taken up, are invading foreign fields more and more, working

side by side with our regular missionaries, and, of course, in the minds of the heathen, representing the cause of gospel truth just as really as are our missionaries themselves.

(4), And this leads to the last consideration which will be presented in this paper, why our church is justified in reviving the office of evangelist. It is this, viz.: that the evangelistic office is not only consistent with the Presbyterian system, but it is necessary to its perfection. The fear seems to be entertained in some quarters that the revival of this office as we find it in the Scriptures is inconsistent with what is regarded as an essential feature of our system, viz.: that "the power of rule is always joint and never several;" and, therefore, that its revival, so far from perfecting our system, will fatally impair it. This is the old view; that is, the view of the old writers on Presbyterianism, who claimed that the office of evangelist belonged only to apostolic times. The fear was then, and the fear is now—prelacy; that it will engraft prelacy upon our Presbyterianism.

Without dwelling upon the fact already mentioned, that it seems to be too late to bring this up now, inasmuch as the evangelistic office is already revived, already a powerful factor in our system, and an exception as to the power of rule being always joint is already embodied for his benefit in our constitution, the reply seems to be:

(a), That the fear of prelacy has no real foundation. There is a wide and radical difference between the "prelate" and the "evangelist," a difference so radical and so wide that there is no danger of the evangelist "evolving" into the prelate. The "prelate" is "consecrated" to his office and work, "receiving the Holy Ghost" through "the imposition of hands" (and likewise "apostolical succession") of his brother prelates. The "evangelist" is simply "set apart" to his office and work by the "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." The prelate's powers of rule are inherent and permanent; the powers of the evangelist are delegated powers and temporary; they are gone the very moment a church court is erected, and can only be exercised in other and unoccupied territories. The prelate has jurisdiction over settled organized churches (as well as over frontier and foreign fields);

the evangelist can have no jurisdiction where the settled church exists—indeed, cannot even have existence. The prelate belongs to a “superior order” of the ministry; the evangelist belongs but to the “one order,” to which we believe all the gospel ministry belong; he is merely an “ordinary” minister of the word, endowed for the time with extraordinary functions. Once a prelate, always a prelate. But not so with the evangelist. When he returns from his extra work and his extra functions he becomes a simple “pastor”; simply this and nothing more. We have several returned missionaries among us now who have taken work at home. Where are their “extra powers”? They have none. What has become of them? Formally divested of them in any way by church enactment? No; but simply left behind the moment they left their field. Thus it seems there is no real ground for the fear some have of prelacy.

(b), But there is another way of looking at this matter, in which the fear of prelacy would appear to be well grounded. And that is, for the church to continue indefinitely in its present unsettled and unguarded policy as to the office it has revived.

This course does, indeed, seem to invite a real danger of practical prelacy. The church has revived the office of evangelist, but she has not settled her policy concerning him. She has raised up a tremendous force, but she still hesitates to say what it is, or what it can lawfully do. These *sine titulo* preachers that the church is multiplying so rapidly, and throwing out as her vanguards on the borders and in the foreign fields, what are they? If not evangelists in the scriptural sense of the term, then are we that far defective in our Presbyterian system in that we have raised up a set of men the Scriptures do not recognize. Nay, not only have we a ministry the Scriptures do not recognize, but we are still further defective in that we have failed to raise up a ministry that the Scriptures do recognize; and we have put in their place a *sine titulo* ministry, as yet unidentified, and with powers as yet undefined. This is clearly anti-Presbyterian; for, if we are to have a *sine titulo* ministry at all, then by all means let us have the ministry presented in the Scriptures. This is clearly unsafe and dangerous also; for if we are to have a *sine titulo*

ministry, then by all means its powers ought to be defined and safeguards thrown around it, else, in the course of time, we will be but treasuring up troubles against the day of trouble. Here is the place where, it seems to the writer, practical prelacy comes in sight.

Two facts will suffice to show the justness of this view, already hinted at. Our foreign missionaries are multiplying, and must be multiplied more and more, to keep up with the onward stride of other denominations and with the needs of the newly opening fields. Every missionary sent out must meet the facts already described (and others like them), which call for the "powers" the Scriptures assign to the evangelist. To send him forth with powers undefined is to lead him into temptation, expose him constantly to the charge of usurping and exercising powers not given him, and invite in many a case (in the course of time) the assumption of the role of a prelate. Just here, it will be well to quote the language of two of our wisest and oldest missionaries, the Rev. Dr. Leighton Wilson and the Rev. G. W. Painter. Dr. Wilson, in 1882, memorialized the General Assembly to pass the following paper, to-wit: "It is the judgment of the Assembly that when a Presbytery ordains an evangelist to the foreign mission work, it clothes him for the time being with all the powers necessary for planting the church of Christ in lands where it has not heretofore existed. In these powers is included the authority to organize particular churches, and, until the regular court exists, to ordain pastors and evangelists; it being understood that where there are two evangelists in the same field these powers as a matter of ecclesiastical propriety are to be exercised jointly."—*Alexander's Digest*, p. 106. Mr. Painter's language is as follows: "I wish first to tell the church how I, and I think nearly all our missionaries, would act under the extraordinary circumstances in which we may and do find ourselves. First, then, if I were unwisely sent alone to a missionary field, or were providentially left alone, I should act as follows: If men were converted, I would follow the book and receive them into the church to be formed, then, without the sanction of the book, I should usurp the duties assigned by the book to a session, and go the length of even dis-

cipling them if necessary. Next, if I should, in the course of time, find a man suited to be an elder, I should proceed as per the book to ordain him, and pending the formation of a session I should, if necessary, even discipline this ecclesiastical equal of mine, and not feel particularly lawless either. Worse still, if this brother under my discipline, should grow and give evidence of a call to the ministry, and I had neither brother minister nor session to help me, I should proceed to ordain him, and should even discipline him, if need be," etc.—*Central Presbyterian*, April, 1895.

Certainly sentiments such as these show what these two honored brethren felt, not only as to the "powers" of the evangelist, but as to the absolute necessity of our church defining and bestowing these powers. Dr. Wilson, all know as a missionary for long years in Africa, and then for long years the first Secretary of Foreign Missions for our church, a man universally prized for his wisdom and prudence; while Mr. Painter is also well known as one of our oldest missionaries to China, a man who while firm as a rock in his convictions is of cautious, conservative nature, and a retiring, unobtrusive temper. There will never be any danger from his taking the liberties described in his article, and we can always count on his stopping himself within the limits of a loyal and intelligent evangelist; but who can vouch for all the missionaries who will go forth from us in the future? And this brings us to the second fact, emphasizing the danger of leaving the policy of our church upon this matter to remain indefinitely unsettled.

We have reached a point in our career as a church when we have begun to send out negro missionaries. A most notable fact it is, and a notable testimony to the lofty, Christ-like spirit our church has always shown in its attitude to the negro race; but is there not food for thought here? We are about sending out the fourth missionary of that race to foreign fields; without doubt the number will increase. In planning the permanent policy of a great church like ours, it would be folly to count upon its being otherwise; but will it be wise with this prospect to face the future with an unsettled policy, to continue to send forth missionaries, white and colored, to a work of extraordinary character, extraor-

dinary responsibilities, and extraordinary temptations, with powers undefined?

Again, is the writer compelled to state that here is where practical prelacy is in danger of coming in? But the rehabilitation of the evangelist of sacred Scripture will settle the policy of our church on safe and guarded lines; his powers will be stated and defined; he himself will know, and the whole church will know, just what he is, and just what he can do; and the danger of prelacy will be avoided rather than created, as we have seen. And more than that, our Presbyterian system will be perfected. The principle that the "power of rule is joint" is not the only principle forming an essential feature of the Presbyterian system. There is another one equally as fundamental if not more so. It is that the Presbyterian Church must be a missionary church. She must be a "going" and a "teaching" church. Dr. Thornwell put it finely when he said, "our Saviour constituted his church with a special reference to missionary operations." And again, "this peculiarity" (*i. e.*, the evangelistic office) "is essential to the perfection of the Presbyterian system." The first General Assembly of our church (1861) put it well when it sent forth the following words: "The General Assembly desires distinctly and deliberately to inscribe on our church's banner as she now first unfurls it to the world in immediate connection with the headship of her Lord, his last command, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,' regarding this as the great end of her organization, and obedience to it as the indispensable condition of her Lord's promised presence." And yet the time-honored characteristic of the Presbyterian Church has been its conservatism. Applying the term to her doctrines, her tenacious love for the truth, her slowness to adopt new customs, in short, to the general influence of her presence and teachings upon the life of an individual or a community, we cannot only confess it, but glory in it. Nay, more; we may say that if she will but keep this great characteristic she will be the great pillar and stay of the truth in the fast-coming days when all the present germs of error, both social and religious, shall have ripened into universal mad revolt and anarchy. But if you apply the term

“conservatism” to her church polity; if you say she is not formed for “aggressive” work upon the world, then surely you have given her a grievous, a fatal stab; you have put your finger upon a radical defect. True, indeed, she is admirably adapted for governing and developing churches, but is she not equipped for planting churches, too? Is it true that this church, glorying in its fidelity to the sacred Scriptures, deriving its ecclesiastical polity solely from the word of God, shall fail entirely to catch what is the very aroma of the New Testament religion; shall fail to take in that which is the distinctive, the all-pervading spirit of the New Testament church; shall be so dull of ear as not even to hear that trumpet blast, that watchword for all time, “Go ye”? Can we, living in this missionary age, believe this? or, believing, can we glory in it? Nay, we cannot afford to rejoice in our conservatism at the expense of our aggressiveness. To do so would outlaw us from the list of New Testament churches, and place us in direct antagonism to the Saviour we adore. And, in truth, to do so would be to do ourselves injustice. Our church has caught the missionary spirit, has heard the watchword, and has not been one whit behind the very chiefest of the churches in evangelizing the world. Our fault has been that we have not developed the office through which the Lord would have this work to be done, and have not given it in our system that definiteness of position and that permanence which our Saviour gave it at the start. This is the real need, in the judgment of the writer, demanded by the sharp, the grave, the growing exigencies of the day; this is the solution of the foreign missionary problem, and this it is that is needful for the perfection of the Presbyterian system.

P. D. STEPHENSON.

Woodstock, Va.

IV. A PERVERSION OF HISTORY.

THE month of May, 1660, witnessed an occurrence in England that flames on the pages of history as a beacon to all succeeding generations. The people at large had grown weary and discontented under the administration of Cromwell, notwithstanding the internal peace and public glory of the protectorate. This discontent was produced by the sternness of puritanical restraint upon the irreligious classes of the population. A great majority were pining for their lost enjoyments in public amusements and private vices. Gaiety, frivolity, balls, routs, theatres, and pageants were more popular than sermons and fast-days, with the other solemnities and proprieties of Puritan society. It is also undeniable that Cromwell had been unpopular as a ruler, because his authority had not been clothed in legal forms and primitive ceremonies. He was an arbitrary and untitled sovereign, who reigned, by virtue of military success, under the plea of necessity. His term had been one of the most prosperous and illustrious ever known in the annals of England, and both public and private virtue received encouragement at his hands.

The death of Oliver and the incompetency of Richard Cromwell gave opportunity for the overthrow of Puritanism by the restoration of the Stuarts. The reaction was tremendous. The bulk of the nation rushed headlong into the wanton arms of Charles II., entirely heedless of conditions, and with a spontaneous servility unexampled. The triumph of carnality over spirituality was never more complete. John Bull began to dance with a glee never manifested before, and welcomed his master to London with demonstrations of joy which no national victory could have occasioned.

This was a plain case of popular suicide from insane impulse, as twenty-five years of sad experience demonstrated. The returning despot was far from being arbitrary like Cromwell. He was incapable of anything so robust. A life of licentious self-indulgence was his supreme aim, and he was willing enough to purchase

it by according equal license to other people. Unfortunately, the other people nearest the throne desired license to repay the hated Puritans for all their interference with themselves in Cromwell's time. The king easily yielded to pressure. A more heartless, unscrupulous, perfidious creature never occupied his position. He was ready to sanction any infamy. He perjured himself to the Scots. He indulged the bigots of his court in the delights of bloody persecution. He betrayed the honor of his country, and sold her possessions to supply his wants and pay for his pleasures. Under his libertine example, society plunged into a corruption that defied all decency. Under his unscrupulous sway, an imperious hierarchy reopened the persecuting violence which Cromwell had suppressed by a milder system of his own. In both England and Scotland the blood of dissenters began to flow, much of which, in the sight of God, was far more sacred than that of Charles I.

It was at the accession of the unworthy son of the so-called martyr-king, in 1660, that this impious, unprincipled, dissolute, and treacherous "Head of the Church" turned it over into the hands of a hierarchy of prelates who, like himself, had been long banished, and now returned, resolved to make the most of their success. A distinguished bishop of the American Protestant Episcopal Church has recently reverted to that event for the purpose of promoting Christian union between his own and the Presbyterian denomination. (See letter of Bishop Coxe to Dr. Roberts.) He there asks if his Presbyterian brethren have forgotten the concessions which they (the Presbyterians of the United States, in the year 1895) had made in 1660 to the "Head of the English Church" in favor of prelacy. Were we to admit our own loss of memory in the premises, we might fairly stop to inquire of the right reverend brother if *he* has forgotten the facts of the same date that implicate his own denomination, with equal significance, in the violent proceedings of that day for the suppression of dissent. We would suggest to Bishop Coxe that, if a handful of downtrodden Presbyterians in London obsequiously surrendered to Charles II. the main point of the controversy, and thereby bound *us* in the United States in 1895 to repeat the

same, he can have no right to object if we regard his own church as bound to the principles maintained by the head and hierarchy of the establishment in 1660; for, beyond a question, a precedent of two or more centuries ago, imposed by a mere handful of ministers acting on their own personal responsibility, and reaching down to us here in a free country, cannot control the millions of living Presbyterians, whilst the Episcopalians amongst us are entirely free from such control, enacted, not by a mere committee of volunteers, but by the sovereign power of the church! The claims on one side ought to be as strong as the alleged concessions on the other. This would commit Bishop Coxe to the principles of Laud.

But we have no idea of admitting what this brother coolly assumes. We cannot *forget* a thing we have never known. Nothing could be more preposterous than the idea he has adopted, that a few alarmed ministers in London, making an address to such a king, could, on their own motion, bind all future generations of their brethren to a full surrender of the main issue. These men could not represent all the English, Scottish, Dutch, French, and Swiss Presbyterians of their time. They did not, in fact, represent any body. If their own views found full utterance, it was as much as the circumstances allowed. It requires little imagination to conceive of their constraint. The attempt of the bishop to dislodge many millions of Presbyterians from the positions they have held in all countries of Protestant Christendom from the beginning of the Reformation, by reminding them that they themselves, as represented by a committee at Whitehall in 1660, had been handed over to the prelatical ranks in the presence of the king, impresses us as one of the most singular specimens of ecclesiastical diplomacy ever recorded.

The inquiry may be at once urged, why this surrender was not accepted. How did it come to pass that only one of the company, Dr. Reynolds, found welcome and preferment awaiting him? The others, including the saintly Baxter, died in non-conformity, in spite of the humiliating surrender they had made, according to Bishop Coxe.

But this assumption is too absurd to occupy further attention.

It is absolutely worthless, unless there was something said in the conference that would justify it. The Christian public ought to know that the issue between Presbyterians and Episcopalians has always had reference to the *powers* of the episcopate, and not to a mere term. We have ever maintained that the true historic bishop was pastor of a congregation or parish. Such an *episcopate* has been our claim from the beginning. The intimation of Bishop Coxe, that *we* conceded in 1660 the same thing that *he* contends for in 1895, conveys an impression that is thoroughly misleading. No matter what Baxter and his associates may have said on that occasion to express their desire of peace, they certainly did not concede the "historic episcopate" now offered by the Anglican Church as a basis of union. Not a syllable was uttered by them that can be so construed. Their subsequent lives contradict it. The hierarchy of England would have offered them an ovation and the king have given them fat benefices in the church.

It follows that unless we have totally misconceived the "historic episcopate," we Presbyterians of this age did not, in any sense whatever, accept that dogma in 1660. The two views of episcopacy—the Presbyterian and the Anglican—are as distinct as language can make them. The former is parochial, the latter is not only diocesan, but regal in its authority. Between the two alternatives lies the field of *expediency*, in which human invention has constructed several schemes of government by way of compromise. These schemes are based upon the assumption that the organization of the church was purposely left to the judgment of the people, to be regulated according to circumstances. The Independents and Methodists have acted upon these premises, and built up different systems for themselves. The conference of 1660 may have resulted in concessions of this character. The English Presbyterians were by no means harmonious amongst themselves. They were few and weak, and almost extinct under the grinding of the two millstones of churchism and independency. The great bulk of the denomination was to be found in Scotland and the Low Countries, where Presbyterian establishments had long existed in a fully organized form. The conferences of 1660 were confined

to the little remnant in and about London, who were consulting only for a *modus vivendi*, on the part of that remnant under the Stuarts. They *appear* to have agreed to submit to a modified episcopacy, adopted for expediency and not on divine authority. We understand them as surrendering an absolute parity of the ministers, and intimating that superintending officers over them, as a practical system, might be provided for without admitting the abuses of prelacy. They went as far as a disheartened party possibly could to conciliate the conquerors. But we deny most positively that even *they* conceded the divine right of diocesan bishops as now claimed by Bishop Coxe and his associates. This brother ought to have produced the documentary proof of his statement, which is not and cannot be true, without involving those eminent men in a most dishonorable transaction. The whole amount of it was that in their view the church is a free commonwealth, which may, at its discretion, choose its external organic forms in different lands, and remodel them at pleasure. But whatever interpretation we may put upon their language, we are sure that it could not have meant "the historic episcopate" now urged upon ourselves as a basis of union.

The latter dogma is no mere episcopacy, but undeniably an episcopacy which a sound Protestant must necessarily reject. It is, by its own statement, one of four indispensable articles of the Christian faith. It stands on a level with the Bible and the sacraments. It is a principle without which organized Christianity cannot exist. It is the direct opposite of a free Christian commonwealth, authorized to assume any organic form it may prefer. The dogma of the historic episcopate does not recognize any autonomy in the Christian church, but places its sovereignty in a divinely-determined order of bishops independent of the people.

English Presbyterianism was never anything positive enough to do what Bishop Coxe imagined it did in 1660. The *Westminster Confession* was adopted too late to acquire an ascendancy in the public mind. The moderate party in the Long Parliament, which had affiliated with the Scots on political grounds, was crushed between the Royalists and the Independents under Cromwell, and reduced to a small unorganized body, incapable of main-

taining its influence against overwhelming odds. On the one hand was the king's party burning with resentment; and, on the other, the army flushed with victory, and bent upon radical measures. Between the two, the Presbyterians of England went down, and found it impossible to introduce either a limited constitutional monarchy, or a church allied to those of Scotland, Holland and Geneva. The sequel is well known. Moderation and compromise were an utter failure. The radical extremes enjoyed a temporary triumph, followed after the death of their leader by inaction, despotism, and high church supremacy.

Bishop Coxe would have us believe that we Presbyterians of another age and country, then and there, through our chosen representatives surrendered the ecclesiastical principle for which we had been contending, and adopted the "historic episcopate" so much prized by Laud and Clarendon.

That nothing of the kind took place is not only plain from the circumstances we have pointed out, but from the nature of the issue that divided the parties. That issue was not concerning the words "bishop" and "episcopacy." The necessity of *oversight* and *overseers* in the church was not in question. Presbyterians, as well as "churchmen," held that some such function belonged to the organism. The "churchman" contended that the people and clergy within certain definite bounds were divinely subjected to an ecclesiastic clothed with a several authority derived from a line of predecessors of his own rank. The distinctive position of this party is that all ecclesiastical administration is invalid where this succession is wanting. They could not deny that the pastors of apostolic churches were bishops. The Bible expressly affirms it. They could not deny that a quorum of such bishops would be as competent to supervise a diocese as one. A Presbytery could be a diocesan ruler as well as a prelate. The thing they desired was, that any orders that did not originate in the Roman Catholic Church were valid.

The present position of the Anglican Church, in regard to union, is the same. The Presbyterians might appoint one of their parochial bishops to supervise a district. This would be "diocesan episcopacy," but not at all acceptable to the Anglican party.

But the good brother states that *we* adopted in 1660 the *sine qua non* which *they* are now propounding. He strangely overlooks the glaring fact that the historic form of episcopacy, as it came through Rome, and not from the Bible, was one of "three orders" in unbroken succession.

The effort thus made to give the readers of his letter the impression that the spirit of union manifested by the bishops in their four-sided ultimatum was not appreciated in Presbyterian quarters at its true value, is made on an inexplicable misconception of the mutual attitude of the parties. The Presbyterian denomination is not chargeable with a want of the spirit of unity, and in 1660 the London ministers who addressed Charles II. urged it upon the churchmen of their day. They even went further in concessions than any of us would now approve, as Bishop Coxe testifies; but the opposite party, then as now, obstructed all such advances with intolerable conditions. The true statement is that, from the reign of Charles I. to this hour, high church exclusiveness has prevailed in the Anglican denomination, and unity has been sacrificed continually on the altar of priestly assumption.

At the beginning of the Reformation the question of valid orders was not regarded as a fundamental one. The English Protestants held close fraternal relations with the Lutherans and Calvinists of the continent. Ministers whose ordination was non-episcopal were frequently inducted into livings of the established church. But the spirit of priestly pretension was augmented more and more under the Stuarts, as those despots were forced to struggle against the rising liberty of their subjects. "No bishop, no king," became the rallying cry of prerogative in the secular and ecclesiastical spheres. From that day the Anglican Church maintained its isolated position of separation from other Protestants, in spite of the growth of free principles. The spiritual prerogative is now insisted upon as if the Stuarts still held sway in London, and a modern Laud still occupied the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury. Our cotemporaries of that persuasion resemble the Bourbons as much as ever, "learning nothing, and forgetting nothing."

Bishop Coxe is distrustful of the Presbyterian memory, and reminds us that we have long ago given up the issue that divides us. But having been born of Presbyterian parentage, he is possibly subject to hereditary forgetfulness, and did not recall, when he wrote his letter, the serious fact that his own denomination has resolved to live or die by "the historic episcopate" of the Church of Rome. This is our interpretation of the terms of union propounded by the English and American bishops. It is one of four most sacred and indispensable articles. Presumably the denial of any one of these four fundamentals would be heretical. No man would be esteemed a member of the church catholic who should refuse those numbered one, two, and three, and we are not authorized to make number *four* an exception.

But what is "the historic episcopate"? It is unquestionably an order of ministers superior in rank and authority to the scriptural bishops of apostolic times. Whether successors of the twelve or not, these historic bishops were a *divine institution*, as sacred and obligatory, according to theory, as the statements of the apostles' creed. Thus we have a demand upon our faith as imperative as a command of Christ, that we shall accept, as a fundamental of our religion, this order of bishops, distinct from that of the New Testament, and never once named in it. The stipulation is not, as Bishop Coxe seems to represent, a mere recognition of *bishops*, but a recognition that the bishops so familiar to all Scripture readers were *not* the officers to whom the government of the church was divinely committed. We are required to admit that this official designation, used by the inspired apostles, was, by the same apostles, afterwards superseded and abandoned!

It is evident that we who presume to hesitate when this test of our orthodoxy is applied are considered outside heretics, whose obstinate unbelief is unaccountable. But our chief inquiry for the present is, how far Bishop Coxe is justifiable in suggesting that the Presbyterians are inconsistent in declining such liberal advances. This is clearly what he delicately intimates. But the words upon which he relies are insufficient for his purpose. We are indeed committed to an episcopate. We do accept "bishops."

But our terms and his are not the same. Jonathan, the son of Saul, used "artillery," and Paul and his travelling companions used "carriages," but the former knew nothing of gunpowder, and the latter lifted their conveyances to their shoulders. Diplomacy becomes a very awkward and unsatisfactory work when an uncertain language is employed.

The responsibility for the distractions and divisions of the professed followers of Christ is truly great. The healing process cannot be promoted by recrimination. It is unjust to lay the chief burthen upon the wrong party. The Bishop does not consciously intend this, but such is the tendency of his suggestions. History is altogether against his conception that Presbyterianism is a sore-headed, unreasonable separation of English Christians from their lawful rulers. Along with Lutheranism, it occupied common ground from the days of the Reformation in Europe, of independence towards the hierarchy of Rome. Neither Luther, nor Zwingli, nor Calvin, was troubled by the danger of losing connection with the apostles! The Reformers in all those countries considered themselves at liberty to assume an organic existence, outside of the Church of Rome, by warrant of Jesus Christ, their Lord. In England alone was the idea retained of an unbroken succession from Peter and his associates. And, even in England, it was not held by all churchmen at first. It was the Stuarts, and not the Tudors, who fostered this insular conceit. The high church party were the real dissenters, because on this matter of three necessary orders they dissented from the great body of Protestants to which they belonged. The earlier Reformers, like Cranmer, were in cordial sympathy, and took earnest counsel, with those of the continent, as brethren engaged in a common cause. Charles II. found their successors transformed into a party bitterly hostile to both Lutheranism and Calvinism.

The responsibility for the present divided condition of Protestantism rests chiefly upon those who obstruct all efforts at reconciliation and harmony. The Presbyterians are not of this class. We have our faults, and have not done our full duty in efforts to promote unity; but our attitude from the beginning has been unwaveringly in favor of a fraternal understanding among all

true Christians. Questions of external order have not been allowed to assume an importance equal to matters of saving faith, and our views of a visible church have generally been coterminous with our conceptions of fundamental spiritual truth.

It would be easy for us, were it of any avail, to meet Bishop Coxe with a counter-proposition. We *have* an episcopate, not only historic, but scriptural, that provides for the *oversight* of districts as well as for local interests in the church. To a certain extent, the *moderator* for a year has charge of these interests. If, then, an episcopal basis of union is required, why not substitute the Presbyterian polity in the programme, and stipulate for "a *scriptural episcopate*"? We are not curious to know, because we can easily surmise, what might have been the result if the Lambeth proposition for union, thus amended in its fourth article, had been adopted by a General Assembly and presented to the Triennial Convention. It would then have devolved on a Presbyterian correspondent to remind his recalcitrant brethren on the other side that the English Reformers, at a much earlier date than 1660, had not appeared altogether averse to the *Presbyterian episcopate*.

A little squabble created by words used in different senses is unworthy of so solemn a question. If permitted, we prefer most decidedly to apply to it a more spiritual test. Our impression is that the kingdom of Jesus Christ is essentially unique, and seated in the recesses of the human soul. Its visibility is like that of its divine Founder. We are not permitted to know how he looked, and we have every reason to believe that his appearance was not described in the Gospels for a wise purpose. *Inspired omissions are profoundly significant.* The silence of the firmament on a clear night is more eloquent than any form of words. The evangelists were restrained by the Spirit of God from any intimation of our Lord's external form and visage, that our thoughts might dwell chiefly upon his work and character. We know that he was like other men, sin excepted; but that is all. It is very much the same with the visible church. We know that it is a society of human beings associated for worship and for work, but little else is directly recorded. There is no *description* of its polity or

worship in the New Testament. Certain features of its presentation are incidentally revealed, and we thus learn a little about its external manifestation. As the Spirit might have caused a portraiture of our Lord to be preserved, so he might have prescribed for the church a definite service and form of government; but he did not. The inference is plain that such instructions were not advisable. The positive and the negative in the Bible are both designed.

But the incidental information in the Scriptures is an authorized guide, as far as it is understood. In this way we may learn valuable truth on many practical questions. The fact of a parochial episcopacy instituted by the apostles is fully established. The fact that synods and councils were invested with authority over the church at large is also undeniable. But on most questions of polity and ritual profound silence prevails. This silence seems to us *a loud proclamation* that these matters are of inferior importance compared with the fundamentals of the faith. If the "historic episcopate" is not found explicitly laid down as a thing to be necessarily observed, it is unwarrantably included as one of the four stipulations for union. If the episcopal throne is not too high to be approached by an unpretentious Presbyterian, we must urge upon those brethren the incongruity of erecting four pillars for the basis of agreement, three of which are authoritative dictates of the Lord Almighty as to the truth contained in them, whilst the fourth is not found at all in his word, and does not carry with it a particle of divine warrant. All Protestant and Catholic Christendom accepts the three. A comparatively small minority of Protestants admits the fourth. Its advocates are confined to England and this continent, and to only a part of the denomination. But the great objection, after all, is its ceremonial character. The three provisions are spiritual, and pertain to the scheme of salvation. The fourth is not only of human institution, but relates entirely to the external form of the church.

Now, the spiritual and the formal cannot be of equal weight under the gospel. The New Testament is full of spiritual doctrine and precept, but void of everything like a system of rules for administration. It contains no organic law. The fourth arti-

cle is, therefore, out of all harmony with the preceding three, and virtually commits all who accept "the historic episcopate" to that Romish system of *performances* which destroys spiritual religion so effectually. If "the kingdom of God is within us," it is designed to differ from temporal kingdoms in the absence of display and magnificence, of pomp, and ceremony, and of ornament and etiquette. Both Christ and his apostles have left us an example of plainness and simplicity in the exhibition of Christianity before the world, of which the Roman Catholic hierarchy is a studied and disgusting contrast. And this latter is the episcopate which the Anglican bishops introduce into the basis of union as an article of faith as necessary as the Trinity, the incarnation, or the atonement!

There is, of course, a secular advantage that Romanism and Anglicanism enjoy in surpassing other forms of Christianity in ceremonial display and architectural grandeur and beauty. We would respond to the advances of our brethren of the latter class by urging them *to unite with us dissenters* in renouncing this temporal consideration and the worldly approbation and favor to which it appeals. It costs much self-denial to give up so much that gratifies our fallen nature. The more spiritual class of Christians will be willing to bear this cross of humiliation in imitation of their Lord. Spiritual peerage and heraldry may well be laid at his feet, who left us his example that we might walk in his steps.

The three orders of Rome have been for ages associated with ecclesiastical pretension and ambition. The promotion of these vanities is contrary to the spirit of Christianity. Our Lord took much pains to warn his disciples against them. It is unreasonable to assume that, by his intention, an aristocratic principle was impressed upon the organism of his church for all time, leading his servants to surround themselves with the insignia of rank and power. Human nature seeks delight in such distinctions, but the heavenly mind finds them foreign and distasteful. We would, therefore, appeal to our brethren who propose union, in behalf of apostolic simplicity in the polity of the church. We would beg to be excused from subscribing to a tenet which we cannot trace in our Bibles, and which appears to us and to the large majority of Protestants

inconsistent with the lowly, unworldly spirit of the gospel. We take our stand on the proposition that kingly government *jure divino* has never been imposed upon the church any more than upon the state. Had it been, it would be easily recognized as *law* in the word of God. But in that case human intelligence would remain forever baffled by its unaccountable character. Why so much responsible power should be placed in three successive and immutable ranks of the clergy, as if the wisdom of God doted upon a *threefold domination*, will continue to trouble the ordinary brain, without hope of solution. The same divine wisdom disapproved of such a polity in the state, and permitted it among the chosen people only under protest. In a free republican country like ours it is a strange dogma, necessarily distasteful to the true patriot, that the Christian church cannot validly subsist in any other than a threefold form of a hierarchy in which rank is emphasized. Giving to the highest rank its prelatie signification, we may safely say that Americans ought to reverse the motto of the Stuart dynasty, and to inscribe upon their banners the apposite legend, NO KING, NO BISHOP!

JAMES A. WADDELL.

Roxbury, Virginia.

V. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

THE chief European sources of Southern Presbyterians have been the English Presbyterians, the Dutch, the Germans, the Swiss, the Huguenots, the Scotch, and the Scotch-Irish. Some of these came directly from Europe, and some immediately from the more northern colonies. Indeed, the Southern Church is one in sources with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, of which it was a part till after the middle of the present century.

That great church, had, owing to the prevalence of latitudinarian views in the realms of theology and ecclesiastical polity, been divided, in 1838, into two independent bodies, viz., the Old School Church and the New School. The New School Church, on account of unbiblical teaching concerning slavery, suffered another division in 1857, the southern segment, which refused to regard slave-holding as a sin, establishing the Synod of the South. The Old School retained its integrity and conservative tone till 1861. But in that year the Assembly, sitting at Philadelphia, was overpowered by the secular, war, spirit in the land. It subordinated itself to a political party, the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ to political ends, thus violating the constitution of the church and usurping the prerogatives of the divine Master. It adopted the notorious Spring Resolutions, wherein it attempted, as Dr. Charles Hodge and his fifty-seven noble fellow protestants said, "to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians was due," and "to make that decision a condition of membership in the church."

In consequence of this course, largely, forty-seven Presbyteries in the then Confederate States of America, each for itself, dissolved connection with that Assembly, during the summer of 1861. On the 4th of December, 1861, their representatives met in

Augusta, Ga., and formed the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, South.

This constituting Assembly did much to make itself memorable. It adopted the constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America as its own constitution. It sloughed off the unpresbyterian machinery of the old church by which it had conducted missionary and other church operations. It recognized the church itself as a Home and a Foreign Missionary Society, and so forth; in short, as the God-appointed instrumentality for the evangelization of the world. For the cumbrous and irresponsible boards of the mother church it substituted the church itself and appointed the necessary executive committees to carry out the will of the church. These committees, of Foreign Missions, Domestic Missions, Education, and Publication, were to be immediately responsible to the General Assembly.

In a letter "to all the churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth," written by the gifted Dr. J. H. Thornwell, this Assembly also stated the reasons of its separate existence; and its distinctive peculiarities. It asserted that the consequences of the proceedings on the part of the recent Philadelphia Assembly, its opening "the door for the worst passions of human nature in the deliberation of church courts," had justified separation, as well as the *de facto* existence of the Confederate States of America within whose bounds they were. The Assembly claimed as distinguishing features of its church, "Witnessing for the non-secular character of the church and the headship of Christ, or, in other words, for a strict adherence to the constitution," and "the complete organization of the church, obviating the necessity of boards and societies." Few assemblies of any kind have ever been enabled to issue a nobler paper than this same letter; and it lends exalted dignity to the beginning of the career of the church whose greeting it carried to all other Christian bodies on the earth.

The numerical growth of the church has been very rapid: Its 47 Presbyteries have become 74; its 700 ministers, 1,337; its 1,000 churches, 2,776; its 70,000 communicants, 203,999; its contributions to Home and Foreign Missions are more than four times as large; and it has kept pace in developing other branches

of church enterprise. It has made this advance in spite of the exodus of about 10,000 colored communicants, who went for the most part to the Northern Presbyterian Church.

This growth is explained by: 1, The church's having taking into organic union with itself many smaller bodies of sound Presbyterians. Thus it took in "the Independent Presbyterian Church (1863), the United Synod of the South (1864), the Presbytery of Patapsco (1867), the Alabama Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church about the same time, the Synod of Kentucky (1869), the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky (1870), and the Synod of Missouri (1874). The union with these churches brought in about 282 ministers, 490 or more churches, and 35,600 communicants."¹ 2, The energetic use of the evangelistic arm of the church's service. Particularly since 1866, presbyterial evangelists have been, in increasing numbers, set apart to preaching to the weak and destitute. In 1880 the Synod of Kentucky entered upon the pioneer enterprise of Synodical evangelism. Not less than eight or ten Synods have subsequently inaugurated some form of synodical work. Thus Christ has been widely preached and the church has grown. 3, The pastors and the people have been generally faithful and so preached Christ.

The development of the church's agencies has also been very gratifying. Foreign Missions had a large place in the heart of the church at the start. That place has steadily grown. Carrying this work as its opportunity and ability allowed till 1866, the church in that year began to plant new stations. It has planted stations in China, Italy, the United States of Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, Greece, Japan, the Congo Free State, Cuba, and Corea. It has in its various missions, at this time, about 140 ordained and unordained missionaries; and can now look upon about 2,050 communicants in these fields, besides many hundreds of young people receiving Christian instruction, many native Christian preachers, teachers, and other evangelical workers, exerting an immeasurable influence on heathenism, predisposing it to hear Christianity.

¹ Johnson's *South. Presb.*, pp. 358, 359.

Home Missions have also had a large place. The Executive Committee of Home Missions was originally called the Executive Committee of Domestic Missions. Owing to the preponderance of Sustentation work in behalf of weak churches, which was made necessary by the war, the name of the committee was changed, in 1866, to that of Committee of Sustentation. By 1879 the church had begun to desire again aggressive evangelistic work on the part of this Executive Committee. Accordingly, in keeping with the projection to the front of this desire, the name of the committee was again changed to that of Home Missions.

The general objects for which the committee has labored are : 1, To aid feeble churches in support of their pastors and to secure a competency to every laboring minister ; 2, To aid in the support of missionaries and evangelists ; 3, To assist weak churches in obtaining suitable edifices in which to worship ; 4, To assist laborers in getting from one field to another where they are without the means of doing this of themselves ; 5, To raise and disburse an invalid fund.

The sustentation of weak churches has been a highly blessed work. The committee's evangelistic work has not been very successful. As the years have passed, an increasing number of Presbyteries and Synods have preferred to push their own evangelistic work. Hence, while the church has been extraordinarily active, of late, in evangelistic work in the home field, the Assembly's committee has done but little of the work. This is to be regretted. The plan of independent Synodical and Presbyterian work appeals more to selfish emulation, synodical and presbyterial ambition. It is apt to result in expenditure where there is no sufficient promise, and non-expenditure in fields full of promise, in the newer and weaker Synods ; and it is Independent rather than Presbyterian in tendency, and weakening to the common life of the great body.¹

Missionary operations among the negroes were placed under the patronage of this committee by its original constitution. It continued to take oversight of the work till 1891, when the Executive Committee of Colored Evangelization was organized. The

¹ Cf. Johnson's *Southern Presbyterians*, p. 337.

latter committee has, in its short life, displayed much zeal and good sense; and its work, chiefly the direction of the Tuscaloosa Institute for the education of colored ministers, has been greatly blessed. The committee has done a very helpful work in assisting weak congregations to secure suitable places of worship. At the bidding of the Assemblies of 1885 and 1888 it established the Church Erection and Loan Fund, which has found favor with the people and steadily grown. In raising the much-needed Invalid Fund the committee's efforts have been attended by only very partial success.

The Cause of Education for the Ministry has been much talked of by the church. The Assembly's plan for securing an educated ministry, adopted in 1861, styled variously, as "a beneficiary, or eleemosynary," or "stipendiary," plan has never been in universal esteem throughout the church. It has been modified and improved, especially by the Assemblies of 1866 and 1895, but still meets with detraction. It is a good scheme if faithfully carried out by the Presbyteries; but seems to be tolerated only because of the necessity of some such scheme. It is so poorly supported, or operated, that many deserving candidates suffer from want of needful funds.

The church has in successful operation the following theological seminaries: Union, in Virginia, founded in 1824; Columbia, in South Carolina, established in 1828; Tuscaloosa Institute, in Alabama, founded in 1877; The Divinity School of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, in Tennessee, organized in 1885; and the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, organized in 1893.

The following colleges are under the control of the church: The Southwestern Presbyterian University, at Clarksville, Tenn., Central University, in Kentucky, Westminster College, in Missouri, Austin College, in Texas, King College, at Bristol, Tenn., the Arkansas College, and South Carolina College, at Clinton, S. C., and many academies and other schools of high grade, doing a beneficent work. Washington and Lee University and Hampden-Sidney College are under Presbyterian influence. So are many private schools of superior excellence.

The Assembly's Cause of Publication has never received a liberal support. In spite of this, and the financial distress into which the cause was carried in its early history, a great success has been achieved by the Assembly's committee under Dr. Hazen. In publishing, in selecting religious books and stamping them with its *imprimatur*, in making gratuitous distributions of literature, and in supporting colporteurs, the committee has done much. While making gratuitous distributions greater than the contributions, it has accumulated a capital of more than \$100,000 in value. Since 1875 this committee has had a separate charter of incorporation. It is a peculiarity of the Southern Presbyterian Church that "the several Executive Committees of the General Assembly, with the exception of that of Publication, have no separate corporate existence. And with this exception the Board of Trustees of the Assembly hold all its property."

The journals of the church, not under this committee's care, but advocating the principles of the church and giving information concerning the church's work, are: *The Alabama Presbyterian*, *The Central Presbyterian*, *The Christian Observer*, *The St. Louis Presbyterian*, *The Southwestern Presbyterian*, *The Southern Presbyterian*, *The North Carolina Presbyterian*, *The Texas Presbyterian*, *The Union Seminary Magazine*, *The Presbyterian Quarterly* and *The Missionary*, and others.

Constitutional Changes. In doctrine the movement has been, if any, to a more thorough-going Calvinism. The changes in polity have been considerable, seeing this church has so brief a history. They have sprung from a more solid conviction of *jure divino* Presbyterianism, and have resulted in a clearer statement of the ruling elder's rights and duties, and a more adequate and scriptural exposition of the deacon's duties and relations.

The Relation of the Church to Other Bodies. In all its formal and well-considered views of the subject from 1861 to 1870 this church has testified to the non-secular character of the church and the headship of Jesus in Zion. It has held that church and state are of right independent. During the war it did, indeed, falter in its testimony for the non-secular character of the church; but her falterings were transient inconsistencies, as her formal testi-

monies of the times abundantly indicate and as her sorrow for these missteps, evinced by her implicit and explicit confessions in 1866, 1870, and 1876, show.

Of the cases of organic union with other bodies which this church has effected, it must be granted that every one was made without any compromise, on its part, of a principle of doctrine or polity, and has been conducive of good.

Fraternal correspondence, more or less close, has been maintained with several ecclesiastical bodies. This has been peculiarly close with the Dutch Reformed Church; and, since 1882, with the Northern Presbyterian Church. Owing to the non-secular character of the Dutch Reformed Church, its thoroughly Calvinistic creed, and its Presbyterian polity, this correspondence bore fruit, in 1875, in a "plan of active coöperation" in publication, home missions, foreign missions, and education.

There were great impediments in the way of coöperation, and for a long time even of fraternal correspondence, with the Northern Presbyterian Church. That church had secularized itself and dethroned King Jesus in his own Zion; the union of the Old and New School bodies had involved the united church in the broadest latitudinarianism of doctrine and polity; the Northern Church had violently and unconstitutionally expelled many members of the Southern Church but a short time before; and it had preferred infamous charges against the whole Southern Church. The Southern Church continued to make a Pauline witness against these wrongs till 1882, when, out of fear that it would be charged with an unchristian attitude toward the Northern Church, it passed a resolution, which *mutatis mutandis* should be adopted by the Northern Assembly, and so furnish a basis for fraternal correspondence. This resolution was adopted by the Northern Assembly and the churches found themselves in correspondence with one another. The real basis of the correspondence thus established was only made plain to the Southern body, however, upon the receipt of the celebrated Herrick Johnson "rider." The Northern Assembly in adopting for itself the *mutatis mutandis* resolution just referred to, had subsequently declared that in that resolution it had intended no reference to any "actions of pre-

ceding Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion," but referred "only to those concerning schism, heresy, and blasphemy."

In 1889 these churches entered upon a plan of coöperation, which is the close analogue of that with the Dutch Reformed Church.

Even this sketch is sufficient to show that there was good reason for this church's coming into existence and for her continued independent existence to this day. God has called on her to witness to the non-secular character of his church, the headship of Christ, the government of the church on constitutional biblical principles, Bible Calvinism, and Bible ethics.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Union Theological Seminary, Va.

VI. NOTES.

THE INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH: A CANDID CRITIQUE.

AN editorial comment, on the general subject of "The Institutional Church," in the columns of *The Southwestern Presbyterian* for April 2, had the fortune to catch the eyes of the managers of two leading reviews, and has issued in almost simultaneous requests for articles on the same line, but more elaborate. As the information then possessed was second-hand, letters were immediately written to three typical institutions with gratifying results. Although the purpose of seeking information at first hand was candidly avowed, with commendable promptness in every instance the information was sent, and in two was accompanied by personal letters of such admirable temper as would have removed prejudice if it had existed, and would have disarmed criticism had our object been less than truth.

The temptation is irresistible to quote a few sentences from them, if only to show the spirit which animates these brethren, and to remind the critic of his reciprocal obligation.

Rev. Dr. Greer, writing from Saint Bartholomew's Rectory, under date of April 20, says: "I send you by mail a copy of our last Year-Book, which will give you some idea of what we are trying to do in St. Bartholomew's parish. The phrase 'institutional church' seems to me an infelicitous one. All that we are trying to do in St. Bartholomew's is, to apply Christianity in a practical way to the life that now is. We did not undertake it by any vote of the church. We simply went to work to do what we could to help people in their struggles and difficulties, and one good thing led to another; but it has not led to a depreciation of the preaching function of the church."

Evidently, like Topsy, it simply "grewed."

In a similar spirit writes Dr. Dickinson, of Berkley Temple, Boston, under date of April 21: "I send you some printed matter concerning the 'institutional church.' I am quite sure that most of the objections to the institutional work are due to a misunderstanding of the aim and spirit of the movement. No one, I think, could honestly object to or oppose the work if he should thoroughly inform himself of the facts. We, of course, often differ as to methods in the old-time

churches. But the method is of secondary importance in the new movement. I am very glad that the subject is to be discussed in THE QUARTERLY, and am sure that, after reading over some of the papers which I send, you will give us fair and intelligent criticism. Such criticism is what we desire, as it is, of course, our aim, as it is the aim of others who may differ from us, to get the right thing. Man merely experiments in a large field, and by our mistakes some one will be the wiser, and the church eventually the stronger."

Dr. Scudder, of the Tabernacle, People's Palace, Jersey City, has kindly responded by sending us a number of pamphlets and posters giving most satisfactory information. We shall make as liberal use of this matter as the limits of this article will permit. To this first-hand information we would add, because peculiarly interesting to the writer, some facts furnished by Dr. Field, in *The Evangelist*, concerning "City Park Branch of First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn."

We make a passing comment on each, in the order named, before criticising some principles, apparently in differing degrees, pervading them all.

St. Bartholomews has a church building and a parish house, both pictured on the covers of the Year-Book, under separate roofs, and apparently in different localities. The first pleases the eye, for it is at once recognized as "a house of prayer." This the tall spire, dominating the vicinity, proclaims, although it must be admitted that modern architecture is a trifle confusing, some buildings suggesting the conundrum, To what *genus* do they belong? churches being mistaken for banks, and courthouses for churches. A devout Catholic woman, for example, climbed the steps of our courthouse and parish prison (under one roof), with its spire and clock, devoutly crossing herself, and kneeling for her *Pater Noster* or *Ave Maria* before discovering her mistake. But to return: the parish house, the separate centre of the humane activities of St. Bartholomew's, seems only a private residence of somewhat imposing appearance. The Berkley Temple consolidates its religious and secular departments under one roof. "But admirably as the edifice is planned" (one only), "having in all twenty-one rooms," etc. The church of the Tabernacle in their erections appear to have confounded the secular and the sacred, or perhaps its advocates would say, have merged, harmonized, and unified the two, possessing a group of buildings. "In addition to the Tabernacle, which the church allows us to use as a public hall for lectures and entertainments, we have four buildings, which communicate freely

one with another, and are put to a variety of uses." The newspaper cut of City Park Chapel, were it not for a large cathedral window and a small cross at the apex of the roof, with its triple rows of windows, its turret, and what might be mistaken for a flag-staff, and its chimney-stacks, would, with the uninitiated, pass for a modern hostelry providing entertainment for man, if not for beast.

Now, without entering minutely into particulars, or instituting a comparison which might prove invidious, we note that soul-saving, in the biblical sense of the term, is one department of institutional church corporate work, but only one. To this is added a multiplicity of secular departments having to do with the body largely, or with the earthly conditions of "spirit, soul, and body." We quote from the account of one of them, and all are upon the same general plan, and, as we shall directly see, on the same principle, and seeking mainly the same ends by similar means. "For those who are intellectually inclined, we have a library and reading-room, together with facilities for debating societies, literary associations, Chautauqua circles, and university extensions; for lovers of athletics and amusement, we have two gymnasiums with senior and junior departments, hot and cold-water baths, swimming-tank, outside grounds for tennis and other sports, and an amusement-hall supplying a variety of healthful and innocent games; for musicians, we provide an orchestra, pianos, a brass band, and instruction in singing for both old and young; boys receive a thorough military drill, and lessons upon the fife and drum; girls are taught sewing, cooking, housekeeping, and dress-making; instruction in typewriting is given. A day-nursery accommodates poor women who are obliged to work, and do not know what to do with their little ones, and a kindergarten cares for neglected children too young to go to the public schools. A clothieri supplies partly-worn apparel to the worthy poor."

We observe, again, that there is mention of "rectors" and "pastors," Sunday services and choirs, prayer-meetings among church people and "the submerged tenth," church and mission Sunday-schools. This department is presided over by a staff of clergymen, one church having six ministers; but instead of the usual ecclesiastical terminology describing the governing bodies in these churches held to be an improvement on the old, we read of "boards of managers" and "presidents" of the same!

Again, we note that in this complex organization the soul-saving—we use the term in no invidious, but entirely in a serious, sense—de-

partment occupies larger or smaller space, and is given greater or less prominence according to the church. Doubtless where the spiritual life is low and creed at a discount, as in "The Militant Church," it is sunk altogether into mere humanitarianism; but in the churches named it is not lost sight of; is, in fact, claimed by some as the higher and ultimate aim of all the secular departments; the converted constitute the senior class to which all others and lower are preparatory! Once more, before advancing to criticism, we cannot better state the mother-idea of the institutional church than in the perspicuous words of its most prominent leaders. Says one: "All we are trying to do is to apply Christianity in a practical way to the life that now is." Another: "Thus the open or institutional church aims to save all men, and all of the man, and by all means."

"While the open or institutional church is known by its spirit of ministration, rather than by any specific methods of expressing that spirit, it stands for open church doors, every day and all the day, free seats, a plurality of Christian workers, the personal activity of all church members, a ministry to all the community through educational, reformatory and philanthropical channels, to the end that men may be won to Christ and his service." Had time permitted larger inquiry, we should like to have fully investigated the history of the "institutional church" and its probable connection with the marked religious movement in England, initiated and represented by such thinkers as Coleridge, Maurice, Kingsley, and Robertson. According to Principal Tulloch, of Scotland, these writers belong to one school, however in minor points they may differ; and in the general order named, transmitted more or less moulding influence to each other. American religious thought in the last fifty years has, perhaps, been influenced by English writers next to German. Now, whether the historical connection of the institutional church with the "broad-church" movement is distinctly traceable or not, there seems to be such an affinity of ideas as to suggest kinship, perhaps descent. Take, for instance, Coleridge's definition of religion, and we are reminded of the central idea of the modern invention: "Religion," he says, "was designed to improve the nature and faculties of man in order to the right governing of his actions, to the securing the peace and progress, external and internal, of individuals and communities." "Again, hear Robertson," says Tulloch. "His aim was to see every subject in the light of the gospel, to show how Christ had grasped the problems of thought and of society at their root, and given forth fertile principles

applying to all time." We might have imagined we were reading some of the institutional literature sent us: fertile principles cultivated and trained by uninspired men into practices and methods, changing with the kaleidoscopic movements of each age! Again, creeds, according to him, never speak last words: "The time might come when they would cease to be adequate; the solution that was fitting to one age might be unfitting to another." But passing from these natural and plausible speculations as to theological origins, and taking the institutional church as a finished product (as complete as anything professedly "growing" can be) and fearlessly challenging criticism, and its implied rebuke of Christendom for its obsolete and effete church methods compelling it, we shall now, without any great expansion, state our objection in the way of suggestion rather than of elaboration.

1. It strikes us that in the institutional church pastoral influence is dissipated, if not wholly lost. The church and congregation have not one shepherd, but many; two in two examined, six in one. It does not mend matters, that one is chief of staff. Lord Chatham once said in one of his splendid parliamentary orations, "Mr. Speaker, confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom"; it is in all adult bosoms. Yet this confidence, the result of personal contact with a minister in life's joys and sorrows and religious experiences, finding him everywhere trustworthy, loving, wise, and sympathizing, is at the root of the wonderful personal influence built up along an individual pastorate over a single church. We are aware that collegiate pastorates are common in one branch of the church. How well it works we do not know; our own observation of it in a limited field is not encouraging. Co-pastors too often create parties in a church; but this is our point—where two or six ministers are in charge of one flock, one of the most potent factors in the upbuilding of Christian character, the personal influence of a good man in constant touch with all his people in all things, is sacrificed.

2. The multiplicity of secular departments, carried on under the presidency of the staff of clergymen, must turn them aside from the duties of their special calling.

The office of the deacon, as related in Acts vi., was specially created, that the apostles might, as thus relieved even of the congenial duty of ministering to the necessities of the poor saints, give themselves exclusively "to prayer and the ministry of the word." How these ministers, even by division of labor, can give time and

thought to all these secularities and find leisure and spirit for the duties of the office to which God has called them, and to which they were ordained; how, in a word, they can be faithful shepherds to immortal souls on the swift passage to their eternal destinies, passes our comprehension. Dr. C. C. Jones, of Georgia, labored all his best years, by pen and lip, for the evangelization of the African slave. Receiving not one dollar of compensation for his self-sacrificing labor of love among the lowly, he was necessarily compelled to manage his own estate. The position of a Christian master, burdened with a sense of responsibility as he was, was no sinecure, but laid to his hand almost as numerous and varied cares as belong to an institutional church. He, with painstaking care, looked after the physical comfort and spiritual interests of his people; his life was, in fact, shortened by anxiety in a season of uncommon mortality among them, in which he, ministering to body and soul night and day, although an invalid, spared not himself. Now this Christian philanthropist once said with much feeling to the writer, "No minister ought ever to burden himself with the management of a plantation; the distractions are almost fatal to any right discharge of the gospel ministry." It cannot but seem strange how any one appointed to "prophecy between the living and the dead," passing with his congregation out of time into eternity, can allow himself to turn aside to even the general supervision of a gymnasium, or pawn-shop, or savings bank!

3. The methods of the institutional church are calculated to secularize the church itself, turning it aside from the obligation resting upon every Christian to be in his or her sphere a messenger of tidings to lost men. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature," is the order of the Captain of our salvation to every private as well as officer in the "sacramental host of God's elect." The worldiness of the church membership in the world all the week surely need not be intensified by organizing them as a church for more secular work. They will be but too apt to quiet conscience for neglect of spiritual work by the plea of church work of an easier kind.

4. Human nature being what it is, the secular departments of the institutional church are almost certain to overshadow the sacred. With the best intentions, and under the most cautious management, this will inevitably occur as a general rule. And for the reason that but imperfectly sanctified as the mass of church members are, they will take more kindly to the one class of activities because more congenial than the other. Church services may be thinly attended, but

church entertainments draw out the strength of the church and congregational membership.

5. The institutional church is not modeled on the New Testament church. This will not be claimed by its advocates. Indeed, one boldly takes the ground that so far from any form of church government being imperatively ordained, in the New Testament none is discoverable. "I do not believe that any particular ecclesiastical system has any substantial ground to stand upon in the Gospels, and very little, if any, in the writings of the apostles. These forms of organization (churches now existing) and government are man-made. They may have been divinely directed, as I believe all great movements of the race have been, and they have been useful for certain great ends; but the only reason for the existence of any form is to be found in the needs of the age which it serves, and its fitness to meet those needs, rather than in any authoritative formula emanating from Christ or his apostles."—(Rev. Charles A. Dickinson's sermon.) Closely akin to this is another view, perhaps identical with or a part of it, to use a term somewhat unsavory in some quarters, the church of each age is an evolution produced by innate tendencies, environment and survival of the fittest. "Our aim, as it is, of course, of those who differ from us, is to get the right thing. Man merely experiments in a large field, and by our mistakes some one will be the wiser and the church eventually the stronger."—(Letter of same.) "We simply went to work to help people in their struggles and difficulties, and one good thing led to another."—(Letter of Dr. Greer.) "As the work goes on it goes forward. It cannot go on without going forward. No good work can. It goes forward, however, upon the old lines, and if some things seem to be new, the newness which they exhibit is the newness of evolution and not of special creation. It is simply that kind of newness which results from growing, and which, as it grows, encounters new needs and emergencies, and provides new methods to meet them."—(Year Book of St. Bartholomew church.) We hardly know how to meet this idea of church organization, which swings away from all *jus divinum* claims and makes the organization of the Christian church as much unprovided for by its founder as the constitution of an institutional cricket club, and leaves the form of the divine society, his chosen instrument for the evangelization of the world, to the wisdom and caprice of devout but erring men of each generation. Man his own church-maker! Who will credit this?

Were we writing an essay on church government, as laid down in the New Testament, we would controvert these assumptions by the sure word of Scripture. But, to be brief, is it not probable that so important a matter would have been provided for in the forty days between the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, in which it is related he spake unto them concerning the kingdom of heaven, or that he would have given directions by his Spirit to the apostolical founders of his church? In any event, however denominations may differ in interpretation, all are agreed that some general scheme at least is outlined in the New Testament for Christians in all climes and ages. Certainly officers are mentioned and sacraments are ordained, their qualifications and duties prescribed, and the principle of the part appealing to the whole in disputed questions taught in the Jerusalem Council of apostles and elders of the mother Hebrew church, and delegates from the Gentile church of Antioch. Surely the omniscient Christ knew the peculiarities of every age, and if he has ordained any form of church government in his word it were to impugn his wisdom to attempt to improve upon his model! Where, too, do we have any intimation that, after the church had been finished by apostolical hands, each generation of Christians were at liberty to re-fashion it to suit the times and needs? Furthermore, human nature is in all important respects the same in all countries and centuries; men are born and die, sin and suffer, and need the same old gospel, and why should entirely different methods be needed to apply gospel remedies for the monotonous wickedness and woes of humanity.

6. But the final and most potent objection to the institutional church is that the very principle upon which it proceeds even in soul-saving is anti-scriptural; and in several vital respects. As a friend of ours, a strong thinker, observes, the institutional church puts the chief emphasis where Christ and the apostles do not put it; namely, on human misery, and not on human guilt. Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners primarily, not to alleviate human miseries; even his healing of diseases was in the character and office of a deliverer, from not only a sin but all sin's consequences. In this sense he not only "was wounded for our transgressions," but "carried our sorrows." Indeed, healing was meant to be proof of his divine mission. "The works which I have done in my father's name, they bear witness of me." "That ye may know the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins he said unto the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed and walk."

Again, there is in it a decided tendency to exalt body-salvation above soul-salvation, the temporal above the eternal. Other-worldliness may be a term of reproach of old-time preachings, but it has its justification in our Lord's great question in spiritual calculus, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" It also by the emphasizing of the visible and temporal discounts faith, the grand principle of Christian living, "The evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for," which deals not with the visible but the invisible, not with the temporal but with the eternal.

Finally, it reverses the gospel method of saving the sinner and society. This is from centre to circumference, that from circumference to centre. This saves the individual first, and through him betters the masses; that would better the masses in earthly conditions as the first step towards the spiritual salvation of the individual. Scripture salvation of the adult begins in the question so intensely personal and individual that it does not allow the entrance of so much as a thought of the wife of one's bosom, or the children of one's loins. "What shall *I* do to be saved?" But God's answer is wider than the question: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, *and thy house*" (family). Saved himself, consciously, from the curse and dominion of sin, the first instinct of the saved sinner is to save others—his own, as nearest and dearest, first; then all others within reach. The incoming of sanctifying grace makes the man better all round—a better man, husband, father, son, friend, citizen, toiler—and lifts all belonging to or dependent upon him to a higher plane. This is God's plan for bettering human conditions and improving the masses, as secondary to fitting men for immortality.

We would not be understood as being inimical to philanthropical enterprises founded and supported by Christians as such; but our contention is that the church, in her corporate capacity as a spiritual body and organized for specific ends, has no business with them.

In putting on record these criticisms we would not be understood as questioning the sincerity and Christianity of the advocates of the institutional church, or as denying their assertions of success. But we desire to lift our voice against this last specious plea, by no means confined to the subject under discussion. It seems to be taken for granted, if an institution does good, that it must be right, and that if our conception of Scripture teaching conflict with it, our exegesis must be reformed. Now, to cast the balance fairly between the good seem-

ingly accomplished by departing from Bible teachings as interpreted by principles of common sense, and the evil bound to be evolved in the long run, requires of us the prescience of the All-wise. It is altogether better and safer to go by the law and the testimony; that is, by their natural, unforced meaning. We especially commend these thoughts to our Southern Presbyterians.

"Lands intersected by a narrow frith
Abhor each other. Mountains interposed
Make enemies of nations who had else,
Like kindred dewdrops, mingled into one."

Only the imaginary Mason and Dixon line once divided North and South, but our peculiar institution constituted no "narrow frith," but "mountains interposed." The mountain barrier has been levelled by the stroke of revolution; intercommunication and intertraffic, and interchange of visits, and even of populations, are bringing about interfusion of ideas in politics and religion. Now, as, according to our information, the institutional idea is spreading in the upper sections of our one country and the germinating theological ideas in which it probably has its origin and justification, it may not be amiss to ask our own people to follow, in regard to all reforms in church methods hailing from a northern latitude and traversing our traditional conceptions and practices, the Scripture rule: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

New Orleans.

R. Q. MALLARD.

THE MEMPHIS ASSEMBLY.

The Assembly was aggressive from start to finish. The Presbyterian Church in the United States inherits a conservative temperament, dwells in a conservative section, breathes a conservative atmosphere, and is considered to be one of the most conservative ecclesiastical bodies in Christendom. The recent Assembly demonstrated that this pronounced conservatism does not prevent aggressive action along all the great lines of church effort.

The preceding Assembly at Dallas, Texas, had been characterized as "the declining Assembly," because of the negative answer which it gave to much of the business presented for its consideration. There was evident an apprehension that the Memphis Assembly would follow in the footsteps of its predecessor, and many thought one of the commissioners had sounded the key-note of the court for 1896, when, on the second morning, he prefaced a report with the story of an old

man who upon his decease was eulogized by the officiating minister with the remark, "Our departed friend had few virtues—and those mostly of a negative character." Perhaps the Assembly's virtues were "few." It cannot, however, be charged that these were "mostly of a negative character."

A convenient phrase with church courts that are anxious to shirk responsibility, or avoid vexed and difficult problems, is, "The time has not yet arrived." Granted that the measure proposed is important and desirable, but "the time has not yet arrived." Before this masterly stroke of ecclesiastical forensic every argument bites the dust. The writer does not recall a single advocate of masterly inactivity in the recent Assembly; not once when the silence of the body was broken by the pleading voice of a commissioner, stirred with the conviction that "the time had not yet arrived." There was action, positive, aggressive action, on nearly every subject considered. The Secretaries and their Executive Committees had no difficulty in getting all they asked for. One good brother, whose benevolent countenance and patriarchal beard remind one of the pictures of Abraham, fairly beamed with joy over the speedy method with which he was launched upon another year of service, chuckling with a deep contentment which announced that, at last, he had reached a place

"Where the wicked cease from troubling,
And the weary are at rest."

Instances of the positive and aggressive spirit of the Assembly may be found in the practical election of a Sunday-School Secretary after the Presbyteries had voted largely in the negative; in the adoption of a new and vastly improved form for Sunday-school reports; in endorsing the contract between the Assembly's Home and School and the city council of Fredericksburg, Va.; in the instruction given to the Permanent Committee on the Sabbath to arrange for a monster petition to Congress in behalf of better Sabbath observance; in refusing to sustain the Presbytery of Charleston in rejecting a candidate for the ministry because he was a negro; and in the instruction given to the Publication Committee in behalf of the Young People's Societies.

Memphis, the city where the Assembly was entertained, has a population of 75,000 people, and a hospitality that is "ferocious." It is a splendid city of imposing business blocks, handsome residences, fine churches, lovely drives, and genial people. Church life is active. Presbyterianism, with ten ministers, ten churches, and 2,155 communicants, is a dominant influence in the city's life. One of the

largest and best-managed Sunday-schools in the South is that of the First Methodist Church, whose superintendent, Mr. J. R. Pepper, is almost as well known and beloved by Presbyterians as by the people of his own denomination. This First Methodist Church and the First Presbyterian Church, in which the Assembly met, are separated by an alley; but the line which divides their Christian sympathies and mutual esteem is even less. The handsome class-rooms and all the church appointments of our Methodist friends were placed at the disposal of the Assembly, and contributed no little to the comfortable despatch of the work assigned to the various committees. The arrangements at the First Presbyterian Church were faultless. Post-office, telephone and telegraph accommodations, correspondence rooms, lobby, &c, were had on the first floor. Never was there pleasanter or more indefatigable host than the pastor, Dr. E. A. Ramsey, and the committee at his back.

Among the delightful courtesies shown the commissioners were excursions by the railroads and street-car lines, and an organ recital and reception by the Second Church. Dr. Woods, the affable pastor of the Second Church, and his good people, surrendered themselves and their magnificent church building to the Assembly on Tuesday evening, May 26th. The splendor and beauty of the edifice was a revelation, to many, of the triumph of church architecture; the welcome of the people the perfection of cordial church hospitality.

Another equally delightful occasion was the "welcome night" in the First Church. This was on the evening of the first day of the session, and consisted of several brief speeches with appropriate rejoinders. Here a dramatic incident occurred. Among the speakers were Rev. R. D. Smart, D. D., pastor of the First Methodist Church of Memphis, and Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D., the retiring Moderator. Both these gentlemen are alumni of Columbia Seminary, and were personal friends before either had decided to study for the ministry. They were on the programme, each without the knowledge of the other, Dr. Smart to speak on "Fellowship," and Dr. Hemphill to respond. In his remarks Dr. Smart went back to earlier days, and related how he had been instrumental in leading his Presbyterian brother, Dr. Hemphill, to give up the law and enter the gospel ministry. The response from Dr. Hemphill was an eloquent and glowing tribute to the saintly professors who had taught the two men that stood there gazing earnestly into each other's faces, and then had sent them out from the walls of the same theological school, the one to fill the most important

pulpits of Southern Methodism, and the other to occupy the Moderator's chair of our own beloved Zion.

Dr. Hemphill's sermon in opening the Assembly was on "The Love of the Holy Ghost," a theme most appropriate, and preached with great power. It sounded the key-note of the Assembly.

In the selection of Moderator there was a departure, ostensibly in the interests of spirituality. It was determined to pray for the guidance of the Holy Ghost and to ballot without nominations, as though the Holy Ghost could not inspire a nomination as well as a secret vote. The result of the first ballot showed, to adopt the phrase of the jovial stated clerk, that "nearly every man had voted for himself"; but, according to the terms of the original motion, all names were dropped save the two receiving the highest number of votes. Three, however, had received this, two tying. The second ballot gave us an election, and Rev. R. Q. Mallard, D. D., of the Presbytery of New Orleans, took up the gavel. Perhaps no better compliment could be paid to Dr. Mallard's moderatorship than to say that he closed the Assembly, having won the loving esteem of every commissioner. There are better parliamentarians than Dr. Mallard, men firmer in their rulings, and swifter in the dispatch of business; but a kindlier-hearted, more courteous, Christian gentleman never occupied the Moderator's chair. His impromptu speeches were strikingly happy, and his rejoinders always graceful.

The Assembly was conspicuous for the presence of a large number of able and intelligent ruling elders, who took a prominent part in the discussions, and were influential to a marked degree in shaping the decisions of the court.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures were literally submerged by a tide of overtures; but, like cork, they bobbed up serenely, and, if I remember correctly, all of their reports went through without so much as the scratch of a pen, albeit they frequently provoked the hottest debate.

Some of the important measures adopted by the Assembly on the recommendation of this committee were the following: the *endorsement* of the "Peace" overture from Knoxville Presbytery; *provision* for annual reports from the churches of the work of Westminster Leagues, or Young People's Societies; an *opinion* that "it is competent for a Presbytery to choose as its commissioner to the General Assembly any ruling elder under its jurisdiction"; *instruction* to the stated clerk to make out a complete schedule of the collections ordered

by the Assembly, the time at which they are to be taken, the address of the treasurers to whom they are to be sent, and to publish the schedule each year in the Appendix to the *Minutes of the General Assembly*; an *opinion* that it is constitutional and regular that a session should be moderated by another than a minister, the church having a pastor who is at the time absent; an *opinion* that the provision of our *Book of Church Order* referring to extraordinary cases applies to ordination as well as to licensure; an *opinion* that a pastor can be installed only by a Presbytery, or by a commission of the Presbytery; an *opinion* that one elder does not constitute a session, and that the pastor, where there are no elders, does not constitute a session; an *opinion* that the charge of the temporal affairs of the church does not inhere in the office of the deacon, but may be committed to the deacons by the session.

Two judicial cases claimed the attention of the General Assembly.

The first came upon a complaint from Mr. J. A. Enslow, a ruling elder of Westminster Church, Charleston, S. C., against the action of the Synod of South Carolina for excepting to the minutes of Charleston Presbytery in refusing to receive Reuben James, a colored man, as a candidate for the gospel ministry. The only objection the Charleston Presbytery had to the candidate was his color. It was admitted on all sides that, had Reuben's skin been white instead of black, the case would never have come before the Assembly. The discussion was prolonged, impassioned, but never bitter. A technical point raised was as to whether the power of the church was autocratic or administrative. But the Assembly refused to be led into a metaphysical fog-bank, or to be befuddled by hair-splitting technicalities in the presence of the great principle involved. By a vote of 119 to 18 (nine voting to sustain in part) the Assembly declined to sustain Mr. Enslow's complaint; and decided that a man must not be shut out of the ministry of the Southern Presbyterian Church because he is a negro.

This action must not be interpreted as favoring amalgamation of any kind between whites and blacks. It is, however, an emphatic endorsement of our work for the negroes, and of our determination to take care of them within our own church lines until they become strong enough to be set off into ecclesiastical bodies of their own.

The other judicial case was on the complaint of Dr. E. M. Richardson and others against the Synod of Memphis. The point involved was as to whether the proceedings of a commission could be annulled or amended by the court appointing it, or whether it was a coördinate

court, reviewable only by the next higher court to that appointing. It was announced in the outset that this was merely "a friendly suit," entered for the purpose of securing an interpretation of the *Book of Church Order* on commissions. The case, however, turned the Assembly into a debating society, and ere the discussion closed one was reminded of Dr. Brown's story of the countryman, who, being asked to account for the gravity of his dog, replied: "Oh, sir! life is full of sairiousness to him—he can just never get enuech o' fechtin." The discussion was very grave, even to belligerency, of a strictly orthodox and ecclesiastical variety, no one being hurt, and all contestants coming together with a good-natured "howdy-do" at the close. By a vote of 75 to 19 the Assembly decided that the Presbytery has power to review and reverse the finding of a commission. The reasoning on which this decision is based may be stated in a syllogism, as follows:

The right of one court to review another presupposes the superiority of the court reviewing over the court reviewed. (Cf. *Book of Church Order*, Chap. XIII., Par. 1.) The Presbytery has the right to review a commission. (Cf. *Book of Church Order*, Chap. V., Sec. VII., Par. 1.) Therefore, the commission is not a coördinate, but an inferior court to the Presbytery.

As to what is meant by the "review" of an inferior by a superior court, the *Book* is plain, stating four kinds of review, at least three of which would seem to vindicate the Assembly's verdict. (Cf. *Book of Church Order*, Chap. XIII., Sect. I., Par. 2.)

The cause of Home Missions was given an evening, during which a number of short, pointed talks were made by specialists. A full-blooded Indian elder, Mr. Silas Bacon, and the Rev. Mr. Gibbons, told of the work in the Indian Territory. Rev. J. H. Zivley and Rev. S. J. McMurray described the work in Texas, dwelling especially on the need of Christian effort among the 80,000 to 100,000 Mexicans in Texas, who seem much more open to the gospel than their fellow-countrymen living on Mexican soil. The story of the church in Florida, where in twelve years our membership has increased 176 per cent., was told by Mr. F. W. Merrin. The Assembly asks the churches to contribute \$50,000 for this work during the current year.

No work came up to the Assembly in better shape than that presented in the annual report of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions. The past year has been one of evident blessing and decided progress. Instead of reporting a heavy debt, as is the case

with nearly all the other great foreign mission boards and committees, our committee closed the year with a balance in the treasury. The receipts were \$142,000, being an increase of \$10,000 over the previous year. Nineteen new missionaries have been sent out, and the cost of administering the office has been proportionately less than during any year in the entire history of the church. Among the many important recommendations adopted by the Assembly in behalf of this work, the following is of especial interest and importance:

“It is resolved by the Assembly that the Executive Committee be directed to withdraw the offer heretofore made of part of our property at Campinas to the Synod of Brazil, for the purposes of a theological seminary; and that the Executive Committee be instructed to consider the propriety of discontinuing, and are hereby authorized to discontinue, if it seem best to them, the professorship now maintained by us in the Theological Seminary of the Synod of Brazil, now located at Sao Paulo, until the need for such an institution shall become more apparent than at present, and until the question as to its permanent location shall be decided by the native church.”

Dr. E. M. Richardson, the faithful Secretary of Education, and his committee at Memphis, still survive, despite the overtures praying that their work be transferred to the Publication Committee at Richmond, Va. The expenses of this office have been reduced to a minimum, amounting to only \$1,300 per annum, outside of expenses for travelling, printing, and postage. The contributions to Education for the past year were \$17,547.

In connection with the Publication work, the question of locating book depositories in the leading Southern cities came up. This is an old question, possessing wonderful longevity. It has been before every Assembly for the last dozen years, and yet its vigor is unimpaired and its natural force unabated. It threatens to be, in one respect at least, like the order of Melchizedek, “having neither beginning of days nor end of life.” The opinion was ventured by one of the speakers that the real trouble was the location of the publication house so far from the centre of the church’s territory. Locate it at some central point, such as Nashville, or Atlanta, easy of access to the entire church, and the cry for depositories will cease. To this the Secretary replied that perhaps 90 per cent. in number, not in value, of all orders sent out, went by mail, and therefore the question of location was of small importance. To a thoughtful mind, however, the inquiry would be raised as to whether the explanation of this

very small proportion of orders sent by express may not be found in the unfortunate location of the Publication House. Locate it centrally, and might not the number of "express orders" jump up to the number of orders mailed? The Assembly gave the answer of former years to the petition, viz., that it is not practicable at present.

Nothing in connection with the Publication work is more important than the action taken with regard to a Sunday School Secretary. The report adopted is as follows:

"Your committee, to whom was referred the matter of a 'Sunday School Secretary,' and the report of the *ad interim* committee appointed 'to prepare a series of graded lessons for use in our Sabbath-schools, which shall be supplemental to the International Lessons, and which shall develop more fully our denominational doctrines and principles of government,' would respectfully report:

"1. That we have examined the answers of the Presbyteries, as far as filed with us, and find that a majority of them have voted against having a Sunday School Secretary. Your committee would respectfully recommend:

"(1), That without setting aside or disturbing the International Lessons as used in our Sunday-schools, this General Assembly direct 'the *ad interim* committee,' appointed by the General Assembly at Dallas, to proceed at once to prepare a supplemental course of study for use in all the grades of our Sunday-schools, in which shall be developed more fully our denominational doctrines and principles of government, embracing the course of study outlined in their report.

"(2), That as soon as these lessons are prepared and issued, the Presbyteries encourage our young people in the study of said system of graded lessons, by giving a certificate to all who will finish this course and stand a satisfactory examination upon the same, and a diploma to those who complete a normal course, said diplomas and certificates to be given by the Presbyteries or church sessions as the former may prescribe.

"(3), That a home class department be established in connection with each Sabbath-school under our care.

"That in view of the importance of the Sunday-school as an agency in building up our church, the Committee of Publication be directed to give special attention to a fuller and more satisfactory exposition of the lesson for primary classes, and to cheapen the cost, if possible.

"2. That the Committee of Publication be directed to employ a suitable man, who shall devote his whole time to the pushing and de-

velopment of the Sunday-school and colportage work, especially as a missionary agency."

In order to meet the additional expense which this entails, a "rally-day" was ordered, with a special collection.

The Publication Committee were also ordered to prepare for the use of the Young People's societies "a series of topics adapted to the teaching and propagation of Presbyterian faith and practice."

Dr. Phillips had Saturday night for the presentation of the colored work. Addresses were made by the Secretary, and also by Revs. I. C. Chandler and L. L. Wells, two colored ministers, the latter of whom was present as a commissioner from Ethel Presbytery. The effort is making by the Executive Committee of Colored Evangelization to purchase the Ferguson-Williams College at Abbeville, South Carolina. This institution has an enrollment of one hundred and fifty-two, of whom forty-eight are boarding pupils, and six are promising young men who desire to study for the gospel ministry. Of the seven thousand dollars needed for the purchase, two thousand dollars has been pledged by the Synod of South Carolina, and the committee was instructed to raise the rest.

The experimental farm at Tuskaloosa having reverted to the former owners through the redemption of the mortgage, request was made for a farm of fifty or one hundred acres and suitable buildings, where the negro students can earn a portion of their support. Before the Assembly closed there were two responses to this request, one offering one hundred acres of land near New Orleans, the other offering a similar tract near Selma, Alabama.

The effort to organize an independent colored church during the past year failed, and the Assembly decided that the work is not sufficiently advanced for this departure. At present there are four colored Presbyteries, two of which are independent. Outside of these Presbyteries there are thirty-six colored churches widely scattered. The Assembly determined to raise fifteen thousand dollars for this work during the present year.

The customary fraternal greetings were sent out to sister Assemblies in session at the same time. An effort was made to decrease the number of delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance from thirty-two to ten, on the ground of expense, but it failed. The delegates, however, were instructed to see if the expenses of the Alliance could not be pro-rated on a less burdensome basis.

The following plan of coöperation was adopted:

“The Boards and Committees of Home Missions, Church Erection, Freedmen’s Missions, and Sabbath-school Work of the American Churches in ‘The Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system,’ both in the United States and Canada, recognizing with gratitude to God their substantial unity both in faith and polity, do agree upon the following principles of action for their guidance in their work, namely:

“1. That in the work of all these Boards, as related to each other, the authority of the church courts is to be recognized as final.

“2. That there shall be no interference with churches, missions, or Sabbath-schools at present existing, unless by voluntary agreement between the denominations directly concerned.

“3. That ordinarily no churches, missions, or Sabbath-schools shall be established in small communities where the field is fully occupied by other Presbyterian or Reformed Churches.

“4. That the supreme judicatories of the several churches recommend their church members, when moving into new communities in which there is no congregation of their own church, to unite for the time being with some other Presbyterian or Reformed Church, if such there be.

“5. That if cases of difference of opinion arise in connection with the work, they shall be referred for consideration and amicable adjustment to the missionary authorities of the denomination directly concerned.”

The matter which occasioned, perhaps, the hottest fight in the Assembly was on “a contract” between the Assembly’s Home and School and the city council of Fredericksburg, Virginia, by which the city voted the interest on ten thousand dollars’ worth of bonds to the school on condition that tuition in the Collegiate Institute be given each year to ten of the proficient pupils from the city’s public schools. The conditions were as follows: The Assembly’s Home and School consists of three departments—a Bible Training School, a Church Home, and a Collegiate Institute. The first two are religious and denominational; the last is not, enrolling pupils from Jews and Catholics as well as Protestants. It is in this last that the city’s pupils secure tuition. Desiring better educational facilities, not caring to go to the expense of establishing a high school, and anxious to increase the prosperity of the Assembly’s Home and School, because of the annual expenditure of a large sum of money which it brought to the town, the city council entered into this contract. Enabling acts, both for the

school, which is an institution chartered by the State, and for the city council, were passed by the Legislature of Virginia. The contract gives neither any control over the other.

Those who opposed countenancing this contract held that it squinted toward the union of church and state, and that, whatever might be the various departments of the institution, the fact was that the entire school, in the end, was benefited by "the trade," and the practical effect was for the state to aid a sectarian enterprise. It was claimed that, if Roman Catholics instead of Protestants were the beneficiaries, there would be no hesitation in condemning it.

The other side admitted that the contract was advantageous to the institution, else it would never have become a party to it, but claimed that it was advantageous only because additional pupils were thus secured, in return for whose tuition-fees a *quid pro quo*, in the form of instruction, was given. It was shown that, if the doctrine of our church as to the separation of church and state was transgressed by this contract, it would be impossible for the church to sell the city a piece of ground, or to enter into any sort of compact which was mutually advantageous, without transgressing said doctrine. If this contract was to be annulled, the church must refuse to allow its property to be exempt from taxation. With regard to government aid for Catholic schools, it was claimed that the cases were in no sense parallel, inasmuch as the Catholic schools give sectarian instruction, and are established for the purpose of religious propagandism. After a full and free discussion of all that "the contract" involved, the Assembly, by a vote of 93 to 45, adopted the following:

"The committee to which was referred the overture from the Presbytery of St. Louis, praying that a certain contract between the mayor and commonalty of Fredericksburg, Va., on the one hand, and the Assembly's Home and School on the other, be annulled or readjusted, would report as follows:

"The Assembly would reaffirm the time-honored traditions and cardinal doctrine of our church, setting forth the teachings of sacred Scripture concerning the absolute separation of church and state.

"It would record its protest against any sort of compact between these two institutions by which either would gain control over the other.

"It would also express its emphatic disapproval of the use of the public state funds for purposes of sectarian education, religious propagandism, or in any such manner as to foster civil interference or ecclesiastical aggressiveness.

“At the same time the Assembly is constrained to answer the overture in the negative, and for the following reasons:

“1. It does not appear from ‘the contract’ that the \$10,000 in question is a gift. It is distinctly declared to be in payment for the tuition of ten students which the city may elect to send to the Collegiate Institute.

“2. It is not a violation of ‘fundamental civil law,’ as appears from the fact that the Legislature of Virginia has passed a special bill authorizing the compact here under discussion.

“3. It is not the ‘repudiation of a distinctive’ principle of our church, unless such distinctive principle denies to the church the right of contracting with the civil authorities, under any and all circumstances, when a *quid pro quo* is given and received.

“4. It does not commit the church to secular education in any sense other than that which obtained before said contract was made.”

A protest, signed by a large number of those voting in the minority, was admitted. In answer to this protest, the Assembly deemed it sufficient to cite in full “the contract.”

A request came from the Synod of Texas, asking that the Assembly encourage a monster petition to Congress and State Legislatures for laws to forbid the running of railroad trains on the Sabbath. On the introduction of this business, oratory became rampant. The eloquence of the Assembly, that had seemed to slumber, awoke, and “speechifying,” that swept from states’ rights to prohibition, electrified the body. One was reminded of the Fourth of July orator, who, about the time of the Mexican war, declared that this country was “bounded on the north by the Aurora Borealis, on the east by the rising sun, on the west by the horizon, and on the south by as far as you have a mind to go.” After this pyrotechnical display of rhetorical sky-rockets had spent itself, the Assembly came excitedly to a vote, and by a goodly majority instructed the Permanent Committee on the Sabbath to get up the petition. All were agreed as to the desirability of stopping railroad traffic on the Sabbath. The doubt was as to whether a petition would accomplish anything in this direction, and as to whether this is the method by which the Lord would have the church make conquest of the kingdom of darkness.

The following action with regard to celebrating the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the standards of the Presbyterian Church was taken:

“The General Assembly commends to the Presbyteries and Synods

the propriety of observing the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Westminster symbols of doctrine, and that order be taken by this Assembly to celebrate this event in connection with the sessions of the General Assembly of 1897. To carry this order into effect, it is recommended that the Assembly appoint an *ad interim* committee to prepare a programme of commemorative exercises, and to select speakers for the occasion."

A committee, consisting of Rev. J. Henry Smith, D. D., Rev. F. R. Beattie, D. D., Rev. W. M. McPheeters, D. D., Rev. T. C. Johnson, D. D., Rev. W. A. Alexander, D. D., and Rev. Jno. A. Preston, D. D., was appointed to prepare a programme and select speakers.

The Bible cause was eloquently presented by Dr. McLean, one of the Secretaries of the American Bible Society. He stated that 890,000 copies of the Bible had been distributed during the past year in foreign countries. The need of increased offerings for this work is seen in the fact that the expenditures for last year were \$80,000 in excess of the receipts.

The Rev. John Grisanti, formerly a Romish priest, but now a Presbyterian minister, and pastor of the Italian church in Memphis, presented the greetings of the Evangelical Church of Italy. This is the last-born child of the Presbyterian household, having recently celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its existence. It now numbers twenty-nine churches, forty-two stations, eighteen ordained ministers, eight evangelists, one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine Sunday-school children, one thousand four hundred and fifty communicants, and a constituency of about five thousand. A number of the prominent men of Italy have been communicants of this church.

The reports from the Theological Seminaries showed sixty students at Union, sixty at Louisville, twenty-seven at Columbia, and thirty-three in the Divinity School of the Southwestern Presbyterian University.

At Union, Dr. Strickler has accepted the chair of Systematic Theology, and Mr. W. L. Lingle has been elected tutor in Hebrew and Greek.

At Louisville, the students are reported as active in city mission work. Lectures on the Sabbath-school will be a prominent feature in the next year's course.

At Columbia, Drs. Tadlock and Laws have been reëlected to their chairs, subject to the approval of the controlling synods.

At the Southwestern Presbyterian University, lectures on Home Mission work, by men prominent therein, has been an especial feature of the last year's course.

Rev. R. E. Steele, in an earnest speech, presented the work of the Seamen's Bethel. Under the patronage of the "American Seamen's Friend Society," the work is now being pushed in New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, Norfolk, and elsewhere.

I have said nothing of the mistakes of the Assembly. If one cared to do so he might find something to criticise. For instance, it was, to say the least, an unfortunate inadvertence that created the incongruity in one of the judicial cases, by which one and the self-same man sat as Chairman of the Judicial Committee, acted as counsel for the respondent, voted as a member of the court deciding, and, as judge, formulated the court's decision.

An ignorance of parliamentary law and of the *Book of Church Order*, on the part of some of the commissioners, sometimes retarded business, and occasionally precipitated parliamentary chaos. But these were not serious blemishes; besides, criticism is such a cheap accomplishment. Dr. Johnson has somewhere declared it to be "a study by which men grow important and formidable at very small expense; . . . and he whom nature has made weak, and idleness keeps ignorant, may yet support his vanity by the name of critic."

The Assembly will not be renowned for any startlingly great thing it did. It will, however, go down in the annals of the church as a court which grappled in a determined and courageous way with the not few intricate questions that came before it, and which approached all the great departments of church effort with the uplook and the outlook. It came to its adjournment without having once marred its deliberations with personal rancor. As the good Moderator offered the closing prayer, he seemed to lead us into the very and beatific presence of the Great Head of the church; and as the great tide of congregational song rose in the words of "Blest be the tie that binds," eyes grew moist, and hearts beat with gratitude for the sweet fellowship that lives under the blue banner of our Presbyterian faith.

Nashville, Tenn.

JAMES I. VANCE.

DR. W. H. GREEN'S JUBILEE.

From the very nature of the case, jubilee occasions are rare. And yet within the last quarter-century Princeton Seminary has had the unusual distinction of celebrating two of them. Each was a memora-

ble event. It was meet and proper that, in 1872, Princeton should pause in the regular routine of her work, throw open her doors, and say to her alumni and the friends of truth in general, Rejoice with me. A post may, though few do, stand in its place for fifty years, but to fill the post occupied by Dr. Charles Hodge, and to fill it as he filled it for fifty years, is an achievement as rare as it is difficult, and as honorable as it is rare. Princeton did well to make suitable recognition of the supreme honor God had put upon her in giving her such a man. She did well to place a crown upon the head of her great theologian, the foremost, in many respects, of his century, and worthy to rank with the foremost of any century.

Nor was it otherwise when, on May 5, 1896, she celebrated the jubilee of her equally distinguished scholar and exegete, Dr. Green.

William Henry Green was born at Groveville, in Burlington county, N. J., on the 27th of January, 1825. He entered the freshman class of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., at the early age of twelve, and, in 1840, when only fifteen, graduated. His bent in those days seemed rather towards mathematics than towards the languages. Indeed, in the course of his happy little after-dinner speech, Dr. Cattell said that, in his college days, young Green preferred a formal request to be excused from the study of the languages, on the ground that he had no aptitude for them. So little can we foresee the end from the beginning. For two years after graduating from Lafayette he filled the position of tutor in mathematics in that institution. He then entered Princeton Seminary, remained a year, and returned again to Lafayette, as professor of mathematics. This position he filled for only a year, when, returning to the Seminary, he completed his course there in 1846. In the class with which he graduated were a number of men who subsequently attained distinction, among them Drs. A. A. Hodge, T. L. Cuyler, and H. J. Van Dyke. Immediately upon his graduation, he was elected assistant teacher of Hebrew, which post he retained for three years. Resigning his place in the Seminary in 1849, he became pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Here he remained preaching and studying until 1851, when he was elected Professor of Biblical and Oriental Literature in Princeton Seminary, taking the place of Dr. J. A. Alexander, who had been transferred to the chair of Church History. From the day of his election to this important professorship, Dr. Green has been quietly and unconsciously to himself, but steadily and surely, preparing the way for the grand ovation given him on May 5th last. During all

these years he has been an indefatigable student, an impressive and inspiring teacher, and a fertile and vigorous writer. His scholarship is broad, thorough, and accurate; his judgment well-balanced and sound; his style clear, calm, and convincing; hence his work is likely to stand the test of time. It is not, however, the purpose of this note to enter upon any review of Dr. Green's career, or to attempt any estimate of his work. I pass on, therefore, at once to May 5th.

I shall not attempt anything like a detailed account of the events of the occasion. Let it suffice to say, in general, that the day was auspicious. The skies, except during a brief and pleasant shower, were clear; the air was cool. The town of Princeton herself seemed to have donned her loveliest dress in honor of her distinguished son. The usual closing exercises of the Seminary were held in the chapel; and it was at once a solemn and inspiring sight to see seventy young graduates in divinity receive their diplomas.

These exercises over, a procession was formed, which promptly moved to Alexander Hall, on the grounds of Princeton College—soon and properly to change its name to Princeton University. Alexander Hall is a magnificent structure, costing, it was said, the enormous sum of \$350,000. It may not be amiss to express surprise and regret that in constructing this beautiful and imposing auditorium so little attention, apparently, was bestowed upon the comfort of the auditors. Beautiful architecture in such a building but poorly compensates for bad acoustics. The representatives of the Seminary and of the College, the invited guests, and those invited to deliver addresses—all together constituting quite a concourse—were conducted into the hall under the guidance of a marshal, and were there comfortably seated upon an elevated platform. In the centre, and toward the front of this platform stands a unique chair of state, or, rather, throne, of costly stone. This was occupied by Dr. Abraham Gosman, President of the Board of Directors of the Seminary, who presided over the exercises of the occasion.

Conspicuous among the distinguished personages who sat to the right of Dr. Gosman were Drs. Booth and Osgood, the former the Moderator of the Northern General Assembly of 1895; the latter well known as a member of the American division of the Committee of Revisers of the Old Testament, and a professor in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Rochester, New York. Equally conspicuous upon the left were Drs. F. L. Patton, of Princeton College, and C. M. Mead, of Harvard Seminary. But, unquestionably, the central and most ob-

served of all the figures upon the platform was that of Dr. Green himself. When he entered and took his seat to the right of Dr. Gosman the whole assembly rose to their feet as one man, and gave expression to their profound regard in prolonged applause. When quiet was at last secured the jubilee exercises proper began.

These, omitting the purely devotional features, fell under three heads, namely, addresses relative to Dr. Green's contributions to scholarship and services to the Seminary and the church; congratulatory addresses; and after-dinner speeches or toasts. Without attempting to go into particulars, it will be proper and useful to note a few points, especially in connection with the more formal and elaborate opening addresses. These, more than anything else, revealed the real nature and importance of the occasion. The subjects chosen for these addresses, the persons chosen to treat these subjects, and the manner in which they were treated, all combined to show that the occasion was designed to honor not merely Dr. Green the man, Dr. Green the scholar, Dr. Green the professor, but Dr. Green the representative and defender of certain well-defined and vitally-important views in regard to the word of God. It was not without significance that immediately after the opening address came Dr. Mead's discussion of Dr. Green's contribution to biblical criticism. By giving this theme not only a place, but the first place, in the programme, the committee who arranged the programme emphasized not merely the value of Dr. Green's contributions to biblical criticism, but their gratification at, and approval of, the position he had taken, and their sense of its supreme importance at this time. Dr. Mead treated his theme at once with vigor and much discrimination. The next address was by Dr. McCurdy, professor in Toronto University, and now widely and favorably known as the author of *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*. He spoke of Dr. Green's contributions to Shemitic scholarship. I cannot pass on without noticing and emphasizing at least one point in this felicitous address. Dr. McCurdy, among other deserved tributes which he paid to Dr. Green, laid special stress upon his minute and thorough acquaintance with his chosen field of investigation. And is not this, after all, the real test of scholarship in any department? One's range may not be wide, but, if he has *mastered the material* falling within that range, he is so far a scholar. It does not necessarily follow, however, as many vainly imagine, that this mastery of the material in a given sphere qualifies one to gather up in sound generalizations the lessons of the phenomena which, in detail, he has

passed under review. But this detailed acquaintance with and mastery of the material is certainly a *sine qua non* to valid generalizations. Scholars frequently arrogate to themselves the functions of judge and jury in the questions that emerge in connection with their investigations. This is, unquestionably, assuming too much. Surely it ought to be enough for them, both in the way of honor and responsibility, that they are the only competent witnesses in these cases, and that their first-hand, exhaustive knowledge of the facts involved is indispensable to a wise or righteous decision.

It will not, I trust, be regarded as invidious to say that Dr. Patton's was, in some respects, the crowning address of the occasion. It was listened to with the greatest attention, and elicited repeated tokens of appreciation and approval. Dr. Patton is evidently, and justly, something of an idol with the constituency of Princeton. As a tribute to his worth, his ability, and his present and prospective influence, President Patton's address must have been peculiarly gratifying to Dr. Green. Among others, two remarks that he made impressed themselves specially upon the mind of the writer. He said—and how truly!—that just at this time the church has no greater need than that of a body of competent *scholars*. This is a conviction which has been rooting itself more and more firmly in the writer's own mind for a number of years past. It is certain, however, that this body of scholars will not be forthcoming unless the church bestirs herself and uses the means to secure them. Suitable young men ought to have their attention directed specifically to this subject. They ought to be taught that they can serve God as truly and as effectively by devoting their lives to the study as by going into the pulpit. And then the church ought certainly to provide the scholarships and fellowships that would furnish them the necessary pecuniary basis for the continued prosecution of their selected lines of investigation. Scholarship and specialism may have their dangers, but these dangers are not to be compared to those of dense ignorance or superficial knowledge. There is the wealth among us to provide all the funds necessary for attaining this greatly-to-be-desired end. Let it be consecrated, and then let the church sound God's call to scholarship in the ears of many of her choicest sons.

The other remark which fell from President Patton and impressed the writer was to the effect that the seminary is not the place to *investigate*, but to *impart to others the body of truth held by that branch of the church to which the professor belongs*. There is, doubtless, a sense in which this is true. The writer, however, could not but regret

that Dr. Patton should even seem to lend countenance to the notion industriously fostered by designing persons, that those who teach in our seminaries are "counsel for creeds" in such sense that their sole business is to ascertain what the church believes, and to teach that. Doubtless President Patton would be as far as any one from intimating that theological professors have less need or less right than any other professors to be open-minded, active-minded seekers after truth.

As long as all creeds are but imperfect and defective expressions of the truth as set forth in the word of God, so long must there be both room and need for re-examination, renewed and more thorough investigation. Who is prepared to say that all the facts and phenomena of Scripture have been fully ascertained and properly classified by those who have preceded us? This is certainly not true in the sphere of text-criticism, of Old Testament and New Testament grammar, of grammatical and historical exegesis, or even of theology. Would it not be wiser to say that every theological professor is under peculiarly solemn obligations to be an original and thorough investigator, in order that he may be an effective teacher? The mere fact that renewed investigation is not likely to lead him to new and different conclusions is no valid reason for ceasing his search into and after truth. It seems to the writer that it cannot be too clearly understood, or too frequently and loudly proclaimed, that no scientist or other investigator, in whatsoever sphere, is freer, more fearless, more earnest and open-minded, or more absolutely untrammelled in his quest for truth, than is the theological professor. True, he ought not to be in his chair unless he has accepted the creed of the church that elects him to the position, and accepted it intelligently and *ex animo*. But surely such acceptance is not tantamount to a pledge to cease to think upon the manifold questions—many of them profoundly difficult, and not a few of them obscure and perplexing—which are involved in every creed. Such acceptance does not imply that one has canvassed, and, as far as he is capable of doing so, has finally settled all these questions. It certainly does not bind one to refrain from looking into questions not in the contemplation of those who framed the creed, and so not covered by its statements. The acceptance by an honest man of a given creed only means that, with such examination as he has been able to give the subject up to that time, he holds this creed to embody the teachings of Scripture on the points covered by it. It neither precludes further examination nor pre-determines the conclusions to which such examination shall lead. The fact is, that a

professor's teaching is likely to have weight in proportion as he produces the conviction on the minds of his students that his teachings are the result of thorough and fearless personal investigation.

While holding these views, the writer recognizes very clearly the fact that every theological professor is bound to confine his teaching strictly within the limits of his church's creed; nay, further, he recognizes the fact that no theological professor has a right to hold, as a kind of esoteric doctrine, views which he has reason to believe would be looked upon with distrust or disfavor if proclaimed to the church.

But I must desist. The question is too large for further discussion at present. President Patton's remark, which led to this digression, if only taken as he doubtless designed it should be, is certainly a just one. After Dr. Patton took his seat, Dr. Green rose and made a brief but appropriate and feeling acknowledgment of the high tributes that had been paid him. His appearance was the signal for another outburst of hearty and prolonged applause. The congratulatory addresses were in good taste, and characterized by a tone of hearty sincerity that must have made them fall gratefully upon the ear of the venerable scholar to whom they were addressed. The after-dinner speeches were, without exception, well conceived and well received.

The impression left by the exercises, as a whole, was not only decidedly pleasant, but will be both lasting and wholesome. In honoring Princeton's noble standard-bearer, we before all, and above all, honored the standard which he has borne so honorably and so well. This standard has on it the motto, "The Oracles of God—The Scriptures of Truth."

Columbia, S. C.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

VIII. AN EPISODE IN IMMERSIONIST HISTORY.

A singular state of things it is that has arisen in the Baptist Church of the South. That denomination possesses, in the loose manner of course necessarily involved in a body which is no more organically united than the Baptists, a theological seminary, in Louisville, Ky. The institution is widely known and deservedly respected and honored. Some of the ablest and noblest men of that faith, or of any faith, are there now, or have been promoted from its work to the presence of him whom they faithfully served. The names of Boyce and Broadus are household words with people of all denominational faiths. The

recent death of the last-named was a loss to all the churches. It is said that a larger number of young men attend this seminary than any other such institution in America. At the head of this seminary, as its president, stands Dr. Whitsitt, a man pre-eminent in the church, and greatly esteemed beyond the limits of his own denomination, because of his ability, scholarship, and fairness, yet withal as ardently devoted to the tenets of his own church and as loyal to her principles and practices as any man within her bounds.

In a recent contribution of a historical nature to *Johnson's Cyclo-pedia*, Dr. Whitsitt has declared that Roger Williams, whom we may almost regard as the "patron saint" of American Baptists, was not immersed at all, but sprinkled in baptism, and that it was not until the year 1641 that among the Baptists of England immersion was substituted in the place of sprinkling and pouring. In defence of his views, which we may well believe met with vigorous opposition, he has, in an article in the *Examiner*, stated that he made the discovery as to the original practice of the English Baptists as long ago as 1877, and that in subsequent years he carefully investigated and studied the matter, making original investigations in the British Museum and elsewhere, confirming the facts that he had already ascertained. For this candid statement of what, as a painstaking investigator and student and teacher of history, he finds to be the facts in the case, he is being soundly berated all over his church, and from many quarters an outcry has arisen against him; and meanwhile inquiry is made as to the relation of the seminary in which he teaches to the Convention of his church, the evident purpose of which is to see on the one hand how far the church is to be held responsible for his teachings, and on the other, what authority it may exercise to put Dr. Whitsitt out. The recent Convention at Chattanooga found that it could do nothing, and accordingly nothing has been done. The soreness, however, remains, more or less discussion continues, and the question is not yet done with.

This is a peculiar state of affairs. It is not a question of the soundness of historico-critical methods, or of the vagaries of "the historic spirit," which nowadays reads so many things into the remote past or reads so many things out of authentic records, but simply a question as to whether a member of a denomination must be more loyal to his church's teachings as to a simple matter of somewhat recent history than to the actual facts of the case as he finds them and to the truth of history. It is simply a question as to whether the assertion of one's

views as to certain matters lying altogether outside the Scriptures, and relating to events occurring fifteen hundred years after the infallible word was written and the canon closed, is to be regarded as unsoundness in denominational faith. Must a man be repudiated as disloyal to his church who wishes to tell the truth? Must a trusted teacher be hounded down because he seems willing to admit the weakness of one line of argument which has been popular in his church as a means of supporting its theory; or should not a vote of thanks be offered him by all who love that church for pointing out to them the risk they ran in relying upon an argument which will not stand the test of close investigation?

To other denominations the outcry against Dr. Whitsitt places all who criticise him in an attitude at once ridiculous and dishonest. No sensible thinkers will condemn a man all around, who, while strenuously upholding his church's tenets, intimates that certain lines of argument are not as reliable as others. Our Baptist friends surely do not wish to cling to a line of proof which may give way at a critical moment, and they should praise the man who, while as loyal and intelligent as the best of them, shows, honestly and loyally, where they expose themselves needlessly to the attacks of their opponents. And the dishonesty appears in the usual form or mode of attack upon the professor. So far as we have seen or heard, the chief crime alleged to have been committed by him is, not that he has believed these facts which he has published, but that he has told them. He should have kept silence, or told them only in a whisper to his brethren. Would his fellow-believers have him conceal the facts, and especially when these facts do not lessen the strength of his and their arguments from other sources, but rather enhance the general respect for him as an honest debater and advocate? But, they claim, there was no need or occasion for him to say anything about them; that is, "Brethren, we see that the facts are against us. Let us just lie low and be quiet, and perhaps this will not be observed. It is true that we have relied upon our assertions of the facts of history, and have taught universally what we now find to be incorrect; but we will keep still, and let the heaven we that have put out do its work, and leave it to our opponents to find out the facts."

If it were a question involving Dr. Whitsitt's doctrinal soundness, even from the immersionists' standpoint, or the honesty of his methods, or the principles upon which he investigates or interprets history, the discussion in our sister denomination would be quite a different

thing. He is not a Toy, rejecting inspiration, or subjecting the word of God to human historical criticism; nor a Briggs, setting up other sources of authority; but simply a historian dealing with historic facts of comparatively recent occurrence, and in no manner whatever affecting, even remotely, the interpretation of the Scriptures. His honesty and fairness commend him to all reasonable people. As it is a simple matter of history with which he deals, there is nothing in it to excite or arouse any except those who do not care to have the truth known, lest it harm them or deprive them of historical testimony upon which they relied. Even if the Baptists did not immerse until within the past two hundred years, the fact should not trouble them; on the contrary, they should rejoice that they are so much sounder in the faith and purer in practice than their progenitors. To those who oppose the immersionists the chief, and almost the only, result which can be seen as following the facts of history which Dr. Whitsitt has developed is the happy lessening which it will bring about of that arrogance which many of the more controversially inclined of our Baptist friends manifest, and with which they sometimes impress unthinking people, but which in nowise adds to the strength or permanency of their position. To all true reasoners, however, their position will be immeasurably strengthened when it is seen that they rely upon no flimsy, uncertain historical events or practices, but upon what they regard as a true interpretation of the word of God, for the maintenance of their views. The Louisville professor should have the sincere thanks of all his church.

VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEET'S NEW LIFE IN CHRIST.

THE NEW LIFE IN CHRIST. *By Joseph Agar Beet, D. D.* New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curts. 1895. Pp. 347. 8vo. \$1.50.

In a preceding volume, *Through Christ to God*, Dr. Beet set forth "the historical basis of the Christian faith and hope." In the volume under our pen he "delineates the goodly structure of the Christian life which rests securely on that foundation." *The New Life in Christ* is a study in personal and experimental religion.

The author has built directly out of the Scriptures. His work belongs to the class of so-called "biblical theologies." It is one of the very best of its kind.

He, in this task, proposed two distinct objects: (1), To make an exhibit of some of the most conspicuous facts in Christian life; and (2), to vindicate for theology its claim to be the science of religion.

In prosecuting these ends, the method has been strictly inductive and scientific. For his materials, he has gone directly to the original and infallible source—the Bible, but he has not, like an egotist, set out upon the assumption that all theological opinions and conclusions which have preceded him and his generation have been derived from some other source than the Bible, and are to be rejected upon the peril of being disloyal to truth and in slavery to baseless tradition.

The spirit of our author is delightful. He has a profound reverence for God's word. He endeavors to form his opinions within Scripture boundaries. There are no harsh polemical flings at his neighbors who think differently from him, but he is not maudlin and colorless. He has positive convictions. He states them boldly, but reverently. He defends them bravely, but not recklessly. The aroma of piety and devotion is very sweet. Perusal of this little volume will quicken and strengthen the Christian heart-beat.

But the book bears the imprint of scholarship as well as that of spiritual unction. Not a pretentious and reeking scholarship which parades itself in foot-notes and quotations, but a scholarliness which is like the dress of the gentleman—neat, but not gaudy. There is a style which draws attention from the man to his clothes. There is a class of books which draws attention to the reading and pretentious learning of their authors. Dr Beet's book is not like these. The ability is felt more than seen. A few encyclopædias and a few days in any modern library will enable an author to make his pages gleam with quotation marks and references. It has ceased to overwhelm the reader with the œcumenical knowledge of the writer. There is little here that is profound; but there is much that is happy in conception and in expression.

Dr. Beet is a Wesleyan—an evangelical Wesleyan. There is in the Armin-

ianism of to-day two decided tendencies—the one gendereth unto semi-pelagianism and the other to traditional evangelicalism. Dr. Miley, in his *Systematic Theology*, lately issued from the press of these same enterprising and accomplished publishers, swung far out to semi-pelagianism, which is semi-rationalism, adversely criticising the historic masters in Arminian theology for their needless concessions to Calvinism and for their bungling defences against it. Dr. Beet, as we interpret him, stands by the old positions of evangelical Wesleyanism.

The New Life in Christ is divided into five parts :

In Part I. the ruin into which the fall brought mankind is considered, and the conclusion is reached, that, apart from salvation by Christ, the present sinful state is one of "utter moral inability." This conclusion, derived from the Bible, is confirmed by the facts of human history. The need of salvation is thus shown to be imperative and absolute.

In Part II. the author considers "the gate" between a state of sin and a state of grace. The parts of this "gate" are repentance, faith, justification, adoption, regeneration. They arise in Christian life in the order in which they are here enumerated. Upon condition of (1), repentance (turning from self); and (2), faith (turning to Christ), God does three things for man : (1), Restores him to citizenship (justification); (2), reinstates him in sonship (adoption); and (3), changes, seminally, his character (regeneration). Man, it will be noticed, takes the initiative, doing two things first, when God follows with three things. "A cry from man to God becomes a cry from God to man." Man enters the gate by taking two steps, and God completes the entry by taking three steps for him.

In Part III. we are led along "the path of life entered at the narrow gate." This "path" is denominated "the Way of Holiness." It receives the most extended treatment at the hands of the author. Here he defines "holiness" for us. It is "devotion to God." Christian holiness in particular is "devotion to Christ." The strength by which the Christian journeys along this way from the gate of entry to the exit in glory is the grace of the Holy Spirit. The abiding condition upon which this grace is available is faith. Christ-likeness is the character-prize at the end of the way. Indwelling sin is a perpetual embarrassment. The moral law is the rule of conduct along the route. The external environment may be so used as to be either a help or a hinderance. No progress is made without effort and struggle. But as man first entered this gate and undertook this journey, so he can face about and go back and go out at this gate into an unregenerate world again, and be finally lost. To encourage and assist him to success, God has placed at the traveller's command such helps as the sacraments, the word, prayer, and the church.

Part IV. deals with "the divine and human in the Christian life." We have seen that it required both God and man to get through "the gate," and both God and man to pursue "the way" to its end. Here the author bravely contends for a divine purpose, "eternal," and which "could not have been prompted by any good outside of God." Every event in earthly history—creation, the fall, sin, redemption, entry at the "gate," and all the incidents on the journey along the way of holiness—is but a step in "the progressive realization of this purpose." Yet this purpose clearly recognizes and embraces within its scope the free will of man. Christian life is the result of a divine-human co-operation.

"The present universe and human life and history as we know them are the

transition from the eternal thought to the eternal realization. In that transition we are permitted and compelled to take part. What our part is to be depends entirely upon ourselves. And upon our part in the process now going on depends our place in the realization." (P. 283.)

Part V. is a study. The Christian life, as it has been traced, is now employed as a "source" concerning God. The precise idea developed is "the revelation of God in the new life in Christ." Upon the topics treated under this head, our author makes some interesting and instructive remarks. He closes with a tribute to the completeness and finality of the Christian religion, and with a prophecy of its ultimate and signal triumph.

After these cursory observations about this book and its author, there are a few points which we desire to signalize, and comment upon:

1. *The Purpose of God.* This topic tests the mettle of a theologian. Has he the candor to admit its existence? Has he the intellectual bravery to line up his thoughts by it? Has he the mental grasp to draw out that plan from the Scriptures in its details? Has he the daring to state and grapple with the problems which are created by it? Before "the decrees of God," theological cowards take to the bushes. Weaklings faint in their presence. The little-minded rant against Calvinism. Dr. Beet elicits our admiration. He repeatedly expresses his thoughts in vigorous language:

"Before the foundation of the world and before the earliest creation of matter, both the material universe and the kingdom of God in all their stages existed as definite thought in the mind of God. In other words, whatever, throughout the ages, God has done in the salvation of men and in building up the kingdom of God is an accomplishment of an eternal purpose." (P. 242.)

"God's purpose to save man could not have been prompted by any good outside God." (P. 243.)

"Notice here two elements in God's purpose of salvation, namely, a selection of the objects of salvation, and a marking out beforehand, or predestination, of the goal to which he has resolved to lead them." (P. 247.)

"All good in man is a work of God and an accomplishment of his eternal purpose." (P. 276.)

"Whatever God does in time is an accomplishment of a deliberate purpose in the mind of God before time began." (P. 279.)

Such quotations might be made by the page. The superficial or timid Arminian would leap to the frantic conclusion that they are disastrous concessions to Calvinism. But the thoughtful Arminian will rejoice in them. He will see that without them the system would be shamefully weak and evasive. He would see how they are consistent with evangelical Wesleyanism, and necessary to it to steer it clear of semi-pelagianism. The author states and contends for all that is necessary to differentiate Wesleyanism from Calvinism.

2. *The Doctrinal Issue.* Dr. Beet clearly perceives the one fundamental point in the debate between Calvinism and Wesleyanism from which all other differences are developed.

"Calvin taught, correctly and earnestly, that salvation, from the first good desire until victory over death, is entirely a work of God and an accomplishment of his eternal purpose; that we should never have begun to seek him if he had not first sought us; and that our seeking him was a result of his drawing us to

himself; that our faith is wrought in us by the word of God and by influences leading us to believe it; and that every victory over sin and self is God's gift to us and work in us." (P. 270.)

We imagine that the average Methodist would be terrified by these brave, true words. He would feel that the author had made an ignominious and irretrievable surrender. But Dr. Beet is wiser and calmer. He proceeds to enter the saving *caveat*.

"But from this correct teaching he incorrectly inferred that God brings to bear, in pursuance of an eternal purpose, upon some of those who hear the gospel and not on others, influences which invariably lead to repentance, faith, justification, and eternal salvation; and that the reason why these influences (without which, owing to the completeness of the fall, none are, or can be, saved) are not exerted upon some men while they are upon others, is entirely in God, and not at all in man." (P. 270.)

This abundantly saves his Wesleyanism. It is the very heart of evangelical Arminianism. Dr. Beet is not afraid to parallel the two systems, Calvinism and Wesleyanism, up to the point of the introduction of the sinner into "the eternal purpose of God." Calvin teaches that God carries the sinner through "the gate" into that purpose; Wesleyanism, that man himself walks through that "gate." Our author says: "Not only entrance into, but continuance in, the new life depends upon ourselves and upon our continued faith." (P. 205.) It is the old distinction between the Calvinist's efficient grace and the Arminian's sufficient grace.

3. *Holiness*. There are two distinct meanings of "sanctify" in the Scriptures: (a), to consecrate; (b), to purify. The first terminates upon an end, the second upon the heart or character. A church building is consecrated, sanctified, dedicated, devoted to God's worship; a Christian is not only consecrated, but his character is purified, made subjectively holy, sinless, and righteous. Dr. Beet uses the word as if it had the first meaning, and that one alone. Modern "sanctificationists" and "perfectionists" are making the same blunder. He, according to these errorists, is "entirely" sanctified who has devoted himself entirely to God's service. But we do not find Dr. Beet teaching even this species of "perfectionism." He insists that the new life is one of continual growth and expansion in its possibilities and duties.

The book tends to hold Calvinism and Wesleyanism closely together. God grant that they may ever be confederated against sin and error!

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

THELEMAN'S HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

AN AID TO THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM. *By Rev. Otto Theleman, Detmold, Germany.* Translated by Rev. M. Peters, A. M., B. D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Ursinus School of Theology. Reading, Pa.: James I. Good, D. D., Publisher. 1896. Pp. 512. 8vo.

The creeds of Christendom are neither infallible nor absolute statements of sacred truth. All the presumptions, however, are in their favor. They are the archives of the church's dogmatic thought. They are the bases of further progress. They are the guiding lines within which future thinking can be most

profitably conducted. They are the bonds of Christian fellowship. They are sacred landmarks for the people. Their removal or alteration is a change of corner-marks and boundary lines between neighbors. They embalm too much to be treated with disrespect. The modern protest against them, in some quarters, is insane. Neither the author of this volume, nor his translator, is guilty of this sacrilege. They handle the *Heidelberg Catechism* with hallowed respect. Their joint work is one of loyalty, ability, and love.

The symbols of faith of the Reformed Church have had the widest acceptance of all the evangelical statements. They have been towers of strength against tyrants, despots, radicals, latitudinarians, sensationalists, egotists, charlatans, "new lights," and the whole breed of one-sided and abnormal developments in both church and state. They are the bones of the evangelical church. When they are broken, martyrs and heroes will cease. The Calvinist who smites his creed digs the ribs of his own church and delivers a blow across the very backbone of orthodox and evangelical theology. Of these Reformed formularies, the *Heidelberg Catechism* has been to the German-speaking what the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* has been to the English-speaking people. Let the devotion of the church to both be deepened.

All hail to this commentary! It is faithful. It is edifying. It is a mine of gold.

It consists of two parts—an exposition and a history of the *Catechism*. The history is in the form of an appendix. But it is full and interesting as it traces the preparation, establishment, and subsequent career of this grand old formulary.

It was prepared in 1562 by Ursinus and Olevianus. Both were doctors of theology, spiritual in temper, and laboriously diligent in the cause of Christ. Zacharias Ursinus died at the age of forty-eight, and Caspar Olevianus at the age of fifty-one. Confederated with these, and the director of both, was Frederick, the elector of the Palatinate, a German State at that time including the territory on both banks of the Rhine. He was himself a theologian and a Christian. He died at the age of sixty-one. Together the three authors lived. Together they struggled and witnessed the successful establishment of their work. They were separated but a few years from each other in their deaths. The Reformed party, the world over, garlands their graves, blesses their names, and bows before their work. It was endorsed by the Synod of Dort. It is the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches of Germany, Holland, and all Teutonic Calvinists on the Continent, and of the German and Dutch Reformed Churches in America.

A few words may be added concerning the plan of the present commentary. The author follows the structure of the *Catechism*, treating, first, of Sin; second, of Deliverance; and third, of Thanksgiving. Each question and answer is given in full. Then follows an explanation of special words and expressions, a short statement of the contents of the answer, and an analysis of the text. The author's work is in the form of notes. The points are multitudinous. The statements are very condensed. The object was to present the substance of the doctrines and their foundations in Scripture. This end is kept faithfully in view. The work is enriched by quotations from Ursinus, Olevianus, Calvin, and other Reformed authorities.

The book belongs to the desk of the student and the instructor. It was not prepared to entertain the reading eye, but to stimulate the thinking mind. It

carries grist to the mill—somebody else must do the grinding. It is excellently good corn—the quality of the meal will depend upon the grinding.

As a fair exhibit of the whole book let us take the author's outline of Question 56, relating to forgiveness, as follows :

I. The Ground of Forgiveness.

1. No person can forgive his own or another person's sins.
2. All sins, even those against men, are committed against God.
3. The ground of forgiveness is the satisfaction of Christ.

II. The Measure of Forgiveness.

1. All sins are remitted to believers.
2. God forgives, not only actual sins, but the corrupt nature of believers.

III. The Nature of Forgiveness.

1. It does not undo a sinful deed.
2. It involves the imputation of Christ's righteousness.
3. God forgives and then forgets.

IV. The Benefits of Forgiveness.

1. Secures against condemnation.
2. All involved in repentance and faith.

After this manner the author analyzes the doctrinal contents of the answer to each question. He elaborates each head just far enough to give the reader the idea. He appends, invariably, one or four references to the Scripture to sustain the point. To a very small degree does he argue any point. The book is a commentary. It is an excellently good one. It is as sound as the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

R. A. WEBB.

MOORE'S COMMENTARY ON JUDGES.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON JUDGES. *By George Foot Moore, Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.* 8vo, pp. lii., 476. \$3.00 net. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895.

In this contribution of the advanced critical school to the literature of exegetical theology, interest naturally centres about the very complete Introduction, where the author's views and the general principles upon which he interprets the book are most fully set forth. Here he first discusses the title of the Book of Judges and the place it occupies in the sacred canon. An analysis of the contents follows, the general division being, that usually followed, namely: I. An Account of the Conquest of Canaan and Settlement of the Tribes; II. The History of Israel in the Days of the Judges; III. The two episodes of Micah and his idols with the Danite emigration and worship, and the incident at Gibeah which led to Benjamin's almost complete extermination. The history of the judges and the character and age of the book are next considered. Here Dr. Moore claims, rightly, that the purpose of the author of this book is not merely to interpret the history, and explain, upon religious principles, why such evils befell Israel in the days of the judges, but to impress upon his readers the lesson that unfaithfulness to Jehovah is always punished; that whenever Israel falls away from him, he withdraws his protection, and leaves it defenceless before its foes. He then claims that the author's purpose is, by historical examples, to warn his contemporaries

against a like apostasy, so that thus his purpose is not historical, but religious. From this, however, his inference that these lessons were specially called for, and uttered through the writing of this book, as late as the beginning of the sixth century, is hardly warrantable. The sins of Israel had long before this called for rebuke, and there had long before this arisen numerous prophets of the Lord, who were as fully imbued with the Spirit of God as was any unknown writer of the sixth century who caught his inspiration from the supposititious Deuteronomic school of this late age. In the exegesis and critical study of individual passages further on in his work, Professor Moore seeks to substantiate this theory, even to the extent of the book having been written some decades later than the beginning of the sixth century, by a study of the vocabulary and style of the book.

In the study of the sources of the book, our author accepts the theory of a "Deuteronomic" preface, and then attributes the material of chapters ii. to xvi. to an older collection of tales of Israelite heroes, which he is pleased to call "a pre-Deuteronomic Book of the Histories of the Judges." He devotes special attention to the question of whether this pre-Deuteronomic history contained other histories than those culled from it for our canonical Book of Judges. This Dr. Moore regards as a question of importance; and after some labored discussion, he concludes that this older book was of the seventh century B. C., perhaps of the times of Manasseh. The grave conclusion is then reached that by "the discovery of a pre-Deuteronomic collection" the question as to the sources of the later collection, our Book of Judges, is pushed back one step. So we must follow Dr. Moore as he analyzes his supposititious pre-Deuteronomist book, and plunges into the intricacies of its composite authorship. We would fain cry, "Give us a rest." The procession of writers seems endless, and we become bewildered in the effort to see how one of the original contributors to the supposed pre-Deuteronomist history is so much more ancient, and his writings of so much greater historical worth, than the rest! Dr. Moore's discovery of different *strata* in the book is as ingenious as his analysis of supposititious contributors. He traces these back into similar strata in the Pentateuch, coming out especially strong in the study of the story of Micah and the Danites. Of the account of the Benjamite episode he kindly tells us that the theory that it is entirely unhistorical, a huge theocratic fiction of very late origin, is a mistake; that "the basis of the narrative is a very old story, having an obvious affinity to the primary stratum in chapters xvii., xviii., . . . overlaid by a stratum akin to the latest additions to the priestly history in the Hexateuch and then to the Chronicles." "This post-exilic *rifacimento*," he tells us, "is clearly dependent upon the former version," that is, the critics' "pre-Deuteronomic history," and is so poor a reproduction, in conception and expression, that he must regard it as a product of the fourth century B. C. more probably than of the fifth.

The author's next section, dealing with the composition of the book, is based upon the critical analysis already described, and need not be further shown. His effort to solve the problem of the chronology of the book is better, and is well worth following.

Of the details of the commentary proper we will not speak, except to say that various apparent discrepancies can better be accounted for on simple theories than those of the critic, with his multiplicity of authorship and gaps of time in the writing. The whole work is characterized by a careful study and application which were worthy of a better end than that to which we think they have been

put; and in no work which we have examined of late is the method of making conjectures, and then dealing with them as though they were facts, more marked than in this volume.

SANDAY AND HEADLAM'S "ROMANS."

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY. A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. *By the Rev. William Sanday, D. D., LL. D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, B. D., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.* 8vo, pp. cxii., 450. \$3.00 net. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895.

For the simple exploitation of the higher criticism in its advanced form, the Epistle to the Romans naturally presents but little opportunity. That ingenious little brochure of Dr. Mead's, *Romans Dissected*, of a few years ago, derived all its satirical force from this fact. The authors of this commentary, therefore, preface the whole with the statement that they are not under any illusion as to the value of their contribution, and that the nearest approach to anything distinctive in their work here to which they would lay claim is in the distribution of the subject-matter and in the effort to make what might be called an historical interpretation. This last feature is justified by the scope of the series to which this commentary belongs, a fundamental idea with its projectors being the exclusion of dogmatics, as far as possible. The authors' special effort is to give an exposition of the epistle, which will show, as well as grow out of, "its true position in time and place; on the one hand in relation to contemporary Jewish thought, and on the other hand in relation to the growing body of Christian teaching."

The Introduction discusses the usual subjects, and, while recognizing certain difficulties in connection with the last chapter, maintains the integrity of the epistle. In the commentary, "dogmatics" could scarcely be avoided, in spite of the efforts of the authors. The interpretation will be found to be sound, and to agree with the usual Augustinian views and application of the apostle's writing. A peculiar feature is the paraphrasing of the several sections, as they are treated in such form as to bring out fully the apostle's meaning.

JUSSERAUD'S LITERARY HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

A LITERARY HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. *By J. J. Jusseraud.* Vol. I. From the Origins to the Renaissance. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

"Many histories have preceded this one," says the author in his preface; "and many others will come after," but "none exactly like this," we might add, "either in conception or in execution." Taine has given us a history of English literature, brilliant in plan and style, but misleading both as to facts and as to philosophy. Green has given us a history with so charming an admixture of literary criticism that lovers of literature could well wish that he had written the definitive history of English literature. Ten Brink's wonderful work, cut short at the Renaissance by the author's untimely end, will long be the scholar's *vade mecum* on this period of English literature. But even in Kennedy's excellent

translation it can never become a popular book, because the average reader cares very little for scholarly detail.

M. Jusseraud's book fills a niche as yet unoccupied, as far as we are aware. While avowedly a disciple of Taine (p. vi., Preface), the author resembles him chiefly in charm of style and luminousness of exposition. His conception of literature is juster than Taine's, founded as the latter's was upon a false and rather shallow philosophy. Further, M. Jesseraud's book is the outcome of painstaking and scholarly investigation of the latest authorities. It is conceived in the same spirit of accuracy that inspired Ten Brink, and executed with that marvelous sense of perspective and proportion which seems to be a special gift of French genius.

Further, it is distinctive in that it happily blends the salient features of the history and the literature without giving undue preponderance to either. It is not, therefore, a history with literature interwoven into it, such as Green's, nor a history of literature such as Taine's and Ten Brink's, but a literary history—a history written from the point of view of literature, and embodying only so much history as may throw immediate light upon the contemporary literature.

A brief outline of the plan of the book will enable us to understand this better. It is to consist of three volumes, each volume being "a complete whole in itself, the first telling the literary story of the English up to the Renaissance; the second up to the accession of King Pope, the last up to our day." So far, only the first has appeared, a handsomely-printed volume of 543 pages, including a very serviceable index.

This volume is divided into three books: The Origins (to 1066); The French Invasion (1066 to Chaucer); England to the English (from Chaucer to the Renaissance).

Nowhere, within so limited a compass, is the story of Anglo-Saxon literature invested with so much charm. We fear the average reader, deluded by the fascinations of the author's style, would be woefully disappointed if he were to dive into the dismal depths of our literature before the Norman Conquest. Valuable as it is from a linguistic and historical point of view, the few passages of literary charm in the extant poetry and prose would scarcely repay the literarian for the toil expended in the acquisition of a somewhat difficult language.

M. Jusseraud is especially interesting when he contrasts the Keltic and Teutonic elements that enter into the make-up of the English people. For a long time, under the leadership of the Freeman school, it was the fashion to ignore or minimize the Keltic element in English character. Now the tendency is rather in the other direction. In fact, Prof. Baynes, quoting Green and Matthew Arnold (*Art. Shakspeare, Ency. Brit.*, p. 740), attributes Shakspeare's wonderful flights of imagination to the fact that Stratford is near the border-line of England and Wales. So M. Sandras would leave to the English very little of Chaucer.

M. Jusseraud is very happy in his references to the Keltic influences in the formation of English character. "The people of Gaul," said Cato, "have two passions—to fight well and to talk cleverly. To this race's (Keltic) intelligence and curiosity is due, with all its advantages and drawbacks, the faculty of assimilation . . . manifested to the same extent by no other race in Europe." (P. 9.) But the Keltic vivacity and poetic color, observable even in the oldest Keltic literature (see p. 17), touched but slightly our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, who remained

in literature, as in life, "a people of isolated dwellings." The lightsome Epicureanism of the Kelt was equally repellent to the stern Teuton. "Mademoiselle," said La Mousse to the future Mme. de Grignan, too careful of her beautiful hands, "all that will decay." "Yes, but it is not decayed yet," answered Mademoiselle de Sévigné, summing up in a single word the philosophy of many French lives. (P. 57.) It was not, therefore, during the Anglo-Saxon period that any literary fusion of the races took place. They intermarried, but a more powerful fusing agent was needed. This came in 1066, through the Norman-French, Teutonic in descent, Keltic and Latin in civilization.

The fusion was slow. It accomplished nothing less than the coalescence of three literatures—English, Latin, and French. For nearly two centuries English suffered an eclipse. Apart from the fact that it was the tongue of a conquered people, the French and Latin literatures from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries were superior in volume and variety to the Anglo-Saxon literature. The main features of the mediæval Latin literatures and those of the Anglo-French are clearly set forth in Chapters II. and III. of Book II. In our limited space we can do nothing more than refer to these.

The temporary submergence of English literature was a blessing in disguise. The Anglo-Saxon genius lacked flexibility, variety, perspective. These and much else came from intimate contact with the Anglo-French for three centuries. When we reflect that the writings of Richard Rolle, of Hampole, the *Ancien Rire*, and the *Owl and Nightingale* are the only productions of any special literary merit, between the Norman conquest and Chaucer, the abundant literature of the fourteenth century is well-nigh phenomenal. A new life, a new language, a new nation, a new literature—all confront us in this great century—each the product of the slow evolution of forces which had been at work ever since the conquest.

"In nearly every respect, thus, the Englishman of to-day is formed and receives his chief features under the Angevin princes, Edward III. and Richard II., practical, adventurous, a lover of freedom, a great traveller, a wealthy merchant, an excellent sailor." (P. 266.)

"The new nation had its poet, Geoffrey Chaucer." At the close of his life, "Petrarch and Boccaccio were long since dead; France had no poet of renown; and Chaucer was, without comparison, the greatest poet of Europe." (P. 268.)

The author's chapter on Chaucer is interesting and appreciative, but adds nothing to our knowledge of the poet. The space devoted to *Troilus and Cressida* is excessive; but, after all, this is a matter of taste, and we hesitate, therefore, to condemn. "Toute discussion litteraire revient à ceci: j'ai plus de goût que vous."

Since Lowell called Gower the "undertaker of the mediæval legend," whose poems have all the "unnatural length and hateful gloss of a coffin," it has been difficult to think of Chaucer's friend with anything but impatience. M. Jusseraud deals very tenderly with him. He suffers by comparison with Chaucer. Whatever we may think of Gower, his contemporaries and immediate successors did not rate him low. Witness Shakspere's *Pericles*, and Caxton's reprint of *Confessio Amantis*.

The chapter on Langland is thoroughly admirable, and shows evidence of the profound study which our author had already made of *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. The treatment of Wiclif is jejune and unappreciative in comparison with

the enthusiastic and scholarly chapter on the "dreamer of the Malvern Hills." An interesting statement at the close of the account of Wiclif and his work deserves citation. After stating the well-known influence of the Wiclifite doctrines upon John Hus and his followers, the author adds: "But the doctrine [that is, of Wiclif and Hus] survived; it was adopted with modifications by the Taborites and the Moravian Brethren, and *borrowed from them by the Waldenses* [italics ours]; the same Moravian Brethren who, owing to equally singular vicissitudes, were to become an important factor in the English religious movement of the eighteenth century—the Wesleyan movement. In spite of differences in their doctrines, the Moravian Brethren and the Hussites stand as a connecting link between Wesley and Wiclif." These remarkable statements the author supports by citations from Poole's *Wiclif*, Loserth's *Hus and Wiclif*, and Wesley's *Journal*. If true, one of the cherished tenets of high-church Presbyterians—the antiquity of the Waldensian Church—must be surrendered.

The chapter on the drama is unsatisfactory. The introductory chapter to Pollard's *Miracle Plays* and Miss Bates's *Religious Drama* give more adequate, as well as more appreciative, views of this interesting subject.

With a few remarks on the close of the Middle Ages, which the author places at the year 1453, with the fall of Constantinople, Volume I comes to an end.

Many points of interest have, of course, been passed by without even a mere mention. Even the pseudo-Mandeville, now known to have been Jean de Bourgoigne, a physician, who died at Liège in 1372 (p. 407), has been omitted.

The temptation to note more points of interest is very great. The author is so thoroughly in love with his subject that he gives fresh zest even to time-worn topics. "What excuse can be found," he says in his preface, "when so many have written, and so well, too? . . . I might, perhaps, allege a variety of reasons, but the true one is, . . . I did this because I could not help it, I loved it so."

Naturally, therefore, the style is charming. Few literary histories contain so many sparkling, quotable epigrams. "Anglo-Saxon poetry is like the river Saone; one doubts which way it flows." (P. 39.) "On the lips of the conquerors of Hastings odes have become *chansons*." (P. 146.) Speaking of the effects of the Norman Conquest on English literature, he says, page 204: "The first duty of a master is to impose silence on his pupils, and this the conquerors did not fail to do. There was silence for a hundred years." Epigram is dangerous here. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* went on its weary way until the year 1154. Again: "The English spring is mixed with winter, and the French with summer; England sings the verses of May, remembering April; France sings them looking forward to June." *Apropos* of present African complications, this quotation from Froissart is excellent: "The English do not observe treaties faithfully, because they do not understand French; and 'one does not know how to force a thing into their heads unless it be all to their advantage.'" Speaking of Lydgate's De Vega-like literary fecundity, he says: "Nothing but death could stop him; and his last poem being of 1446, his biographers have unanimously concluded that he must have died in that year."

These are but a few of M. Jusseraud's pithy sayings, selected at random. They come upon us always as pleasant surprises, and help to lighten up the driest of subjects.

We shall look forward impatiently to the publication of the author's second volume, which includes our literary history from the Renaissance to Pope.

W. S. CURRELL.

Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

CABRERA'S CUBA AND THE CUBANS.

CUBA AND THE CUBANS. *By Raimundo Cabrera. Author of "Mis Buenos Tiempos," "Los Estados Unidos," "Impresiones de Viaje, Etc., Etc. Member of the Bar of Cuba. Ex-Provincial Deputy. Member of the Executive Committee of the Cuban Autonomist Party, Etc. Translated from the Eighth Spanish Edition of "Cuba Y Sus Jueces." By Laura Guiteras. Illustrated with 91 Line Engravings of Portraits and Localities; 32 Phototype Portraits and Views, and a Detailed Map of the Island. Revised and Edited by Louis Edward Levy, and Compiled with a Supplementary Appendix by the Editor. Philadelphia: The Levytype Company. 1896. Pp. 450. Cloth, \$1.50.*

The pending conflict on our neighboring island has awakened the inquiry in numerous quarters as to where one will find an authentic account of the situation there, and of the conditions and events leading up to the present condition of affairs. A calm and dispassionate statement of the social, religious, moral, and political condition of that now unhappy isle, rather than a partisan view, is what has been specially needed. In the work before us, a translation of the eighth edition of a work which first appeared nine years ago, this desideratum is met. Having been written before the present contest began, it has not been influenced by the special developments or rancors of this conflict. Its wide circulation, from its earliest appearance, shows how fully it has met the popular desire.

The author writes from the vantage-ground of an acknowledged leadership of the Autonomist party of Cuba. He was largely engaged in the effort to secure from the mother country those reforms, the postponement or refusal of which has led to the present condition of affairs. In thus voicing the demands of the people he was in accord with many of the leading statesmen of Spain, and in accord with the principles which Spain herself acknowledged but failed to put in force. Administrative reforms and a larger measure of self-government have been the demands of the Cubans and the promise of Spain. It is not in the lurid light of war that the ground for these can be properly seen, and hence the special value just now, when sympathies rather than reason hold sway, of a work written under auspices and amidst circumstances surrounding the people prior to the present outbreak, though intimately associated with it as cause.

Señor Cabrera traces the geographical, historical, social, political, and economic condition of Cuba and its people. Its journalists, literature, art, judicial system, religion, local government, industries, and resources are fully set forth and well illustrated. The whole work forms not only an interesting page in history, but a powerful plea for autonomy, as the only solution of the many problems by which the people are confronted.

The book is handsomely printed and illustrated, and will be found interesting to young as well as old. The author's style, happily preserved by the translator, is clear and simple, but full of vigor.

VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. *By F. Godet, D. D., Professor in the Faculty of the Independent Church of Neuchatel.* Particular Introduction. I. The Epistles of St. Paul. Translated from the French, by William Affleck, B. D. 8vo. pp. xiv., 621. \$4.50 net. New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. 1894.

The author tells us that he presents here the fruit of forty years' teaching. He apologizes for departing from the usual method of giving first general and then afterwards special introduction, on the ground that at his age he feels himself unequal to the task of accomplishing both successfully. He presents with frankness and fidelity and discusses with impartiality the views which he differs from, but holds that however much one may begin a study with absolute neutrality one cannot finish it without having one's own views. He maintains that there is a true science of criticism, but urges that the church must not wait till all the representatives of critical science can agree on the authenticity and normative authority of this or that book. She must not commit the keys of her fortress to the keeping of the chief of the hostile army. His plan in the volume before us is to consider the Epistles of Paul in their chronological order. Preparatory to this, he gives an outline of Paul's career. He gives thirteen as the number of Paul's Epistles. Of the Epistle to the Hebrews he says that he cannot say more than that if it did not come from the Apostle Paul it came at least from the circle of his companions in labor. He gives unusually full comment on the contents of each epistle, the interpretation turning largely upon the facts brought out in the special introduction. As in all his other writings, the ability and learning, as well as the earnest spirit, of the author shine out on almost every page.

THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF SAINT PAUL. *By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M. A., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and the Rev. J. S. Howson, D. D., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool.* With a Preliminary Dissertation by the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D. D., Professor of Revealed Theology in Yale College. People's Edition. 8vo, pp. 1015. Hartford, Conn.: S. S. Scranton & Co. 1896.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. With Numerous Illustrations and Maps, Engraved expressly for this work. *Edited by William Smith, Classical Examiner of the University of London.* 8vo, pp. 1024. Hartford, Conn.: S. S. Scranton & Co. 1896.

Our sole object in naming these volumes, unrevised editions of works so long and widely known, and everywhere so favorably known, is to call the attention of our readers to the exceptionally low price at which they can be purchased. We could scarcely believe it when the publishers offered them at eighty cents each;

but so it is, as many students and ministers have found ; at this rate no one need be without them, and they are indispensable. "Conybeare and Howson" will never be displaced by Farrar, or Geikie, or Stalker, or Ramsay. The more we study the various lives of Paul, the more satisfaction do we find in turning back to this one. And the same may be said of Smith's abridged *Dictionary of the Bible*. These two works will easily claim a place in the first fifty volumes of every minister or theological student.

BIBLICAL EPOCHS. *By Rev. Burdett Hart, D. D., Author of "Aspects of Christ Studies of the Model Life," "Aspects of Heaven," etc.* 12mo, pp. 224. \$1.00. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1896.

The author here divides and studies human history, as set forth in the Holy Scriptures, in nine great epochs, the Paradisean, the Antediluvian, the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, the Prophetic, the Messianic, the Apostolic, that of the Holy Spirit, the Millennial. He is devout and reverent in his attitude towards the word of God. The book is more spiritual and practical than scientific, and the lessons from the events recorded are brought out with special fulness. In his discussion of the Millennial Epoch, he adopts that view as the more just and scriptural which holds that the kingdom of Christ, through the agencies which have been and are being employed, shall at length become universally prevalent, and that then for a long period he shall exercise a spiritual dominion over the race, not that all souls will be converted, but so that, in a general way, it may be said that the world is converted.

A TRANSLATION OF THE MINOR PROPHETS. With an Occasional Brief Note Introduced. *By Benjamin Douglas, of Santa Barbara, California.* 12mo, pp. 115. 60 cts. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

As one may judge from the Preface, this translation has been made chiefly in the interest of the author's belief in the pre-millennial coming and the personal reign of Christ on earth. He declares all translations by companies of men to be compromises. He maintains that the prevalent method of interpretation of the Scriptures is mystical and spiritualistic, and a relic of the Dark Ages. He finds that reputed scholars, translators, failing to catch the prophets' idea, or unwilling to believe it, have substituted for the person the thing, the neuter for the masculine, the plural for the singular, and prophecies that are yet future for those already fulfilled. He is horrified at the infrequent preaching of the second advent of Christ. These and such like expressions will show the reader what to expect in the translation which follows.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *By the Rev. W. H. Bennett, M. A., Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature, Hackney and New Colleges.* Cloth, 75 cts. 12 mo, pp. 218. New York: Thomas Whitaker.

Our readers are familiar with Professor Bennett's critical views, from reviews of his contributions to the *Expositor's Bible*. They will not be surprised, then, to learn that in this work, admirable though it is in spirit and somewhat sounder in the

exposition of the prophet's relation to sacrifices than some of his masters, there is an adaptation of his interpretation, nay, an adjustment of the word of God itself, to the hypotheses of modern criticism. We can see but little ground for accepting as true any theology which may be derived from a fraudulent book. If the Pentateuch, or any part of it, and Judges, be Hilkiah's books, or Josiah's only, or were enlarged and re-edited in their day, we see little reliance to be placed upon any claims which the Bible may make.

SELECTIONS FROM THE PSALTER—FOR USE IN THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCHES. *Arranged by the Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D., LL. D., and the Rev. Louis F. Benson.* Pp. 109. 30 cts. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1896.

The book is very clearly printed, and daintily bound, and is well adapted for the use of those who think our old-fashioned Presbyterian form of worship too "bald," and who would introduce responsive reading. It is so arranged, by bold-face numbers opposite alternate verses, that the devout worshipper may look off when the minister reads and yet see just where to fall in when the people's turn comes. It thus ingeniously reduces one evil result of inattention to a minimum. We must confess that we would prefer our Bibles, if we must have the responsive reading or service, and not a selected Psalter.

NEW TESTAMENT CONVERSIONS—THEIR MANIFOLDNESS. *By the Rev. William Charles Roberts, D. D., LL. D.* 12mo, pp. 176. 75 cts. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1896.

Eleven sermons, on as many different instances of conversion named in the New Testament, as of Andrew and John, Zaccheus, Bartimeus, the woman with the issue of blood, the woman of Samaria, the Syro-Phoenician woman, the demoniac of Gadara, the malefactor on the cross, the Ethiopian eunuch, Cornelius, Saul of Tarsus. The preacher's purpose is to show New Testament instances which will be of comfort and instruction to those who are sometimes perplexed about the matter of their personal faith and who anxiously inquire, "Am I his or am I not?" The collection is divided into four groups or classes, according to peculiarities common to the members of each. The first is of those who have been religiously reared but differently situated in after life. The second is of certain women, representing different associations and peoples. The third is of two men, one of whom was wrecked in body and mind by a dissipated life, and the other the dying malefactor. The fourth is of men who were prominent in society and the world, one being the prime minister of a monarch, another a member of an illustrious family, and another the greatest genius of his age. The sermons are practical and full of helpfulness, and withal glowing with fervor and spirituality.

THE MASTER'S INDWELLING. *By Rev. Andrew Murray.* 12mo, pp. 180. Cloth, 75 cts. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

The recent visit of Dr. Murray to this country, and the uplifting and instructive services which he held in many places, invest his writings with peculiar interest. This interest will be enhanced in the case of the present book by the fact that its contents are the discourses, in substance, which he delivered at the

Northfield Conference, in 1895. Like all his other writings, which are among the best devotional works extant, this little volume of discourses is full of spiritual fervor, evangelical and helpful. Among the subjects presented with such unction are, *Waiting on God*, *The Kingdom First*, *The Complete Surrender*, *Joy in the Holy Ghost*, *The Source of Power in Prayer*.

THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT. A Biblical Study on the Holy Ghost. *By James Elder Cumming, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 316. Price, \$1.50. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

It is to be regarded as a healthful sign that there has been such an increase of late in the study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, his divinity, personality, work, etc. Not fewer than four treatises have come to our hands within the past few months on this one subject. Dr. Vaughan's and Dr. Gordon's works are already well known and widely read. The present volume begins with a cordial, appreciative, prefatory note by Dr. F. B. Meyer, of London. The author then declares his purpose to be to supplement the many other works which have appeared by one which will be less fragmentary in treatment, and following a more definite method. He proposes to present the whole teaching of Scripture in a short compass, and in a clear and methodical order, with a view to furnishing the means whereby the reader may test the accuracy of all the conclusions reached by the author also, and form his own judgment. The first two chapters give us a literal repetition of every passage in the Old and New Testaments which bears directly upon the subject. He pleads for a fuller study and preaching and teaching of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. In the following chapters he gives comments on and inferences from the passages cited. The relation of the Spirit to the Godhead, to the Messiah, to inspiration, to regeneration, and other like topics, are then dwelt upon. Several appendices, an index of subjects, and a very full index of the passages cited from the Scriptures are added, and give fulness to this excellent work. The author disclaims any theological purpose or method, and deals with the subject in an unscientific, but very earnest and practical, manner.

THE MANIFOLD MINISTRY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. *By the Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D., Author of "Ecce Deus Homo"; "Christ the Teacher"; "The New Life, Not the Higher Life."* 12mo, pp. 62. Price, 25 cts. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1895.

In this delightful monograph the beloved Washington pastor treats of the Holy Spirit's ministry, as set forth in the Scriptures, in creation, in providence, to the Son of man, the Mediator, to the writers of the sacred Scriptures, to believers as individuals, to the church as the body of Christ, and to the world. On all these topics the writer gives forth no uncertain sound. Each is unfolded clearly and scripturally, and would make an excellent basis for an elaborate discourse. The booklet would be an admirable one to use at services held by our elders in the absence of the pastor.

SABBATH AND SUNDAY. *By William DeLoss Love, D. D., Author of "Saint Paul and Woman," etc.* 12mo, pp. 325. \$1.25. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896.

This volume is a republication, with revision and additions, of a series of arti-

cles which appeared in 1879 to 1881 in *Bibliotheca Sacra*. It is a most complete discussion, from the orthodox and conservative standpoint, of the Sabbath question, and a setting forth of the grounds and historic proof of the change from the seventh to the first day of the week, together with the unchanged obligation to observe the day according to God's appointment. The book is specially valuable for the great mass of evidence which it collects from the best attainable witnesses, from the Bible to eminent men of modern times.

DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY AND HUMAN FREEDOM. *By Rev. John T. Duffield, D. D., LL. D.* 12mo, pp. 20. Price, 15 cts. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1896.

We confess to some disappointment on reading this most readable and admirable discourse. The disappointment, however, is only in the title, which is entirely inappropriate to the body of the discussion, which is more upon Pilate's question, "What is truth?" than upon any other subject, with the conclusion or answer that whatever is distinctly taught in Holy Scripture, however hard to be understood, should be received with unquestioning faith, and allowed its due influence on the heart and life. This principle, which is well set forth and admirably proved, is then applied to the difficulty which arises in some minds between the principles of God's sovereignty and man's freedom, as well as to other difficulties.

LAWS RELATING TO RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS. Being a Collection of the General Statutes of the Several States and Territories for the Incorporation and Management of Churches, Religious Societies, Presbyteries, Synods, etc., with References to Special Legislation Pertaining to Denominational Churches. *By William Henry Roberts, D. D., LL. D.* 8vo, pp. lxvi., 591. \$3.00 net; law calf, \$4.00 net. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1896.

The sub-title of this work explains its character and purpose sufficiently. The volume was prepared under the auspices of a committee of the General Assembly, which was appointed in 1892, in answer to overtures from thirty or more Presbyteries, to take into consideration the whole subject of church temporalities, and which was directed, a year later, "to have made a satisfactory collection and digest of the laws of the various States connected with the management of church property." After compiling these laws, the committee entrusted the completion of the work, in classification, making a digest of them, etc., to Dr. Roberts, the Assembly's Stated Clerk. The Introduction deals with certain general principles touching the relation between church and state in the United States; the relations of churches to the corporations which hold their property; the organization of religious corporations; the decisions of judicial courts as to rights in church property, and the relations of spiritual officers of a church to the trustees. In dealing with these subjects the compiler has specially in view the Presbyterian churches of the land. Forty-four pages of the work comprise a syllabus of laws by States. This syllabus, together with a most copious index, makes the volume thoroughly practical and useful. Together they form a cross-index, chiefly by States and subjects, which makes the entire contents available, and any topic readily found.

and traced. The volume, well printed and bound, will take its place at once as a standard work of reference on all matters in our churches pertaining to the laws under which we live.

THE PREACHER AND HIS PLACE. The Lyman-Beecher Lectures on Preaching, Delivered at Yale University in the Month of February, 1895. *By David H. Greer, D. D., Rector of Saint Bartholomew's Church, New York City.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. 12mo, pp. 263. \$1.25.

The first of these eight lectures is entitled "The Preacher and the Past." It is suggestive and helpful, but with a somewhat too strong trace of disparagement of the lessons of the past, and too bold an assertion of the progressiveness of divine truth and the knowledge of it. The creeds and symbols of the past are to be treasured, but largely in a monumental way, not as expressive of present-day beliefs. The other lectures have in them fewer objectionable ideas, and are very practical, clearly and happily expressed, and well illustrated. The subjects are: "The Preacher and the Present"; "The Preacher and his Message"; "The Preacher and Other Messages"; "The Preacher Preparing his Message"; "The Preacher and the Parish"; "The Preacher Making the Most of Himself." In the lecture on "The Preacher and Other Messages" he makes a plea for the truth which lies outside of the Bible and maintains that it, too, is of divine revelation, only differing from what is usually regarded as revealed in the method of revelation. There is almost too much yielding, throughout the series, to the spirit of the times.

HEROES OF THE SOUTH SEAS. *By Martha Burr Banks, author of "The Children's Summer,"* etc. 12mo, pp. 220. \$1.25. New York: American Tract Society. 1896.

A beautifully illustrated account of missionary operations and missionary workers in the South Sea Islands. The materials for the book were gathered from *The Encyclopedia of Missions, Missionary Review of the World, Life of John G. Paton,* and other periodicals and books and papers with which most of our readers are familiar.

THE EMPIRE OF THE PTOLEMIES. *By J. P. Mahaffy, Fellow, etc., of Trinity College, Dublin; Hon. Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford; Knight of the Order of the Redeemer; author of "The Greek World Under Roman Sway,"* etc. 8vo, pp. 533. Cloth, \$3.50. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

The Egypto-Macedonian period was unquestionably one of the most fertile of all the periods of inter-Biblical history. The developments begun and continued during the sway of the Ptolemies prepared the way for the coming of Christ, the Expectation and Desire of all nations. In many respects, Ptolemy Philadelphus was, all unconsciously, one of the greatest missionaries of ante-Christian days and of anti-Christian characters. This period is usually obscured, however, by the great interest that attaches to the earlier Egyptian civilization and history. The fact, too, that the developments of this period were, in their origin, foreign to Egypt, has diverted attention from centuries of the most important events. Professor Mahaffy has presented his subject well. He is

thoroughly versed in the monumental testimony, papyri, and other sources of information. This work will be found of great value, as well as of interest.

THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA. *By Edward Washburn Hopkins, Ph. D. (Leipzig), Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Bryn Mawr College.* 8vo, pp. xix., 612. \$1.85. Boston and London: Ginn & Company. 1895.

This is the first volume in a series entitled "Handbooks on the History of Religions," to be published under the editorial supervision of Professor Morris Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania. The series springs from the recognized increase of interest and progress in the historical study of the great religions of the world, and is designed to exclude rigidly all polemical discussion, and view the subject exclusively from the historical side. We regret to say that for the present the series will be confined, so the publishers inform us, to the ancient and non-Christian religions. For the past few years we have surely had enough of these. It is proposed to begin each volume with an introductory chapter setting forth the sources for the study, to be followed by sections on the land and people under consideration, and this in turn followed by a division which will be, as it were, the kernel of the book, embodying a full exposition of the beliefs and rites, the religions, art and literature, set forth in each case in the manner best adapted to the religion in question. Such is the publishers' announcement. The editor also adds that another division or section will furnish a general estimate of the religion, its history, and the relation it bears to others.

This first contribution to the series is able and scholarly, showing great research and painstaking investigation. It follows the outline indicated above, as to general method, but not as closely as the impartial historian should follow it. The author appears to be too ready to enter sympathetically into the interpretation of the faiths he describes. For instance, he concludes his section on the Methods of Interpretation with these significant words: "To set one's self in the mental sphere of Vedic seers, as far as possible to think their thoughts, to love, fear, and admire with them—this is the necessary beginning of intimacy, which precedes the appreciation that gives understanding." His estimate of the Religions of India, given very briefly at the close of the volume, reflects this same spirit. There is manifest in it a decided glorification of the Hindu theoretical faiths, and a disparagement of Christian missionary effort, at least until that missionary effort become disencumbered of all its dogmatic instruction and be reduced to a simple appeal to the ethical code of these old faiths. His conclusion is that the strength of Christian teaching in India lies in uniting with the morality which Brahmanism, unsectarian Hinduism, the Jain heretics and others taught before Christianity existed and which they developed without Christian aid, the practical altruism which was taught by Christ!

THE GOSPEL OF BUDDHA, According to Old Records. *Told by Paul Carns.* Fourth Revised Edition. 12mo, pp. xvi., 275. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 35 cts. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1896.

The compiler disclaims any attempt in this volume to popularize the Buddhist religious teachings. As a representative of the school of monism, he finds in Buddhism monistic teachings. This, we take it, is largely the underlying cause of the publication of this book. Its spirit, however, is manifest. The compiler is at war with the churches and with Christianity.

PUSHING TO THE FRONT ; or, Success Under Difficulties. *By Orison Swett Marden.*

Illustrated with Twenty-four Portraits of Eminent Persons. 8vo, pp. 416.

\$1.50. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1896.

ARCHITECTS OF FATE ; or, Steps to Success and Power. *By the Same Author.*

Thirty-two Illustrations. \$1.50. *The Same Publishers.*

The author need not apologize for adding these books to the literature of the world. They may not be original, indeed, but they have that quality which they themselves declare to be better than genius, namely, tact. They are designed for the inspiration and encouragement of all who are struggling for a higher and more useful career. The suggestions savor, perhaps, too much of the world, and too little stress is laid upon Christian faith as the fountain of all true character. And here and there we find a fly that spoils the ointment. It adds no strength to the books when the author attributes Calvin's writings and doctrines to the malady of dyspepsia. The books are full of examples, illustrating from actual history and experience the teachings which are given. They lay the greatest possible stress upon the principle that character is the secret of all true success.

GATHERING CLOUDS : A Tale of the Days of St. Chrysostom. *By Frederic W.*

Farrar, D. D., Dean of Canterbury, Author of "Darkness and Dawn," etc.

8vo, pp. xiv., 593. New York and London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1895.

All the wealth of learning and beauty of style of the distinguished author are drawn upon in this wonderful volume. He deals with an age of growing darkness in the church, when the clouds were gathering thick and fast and already pouring forth some of their fury which, but little later, rent the church and swept it into the abysses of the Dark Ages. The book is a recountal of the events occurring in Chrysostom's day, or connected with his times, and is a defence of that great patriarch's character and life. The facts are woven together, not always as the author himself disclaims attempting to do, in chronological order, in the form of a connected story, the warp of the web being just enough discernible to hold the weft together, and the whole combining to give even the ordinary reader a great chapter in ecclesiastical history that will well be worth the interesting study. We could wish that the distinguished author had not here and there strode upon such high stilts, and that the printers had avoided many typographical errors in a work so richly deserving the extremest care, and in many respects so handsomely printed and bound.

AS QUEER AS SHE COULD BE. *By Jessie E. Wright.* 12mo, pp. 255. Price, \$1.25.

Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1895.

This is, unquestionably, one of the most delightfully interesting and entertaining books for children, for either Sunday, or week day, that we have ever read. It sparkles with brightness and humor, is full of movement, and inculcates correct principles. It is as wholesome as it is captivating.

HIS GREAT AMBITION. *By Anna F. Heckman.* 12mo, pp. 317. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1895.

While by no means as attractive as the last-named book, this publication for young people is good and wholesome, and may be safely added to the Sabbath-school library, or placed in the home. It is thoroughly good.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 38.—OCTOBER, 1896.

I. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SEMINARY CURRICULUM.¹

I AM disposed to look upon the subject the discussion of which I have been asked to open, as a practical rather than as a purely theoretical one. One result of this mode of looking at it will be that we shall approach it from the point of view of our existing institutions, and ask, not what is the ideal curriculum for theological study, but what is the ideal and what the practicable curriculum for such institutions as our theological seminaries actually are.

The fundamental facts here, I take it, are three.

(1), Our theological seminaries are not the theological departments of universities, but training schools for the Christian ministry. That is to say, the object they set before themselves is fundamentally a practical one. They do not exist primarily in order to advance theological learning, but in order to impart theological instruction; their first object is not investigation, but communication; and they call their students to them, not that these may explore the unknown, but that they may learn the known in the sphere of theological truth. They do not exist primarily, again, in order to place in reach of all who may be interested in theological thought facilities for acquiring information concerning whatever department of theological learning each inquirer may for the moment desire to give his attention to; but in order that they may provide for a select body of young men, who

¹ A paper read before the "General Association of the Professors of the Theological Seminaries of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," June 3, 1896.

have consecrated themselves to the Christian ministry, the thorough training which they require to fit them for the proper exercise of its functions. Their aim is not to lay before the general public the widest and most varied line of theological goods possible, from which each comer may select as it may suit his taste or fancy, but to bring to bear on those who are committed to their charge just that body of well-concatenated instruction which will provide for the church ministers which need not be ashamed, able rightly to divide the truth and thoroughly furnished for the work that is set before them.

(2), Our theological seminaries are not training schools for the Christian ministry in general, but, specifically, training schools for the Presbyterian ministry. There is, no doubt, much of the instruction and discipline given in any of our seminaries which would prepare equally for the ministry of all denominations and especially for that of all evangelical denominations; and it is to be recognized, of course, that this body of instruction will form the most fundamental part of the curriculum of any properly ordered seminary. But a Presbyterian training school cannot confine itself to the circle of studies which would be equally appropriate in a Romish or a Methodist or a Congregational training school. It is the business of the training school to fit those who resort to it for the precise environment they are to occupy; and the environment into which the graduates of a Presbyterian seminary are immersed on leaving the seminary is a specifically Presbyterian one. Not only are there peculiar branches of study which the genius of each denomination imposes upon the schools designed to prepare men for its service, as, for example, the thorough study of moral theology in Romish seminaries, to qualify the future priests for their work in the Confessional, and the careful study of presbyterial usage in the Presbyterian seminaries, to render the future presbyter competent for his work of government; and not only is there a special color thrown, in the schools of each denomination, over the treatment even of the subjects which are represented alike in all, by which, for example, the dogmatic theology, the church history and the church polity taught in each may be made to take on a

very different and even directly opposing aspect: but also, as the specific task and spirit of each denomination are different from those of its fellows, the needs of its ministers are so far different, and this necessarily affects the whole curriculum of its training schools, subtly but profoundly modifying their whole work. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that the training received in the Theological Seminary at Oberlin would prepare a student for the Romish priesthood as well as that received at Louvain, or that the training received at the College of the Propaganda at Rome would fit one for the Baptist ministry as well as if he had been educated at Rochester. By the same token, a Presbyterian seminary needs to remember that it exists to prepare specifically for the Presbyterian ministry.

(3), The Presbyterian Church, to which we belong and for the ministry of which we essay to prepare our students, is a church which cherishes a high ideal of ministerial education. In one short chapter of its *Form of Government* it repeatedly records its horror of a ministry of a low grade of intellectual acquirement. It looks upon the commitment of the ministry to "weak" no less than to "unworthy" men as "a degradation of the sacred office" (XIV., 1); and because it deems it "highly reproachful to religion and dangerous to the church to entrust the holy ministry to weak and ignorant men" (XIV., 3), it requires the presbyteries to try each candidate for the ministry in quite an extended circle of learned studies. In the same spirit, when, in 1810, it determined to establish a seminary, it declared that the object sought was to "secure to candidates for the ministry more extensive and efficient theological instruction," and laid down, in the plan adopted for its first seminary, a scheme of study to be required of all its students which is certainly a very broad, and may still be taken as a model, curriculum. Seminaries whose reason for existing is to train a ministry for this church must needs aim high in their curricula. It would be absurd to pretend to prepare men for the exercise of its ministry by teaching them less than the church requires for entrance upon that ministry. We may fairly give more than this minimum, we can scarcely be content to give less.

I. If we bear these constitutive facts in mind, our task in determining what ought to be taught in our seminaries and how it ought to be taught will become a somewhat easier one. For example, I think it will become plain how we ought to answer one of the most disturbing of those questions which are now troubling the theological schools of the country: the question, namely, whether we ought to have a curriculum at all or not. We have been very frequently told of late, and that on the highest pedagogic authority, that our theological schools must be liberated from their ancient bonds. On the one hand the teacher must be emancipated from the bondage of creeds and permitted to teach just what he chooses and just how he chooses; and on the other, the pupil must be delivered from the bondage of a procrustean curriculum and permitted to develop freely, according to native aptitude, under the special stimulus to which he most readily responds. Thus, to take a single example, President Eliot, of Harvard, has told us,¹ that if theological study cherishes any hope of being "respected by laymen" it "must absolutely be carried on with the same freedom for teacher and pupil which is enjoyed in other great departments of learning." The teacher must be "free to think and say whatever seems to him good, and to change his mind as often as he likes;" and the pupil must be "free to adopt whatever opinions or theories commend themselves to his judgment after he has studied the subject." And further, since it is important to know some things well rather than many things superficially, and theology is so vast a field that it can be all surveyed only in the most superficial manner in the course of three years, and the object that must be held in mind is "the imparting of power, not of information," a free election of studies rather than an unyielding curriculum must be adopted as the method of theological instruction.

It seems quite obvious that those who speak thus are looking at theological schools as departments of universities, and from the point of view of university ideals. President Eliot, indeed,

¹ *On the Education of Ministers*, by Charles W. Eliot, in the *Princeton Review* for May, 1883, p. 340 sq. Cf. the admirable rejoinder made by Dr. F. L. Patton in the same journal for July, 1883.

frankly owns as much, and Prof. A. L. Gillett, of Hartford Seminary, who has written strongly in favor of what we may call the broadly elective system of theological instruction, lays this conception down as the first stone in his argument.¹ "It is to be recognized, first of all," he says, "that theological education is essentially university education."² No doubt the immediate purpose of the remark, as made by him, was rather to differentiate the seminary from the college, as an institution which aims not at a general, but at a special, end;³ but the remark obviously reaches further than that in his mind, and dominates his conception of the proper mode of teaching theology. Let us admit that the theological department of a university may well be organized on the principle of a multitude of disconnected courses, to be concatenated by each pupil for himself in accordance with his fancy or his needs. Must it not also be admitted that such a method is not congruous to the object of training schools for the Christian ministry, and least of all of training schools for the ministry of a specific church, with its special standpoint, spirit and methods of work? We could not easily have a better proof of this than the fact that in countries where theological instruction is given after the university fashion, as, for example, in Germany, it has become necessary to establish separate training schools for pastors, where the deficiencies of the university training, in a practical point of

¹ *Electives in Theological Seminaries* in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, August 1893, p. 296 sq; and *The Trend of Seminary Instruction* in the same journal, October, 1893, p. 23, sq. The same general position is taken by President Thwing, in the paper on *The Improvement of our Theological Seminaries*, published in *The Independent* for May 23 and May 30, 1895; and in a very radical paper by Prof. L. L. Paine, of Bangor, entitled *The Problem of the Seminary Curriculum*, published in *The Advance* for May 28, 1896.

² L. c. p., 298.

³ "A college is intended primarily and supremely to train the mind; it is the part of an university to furnish trained minds with special schools of professional and scientific knowledge," is the just discrimination as stated by Mr. John Fulton in his *Memoir of Frederick A. P. Barnard*, pp. 339-'40, and in this sense the theological seminary is, of course, a section of the university. The distinction suggested in the text is, however, a different one, and turns on the idea that the university exists to communicate universal information, and that its teaching is to be dominated solely by its function to provide opportunity for all comers to obtain instruction in whatever they may chance to desire to know.

view, may be supplied. And it is observable that the advocates of the broadly elective method for theological teaching, are usually drawn from circles in which a somewhat different ideal of the functions of the minister obtains from that which is held by Presbyterians, an ideal which in a greater or less degree conceives of ministers as fundamentally the leaders of the community in its general progress to better things, rather than as the simple bearers of the glad tidings of salvation to a sin-stricken race; and which, therefore, may desiderate in ministers intelligence and power rather than what we may sum up under the phrase, of course to be taken in a pregnant sense, "the knowledge of the truth."

Training schools, on the other hand, the very reason for the existence of which is to fit men for the specific functions which belong to the ministry of a special church, must, it would seem, bear a closer relation to the actual process of fitting them for those functions than will grow out of the mere fact that they provide, along with a multitude of other studies, opportunities for the study of those topics also which, if they are chosen by their pupils and duly improved by them and properly concatenated, may reasonably prepare them for the exercise of those functions. Such schools must obviously themselves undertake to see to it that the pupils, committed to their charge for the very end that they may be fitted for these functions, do choose the necessary topics of study, do give the needful attention to them, and do so concatenate them that they may, together, give them the requisite training to prepare them for the work before them. When we have said so much, however, we have said that such schools must have a required curriculum of study. It may still remain an open question how this required curriculum is to be presented to the students, how their attention to it is to be secured, and what relation it shall bear to the total teaching effort of the institution. But it seems quite plain that the functions of a training school for such an office as that of the Presbyterian ministry, with its specific needs and its specific requirements, cannot be performed by institutions which do not undertake to guide and govern the work of its pupils to that end.

There are two general methods upon which the work of the

students might be so guided and governed. One of these is based on a broadly elective scheme of teaching, quite after the university model, and proceeds by simply requiring the completion of a given circle of studies, prescribed by the faculty, before students may apply for graduation. Out of the multitude of studies offered, from which the student is quite free to choose, he is required to make his selection in such a manner that, along with whatever else he secures, he shall also accomplish a certain specified course before the faculty will put its imprimatur upon him as fitted to take up the calling and enter upon the work of the ministry. This manner of arranging their work has already been adopted by a number of American seminaries, of which the great Baptist Seminary at Louisville may be taken as the type; and it has received the distinguished endorsement of so experienced an educator in our own Presbyterian circles as Dr. Robert L. Dabney.¹ The advantages offered by it are very obvious. It seeks to unite the widest practicable freedom on the part of the student with a sufficient control on the part of the faculty of the comprehensive compass and training value of the work done by him. Subject to such slight regulations as may prove necessary, the order in which the student may take up the several topics required of him, the time he may consume in completing them, the depth to which he may prosecute his investigations in any given branch of work, and the breadth of the general theological information which he may choose to acquire in the meantime, may all be at his own disposal. The faculty retains, meanwhile, sufficient control to secure that he shall not go out to the churches without having received that all-around instruction in a carefully selected curriculum of studies by which alone he may be prepared to meet the various needs of his new work. Such a scheme seems at first sight ideal.

But when more carefully considered, it appears sufficiently beset with practical difficulties to render, in my opinion, the alterna-

¹ *Memorial on Theological Education* (Dabney's *Discussions*, Vol. II., p. 57, sq.) p. 57. Cf., also, his papers on *A Thoroughly Educated Ministry*, Vol. II., 651, sq., and *The Influence of the German University System on Theological Literature*, Vol. I., p. 440.

tive plan of a set curriculum of study preferable. For one thing, for its proper working it would require a far more numerous force of teachers than is at present at the command of any of our seminaries. When the students are at all numerous, the number and variety of combinations of studies they can manage to desire to put together in the course of three or four years is really appalling; and in proportion as these possible combinations are abridged, in that proportion we drop back again into what is practically a fixed curriculum, curtailed of some of the most obvious advantages of instruction in a curriculum. For another thing, for its effective control there would be required a far larger measure of influence over the students and over the churches on the part of the seminary authorities than they possess, or possibly than would be altogether good for them to possess. The temptation to undue and hurtful specialization within the institution is so fostered by the very *genius loci* of a school so organized that it becomes almost uncontrollable; and on the other hand, the temptation of churches to secure the pastoral services of young men who have sojourned for some years at the seminary and received its advantages to obviously brilliant effect in this direction and that, while they have not conformed to its terms of graduation, and therefore have not received the symmetrical training indispensable for their best development, is too great to be overcome. For still another thing, the training value of the very same courses, under the very same instruction, is very different when taken in different sequences and in different combinations, so that it really is impracticable for a school to fulfil its functions as a training school by merely requiring that certain specified courses of study shall, at all events, be at some time or other taken. One might as well expect to produce equally good gastronomic effects by eating his dinner backwards—beginning with the sweets and ending with the soup—as to produce the best educative effects by any and every jumble in the order of the topics studied. A certain oversight of the blending of the topics seems needful if the full effect of their training value is to be reaped.

On the whole, therefore, attractive as this scheme is, it would

seem best to fall back on the old-fashioned fixed curriculum as the method of instruction best fitted to secure the ends of a training school for the Presbyterian ministry. A good deal of scorn has been poured out upon this method it is true, as an attempt to squeeze the most diverse figures into the same shaped and sized garments. But, as a matter of fact, it no more requires the same fixed course of study from all pupils than the apparently more liberal method just discussed. The only effective objection to it, as over against that method, proceeds on the supposition that, with the fixed curriculum, nothing but the curriculum is placed in the reach of the students, while, on the other method, the required curriculum constitutes but a small part of the opportunities for acquisition offered him. This is obviously, however, an entire misapprehension. The only difference between the two methods concerns the question of whether the order and combinations, in which the studies included in the fixed curriculum common to both are taken by the student, shall also be under the control of the directors of his education, or whether these matters are judged of comparatively so little importance that they may be safely left to the student's own caprice. There is no reason why, with the fixed curriculum, further opportunities in the way of elective studies, in any number which the teaching force of the seminary is capable of providing, may not be placed in the reach of the student. And there is no reason why the student may not, with a fixed curriculum, enjoy the advantages of just as large a body of additional studies, succeed in just as profoundly deepening his knowledge of special departments, or in just as widely broadening his knowledge of the several departments, as under the other method of instruction. The point is not that his course shall be narrowed; the point is simply that it shall be more efficiently directed to the attainment more surely and completely of its primary end. Let there be along with the fixed curriculum any number of elective courses offered, and let their advantages be fully reaped by the student. But let it be definitely understood that they are subsidiary to the curriculum itself, and are intended not to modify it, but to supplement it. In all cases let it be understood that it is the curriculum on which the educative stress is

laid, and on which the educative hopes are hung; and that the additional, elective studies, however valuable they may be in themselves severally, and in their adaptation to perfect and deepen and widen the course, cannot safely be allowed to supplant or to take the place of any part of it. Elective studies considered as supplements to the regular and well-compacted course of training in a training school are of the utmost value; elective studies considered as substitutes for the well-chosen course of such a school, or for any part of it, can only operate to confuse the minds of the students and to endanger the attainment of the primary purpose of the school. A fixed curriculum, supplemented by electives, has, at least, the great advantage over every other method of ordering the work of such a school, that it emphasizes the solid educative core, raises it to its proper importance in the minds of both teachers and taught, and tends to increase the certainty and perfection with which it produces its educative effect.

II. The same constitutive facts which would seem to require Presbyterian seminaries to arrange their work on the basis of a stated curriculum, go far also to determine the scope of the curriculum which should be adopted by them. The principle of decision here is found in the very nature of the seminaries as training schools for the ministry, supplemented by the ministerial requirements of the church for whose ministry specifically they undertake to train their pupils. The curriculum ought to contain every element of instruction which is needful in order to mould men into ministers of efficiency and power; but it cannot, on any account, contain less than is required by the law of the Presbyterian Church for the admission of men into its service. The minimum is thus authoritatively set for Presbyterian seminaries by the trial requisitions laid down for licensure and ordination in our *Form of Government* (XIV., 3, 4; XV., 11). These requisitions include, besides such an acquaintance with the arts and sciences as would entitle the candidate to a diploma of bachelor or master of arts, specifically a knowledge of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, of theology, natural and revealed, of ecclesiastical history, and of the sacraments and the principles of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church. Here we see recog-

nized the great departments of sacred philology, inclusive of the principles and practice of exegesis or "sacred criticism," as the "parts of trial" indicate, and of apologetical, historical, systematic, and practical theology. No curriculum, therefore, which does not give a fairly representative place to each of the five great departments of theological encyclopædia,—Apologetical, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical Theology,—can be adjudged sufficient from the Presbyterian point of view.

This is emphasized, and much of detail added, by the singularly rich and admirable outline of the work to be required of its contemplated seminary which the Assembly of 1811 drew up and made part of the Plan of the Seminary. The Assembly ordered that "at the close of his course every student must have made the following attainments, viz.:

"He must be well skilled in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures. He must be able to explain the principal difficulties which arise in the perusal of the Scriptures, either from erroneous translations, apparent inconsistencies, real obscurities, or objections arising from history, reason, or argument. He must be versed in Jewish and Christian antiquities, which serve to explain and illustrate Scripture. He must have an acquaintance with ancient geography and with oriental customs, which throw light on the sacred records. Thus he will have laid the foundation for becoming a sound Biblical critic.

"He must have read and digested the principal arguments and writings relative to what has been called the deistical controversy. Thus he will be qualified to become a defender of the Christian faith.

"He must be able to support the doctrines of the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms* by a ready, pertinent, and abundant quotation of Scripture texts for that purpose. He must have studied, carefully and correctly, natural, didactic, polemic, and casuistic theology. He must have a considerable acquaintance with general history and chronology, and a particular acquaintance with the history of the Christian church. Thus he will be preparing to become an able and sound divine and casuist.

"He must have read a considerable number of the best practical writers on the subject of religion. He must have learned to compose with correctness and readiness in his own language, and to deliver what he has composed to others in a natural and acceptable manner. He must be well acquainted with the several parts and the proper structure of popular lectures and sermons. He must have composed at least two lectures and four popular sermons that shall have been approved by the professors. He must have carefully studied the duties of the pastoral care. Thus he will be prepared to become a useful preacher and a faithful pastor.

"He must have studied carefully the Form of Church Government authorized by the Scriptures and the administration of it as it has taken place in the Protestant churches. Thus he will be qualified to exercise discipline, and to take part in the government of the church in all its judicatories."

This comprehensive scheme of training, requiring detailed attention to all the great departments of theological encyclopædia, forms a part of the organic law of the majority of our seminaries, and may well be looked upon as the normal curriculum of them all.

To much the same curriculum the seminaries would doubtless, indeed, have come, had they been left entirely free to choose what they should teach, under the guidance merely of the general scientific consideration of what is essential in order to give a rounded and comprehensive ministerial training. This is fairly illustrated by the fact that there exists a general practical agreement as to the proper scope of a theological curriculum among theological institutions of all lands and all forms of the Christian faith. The circle of proper professional studies which President Eliot, for example, thinks should be placed within the reach of all students for the ministry, and among which they should be allowed to specialize; the series of departments which a German student of theology ordinarily seeks to compass; the curricula laid down by the great theological colleges of Scotland, and the well-appointed Irish Presbyterian schools of divinity; and the common body of studies offered by American seminaries of whatever name, agree in more or less fully covering the five great branches of theological encyclopædia, and differ in details ordinarily only where the different needs of the several churches or lands necessarily affect the preparation for service in them.¹

¹ For purposes of comparison I append the outlines of study mentioned.

President Eliot gives the following list of topics as embraced in the professional studies of the candidates for the ministry, viz. :

"1. Semitic studies: linguistic, archæological and historical.

2. New Testament criticism and exegesis.

3. Ecclesiastical history.

4. Comparative religion, or historical religions compared.

5. Psychology, ethics, and the philosophy of religion.

6. Systematic theology, and the history of Christian doctrines.

7. Charitable and reformatory methods, and the contest of Christian society with licentiousness, intemperance, pauperism and crime." (l. c. p. 353.)

A very instructive *précis* of the outlines of ministerial training in the various churches may be found in a brief paper, signed "C. A. S.," published in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for September, 1879, p. 207, sq. From it I borrow the following lists. The ordinary course marked out for himself by a German student

When so much is determined as to the scope of the curriculum, viz., that it is to give an equitable place to each of the five great branches of theological encyclopædia, and attention is turned to the details, the dangers that are to be avoided are easily seen to be that the curriculum may be made too extensive, that it may be made too meagre, and that it may be permitted to be too much diluted. If the requirements of the scheme for examination of candidates laid down in our *Form of Government*, and especially if all the suggestions of our Plan for Seminaries be fairly provided for in the curriculum, there is, perhaps, very little danger that it will be made too meagre; and I do not myself think there is much danger of its being made, in the proper sense of the words, too extensive. There seems, however, a real danger of its being seriously diluted by the invasion of showy or temporarily popular branches of study, or by branches which belong less to the fundamental basis of theological training than to its perfecting, if not only to its ornamentation, and which the seminaries may permit to be introduced into their curricula by the pressure of popular clamor, or of the fashion

of theology includes, in the first year, Church History, Exegesis and Philosophy; in the second, Biblical Theology, Dogmatics and Ethics, History of Dogma, Symbolics and Introduction; and in the third year, Homiletics, Catechetics, Pastoral Theology, Liturgics, and Church Constitution. The curriculum of the Free Church College, Edinburgh, is as follows: First year, Junior Hebrew, Natural Science, Apologetics, Evangelistic Theology, Elocution; second year, Junior New Testament Exegesis, Junior Systematic Theology, Senior Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Elocution; third year, Junior Church History, Senior New Testament Exegesis, Senior Systematic Theology, Elocution; fourth year, Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Theology, Church History, Evangelistic Theology and Elocution. A typical Irish scheme is as follows: First year, Hebrew, Christian Ethics, Church History; second year, Church History, Theology, Sacred Criticism; third year, Theology, Sacred Criticism, Sacred Rhetoric. For the purposes of a comparative study of curricula, I may mention the following very instructive papers: *Professional Studies of the Clergy in Scotland*, by Professor James Iverach in *The Catholic Presbyterian* for November, 1879, p. 364, sq.; *The State of Theological Teaching in France*, by Professor Jean de Visme, in the "Report of the Third General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance," p. 317, sq.; *On the Professional Studies of the English Clergy*, by Dr. Littledale, in *The Contemporary Review* for April, 1879, p. 1, sq. (on p. 9, sq. of this paper the curriculum of the best French-Romish schools is given); the papers of Professor A. L. Gillett on the Congregational Seminaries of the United States in the *Hartford Seminary Record* for August and October, 1893.

of the hour. There may be a legitimate place in the teaching of a theological seminary for every branch of learning which in any way concerns the interests of the kingdom of God in the world, or the preparation of a minister of Christ to meet and satisfy, not only the requirements of his Lord, but the needs of the world, and even the demands of the moment. I should myself like to see every phase of modern culture and modern thought, or even, if you will, of modern fancy and what is sometimes called "faddism," which can in any way concern the man who works among the men of his generation for the glory of God and the building up of his kingdom, appropriately dealt with in the seminary. But these things certainly have no proper place within the curriculum. The principles which should govern the framing of it seem to me to be summed up in the statement that it should be made to contain all that is needed to train men for an adequate ministry and nothing that is not needed for this one purpose. That it may contain all that is needed, it must be made broad and comprehensive; that it may contain nothing that is not needed, it must be confined to what is really fundamental. And here, I take it, are the two marks of a really good curriculum: that it covers the whole circle of theological science, and that it contains nothing which is not of fundamental importance.

When we lose hold, in however small a degree, of either one of these two mutually limiting principles, we mar and deform our curriculum. It may even be said, with proper limitations, that the fixed curriculum is no place for detailed discussion, is no place for special courses, however valuable they may be in themselves, in either a theoretical or a practical point of view. Let all such be relegated to the supplementary and optional courses. The curriculum is the place only for those courses which, when taken together, will provide a comprehensive survey of all the theological disciplines and a fundamental training in each: on the basis of which, therefore, from a practical point of view, the young minister can enter upon his work an all-around, systematically trained man, with a fundamental acquaintance with all that enters into his task; and, from the educational point of view, the student can safely build up special knowledge in whatever

department he may elect to pursue detailed study, without danger of that undue specialism which, in its combination of pedantry in a narrow field with ignorance in a very wide one, is becoming one of the peculiar dangers of the churches.

III. We lose the guidance of direct church law when we proceed next to inquire into the relative amount of time which should be given, in the curriculum, to the several branches of theological study. There reigns here naturally a considerable difference of opinion, but on the whole less than might be expected. I think we may, on practical and scientific grounds alike, very readily acquiesce, with one modification hereafter to be mentioned, in the solution which has been arrived at as a matter of fact in most institutions, and which assigns about an equal amount of time and about the same emphasis to each of the great theological disciplines. It is easy to say, of course, that some of these disciplines are more fundamental, or more practical, or more necessary than others. But the force of this remark is very much broken by asking, More fundamental, practical, necessary to what? If of some we may say that they are scientifically more fundamental than others, the tables are turned when we ask which are more fundamental to the practical training of a minister. And when we remember that the function of our seminaries is training for the actual work of the ministry, the categories of fundamental and practical become so confused that it would require a chemical analysis to distinguish them. The truth is, that each discipline is fundamental, in one respect or another, to the training of the minister; and each must have its own place in the comprehensive training of the minister. And as we turn the body of disciplines around and around, we shall probably conclude that the need of each is practically about what that of each of its fellows is. The practical solution, at all events, seems to be to give to each of the great branches about an equal place in the curriculum.

There is, however, as already intimated, one modification which needs to be made in this conclusion. The discipline of exegetical theology includes, in its two divisions of Old and New Testaments, branches of study so diverse from one another in the

equipment needed for their prosecution, the methods of exegetical study are necessarily so detailed and slow, and the relations of exegetical theology to the other disciplines and to the practical work of the ministry are so fundamental and constitutive, and so varied and numerous, that it is widely, and, I think, properly felt, that exegetical theology should rank in the constitution of our curriculum as two disciplines, and that, therefore, the same relative time should be given to each of its great branches—Old and New Testament exegesis—that is given to each of the other disciplines. The wide adoption of this point of view in our seminaries is, at least, an evidence of its plausibility; and, I fancy, it will be accepted without argument as reasonable by most of us here to-day. I think we shall also all agree that the purely philological study of any language, even those in which the Bible is written, is not a substantial part of exegetical theology, but must rather be accounted its precondition; so that, if these languages are to be studied at all in a theological seminary, this must be considered a concession to practical needs, and the time consumed in such study ought not to be subtracted from that available for exegetical theology. As a matter of necessity, the elements of Hebrew have always been taught in the seminaries,¹ and for the present, at least, they must continue to be taught in them. Heretofore we have been able to look to the colleges to instruct our pupils sufficiently in Greek; but with the extension of elective schemes in our colleges, sometimes with insufficient guarding, we are confronted with the danger that we may sooner or later be compelled to introduce the elements of Greek philology also into our seminaries. Meanwhile, we can only do what we can to secure that our pupils shall continue to come to us with an adequate Greek training, and make what efforts may seem wise to have Hebrew, too, made a pre-seminary study, and, meanwhile, take up the situation as we find it. We find it in a form which requires us to place

¹ The statement is true in a very wide range. For example, the best Romish schools also feel the same necessity. Ernest Renan wrote, *e. g.*, in 1843, to his sister as to St. Sulpice: "As to study, the only one practiced here, strictly speaking, is theology in all its various departments, canonical law, Scriptural history, and so forth. Hebrew is the only branch of knowledge, apart from theology, in which a special course is given."—*Brother and Sister: Memoir, etc.*, p. 120.

Hebrew philology among our regular seminary courses, and to give it about the same amount of time that is available for each of the proper theological disciplines.

In these conditions, the seminaries discover themselves with some seven departments of study instead of five, to which about equal time needs to be devoted. And there is yet another department from which, as schools of practical training, they must not withhold their attention—the direct training for the work of preaching, including voice-culture, elocution, trial-preaching, and the like. Here is another time-consumer, and surely one of as fundamental practical importance as any study in the list. An eighth department must be added to meet its needs, and this has of course been done in all our institutions. It is curious to note, indeed, how nearly similarly the time at their disposal has been distributed among the several branches of work in the several institutions. I give below a rough tabular view of the proportional¹ distribution of time in those of the seminaries reporting to the General Assembly, whose catalogues for 1895-'96 provide the requisite data, and, for purposes of comparison, I add the data for the Free Church College of Edinburgh, which confessedly

¹ I say "proportional" wittingly; since the absolute time is not exactly ascertained in every case. I have assumed that the year in each seminary is just thirty weeks long.

DEPARTMENTS.	Edinburgh.	Princeton.	Auburn.	Western.	McCormick.	San Francisco.	Yale. ¹	Andover. ¹
Hebrew Philology, ----		150	120	120	120	180		
Propædantics, ----			15				30	
Apologetics, ----	240	180			180	180		
Exegetics, ----	(480)	(510)	(315)	(510)	(600)	(450)	(645) ²	(751) ²
Old Testament, ----	240	210	60	240	240	150	345 ²	411 ²
New Testament, ----	240	180	240	270	240	300	300	340
Biblical Theology, ----		120			120			
Historics, ----	240	180	210	180	180	120	180	136
Systematics, ----	240	180	225	180	210	180	270 ³	202 ³
Ecclesiastics, ----	280	210	300	210	270	180	270	386
Practics, ----		180				180		
Totals, ----	1480	1590	1185	1200	1560	1290	1395	1475

¹ Catalogue of 1892-'93.² Including Hebrew Philology.³ Including Apologetics.

offers the best and completest curriculum of all the foreign schools, as also for certain of our American Congregational seminaries.¹

Such a general practical agreement as is here exhibited will go far towards proving that we are on the right track. I think the general principle that ought to govern us is that the seven departments of Apologetics, Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, New Testament Literature and Exegesis, Historics, Systematics, Ecclesiastics and actual Practice, make about equal claim upon our time and effort. If we can manage to add a chair of Biblical Theology, its own importance and its organic relation to exegesis on the one side and to systematics on the other, will justify a generous assignment of time to it. Hebrew philology must be accepted meanwhile as a necessary evil, and full provision made for it; and I think some brief time ought to be given to general theological encyclopædia or propædeutics, a subject for which at present few seminaries seem to make formal provision, though, of course, in one way or another, it receives attention in all.

IV. I do not think the next topic which naturally claims our attention, viz., the order in which the several branches of study should be taken up, need delay us long. In the case of some of the branches, an order is imposed by the nature of the case, as, for example, the study of the elements of Hebrew must precede the use of Hebrew philology in the exegetical process. And, no doubt, there is a scientific order for all the studies, the adoption of which would give to the curriculum the regular development inherent in the relations of the disciplines to one another. Apologetics lies at the foundation of all theological thought, exegesis at the root of all construction of Biblical material, the knowledge of the truth at the basis of all use of that truth for the salvation of men. Led by this natural interrelation of the departments of study, there has grown up a pretty well-settled general order in the arrangement of the topics. This order, in general, places what we may call the fundamental studies, such as philology, apologetics and exegetics, in the first year; the constructive, doc-

¹ These represent the catalogues of 1892-'93, and are taken from Prof. Gillett's paper in the *Hartford Seminary Record*, October, 1893, where will be found an instructive comparison of the curricula in the several Congregational seminaries.

trinal and critical studies in the second year; and the practical studies in the third. This general order is followed alike in the best Romish schools, in the ordinary course of the German theological student, in the prescribed courses of the Scotch and Irish divinity halls, and in the usual disposition of topics of study in our American seminaries.¹ Not only in this general form, but throughout the details, the scientific order would necessarily govern the order of study, if our courses were dominated solely by a scientific motive, and if the study of theology were taken up by our pupils as something entirely new.

It is because neither of these is the fact that I look upon the whole question of the scientific order of study as of little actual importance for our schools of theology. Our fundamental object is not a purely scientific but a practical one, and it may very well happen that the scientific order may properly give place, in a training school, to one more adapted to meet the practical needs of the institution. For example, it may be worth considering whether the abstruser discussions of apologetics, fundamental as they are to all theology, might not wisely be postponed until a period when the growing intelligence of our pupils is better able, I will not say to cope with them merely, but even to appreciate their importance. And it is quite debatable whether, though exegesis, of course, is the very ground-work of systematics, a knowledge of theology may not only be desirable for the proper prosecution of exegetical study of doctrinal passages, but even be necessary to the creation of that interest in doctrinal exegesis without which its prosecution is simply impossible. If I may be allowed to testify from some experience in teaching both branches, I should say that some knowledge of theology is practically more fruitful for the exegetical classes than some knowledge of exegesis is for the theological classes. It is very difficult to obtain from the exegetical classes anything but shallow work unless the students come prepared by some knowledge of doctrinal construction and doctrinal controversy to take an interest in the results of the exegetical processes. In the interests of the practical efficiency of teaching and the best results of class-room work, the purely scien-

¹ See footnote on page 424 for sources from which the details may be had.

tific order may often give way to a more practical one, by which the topics may be studied in the order of convenience and of effect rather than of logic.

All this would certainly be absurd were it not for the other consideration at which I have hinted, viz., that our pupils do not come to us entirely ignorant of the great subjects of study which they are to attack in our seminaries. Were we asked to form a curriculum for the study of the Vedas, I suppose we should feel it necessary to arrange the topics in scientific consecution. That would enable our pupils to approach the study of these unknown scriptures and of this unknown religion in a systematic way; and only thus could we hope to reach a thoroughly scientific knowledge of them. But our students do not begin thus at the beginning of the study of the Bible and of Christianity in our theological seminaries. They do not wait for their seminary course to begin to assure themselves that there is a God, or to inquire what the Bible is or what it contains, or to learn that salvation is by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Every student, when he enters our halls, brings with him a fundamental acquaintance with most or all of the branches of study which he is there to prosecute. He comes, not to make their acquaintance, but more thoroughly to ground himself in them. He knows already the elements of philosophical and historical apologetics alike; he has ordinarily been a student of the Bible for many years; he has, perhaps, already served an apprenticeship as a teacher of religious truth. It would be absurd to refuse to take him as we find him, and to insist on requiring him to approach the body of studies he is invited to devote himself to, as a complete novice. It is, in a word, possible to lay aside, in his case, the purely scientific order and to arrange the curriculum on the basis of practical needs. He can be introduced to all the subjects of the curriculum from the beginning; or he can be invited to attack them in the order in which the subjects treated or the methods of treatment may be made most strongly to appeal to him, or to be most readily conquered by him, or most powerfully to work together for his preparation for ministerial work. In a word, the principle that should govern the arrangement of our curricula, as it seems to me, in the

actual circumstances in which we are placed, should not be the encyclopædic-scientific one, but the pedagogic-practical one.

V. As soon as this fact emerges, we are face to face with what seems to me at least, the most urgent problem which arises in connection with the question of the constitution of the curriculum—the problem which concerns the distribution of the hours which are devoted to each branch of instruction, for the attainment of the best results. Two broad views are here current. One of these lays stress on concentration, and the other on diffusion; one seeks to gain, so far as may be, for each subject of study in turn, the undivided attention of the student for a time, while the other seeks rather to gain for each study the longest continued attention of the student attainable. The one lays stress on the value of absorption in a single topic; the other on the value of prolonged occupancy of the mind with each topic. Under the influence of the one conception, the number of branches studied contemporaneously by the student tends to be made as few as possible, and the several topics are distributed each to a separate portion of the course, to which, as far as possible, they are confined. In its extreme form, this mode of ordering the curriculum would give practically the whole attention of the student for blocks of eight or ten weeks at a time to single topics, and thus carry him topic by topic through the course. Under the influence of the other conceptions, the several branches of study tend to be made each to engage some part of the student's time and attention through all three years of his course, and the element of time and digestion is reckoned a factor in his training. Such a broad question cannot be argued in this paper; it is not one peculiar to the theological curriculum, but concerns general pedagogic theory. I must content myself with simply confessing that I am myself a hearty advocate of the latter of the two theories. I believe in *time* as a factor in education; I believe as little in the policy of "bolting" a course of study, whether the whole theological course, or any of its several branches, as I do in the policy of "bolting" food. I think that the instruction in every department should be distributed over as large a portion of the whole three years as possible; that the instruction in each depart-

ment in a single year should be distributed throughout the whole year; and that it is even an advantage to have the consecution of recitations in the same department occurring in the same week follow each other, not immediately, but with an interval between them.

It will be at once recognized, of course, that the process of diffusion may be overdone. A wise mean must be sought here as well as elsewhere. Nor am I unaware of the strong objections that have been brought against the whole method. Repeated and rapid changes in the subject of study do have a tendency to distract the mind, to dissipate the energy, to loosen the grasp already attained on the subject, to discourage from effort, to confuse the mind with a multitude of imperfectly connected facts. If these evils are inherent in the method of diffusion, and not merely the result of a good method pressed to an unwarrantable extreme, that method would stand condemned. But on the other hand, we must remember that change is rest, variety is spice, and nothing so impairs mental vigor as monotony of work, while nothing is more important for solid acquisition than *time*. Above all other reasons for adopting the method of diffusion, however, I rank the consideration that to require the student to absorb himself in turn in the several branches of study, instead of occupying himself with a number contemporaneously through a proportionately long period, is likely to prove equivalent to inviting him to adopt a feverish habit of work which seeks to reap immediate and, too often, temporary results, rather than to cultivate that method of quiet and long-continued acquisition which ends in solid and permanent attainment. Let it be granted that recitations following immediately on one another gather impulse each from each, and make acquisition proportionately easy and rapid. Is not the loss equally rapid, when the recitations are wholly intermitted? Let it be granted that when the recitations stand a considerable interval apart something is forgotten between them, and some of the acquisition gained in the one is lost, and needs to be recovered before progress is made by the other. Does there not lie just in this, when properly viewed, the pedagogical value of the method? Is not opportunity thus given continuously, to

observe what has been really assimilated, and to recover what has been lost; and is not this repeated review and recovery the very essence of solid acquisition? In a word, the hinge of the question seems to me to come really to this: shall we seek brilliant immediate results, or permanent effects? The "solid-block" system of distribution will give us far more sparkling recitations and far more brilliant examinations; but the "long-time" system will give us, in my judgment, by far the best-trained men. Briefly, the one method is a method of "cram," and the other a method of "education." And it is because I look upon it in this way that I heartily give my voice for the distribution of the topics of study through the curriculum in a manner to secure to the students long-continued contact with each study. Of course, I repeat, this can be overdone; a certain mean must be observed, lest we push a good principle to an evil extreme. But it is on the side of this principle of curriculum arrangement that I wish to range myself.

VI. And now let us ask, in conclusion, as to some of the desiderata of our curriculum as at present existent. I think our Presbyterian seminaries have worked out what must be acknowledged to be an exceedingly good curriculum. But we need not contend that it is as yet perfect. What are some of the places at which we yet feel lacks, of a kind at least that we may hope to supply?

1. The first desideratum that strikes me at least, as I look over our common curriculum, is the need of provision for more thorough scientific work in special departments. I ought not, however, to name this as a desideratum of the curriculum itself; it is rather a desideratum of our theological teaching. And it ought to be supplied, not by the insertion of more detailed work into the curriculum itself, by which we should only overload the curriculum without adequately supplying the need, but by the provision of a rich body of elective courses, and by the establishment of inducements to take advantage of them, such as prizes, fellowships, honor courses and fourth-year courses. The demands of the scientific study of theology in all its branches are so clamant that it would seem to be incumbent on all our seminaries,

as rapidly as possible, to make the fullest possible provision for thorough detailed work in all departments, in this supplementary way. In this manner only can the seminaries accomplish the task—which belongs to them as truly as the actual training of a practical ministry—of fostering Christian learning and providing defenders for Christian truth. As this whole branch of their work belongs, however, to the university or extra-curriculum side of their task, I pass it over in this paper, which is devoted to the curriculum itself.¹

2. Another desideratum that strikes me is some more adequate provision for the acquisition by the students of a more thorough knowledge of the Bible as a whole. This seems to be the element of good in the rather frequent demand made upon us for better and more thorough training in “the English Bible.” Our theological seminaries can never make “the English Bible” the basis of their instruction, or a thorough knowledge of it the main object of their efforts. But I fancy it may be acknowledged that in the work done in the seminaries there is danger that men may obtain only a fragmentary knowledge of the Bible, and may go out ignorant of broad stretches of its contents. We do need somehow, in a practical interest and in a scientific interest alike, to give them a more thorough acquaintance with this Book as a whole. What I have in mind here is very much the same as, but something more than, what Principal King, of Winnepeg, pleaded for before the Third General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance,² when he asked:

“Should a student, at the close of his theological course, not be prepared to pass an examination on the contents of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation: to give, where practicable, the authorship and date of any separate book, the circumstances which occasioned it—its historical setting, so to speak, and its main contents? Should he not be expected to be able to give, if required, a synopsis of the prophecies of Isaiah and of Micah, and of the Gospel of John, and of the letters of Paul to the Corinthians or to the Galatians? Does it not seem fair and rational to expect that a man should, at the completion of his course of preparation for the ministry, know, at least in a general way, the whole book which is to be his life-work to teach, and not simply, however well, a single important section of it, or even two or three select sections?”

¹ I have said a few words on the subject in a paper printed in *The Independent*, June 20, 1895.

² See the *Report*, p. 297, sq.

Adequate formal provision for all this is undoubtedly made in our seminaries in the instruction given in the chairs of Old and New Testament literature; but it is a desideratum that the knowledge should be deepened to a real knowledge of the whole Bible as a book of religion. I should not like to be understood as implying that even this is not already done in some of our seminaries. I know that it is done in some of them, and doubtless it is done to a greater or less extent in all. I am only pleading that it should be made more than at present, a prime object in their teaching.

3. I should say that a more thorough denominational training may well be accounted a third desideratum in our seminary work. There is, of course, wrought into the very warp and woof of our seminary instruction a denominational character; we are Presbyterian seminaries established by the Presbyterian Church to train men for the propagation of Christianity as it is understood by that church. Nevertheless, there is a real danger lest in our work we may neglect, more or less, the more distinctive features of Presbyterianism; and there is a real need, accordingly, for some more thorough training in what is distinctively denominational. The General Assembly of 1882¹ formally advised the seminaries "to give more attention to thorough and systematic instruction on the constitution and polity of the Presbyterian Church." And the advice, to my thinking, might well be broadened. The seminaries ought to take means to inform their students more fully of distinctively Presbyterian history—a history of which none need be ashamed, but of which many among us remain shamefully ignorant; to indoctrinate them more completely with distinctively Presbyterian doctrine—a doctrine which is the purest transcript of the inspired teaching, and as such the hope of the world; and to instruct them more perfectly in distinctively Presbyterian principles and polity—a polity which is at once scripturally simple and simply scriptural. In a word, we desiderate a more complete denominationalizing of our training. Nor need we fear that we may mar the beautiful catholicity of our Presbyterian ministry by

¹ *Minutes*, p. 91. See Hodge's *What is Presbyterian Law?* Third Edition, p. 536.

infusing into it a more denominational spirit. Narrowness does not belong to the genius of Presbyterianism; while definiteness of conviction, which does stand at its core, is not inconsistent with catholicity of spirit, but is rather one of its sources. As he best serves the church at large who most devotedly and intelligently serves the church to which he belongs, we are training men for the best service of the whole church of Christ when we are making them able and instructed, loving and appreciative servants of the church whose agencies of instruction we are. There are sources of enthusiasm in our denominational history and doctrine and methods, of the impulse of which we ought not to deprive the students committed to our care.

4. A fuller instruction as to the practical value of the instruction rendered in our seminaries, I should look upon as still another desideratum of our work. I do not refer here to the direct practice of religious work—a kind of theological “clinic” which we all wish could somehow be effectually obtained for our students; though this, too, is a desideratum which, though we are ever keenly feeling it, we are ever finding it impossible fully to supply.¹ Nor do I refer to that part of training in actual use which comes from homiletical exercises, elocutionary teaching, moot presbyteries and the like; this is already pretty fully, probably as fully and efficiently as possible, provided for in our work. I refer rather to a broader thing—to some efficient aid to be afforded the students in mentally bridging the gulf between their studies and the practical work that lies before them, some real help in enabling them to apprehend the practical good to a minister of Christ of all the mass of what seems to many the dry intellectual acquisition they are forced to make in college and seminary. There are more than we think who never succeed in correlating their learning and their work. How many of our students, for instance, never perceive the practical value of Hebrew to a humble minister of the gospel!

¹ Some wise remarks as to the tendency to demand of seminaries more in the way of practice in religious work than can possibly be provided by them, may be found in a paper, the joint production of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. J. A. Alexander, in the *Princeton Review*, Vol. XX. (1848), p. 479. Cf., also, Dr. Dabney, as cited, pp. 66, 67, who thinks the attempt to combine practical training with seminary teaching, in the same course of years, a demonstrated failure.

A vast deal of the sheer folly that is talked, and acted on, as to an "over-educated ministry," and as to the greater efficiency of what is called a "simply-trained ministry," would be avoided, if we could somehow get the bridge built which would practicalize in their own minds the intellectual training which we give our students. How this can be done may be difficult to say. I do not know that the question has been seriously grappled with anywhere except in the United Presbyterian Hall at Edinburgh. There, we are told, the professor of practical training is charged with the duty of opening the eyes of the students to the practical value and use of the whole body of instruction they have received.

"The professor first reviews in detail the whole preliminary study prescribed by the church, and shows how it bears on the equipment of the minister as a Christian man, and on the fulfilment of his work as a Christian teacher and pastor. The university course is considered in its three divisions, classical, physical, and philosophical. Next, the theological course is taken, and it is shown how each part should be brought to bear on ministerial work. The apologetics, exegesis, systematic theology, church history, the church as a society, and the work of the ministry as presented in the New Testament, are expounded with a direct reference to the work of the ministry; in fact, all the student's previous training is gone over, and sharpened with a view to direct ministerial efficiency."¹

I adduce this merely by way of illustration; whether it is the best way to obtain the end sought may be open to question. I fancy, however, that we shall scarcely question that it is desirable in some way to make it understood by our pupils, that the theological seminary is really a very practical institution.²

5. I have reserved for the last what is probably the most important desideratum of all, the securing of a deeper training for our students on the side of practical religion. It will not do for us to say, or, worse than that, to think, that this is not the function of a seminary, though even so eminently good a man as Dr. William G. Blaikie, who surely, above most of us, has his heart in the practical piety of his students, does allow himself to say

¹ James Iverach, *Professional Studies of Clergy in Scotland*, in *The Catholic Presbyterian*, November, 1879, p. 370.

² Cf. *The Theological Seminary a Practical Institution*. By Rev. D. D. Demarest, D. D., in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, II., p. 312.

something very like this,¹ and that in a context in which he is urging on students of theology the duty of cultivating the spiritual life, and on theological professors the duty of furthering this in all proper ways. Certainly an American Presbyterian theological professor cannot say with Dr. Blaikie: "True, indeed, our halls of theology were set up expressly for that purpose." This *is* one of the purposes for which the plan of the seminary adopted in 1811 expressly asserts that our seminaries are set up. One of the chief beauties of the curriculum of work there laid down for the seminaries is its admirable balance, and in its balanced requirements is made very prominent an express provision for training in practical piety. And surely this is as it should be. What element in the training of an effective ministry can compare in importance with the cultivation of a devout spirit and a holy mind? Least of all can we American Presbyterians doubt either the value or the possibility of imparting such a training along with whatever intellectual acquisitions may be made at the seminary, when we have such examples as, for instance, the career of Dr. W. S. Plumer at Allegheny before our minds. The fires of Christian love which he kindled there are not burnt out yet, and eternity alone can tell the full tale of results which have flowed from the training in practical piety which he gave those who gathered about him for instruction, not only in theology, but also in holiness.²

By what processes an efficient training in religion is to be secured to our pupils it is naturally somewhat difficult to say. There are, of course, all those methods of quiet influence by which a teacher may act upon his pupils' hearts and minds: the devout tone in which all the work of the institution is prosecuted; the stated meetings for religious conversation and prayer; the obviously devoted lives of instructors and guides: and all these must enter as factors to the securing of the end. And there is the method suggested by the Plan of the Seminary, which consists in requiring students before graduation to have "read a considerable number of the best practical writers on the subject of reli-

¹ *Catholic Presbyterian*, January, 1880, p. 31.

² On the general subject cf. Principal King, as cited, p. 304; and see Charles Hodge and J. A. Alexander, as cited, p. 478.

gion," obviously a good method of promoting the growth of practical piety. I wonder how many of our seminaries conscientiously require it? You will permit me to say here, too, that in this aspect of their work I consider those seminaries especially blessed which maintain regular chapel-preaching on Sabbath, in addition to the more familiar Conference, which probably all of them hold weekly. The body of seminary students constitutes a congregation, and a congregation of somewhat special character and with somewhat special needs. It is good to gather them together on Sabbath for a formal church-service of their own, keyed to their actual state and position, and adapted specifically to their peculiar needs. The distribution of the students among the churches of the neighborhood, while possessing obvious advantages and serving certain valuable ends, does not take the place which a chapel service of their own can alone supply. Let us foster in our students the idea that they constitute a church, and are to live as becomes those who are, in their corporate union, a church of God. Shall I go further? Shall I say that, constituting a church, they ought to have a pastor? It is a matter, at least, worth considering. Amid the multitude of agencies gathered together to further the intellectual advancement of our students, may it not be worth considering whether there may not be work enough to be done in the advancement specifically of their religious life to occupy all the energies, and time, and thought of one man? Of course, all the professors are, first of all, ministers of grace, and will do all that is possible in them to quicken the religious life of their pupils. But is it not worth our careful thought, whether a body of from 100 to 250 young men gathered together in a semi-isolated community, on the one hand do not require more pastoral oversight than is likely to be given them, in a purely spiritual interest, by teachers already overburdened with work and care; and on the other hand, will not richly repay, in a ministry of deepened grace and power, the spiritual labors of a pastor devoted to the deepening of their religious life and to the quickening within them of an ever-growing devotion and of a constantly perfecting consecration?

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ITS RELATION TO SOCIAL REFORM.

THERE has, probably, never been a time when there was a greater desire among men, and especially among the laboring classes, to improve their condition, than in our own. The question of division and remuneration of labor has created a movement, the like of which the world has never seen. An international party of revolution has been formed, which means to bring about this improvement of the social relations by means of force. The aim of this so-called socialism is an entirely new order of things, in which all inequality is to disappear in universal communism, where there will be neither rich nor poor, neither master nor servant, and where all dissatisfaction, strife, and misery shall cease. Certain voices in this party even demand the abolition of religion and the church, of matrimony, and of private property. The earlier socialists, as *e. g.*, Count St. Simon (died 1825), Charles Fourier *et al.*, did not by any means intend to break with religion, and among the later socialists there are also nobler men, such as the American, Edward Bellamy, who have not yet lost all respect for the things considered sacred by most men. In that communistic era described by Bellamy, even divine worship is held every Sabbath. But the great mass of socialists is undoubtedly inimical to religion.

The views of the socialists, which are proclaimed with all the enthusiasm of a new faith, are all the more dangerous, because, under the present social conditions, there really exists an oppressive inequality among men. An unheard-of development of the mechanical arts, caused by the invention of ever new machinery, and which threatens, before long, to drive the small artisan entirely from the field; a system of unscrupulous spoliation of laborers, who are considered by the employer merely as so many "hands," and whom he uses like machines for his own enrichment; a fabulous amassing of wealth in the hands of a few, and at the same time total impoverishment of thousands; these things impart to socialism a certain degree of vindication.

It cannot be expected, however, that the evils in human society will be removed in the manner proposed by socialism. This can only be accomplished by removing the causes which lie at their roots. And these are to be found, on the one hand, in the materialistic views, according to which the goods of this world are alone considered worth having; on the other hand, in the selfishness of men, in that cold and heartless egotism, that would keep and increase everything it has, no matter what may become of the others. These two go hand in hand; selfishness has assumed such terrible dimensions in our days, because irreligion has become so general. When men lose the living God of revelation, then they also lose the foundation of all "morality and virtue." Then there is no plausible reason why matrimony and property should be considered sacred. If there be no living God who gives to every man what he pleases, then all human order and human rights are also overthrown, and mankind becomes a horde of robbers who know but one right, viz., to take what they can get.

In order to remove the social evils of mankind, a remedy is required which will remove the selfishness of men. This remedy is found solely in religion. In the revealed word of God alone are to be found the ways which lead to a reconciliation of the contending parties, and to the amelioration of the social relations. Not until men return to God will peace be established. To prove all this, with the aid of the Old Testament, is the object of this paper.

I. THE SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THE PAST.

If the social problem could be solved by legislation, it would have been solved long ago by the Mosaic law. Moses justly exclaims, "What nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?" (Dent. iv. 8.) These laws, in which mercy and justice are wisely blended, form a veritable mine of social wisdom, which nowadays is heeded far too little. There is, perhaps, no part of the Old Testament of which it is so difficult for ordinary readers to get a clear idea as that which relates to the Mosaic legislation. There is such a mixing-up of narrative with law that the reader is easily bewildered. The laws of Israel may be classified under

four heads: (1), The Ten Commandments, or Words; (2), The Book of the Covenant; (3), The Levitical Code; (4), The Deuteronomic Code. In casting a glance into these laws, we can only notice what is of importance regarding the social relations of men. We begin with a brief review of the ten commandments. These are the fundamental law, the brief sum of the divine will.

"I am Jehovah, thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage;" these words form the preface to the ten commandments. Reminding the people of God's mighty miracles, through which he had revealed himself as the almighty God and gracious Saviour and protector of Israel, they were to them a standing exhortation to obey and trust God. Jehovah is the God and King of Israel; this is, therefore, the fundamental article of the Jewish constitution. The relation to God dominated all the views of the Israelites, and formed the basis of their entire social life.

Man's relation to God determines his relation to his fellowmen. Luther justly says of *the first commandment*: "Where the heart is right with God, and where this commandment is kept, there all the other commandments follow." For, while it forbids all idolatry, it also enjoins that fear of God which is mingled with love, such a fear as an affectionate and dutiful child has of offending the parent. This fear of God excludes all fear of men and, therefore, assures the possession of true liberty; while the love of God, as our common Father, assures true equality and fraternity among men. Thus the first commandment furnishes the true foundation for the three supreme demands of socialism: liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The fourth commandment, also, has an important bearing upon the social relations of human society. It is to be noted that it does not merely enjoin the keeping holy of one day. It also says: "Six days shalt thou labor." In requiring every man to labor, it ennobles and exalts labor. It stamps idleness as sin. The industrious wage-earner is exalted far above the distinguished man of leisure, whose sole object of life is idleness and enjoyment, instead of work. In setting apart the seventh day as a day of rest, the fourth commandment meets the want of the human system for

rest. "The Sabbath was made for man." Every creature needs rest. It has been demonstrated that men and animals that rest one day out of seven, accomplish more in six days than others do in seven. The weekly day of rest is a most beneficent gift of God to the laborer, after the fatigue of the week. A really beneficent Sabbath rest is impossible, however, except where the day is indeed kept holy. With only an outward observance of the Sabbath as a day of recreation, its observance becomes frivolous, and such a Sabbath is a social menace, rather than a blessing. The Sabbath must be, above all, a day of private and public worship, without which true piety and religion itself are impossible.

The fifth commandment furnishes the basis of a happy family life, which is, again, the foundation of social welfare. In the socialistic commonwealth, as described by that eminent socialist, August Bebel, there can be no well-regulated family life. The children are turned over to a general training-school. Everybody is fed in immense state restaurants. Thus the hearth and home are destroyed. How, in such a state, a regulated, much more a happy, social condition is possible, is unimaginable. With the Israelites, these tender family bonds were fostered as with no other nation. Even the slaves were considered members of the family. Blessed is the nation, with whom these firm and tender family ties prevail among the high and low classes. Therein lie the strength and marrow of a nation. In this commandment temporal well-being is made dependent on its fulfilment. What socialism demands—temporal prosperity—here it is promised, in a manner, it is true, which is directly the opposite of what they propose. Not by undermining authority, but by upholding it, is the welfare of a nation promoted.

The morality of a man and of a people may be estimated according to the value they place on human life. *The sixth commandment* is, "Thou shalt not kill," or, more properly, "commit murder." Among the Israelites, the principle had prevailed since the days of Noah, that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." (Gen. ix. 6.) In our days many socialists contend that a political murder is not only at times

justifiable but a heroic act. We need only allude to the laxity of many courts in punishing murderers, to justify the wish that the severity of the Mosaic law on this point would still prevail. That would, doubtless, be the most effective means of restoring the correct view of the value of human life.

If, furthermore, the conception of matrimony is a gauge of the morality of a nation, then Israel need not feel ashamed alongside the other ancient nations. In the Old Testament, marriage is regarded as a divine institution. (Gen. ii. 18.) While polygamy prevailed with all the ancient nations, the Mosaic law, though not expressly forbidding it, placed so many barriers around it as to gradually suppress it. At the time of Christ, polygamy had almost entirely disappeared from among the Jews, a proof that the spirit of the law was inimical to it. No law is more ruthlessly set aside by socialistic writers than *the seventh*. Bebel, in his book, *Woman and Socialism*, advocates free love. One cannot but shudder at the thought of the moral conditions which would ensue, should the state of affairs advocated by this writer ever be realized.

The eighth commandment protects man's property, and touches one of the most burning social questions. The Israelites possessed no absolute right of possession, for Jehovah said: "The land shall not be sold for ever; for the land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." (Lev. xxv. 23.) What is here said of the right to the soil is true of all earthly possessions. "For what hast thou, that thou hast not received?" Christians are to regard all their possessions as a trust, for which they are responsible to God. Unfortunately, most men have no idea that they are God's stewards and accountable to him for the use of their temporal goods. Socialism demands the abolition of all private property, on the ground of the notorious principle of Proudhon: "*La propriété c'est le vol.*" (Property is theft.) This principle is not more reprehensible before God than the other: "My property is mine; with it I may do as I please." Both are in conflict with the biblical principle, that all property is a trust. But there is a human right to property. This is threefold. It is (1), either the right of acquisition, or (2), that of inheritance, or (3), that of donation. Any encroachment upon these rights is a transgres-

sion of God's law, whether it is through force (by robbery, theft, or extortion), or through fraud and deceit, or with an appearance of right (by twisting the law, or taking advantage of its letter, while its spirit is violated). Thus it is also a sin to make too great demands upon the laborer, as it is a sin for the latter if he does not guard the interests of his employer with all diligence. This commandment, therefore, forms the basis of all honesty, faithfulness, and conscientiousness, which are the very pillars of social life.

The ninth commandment resists all injury inflicted upon the neighbor through the tongue, whether by unjust accusations or slighting contempt. The non-observance of this commandment is adding much to heighten class hostility. While many of the upper classes look with contempt upon the laborer and servant, it cannot be denied that in laboring circles, too, abuse and slander largely prevail, and have become favorite weapons and shameful means of agitation, especially with a large part of the press.

Finally, *the tenth commandment* wards off, summarily and emphatically, all the demands of socialism. For what is socialism, essentially, but coveting the neighbor's property? To create this covetousness in those who are without means, is the real object of socialism. To incite laborers to strike, what is this but alienating servants from their masters?

Thus we have seen that the decalogue guards the most sacred and cherished goods of man, those very goods which are assailed by socialism. No wonder the latter rejects religion; the divine commandment everywhere obstructs the execution of its plans!

We must now cast a brief glance upon the other Mosaic laws. They are really only an enlargement of the decalogue.

The Book of the Covenant follows directly after the decalogue. (Exodus xx. 23 to xxiii. 33.) For the name "Book of the Covenant," see Exodus xxiv. 7. Here, too, we find many ordinances which relate to social life, and require a conduct characterized by fairness, honesty and kindness, even towards enemies, as well as towards strangers, the poor, and the slaves.

The fact that the Mosaic law permitted slavery has often been the cause of unjustified attacks on the part of many scoffers. We

must not forget that slavery, like polygamy, was prevalent with all the ancient nations. With the Israelites it was generally self-incurred, sometimes even voluntary, and always but temporary, for after six years the slaves were to be liberated (Exod. xxi. 2), unless a slave, as it not infrequently happened, so loved his master that he preferred life-long bondage in his master's house to liberty. (Exod. xxi. 2-6.) The Hebrew slave was by no means without rights. The law protected him everywhere, and assured him a mild and just treatment. As already mentioned, he was considered a member of the family, and he, too, enjoyed the rest of the Sabbath-day. Whenever a slave died as a result of maltreatment on the part of his master, the latter was punished (Exodus xxi. 20); or, if the slave was maimed he was liberated. (Exodus xxi. 26.) Kidnapping of slaves was a capital offence. (Exodus xxi. 16.) The lot of the Hebrew slave was, in many respects, easier than that of thousands of laborers in factories today. Slavery, as it existed with the Israelites, is, therefore, not to be compared with heathen slavery, or even with modern wage-slavery.

The Book of the Covenant has much to say on the subject of justice between man and man, and the statutes bearing upon this topic commend themselves as essentially just and reasonable. "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," etc. (Exodus xxi. 24, 25), is a barbarous law, literally carried out; nevertheless these phrases embody the fundamental principle of jurisprudence, that for all wrong there must be adequate compensation. Just one other commandment may be noticed in this book: "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him." (Exodus xxiii. 4, 5.) This is indeed an anticipation of the great law of our Lord Jesus Christ, "Love your enemies."

By the term "Levitical Code" is meant all those laws which are found in the second-half of Exodus (beginning with the twenty-fifth chapter), and Leviticus and Numbers. They relate chiefly to the duties and position of the priests, yet also contain

many statutes of social importance, especially those which regulate family property. The Hebrew constitution was so arranged that all poverty should be impossible. A plot of ground was assigned by lot to each family for their possession. If, by reason of indebtedness, this property was alienated from the family, it was restored to them in the "year of jubilee," every fiftieth year. (Lev. xxv. 24.) Besides, they could redeem it, or any part of it, at any time. (Lev. xxv. 25.) Such laws as these rendered it impossible for a few owners to control immense tracts of land, and, at the same time, furnished an effectual means against general impoverishment.

In the Deuteronomic Code the law of kindness has grown to still larger proportions, and now embraces a variety of particulars. Thus it is forbidden to withhold the hire from the poor and needy; it must be paid before the sun goes down. (Deut. xxiv. 14, 15.) The rights of the fatherless and the widow, and of the stranger, are again specially protected. (Vs. 17.) The gleanings must be left for the poor in the orchard and harvest field. (Vs. 21.) Even the beasts of burden are remembered. (Deut. xxv. 4; xxii. 10.)

This brief review of the Mosaic law suffices to demonstrate how wisely the social affairs of the Hebrews were regulated. One would think that, with such laws, the people would have enjoyed continued prosperity, that poverty, want, and other social evils would have remained unknown to them. Yes, had the laws been observed, all social evils would have been impossible. That the public welfare of the people would depend upon their true and willing obedience to God's law, is clearly stated in Deut. v. 29: "Oh that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever." But, alas! there was but seldom such an heart in them. Again and again they rebelled against God. (Isaiah i. 2; Jer. ii. 13.) But they never rebelled without incurring his punishment. Drought, locusts, poor crops, and famine were often the direct penalties for their disobedience (Amos iv. 9-11; Haggai ii. 17, 18); and these, naturally, resulted in hard times. Besides this, their infidelity, even then, begat that heart-

less selfishness with which the strong oppressed the weak, notwithstanding God's commandments and the constant reproofs of the prophets. (Amos iv. 1; Isaiah v. 7, 8, 18, 20-23.) Thus the people of Israel already had their "social problem" in spite of the excellent laws which were intended to prevent it. And here, too, its causes were infidelity and selfishness. The law was not able to eradicate selfishness from the hearts of men, nor is it able to do so now. Love to God and love to the neighbor cannot be inculcated by command. But without these we must forever despair in solving the social problem. Thanks be to God, that there is a way to plant this love into man's heart. This is, the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

II. THE SOCIAL PROBLEM AT THE PRESENT TIME.

That the covenant of the law made with Israel would not be final, was clearly prophesied to them. Thus God spake through Jeremiah, that he would make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: "I will put my law into their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." (Jer. xxxi. 31-34.) Other passages in the prophets declare that this new covenant with Israel and Judah would, at the same time, embrace all other nations. Through Isaiah God says: "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." (Isa. xlix. 6.) The "servant" of God here spoken of can be none other than Christ. In the whole wide realm of history there is no one besides him of whom could be said, or who could accomplish, what is here said of this servant of God, viz., to be a Saviour of all mankind. Through Ezekiel God promised that he would save his flock, and they shall no more be a prey. He would set one shepherd over them, who shall not only deliver them from their oppressors, but make them happy in every respect. (Ezek. xxxiv. 22-24.) It requires no proof that this shepherd and prince, who is to be a second David, can again be none other but Christ. Besides him, there is no one in the

whole history of mankind, who, like him, has brought, or could bring, to poor, suffering humanity relief from all anxiety and oppression. The words of Old Testament prophecy, everywhere, describe Christ as a mighty Saviour, sent from God, who is to mitigate all human misery, and spread true happiness upon the earth. All the relief, the liberty, and prosperity which men hope for shall be bestowed upon them through him.

The gospel of Christ is the new covenant made with all men. It offers the only solution of the social problem, because it is the only means to eradicate selfishness from the hearts of men and supplant it with a new disposition, viz., love. It differs from the old covenant, in that it approaches man not primarily with a demand, but with the glad tidings that, for Christ's sake, God is willing to pardon our sins. It does not tell us, primarily, what we are to do, but what God has done, and is willing to do, for us. And in revealing to us the whole immeasurable love of God, it creates a new love in us, so that we say: "We love him, because he first loved us," and likewise: "If God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." Thus the gospel plants into our hearts the love for God, and the love for our neighbor. The gospel does not make void the law. The law remains the rule of obedience for all time. But what is commanded in the law becomes, through the Holy Spirit, man's own desire, an inward constraint, so that now man's will corresponds with God's will. (Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27.) Now it is no longer "thou shalt," but "I will; the love of Christ constraineth me." Love is the only source of true obedience. Love is the fulfilment of the law. Therefore the gospel is indeed the "balm of Gilead" (Jer. viii. 22), the true panacea for all the ills of human society.

But some may retort: "How is it, then, that the social problem still exists?" To which we reply: "The best remedy will not avail for him who will not apply it, or applies it only partially." No one will deny that, if the spirit of true Christianity would prevail generally among men, then they would not injure or offend one another, nor oppress one another, or do anything to embitter the life of one another; they would rather be kindly affectioned and brotherly in their intercourse, and gladly assist one another;

it would be their pleasure and their joy to help and to comfort one another. Then the earth would become an abode of peace and gladness, a pattern of heaven. What a benignant influence the gospel of Christ has actually exerted upon mankind is apparent to any one at all acquainted with the history of the nations, and especially with the history of modern missions. Without it, most of the laborers would still be slaves this very day. That with the true spirit of Christianity even communism, so eagerly desired by the socialists, is possible, is proven by the example of the apostolic church. For a time there actually existed among the first Christians a perfect community of goods, viz.: so long as they were all led entirely by the divine Spirit which had descended on the day of Pentecost. But as soon as selfishness resumed its control, communism was no longer feasible; and if the present polluted state of the church precludes communism, even among Christians, the fault lies not with the gospel, but in the sinfulness of man. When we compare the present state of the church with that of the first Christian church in Jerusalem, we must cast down our eyes in shame. Where is that meek and self-denying spirit that looketh not on his own things, but also on the things of others?

It is the supreme duty of the church of Christ to pray without ceasing, that the Spirit of Christ resume his control in all her members and spread more and more upon earth. This she must strive to achieve with the appointed means. Chief among these is the preached word. That the Christian pulpit cannot and must not ignore the social question, might be proved by hundreds of examples from the Old and New Testaments. It must assert the rights of the employee as well as those of the employer, and enforce the duties of the employer as well as those of the employee. This may give offence in certain quarters, but hardly greater offence than that caused by the sermons of John the Baptist, and of the Saviour himself. That it must be done in a spirit of wisdom and of love, in that spirit in which Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, preached to Philemon, his "dearly beloved and fellow-laborer," is self-evident. But, above all, Christians must furnish the actual proof that the gospel is really the cure for the

evils of the times, by practicing that mercy which Christ enjoined. They must really use their temporal means for the amelioration of the woes of humanity, as God's stewards, and not for selfish purposes. They must not forget to do good and communicate; for with such sacrifices God is well-pleased.

Repentance, an actual turning-back to the spirit of Christianity, this is the only way to cure the thousand ills of mankind. (Isa. i. 16, 17; viii. 20.) And may the prospects for a true and general conversion of the world to Christ and his gospel be ever so discouraging; may the number of true Christians be ever so small; and may the spirit of anti-Christ assume ever so threatening an attitude, yet we believe that the final victory belongs to him whom God promised, as a deliverer, to the fathers of old, by the mouth of his prophets, and who "came in the fulness of time to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.)

III. THE SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THE FUTURE AND ITS FINAL SOLUTION.

There is a firm conviction among the socialists that, when the future socialistic state shall have been established, humanity will enjoy a prosperity, a felicity and universal peace, as never before. Thus Bebel writes in the afore-mentioned book, *Woman and Socialism*, as follows:

"Then when the final social conflict has been determined the new society will be reared upon an international basis. The nations will fraternize and shake hands with one another, and strive to extend the new order of things, gradually, over all the nations of the world. One nation approaches the other no longer as an enemy who seeks to despoil and to suppress, nor as representatives of a strange faith which it would inflict upon it, but as a friend who would educate his fellowmen to become men of culture. . . . Neither powder, nor lead, nor fire-water, nor the Bible will be used in this mission of culture, but it will be undertaken by peaceable means, which make the civilizators appear to the savages not as their enemies, but as their benefactors. . . . When once the civilized nations are united into a great federation, then

the time will also have come when the storms of war shall cease. Eternal peace is no dream."

Bebel evidently loves to play the role of prophet, only that he is not divinely inspired, and cannot say: "Thus saith the Lord!"

In this connection we must also allude to Edward Bellamy's book, *Looking Backward, 2000 to 1887*. No one can read this book but with the ardent desire: Would that such a state of happiness prevailed among men, as is here described! In order to transpose the reader into the year 2000, the author makes a certain well-to-do man fall into a mesmeric sleep, or trance, in the year 1887, out of which he does not awake until 2000. This man then describes the new world as he finds it. All private property has been abolished; all people labor for the common weal. Competition in commerce and all intermediate commerce, which at present enhances the price of all things, have ceased. The national property is so great that at its expense all may lead a life pleasant and free from care. And now, when all enjoy the same well-being, hatred, envy, and strife have disappeared from earth, and love rules mankind. That men should doubt God now seems "a pitiable insanity." "It is very easy to believe in the fatherhood of God, in the twentieth century," so we are told in a sermon preached in the year 2000. But this very sermon is a mockery of the gospel. As mankind has redeemed itself, men need no longer a Saviour and Redeemer. It is also contended in this sermon, that now it is fully revealed "that human nature in its essential qualities is good, not bad; that men by their natural intention and structure are generous, not selfish; pitiful, not cruel; godlike in aspirations; images of God indeed, not the travesties upon him they had seemed." But this we must beg to doubt, because the experience of all ages has shown that infidelity with all its fruits, such as selfishness, hatred, haughtiness, arrogance, sensuality, cruelty, and falsehood still carry the day, even where the external relations are the most favorable, and the question of "mine and thine" is not at all involved.

Christians entertain no doubt whatever, that without God, and contrary to God, men will never achieve a state of peace and true happiness. But any one somewhat acquainted with Old Testa-

ment prophecy will recognize, at the first glance, a remarkable similarity between the latter and the expectations of the socialists. The Old Testament prophets, too, predict an era of righteousness and peace, in which the "storms of war" shall cease. What wonderful visions have they beheld! They see how men throw away their idols of silver, and their idols of gold, and how the idols shall be utterly abolished. (Isa. ii. 18 and 20.) The King shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth (Psa. lxxii. 8); all kings fall down before him, all nations serve him (Vs. 11); his name shall endure forever, and the whole earth be filled with his glory. (Vs. 17 and 19.) The Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, receives dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages shall serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not be destroyed. (Dan. vii. 13, 14.) Then shall be fulfilled what was promised to the Son of God: "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." (Psa. ii. 7, 8.)

This universal dominion of the kingdom of God upon earth, and the subjection of all nations to the King, is to be brought about by an universal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. When God promises by his prophet Joel (ii. 28): "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh," this promise could not have been wholly fulfilled in the outpouring of the Spirit at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. This, to be sure, was the beginning of the fulfilment, as also Peter, in explaining that miracle, describes it as a fulfilment of this prophecy. (Acts ii. 16, 17.) But it was not yet an outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh. Even at Jerusalem, there were comparatively few who opened their hearts for the divine Spirit. Thus, also, was the perpetual fulfilment of this prophecy through all centuries and down to our present time, always and everywhere, only local and partial. But the prophet speaks of a time when this outpouring shall be quite general, so that no man is excluded; and he adds, that every age (the old men and the young men), every sex (the sons as well as the daughters), and every class (even the servants and handmaids) shall participate in it. (Vs. 29.)

At this time it will dawn upon earth as it has never dawned before. Then the nations shall flow unto the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, to learn his ways and to walk in his paths. (Micah iv. 1, 2.) The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. (Isa. xi. 9.) Then God will also gather his people of Israel from among the nations and out of all countries, whither they were scattered, and at that time put his Spirit into their hearts and cause them to walk in his statutes. Then they will be his people and he their God; then in truth will Jehovah be Israel's King and Lord. Thus it is thrice prophesied by Ezekiel (xi. 16-20; xxxvi. 24-28; xxxvii. 1-14); also by Hosea (iii. 5) and Jeremiah (l. 4, 5).

Now, when this time comes, when God will send from heaven a new Pentecostal storm; when he will cause his breath to enter into the dry bones (Ezek. xxxvii. 5), and take away the veil from the eyes of men; when at last "all flesh" is converted to God; when the Spirit of God shall control the hearts of all men, and their selfishness is turned into true love; then, yes, then, a new era must dawn upon earth; then the relations between individuals and between nations must become radically different from what they are now.

Correspondingly, the prophetic view sees a reign of righteousness and peace upon earth, as never before. The oppression of the poor and needy has ceased (Isa. xi. 4); the nations live in peace (Hosea ii. 18); nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; the weapons are turned into implements of peace. (Isa. ii. 4.)

Along with the regeneration of the nations, the prophets also predict a renovation of nature. Nor can this surprise. For the sake of man's sin nature shared the curse. Now, if the power of sin be broken, this bane must also be removed from her. Therefore the prophecy of the Old Testament has much to say concerning a rejuvenescence of nature. The wilderness and the solitary place shall blossom (Isa. xxxv. 1, 2, 6, 7), the earth yield her fruit abundantly, the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed, and the mountains shall drop sweet wine. (Amos ix. 13; Joel iii. 18.) Such

a fertility would necessarily influence the whole life of man. When the wilderness becomes a "garden of God," and earth a paradise, what consequences must this have upon the entire national prosperity!

Therefore the prophets describe this era as a season of general prosperity, wealth, and abundance. Every man shall sit under his vine and under his fig tree (Micah iv. 4); and every man shall call his neighbor under the vine and under the fig tree. (Zech. iii. 10.) They shall enjoy the work of their hands and shall not build and another inhabit, nor plant and another eat. (Isa. lxxv. 22.) Even the long life of men shall be restored. (Vs. 20.) Finally, this will be a time of answers to prayer, as it has never been. (Isa. lxxv. 24; Hosea ii. 21-23.)

Thus, in the Old Testament a life of consummate bliss is promised—a life of earthly pleasures, as well as of perfect sonship. What is now called the social problem no longer exists in that blissful era. It has been solved forever! The dreams of the socialists have become reality—not, it is true, in the manner proposed by them—the Lord has done it! "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." (Zech. iv. 6.)

Then the voice of rejoicing and salvation shall be in the tabernacles of the righteous:

"The right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly,
The right hand of the Lord is exalted:
The right hand of the Lord doeth valiantly."

—PSALM cxviii. 15, 16.

New Orleans.

LOUIS VOSS.

III. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD.

It has been well said by Thomas Carlyle in his *Heroes and Hero Worship*, that "a man's religion is the chief fact in regard to him. Of man, or a nation, we inquire, therefore, first of all, what religion they had." As there is, and ever has been, but "one living God," all the rest being dead, this religion is readily found by differentiation from multiform paganism. This leaves us Christianity with its variations, and Islamism, which is a violent protest against the corruption of the Syrian bishops. None of these can claim a monopoly of religion. They all bring us to God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only living and true God. Jeremy Taylor and Augustine, Spurgeon and John Bunyan, Pascal, Quesnel, and Thomas á Kempis belonged to the church of the living God, though in different communions. Protestantism, also, is protean, yet all of its variations claim origin from the same source and authority for their distinctive features in the same Scriptures. Of the many shapes assumed by corporations of Christian people, there must be one that conforms more closely to the outline given in these writings than do the others, and that receives the largest patronage of individual Christians. This, if found, may be accepted as more authoritative over the sanctified conscience, and more helpful in developing a godly character and godly seed, than any other.

The spiritual and invisible gives origin to all things, and supports them. Matter is secondary to spirit, and is upheld by it. So in the church. The spiritual and invisible body is first in order of time. This is the organizing and life-giving principle. The elect of God, given to the Son by the Father, are they whom he came to call out of the world for "a possession." As the Spirit says in Ephesians i. 10: "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him, in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated

according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." This possession is, or must be, universal "in the fulness of times."

With this idea we start in our search for "the Church of the living God." In order to become visible, this church, unorganized at first, must be organized. And to organization, the following things are necessary, viz.: Outward profession, officers, duties. These duties, which are teaching, ruling, and managing temporal matters, must be permanent and universal. This gives it visibility everywhere, sometimes more and sometimes less, accordingly as the truth is taught in purity and the duties faithfully performed.

All the varieties, though numbered by the hundred, may be classified under three heads: that in which the governing power is vested in one man; that in which the people confer upon a select body this power; and that in which it is retained in the mass. The Lord Jesus dwelling in the midst of the church, as the centre and source of its life and power, supersedes the necessity for any intermediary. The church is, therefore, a theocracy. From him comes all the power to the people. In answer to prayer, he appoints or indicates those whom he wants to rule or teach in his possession over his people for their good and for his glory.

He lodges the power of governing separately to itself, or in combination with that of ruling. This is most clearly taught in 1 Timothy v. 17: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." That is, some elders rule only, and others both rule and preach. Their rank is one, but their powers are two. This combination of functions has never been successfully controverted. The ruler is called by two names in Scripture, sometimes by one and sometimes by the other. But the functions are never complicated. In the same chapter we sometimes find the one word used to express the one power, and in close connection another word, used of the same person, to express the other power. In Acts xx. 17, the rulers are called presbyters, and in verse 28, immediately below, they are called bishops. The most eminent scholars, even in the Anglican church, now notoriously admit this,

and some of them go so far as to say that presbytery was the form of government first established in the church, and that episcopacy or prelacy, its offshoot, developed by circumstances in the third century.

If the two words express two different officers, having different powers, then the authority for presbyter or ruler is fifteen times as strong as that for bishop, because used fifteen times oftener to signify this function—the word bishop being used four times and the word presbyter sixty-two. The equivalency of the words is indispensable to perspicuity. Their differentiation would introduce hopeless confusion.

The permanency of this office is unquestioned. The ruler has held his place in the church of the living God in all ages and dispensations. Changes have occurred in her outward form, in her modes of worship, sacraments, names and duties of officers; but the ruler has always been the elder. Strictly speaking, the minister of the word had no place in the Old Testament church. The scribe more nearly resembled him than any other officer. Preaching the gospel, as a means of religious instruction, and for the promotion of religious feeling, was first *formally* instituted by Christ when he said, "Go, preach." Reading the Bible publicly for this purpose seems to have begun with Ezra, the scribe. Priesthood ceased when the great antitype came. The order of Levites ceased when the temple fell. Altars vanished when the veil of the temple was rent in twain. But the ruler has held his place in the church of God from the beginning, and was seen in prophetic vision in the church in glory by the Apostle John. It is, therefore, the one everlasting office in the church of the ever-living God.

The apostles emphasized the fact of their office as elders in the church. "I exhort you, who am also an elder," wrote the Apostle Peter. Though the first called of all the apostles, and very eminent, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker of the glory to be revealed at the resurrection, he yet felt that his office as elder was a subject of cordial self-congratulation. The Apostle John styled himself "the elder unto the elect lady and her children," and "the elder unto the well-beloved Gaius."

While magnifying his office as apostle, he yet prefers to be thought of as a permanent officer in the unchangeable church.

This church of the elders it was that fled from persecution into the fastnesses of the Alps and Appennine mountains, where she nourished an independent life down to the Reformation and our own times. The Reformers throughout Europe adopted it as their church. Only in England, where the Reformation was a secession from Rome, led by King Henry VIII., who was actuated by prudential considerations, personal to himself, was the feature of diocesan episcopacy retained.

It is also true that in our times churches, in which the spiritual oversight is specifically bestowed upon bishops, are adopting our distinctive feature. The "lay element" is now generally admitted into the church councils of the Episcopal and Methodist Churches of Great Britain and her colonies, and of America. The "historic episcopacy" is being modified by necessity. The same necessity is felt in the Baptist or Congregational communion. Spurgeon lavished his praise on the session of the Presbyterian Church, and had associated with himself in the government of his enormous congregation a company of men answering to all intents the purposes of our session.

On the ground of scriptural authority and practical efficiency, the Christian world might more readily confederate in a great spiritual commonwealth, a representative republic, than on diocesan episcopacy. This would be indeed a formidable foe to the absolute monarchy of Rome, and popular with the world. When "the torch of liberty" is enlightening the world as to the true and best form of civil administration, the Presbyterian Church might well rise to the occasion and do likewise for ecclesiastical administration. We start midway between absolute monarchy and unorganized democracy. Ours is, therefore, the true meeting-point for all "the variations of Protestantism."

Moreover, the flexibility of our system invites this effort. Presbyterianism is capable of indefinite contraction and indefinite expansion. The story of Prince Ahmed and his fairy wife Parabainon, given us in the *Arabian Nights*, well illustrates this idea. In order to ingratiate herself into the good will of her father-in-

law, the Sultan Mirza, who had turned his face away from his son because of his romantic marriage, she wove and sent to him, as a present, a tent of the finest and most elastic material. It was so small when folded that Prince Ahmed carried it in his hand. Yet when he gave it to his father and opened it, the tent spread until it completely covered the Sultan and his family, and, still spreading, it covered his entire army, and he was assured it would spread until it covered an army twice as great as any that he could set in the field. It is literally true that the Presbyterian Church can contract into a single family, as that of Abraham or Chloe, and it can expand until it includes the human race, and govern it without confusion.

This is, therefore, the church most nearly conformed to the pattern given us in the Scriptures, and best adapted to the wants of companies of believers in all the ages. Other churches and their ordinances are valid, though irregular; this is both valid and regular.

Valuable as government is for efficiency in promoting the best interests of both the individual and the mass, it is yet much less important than the saving doctrines of the Bible. "Truth is in order to goodness, and the great touchstone of truth its tendency to promote holiness." We are "born again . . . by the word of God that liveth and abideth forever." We are "made clean through the word."

While Presbyterianism, strictly defined, is that body of professing Christians which is governed by elders, yet there is a sense in which we may use the phrase *Presbyterian doctrine* as well as Presbyterian government. There is a system of doctrine, closely knit, setting forth the true ideas of God, men, and Saviour, which was first developed from the Scripture in its three integral parts, respectively, by Athanasius, Augustine and Calvin. This system has been held by the Presbyterian Church in all her history, and is now held by this church throughout the world. Nor is it merely held as "a form of sound words," a party shibboleth; but it is cordially believed and lived by. It is the "strong meat" on which Presbyterians have ever grown strong in faith and good works.

The starting-point of this system is the fact that God determined to save a people—a definite number of immortal beings—out of this ruined world. To this end he entered into a covenant of redemption with the Son, to whom he gave this people to be saved. Predestination, then, is the first fact, and the Saviour the second fact, in the Bible. From this point of view the whole Bible is to be studied; for the Bible is an inspired record of the government of God over this world, executing his eternal purpose. Of this elect people our Lord Jesus himself says, “All that the Father hath given to me shall come to me.” For this purpose “he was made head over all things to the church.” As mediatorial king, his reign is absolute and universal. In executing the decree of the Father, all things are done under the sun by him, “by whom are all things and we by him.” Creation, providence and redemption converge to this result. For this the world was made, the seasons revolve, kingdoms and governments rise and fall, wars cease unto the ends of the earth.

The setting up of this church in the wilderness; the completion of the canon of Old Testament Scripture; the incarnation; the descent of the Spirit; the dispersion of the church from Jerusalem into all lands; the calling of the Gentiles; the finishing of Scripture—all these signal events of divine providence are simply waymarks “in the course of human events,” showing how the eternal purpose of God in election is executed.

This is the thread by which we make our way through the labyrinth of Scripture. The “progress of doctrine,” both in the Old and New Testaments, cannot be seen except in the light of this fact. The law makes way for the prophets, and the prophets for Messiah and his church. The last book in the Bible, written after the church had been established, and forty years after Messiah had ascended, whose text is in these words, “Come up hither, and I will shew thee the things which must be hereafter,” is history written in advance, an outline of “the things,” symbolically stated, which were to precede his second coming. And so we see how it is that the purpose of God, according to election, is made to stand.

The decree of election is, then, the first link in the golden

chain of redemption, and the starting-point in the career of every soul whom God means to save: "For whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The *εκκλησιοι* become the *κλητοι*, and the *κλητοι* become the *δικαιοι*, and the *δικαιοι* become the *αγιοι*, and the *αγιοι* compose the *εκκλησια*.

This sequence of events in the moral history of each soul, beginning with its being given to Christ in the covenant of redemption, is not only recorded in Scripture, but also realized in the experience of that soul. He knows his election by these events. These are its logical outcome to his own consciousness. Like a chain-shot from a cannon, the one draws the other after it inevitably. This is true of the individual because true of the mass. Effectual calling, justification, adoption and sanctification, are linked to election and stapled in the all-embracing decree or eternal purpose of God. The Holy Spirit abiding in them as the church of the living God imparts to them the power of self-government.

For this system of doctrine the Presbyterian Church feels an intense zeal. Her pulpits give no uncertain sound. In the Roman, Zwinglian, Lutheran, or Episcopal Churches the pulpit is divided between Calvinism and Arminianism. But from the Presbyterian pulpit, whenever the sermon runs along the dividing line between the two opposing systems, we confidently expect to hear something more or less directly connected with—

"Fixed fate, free will and foreknowledge absolute."

Believing that the highest duty of the church, the chief end of her existence, is to keep, as a trustee, and hold forth the word of God, the lamp of life, in all places and through all time, she guards the treasure most sacredly; whenever necessary, contending earnestly for it against all enemies, whether without or within her fold. The church has been a controversialist in all her history, and her sons have ever been in the forefront of the battle between truth and error. She followed "Athanasius against the world," he having been elected to the Patriarchate of Alexandria by the clergy *and the people*. She followed Augustine against Pelagius, and Knox against the Stuarts. At the sound of this

trumpet call, "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," she has never failed to gird her sword upon her thigh to slay the enemy on the highest places of the field. Knowing this fact, they have been wont at times to avoid this conflict. At the rise of Arminianism in Holland the innovators "sought to hinder the meetings of ordinary synods; and at other times it has been when the safeguards of Presbyterian discussion and discipline have been in abeyance that error has come in and spread." This has been true in a more especial manner of the Presbyterian than of other churches. "Everything connected with the formation of its creed, the admission of its members, the education, license, and teaching of its ministers, and the bearing of its public acts, as affecting the truth of God, is thus matter of public interest and debate, and the ordinary procedure of its courts affords innumerable opportunities of witnessing for truth and resisting defection, such as do not exist under other forms of government." (*First General Presbyterian Council*, p. 55.) So Dr. Briggs, of Union Seminary, New York, and his allies, fearing these safeguards of the truth in the Presbyterian Church, sought to avoid conflict in endeavoring to set aside the supreme authority of Holy Scripture and introduce a new religion. But in vain. A deep sense of the value of the truth and her responsibility for it, as divinely-appointed trustees and guardians, constrained his presbytery to arraign and try him, and his General Assembly to pass sentence of condemnation upon his teachings. Within the last thirty years the Northern Presbyterian Church has disciplined and sentenced many heretics. Faithful and godly men in other churches lament the fact that heretics are tolerated in their midst. This is because either of a lack of unanimity and zeal, or of plain statutory law. This church of the living God is known to be such by fruit in history peculiar to herself.

In conversation some years ago with the Rev. Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, the most notable antagonist of Calvinism in our time, he said, "Though in my younger days a member of one and now of another church, there are three facts in the history of your church for which I admire it more than any other, viz., 'it has given to the world religious liberty, the martyrs, and the best devotional

literature.'” This opinion is well sustained both by authority and by “the cold facts of history.” The pen of Calvin quietly planted the seed which yielded both civil and religious liberty. His *Institutes*, dedicated to King Francis in 1536, had a wonderful circulation. We may not accept as strictly true the statement that it reached one thousand editions in his life-time, yet it certainly was enormous, and exerted great influence in preparing Europe and America for the true theory of human rights.

In the centre of Europe he founded a republic on the four following principles: (1), All power of government flows from the will of the governed—the people *en masse*; (2), This power is properly deputed to rulers chosen by the votes of the people; (3), The exercise of power by the rulers is properly regulated by the will of the people; (4), The church and state in two different corporations, each existing by divine right, each ordained for divine glory, but aiming to attain this end, the one by administering justice, the other by communicating grace. These are the four cardinal principles of Presbyterianism. These ideas revolutionized Western Europe. Geneva, of course, was revolutionized; and from every part of Europe thinking and enterprising men came to study his doctrines, and so applied them that for a century and a half they governed a large part of Europe. The General Synod of France, which met May 25, 1559, epitomized these *Institutes* into a Confession of Faith. In his *Memoirs of the Reformation in France*, p. vii., the Rev. R. Robinson says, “The New Testament was the Goliath’s sword of the clerical reformers; there was none like it.” But he adds on the same page, “Calvin . . . was a chief instrument; he slid his Catechism and other books into France, 1541. . . . *The Reformation was called Calvinism.*”

Knox carried these principles to Scotland and impressed them ineffaceably upon his countrymen, and by them the monarchy of the Stuarts in England was overthrown. Dr. C. Hodge, in his *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*, Vol. I., p. 53, quotes from *Hallam’s Constitutional History of England*, Vol. III., p. 427, as follows: “In the providence of God, it was the struggle of the Scotch for the liberty of their church which

was the means of preserving the liberties of England. Charles had succeeded in governing the latter kingdom for twelve years without a parliament. When the Scotch formed their national covenant, that is, a voluntary agreement to sustain each other in resisting the arbitrary measures of the king, and prepared to oppose force by force, Charles found it absolutely necessary to summon a parliament. The Scotch being in arms in the north, the friends of liberty in the House of Commons were emboldened in their opposition to the court, and entered on that course which soon ended in the overthrow of the monarchy and of the established church."

These principles of Calvin were also received into Holland and inspired that love of liberty, which, after a protracted struggle with Spain, resulted in the Dutch Republic. The English Puritans restated the system of doctrine in the *Institutes* in their *Westminster Confession of Faith*.

Now, from these sources flowed the streams of population that settled our country and laid the foundations of our institutions, both civil and religious; because of which fact the historian, Bancroft, called Geneva "the fertile seed-plot of liberty." Motley also, in the preface to his *History of the Dutch Republic*, says, "So much is each individual state but a member of one great commonwealth (international), and so close is the relationship between the whole human family, that it is impossible for a nation, even while struggling for itself, not to acquire something for all mankind. The maintenance of the right by the little provinces of Holland and Zealand in the fourteenth, by the Hollanders and English united in the seventeenth, and by the United States of America in the eighteenth centuries, forms but a single chapter in the great volume of human fate; for the so-called revolutions of Holland, England and America are all links of one chain." And so Calvinism has been powerful, both as a religious and political force.

An agent of the American Tract Society, Rev. Jonathan Lyon, attended a meeting of the Methodist Conference of North Carolina when they were debating the proposition to establish a publication house for their use as a denomination. One of the speakers

objected, urging the fact that they then had excellent religious literature, suitable for devotional purposes, published and sold on good terms by the American Tract Society, and that it would be a misappropriation of money to spend it in building a house they did not need. The argument was answered by saying that while the literature of the Tract Society was good, yet it contained Calvinism in dangerous quantities; as a fact, he asserted that it was full of it, as the cup of coffee he drank for breakfast was full of sugar, every drop of it being sweetened with sugar, which yet could not be seen. His argument prevailed, and the Conference cast its vote in favor of what is now known as the "Methodist Book Concern." Mr. Lyon gave me this fact as his own personal testimony. Nor need we hesitate to agree with the speaker when we remember that the body of that literature was the work of Bunyan, Baxter, Doddridge, James, Wilberforce, Hodge and Alexander, all of whom were Calvinists. The hymn writers, Watts, Toplady, Cowper, Newton, Doddridge, Kirk White, Bonar and others, were Calvinists.

In Edinburgh, Scotland, in a corner of the yard of Old Greyfriar's Church, is a marble slab, colored with age, on which is carved an epitaph in memory of eighteen thousand Presbyterians who were put to death by the Episcopal government for refusing to worship God according to the liturgy of the established church. These all laid down their lives between 1661 and 1688, or in about one-quarter of the century throughout which the persecution raged. The number of those in Scotland, from Patrick Hamilton, who had the honor of being "the first to announce the glad tidings to his countrymen and of sealing them with his blood" (*Life of Knox*, by McCrie, p. 32), greatly exceeded eighteen thousand. Besides these were the countless martyrs among the French Huguenots, the Hollanders, the Alpine Vaudois, the Bohemians, and the Presbyterians whose blood reddened the hills and plains of Europe. The Presbyterian Church has been emphatically a martyr church.

The admiration of Dr. Albert Taylor Bledsoe, author of a *Theodicy*, editor of the *Southern Review*, the greatest champion of Pelagianism of this century (though stoutly denying it himself),

who claimed to have overthrown *Edwards On The Will*, and found a common ground on which Arminians and Calvinists might stand, was well founded.

That which has given to the world religious liberty, the martyrs, and the best devotional literature, may well be called "the chief fact" in regard to a man or nation; and the church that professes and practices this religion is presumably the church of God; and if it has been shown that the Presbyterian Church of which this is true is also, in its internal faith and external form, agreeable to Holy Scripture, have we not attained that which we seek for?

Winchester, Va.

H. M. WHITE.

IV. THE AUTHORITY OF THE CATECHISMS AND CONFESSIONS OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES HOLDING THE PRESBYTERIAN SYSTEM.¹

It is a historic characteristic of this family of churches that they emphasize the importance of a correct apprehension of the truth. "Truth is in order to goodness," and the right acceptance of the truth is necessary to a right attainment of the goodness. Accordingly, the history of symbolics is one of the largest chapters in the chronicles of Reformed Christianity.

It is a psychological truism that the mind must interpret to itself any body of truth in order intelligently to accept it. Chillingworth's remark that the Bible is the religion of Protestants, may be the watchword of an Arius or an Athanasius, of an Arminius or a Calvin, of a Theodore Parker or a Joseph Parker.

The confessions of christendom are only intellectual interpretations of the word of God. Such a confession may be formed *de novo* by the believer himself, or it may be accepted by him from the hands of those who have gone before him. The prerogatives of private judgment are in neither case invaded if only the mental assent be hearty, intelligent, and free.

The truth alone has supreme authority upon the mind of man. Any attempt to add to its claims is adventitious and gratuitous. The axioms of geometry are true, apart from any authority of the geometer. The principles of Christianity are true, apart from any authority of the theologian or the church.

This intrinsic self-evidencing ground of the truth which a confession contains is one canon of its authority. It is not because it is a confession, but because it is true. In so far, Coleridge was right in saying, "He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth will proceed by loving his own sect or church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all."

¹ Read at the Sixth General Council of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system, June, 1896.

To throttle the reason is to cripple faith. No theory of the unknowableness of the Infinite, or of the irrationality of the intuitive visions, or that, inasmuch as God has revealed his truth to man, there is, therefore, nothing for man's reason to do, has changed the historic conviction of the Reformed churches, that there is an antecedent authority of the truth, *qua* truth, apart from all logical and practical consequences, and if that truth be embodied in a confessional dogma, its force, as truth, is neither added to nor taken from by the particular form into which it is thrown.

The scripturalness of any Christian confession is a first and final test of its authority. The supreme *regula auctoritatis* for the church of God is the "word of God as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." Dogmatic Christian thought begins where preliminary biblical criticisms end. Rob us of our Bible, and you have bereft the world of the dogmas of the Christian faith—in any case, those dogmas must look elsewhere for their binding force.

The ecclesiastical sanction of a confession is another test of its authority.

It is necessary to remember that the Christian church is pre-eminently a propagandic, a dogmatic institution. She is at her best in the chapel, rather than in the laboratory; in the sanctuary, rather than in the university. Her apostles were not philosophers, or critics, or scholars, but preachers. The work of the church is not to be "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." The very command to preach presupposes the *Κήρυγμα* to be preached. With her credentials in one hand and her message in the other, the present errand of the church is primarily to proclaim, and not to argue, to witness, and not to analyze or defend.

The church of God is the bride of Christ. Her origin is divine. Her charter is from heaven. Her laws are based upon principles that are necessary and eternal. She has no rival in the spheres for which she is ordained. Her government is a means to an end; this end is the dissemination of the gospel and the salvation of the elect. That government is only nominal, if it be not in-

vested with authority for its enforcement, and with disciplinary apparatus for the maintenance of its integrity and the accomplishment of its ends. The promise of her Lord is on record that his Spirit shall guide his church into all truth. The infirmities of her human representatives and the divergencies of discordant branches of christendom may prove the fulfilment of that promise a sluggish though progressive process; but the transcending elements of Christian history, the underlying unity of the church, catholic and invisible, and her inflexible loyalty to the fundamentals of the truth, prove that that promise is also the pledge of divine guidance, even unto the end.

It is always fully recognized that the functions of the church are purely ministerial and declarative. Her interpretations of the Scriptures are only interpretations; but, as such, they have the sanction of an institution which is divine in its origin, and divinely guided in its work in so far as the promised guiding Spirit has been yielded to and obeyed.

Manifestly is this true of that form of the church which we hold to be distinctively apostolic in its origin, abundantly vindicated in its history, and intrinsically invested with the blessings of regulated self-government. All representative government, civil or ecclesiastical, must sink into anarchy if it lack its carefully-guarded system of sanctions and penalties.

To be sure, it is now an accepted postulate of all Protestantism that the church has none other than a moral power for the enforcement of her laws. The crown of Cæsar was never made nor meant for her benignant brow. But, happily bereft of all other, she regards as the more sacred and potential the sole power she does possess. Her subjects are not unwilling subjects. Her faith for ages has been published to the world. Gratefully and voluntarily has every ordained elder avowed allegiance to her gracious sceptre. Born within or without her pale, he has set the seal of fealty to her constitution, and subscribed to her confession that it is true.

Hence it is that there is added to the authority of the truth as truth the authority of the Confession as a confession. The very avowal of a confession creates new relations, to which obligations

of gravest moment attach themselves. The church is not less a human association because it is also, and first, a divine institution. The purely spiritual relation which the believer sustains to God in no degree impairs the purely ethical relation which he, at the same time, assumes in connection with his church. They are co-existent and co-relative.

This being true of the *credenda* as well as of the *agenda* of the church, it becomes a matter of serious concern whether it is proper that men should, by avowing ethical relations emphasized by solemn spiritual sanctions, thus forswear, as it is said, their intellectual independence for to-morrow, or even for to-day. The question gains timeliness from the acknowledged achievements of modern research, and the consequent shifting centres of gravity in human knowledge. The undisguised distaste for dogmatic pronouncement, the negative drift of a prevalent skeptical spirit, and the various tendencies that have combined to exalt the heroism of emancipated thought, have led honest men to reconsider whether, after all, on the whole, it be consistent with the highest type of intellectual conscience and religious principle to subscribe to any confessional dogma, with the stipulation, tacit or explicit, that the subscriber is bound by, or bound to, the dogma which he thus adopts as his own.

It must not for a single moment be overlooked that the specific subject-matter of this inquiry is not in any sense the faith of the believer, but rather the solemn relations assumed in its public avowal. The theme set for this paper is not the *content*, but the *authority*, of the confessions. Upon one who has not avowed it, a confession, however worthy of veneration as such, has no authority whatever; its only force is that of the truth which it contains. With him who has avowed it, however, the free, rational assent is presupposed in the ecclesiastical; for him, therefore, it is not only the truth that binds; it is the confession with all its pursuant obligations.

The base-line of orthodoxy is not truth rationally apprehended; it is the confession, ecclesiastically enunciated on one side and voluntarily affirmed on the other. Orthodoxy and heterodoxy, though contradictory, are correlative terms; they refer not to the

utterances of the reason, not to the system of some great master, not, immediately, even to the Scriptures themselves, but only to the formally promulgated symbols of some ecclesiastical body. Thus it appears that truth may be heresy and error orthodoxy. The norm is the confession and the test is harmony or disharmony therewith. If the straight-edge be crooked, then absolute straightness itself is guilty of departing from the line. If Unitarianism be the creed, Trinitarianism is heresy; and if the Confession teach that men die as the beast, then faith in immortality becomes heterodoxy.

A Presbyterian to-day believes what the standards of his church set forth. He agrees to be a Presbyterian to-morrow, provided, first, there is not meanwhile a change in his own belief; and, provided, secondly, the Presbyterian Church does not change its standards. In the former event, he may honorably sever his connection with the Presbyterian Church, and there should be none to say him nay. In the latter event, we may all expect the heavens to fall. The authority of the Confession, therefore, is sacred and determinative, because it involves certain obligations of highest religious solemnity, certifying to the world the belief that certain tenets are scriptural and true, and, especially, implying a personal devotion to him who is himself eternal Truth, and, therefore, the supreme Lord of the conscience.

And yet it will hardly be reckoned that a question so deep and delicate is to be decided for every case on *a priori* principles. Honest heresy is better than pretending orthodoxy, but it is not always easy to know what is honesty and what is orthodoxy. A candid spirit desires above all things to have "a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men"; certainly a supersensitive honor may lead to disastrous ruptures where healthier conceptions would avoid them. The widening of mental horizons after assuming ordination vows, the natural disappearance of youthful immaturities in "the years that bring the philosophic mind," the variability of incidentals and essentials in accordance with the personal perspective, the undefined elasticity of the terms of subscription, the inexact latitudes of private interpretation, the crowding, driving tasks of a busy life, the boundless field

and transcending implicates of the truth in contemplation, and, besides all this, oftentimes a timid mental temperament that shrinks from calling anything truth lest, peradventure, there be those who believe otherwise, or, indeed, lest haply it so be that, by the next moon, it may think otherwise itself—all this grievously embarrasses and encumbers the solution of this most perplexing of all problems. Honestly are doubts suppressed and fearlessly is the truth proclaimed. Fervently is guidance sought and faithfully is duty done. Cautiously is the *man* weighing evidence on this point, and loyally is the *minister* preaching God's word on that point.

It is easy to believe that not a few godly and successful ministers of the gospel in the Reformed churches of christendom are in this frame to-day. They are not traitors, but loyal sons of the church. They are not candidates for harsh measures, but for sympathy and guidance. They need the fraternal counsels of their brethren in the Lord. They need to know that the believer's doubts are infinitely above the unbeliever's faith. They may hear the stalwart man of faith declare, "He who doubts religiously has the true religion," and there will be not a few to comfort them with the strained epigram of the poet—

"There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

The weak in faith will not grow strong by doubtful disputations. Paul's words to the church at Rome are not obsolete to-day, and the modern church should never forget that gentleness makes it truly great, and that to leave unspoken the kindly word of sympathy is the most ungracious heresy of all.

But there is a doubt less tentative and timid. There is a doubt that crystallizes into the bold affirmations of dogmatic error.

It is neither possible nor desirable that there should be a lifeless uniformity within the church. The more men think for themselves, the less likely they are to think exactly alike; and the less men think for themselves, the more likely it is that they will think exactly alike. It is needless to say that the Presbyterian system provides a proper method of revising its confessional standards. Such revision, however, is only revision. The

authority of the Confession should always be above the easy reach of those who recognize its binding force. The fundamental elements of a Reformed confession can never be transformed by any possible process into another confession in which those fundamental elements are wholly forfeited and lost. NEVERTHELESS, there is generous room for discussion and agitation and public education, within confessional limits; and not unfrequently does it happen that the most loyal champions of the truth are they who clamor most earnestly for needed revivals of faith and for needed reforms in practice. But clear conceptions of faith should always be matched by clear conceptions of duty. If a minister's creed change, the sequent relations which that creed alone can make honorable should also change.

If the champion of *laisser-faire* should suggest that the church, having ministerial functions only, has no proper right to define her limits along confessional lines, it remains to be said that, even if that were true, such a challenge is ethically defensible only before entering upon solemn covenant relations in which the very rights that are challenged are both tacitly conceded, and, in the vows of ordination, explicitly acknowledged.

This paper does not discuss the status of the laity, from whom very few of the Presbyterian Reformed churches exact any full confessional subscription. Every ordained elder, however, is a recognized exponent of the doctrinal positions of his church. The very continuance of his official relation is tantamount to a continuous renewal of it. Accordingly, the church is properly regarded as giving her deliberate *imprimatur* to the utterances of her elders. She speaks with their lips. Her voice were better silent than speaking words of error. If the conscience of the diverging elder do not suggest a change of relation, the conscience of the church must supply the need. The individual is now the elder, and the elder stands upon his ordination vows. The glory of Presbyterianism is in its representative self-government, and the essence of that grand principle is embodied in the American motto that under God the majority rules.

With the Presbyterian succession of appellate courts, all constitutional rights are fairly safeguarded, and if human infirmity

should defeat the will of the guiding Spirit to the very last, then, with the single remaining contingency that the judgment of the court enlightened may be modified by the court better enlightened, there is, beyond the possible consciousness of a misjudged integrity, no redress or remedy this side of that supreme court from whose assize all error is eliminated, and from whose verdict there is no appeal.

When such an unfortunate crisis comes, and such unwelcome problems follow, the duty of the church has always been held to be as clear as the light of day. For the sake of the truth, for the witness and for the defence of which she is set; for the sake of a beholding world, which looks to the church for the true setting-forth of the word of God; for the sake of her fidelity to her Christ-given trust, and of her loyalty to her risen, ruling, but absent, Lord, it becomes obligatory upon the church of God, summoning her highest wisdom, and carefully observing every constitutional safeguard, to vindicate her honor, and to republish her unswerving devotion to the word of God as the enlightening Spirit has given her to understand the word of God.

Not otherwise is coherent organic Christianity possible. A house large enough to take in all out-doors ceases to be a house. Universalism, here and hereafter, ignores or obliterates all distinctions. Any evangelical church must be exclusive in order to be inclusive. The Reformed churches, therefore, have always believed, and believe to-day, that while no shackles should be fastened upon the hands and feet of intellectual enterprise and inquiry, yet in the confessional relations of their ordained eldership, it is not a matter of mental caprice, or of rational apprehension only, it is also a matter of solemn ethical and religious import, born of the church's commission, involved in the very genius of her organization, fraught with transcendent consequences and bearing, with commanding cogency, both upon the intellect and upon the conscience. At whatever cost, therefore, the church of Christ must stand by and stand for the truth which he has given for her own edification and for the enlightenment of the world.

It were, indeed, a work of supererogation for the church to justify the wisdom of obeying her Lord. The churches represented

in this august body have led the van of intellectual and moral progress in the history of the modern world. Their educational centres count the circles of science, and philosophy, and literature largely their debtor. The churches that honor the intellectual possibilities of mankind are the churches that do most to develop and realize those possibilities. If history is the tribunal of the world, the Reformed churches need take no appeal from the findings of that court.

Let their past be a pledge of their future. They have their own work to do. They have their own mission to fulfil. They have their own elucidation of divine truth to stand for, and with Christ the Lord for their leader, with his word for their charter, with that interpretation thereof for their standards, which has been crimsoned with the blood of martyrs and sealed by his blessing in the ages of the past, "with malice toward none and with charity for all," with a warm hand and a warm heart for all who trace their faith to the same divine source, and vowing eternal resistance only to those who resist the truth and word of God, they bid fair by his grace to go on from age to age in rational freedom, in scriptural loyalty, in ethical allegiance, in ecclesiastical unity, and in spiritual fruitfulness, fighting a good fight, and keeping the faith until the Lord, the righteous judge, shall come with a crown of righteousness to bestow upon all them that love his appearing.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

San Francisco.

V. CHRISTIAN GIVING IN THE SANCTUARY SERVICE.¹

ONCE every year, on the day of atonement, from the Samaritan altar on the summit of Mount Gerizim, the smoke of the burnt offering ascends and mingles with the clouds. In no other place for the past eighteen hundred years has such a sight been witnessed. Elsewhere that altar fire has gone out forever. We, however, are so familiar with that scene in the history of the church of God before the Christian era, that although all the symbolic teaching and pointing of the altar service has ended in its actual fulfilment, it still influences our judgment. We are affected to-day in our sense of the proprieties of God's house by the sacrificial blood, and fire, and smoke, and their relation to the ancient worship. The use of the word "sacrifice" in our English Bible, when describing the offerings on the altar, sensibly controls thought and shapes our estimate of the proper thing. It has taken away the simple idea of an offering, and led the mind to conceive only of something put upon the altar, and thereby made sacred.

The word "sacrifice," derived from the Latin and meaning something made sacred, and implying dedication upon an altar, fails to be an equivalent of the Hebrew in the Old, or the Greek in the New Testament, when speaking of an offering. The thing offered ceremonially, with the English word "sacrifice" describing it, has led the religious mind to think of the life poured out and the body consumed on an altar as the only offering belonging to the services of God's worship, and that form of offering having passed away, nothing appeals to us in its place as belonging to or being an act of worship.

To give money is one thing, but to give money in God's house and as a part of divine worship is another thing. The ceremo-

¹ A paper read by Ruling Elder Ralph E. Prime at the Glasgow General Council of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, June, 1896.

nial offering of common money, which buys alike the good and bad, seems unseemly to the person who feels affectionately and tenderly, but thinks not deeply.

Although from the earliest times, as was true of the time of St. Paul, collections were made among Christians for the saints, presumptively the poor, they seem at some period in very early times to have come to be regarded as gifts only to the saints, and not as gifts to God. There may have been others, but the only contributions in apostolic times of which we read in Scripture were the contributions for the saints. How these offerings were made, or whether given as alms, or in some cases as distribution of goods held in common, as some have written, is not stated. Down through the post-apostolic times the contributions among the Christians continued, but almost always, if not in every instance, the gift was strictly for the poor. At some time, if not from the very beginning, these offerings were taken in the church service. But whether recognized at all after apostolic times as a gift to God, it will be hard to prove until we come to the time of Edward VI. of England. Yet it is claimed that at one time in France, as early as A. D. 700, a gift for the ransom of the soul in lands or goods or money was to be granted by deed or epistle, executed in the presence of witnesses, and the writing laid upon the altar. Note, the thing or the money was not present, nor does the idea of worship in this act appear. The rubrics of the first prayer book of Edward VI. provide for collections for the poor to be taken, giving special direction for a collection in the time of service into *the poor man's boxes*, but no word in prayer or address recognized the fact that the gift was an act of worship. In the second prayer book of Edward VI., put forth in 1552, the fifth year of his reign, the offering being still given for the poor only, in the prayer commonly called the prayer for the church militant, for the first time in the English liturgy the offering is regarded as alms to God.

We do not hesitate to claim that the Christian act of contributing to the relief of the poor saints no doubt was also the custom of all Christians, and that the custom was continued with the Reformers and in the Reformed churches; but the collection among

Christians seems with them, also, to have been limited to the gifts to the poor, and to be no part of divine service. Whether violent distaste for the papacy, and the determination not to do anything the papists did, had any influence in crystallizing sentiment in the direction which it took in the Reformed churches, cannot be certainly averred at this distant time, but the fact remains that though the clause referred to was introduced in the second prayer book of Edward VI. and into the prayer for the church militant, by which the gifts to the poor are recognized as alms offered to God, it was not followed in the Reformed churches, and the collection was put into such relations that it did not become a part of the public divine service at all.

Besides the general aversion to any imitation of anything papistic, or even prelatie or episcopal, look as we will upon the quality of the thing given, in the Reformed churches the act itself as connected with the worship in the sanctuary was regarded as disturbing the service, distracting to the mind, turning the worshipper from sacred things, and from thoughts and meditation appropriate to the service, the place, and the occasion, and from the very idea of worship.

Early in the history of the churches of the Reformation, the custom obtained in some places of collecting money at stated or set times among God's people, and when gathered in the sanctuary at divine service those gifts were for the poor, and we read in *Pardovan's Collections*, that by an act of Assembly of the Church of Scotland, on the eleventh of August, 1648, concerning such a practice, it was ordered in these words: "Collections for the poor in the time of divine service (which is practiced in some churches abroad) are discharged as being the very great and unseemly disturbance thereof. And kirk sessions are ordained to appoint some other way for receiving these collections." And the book further says: "The method now ordained taken is this; the elders or deacons do collect at the church door from the people as they enter in, or else from them when within the church, immediately before pronouncing the blessing, and after divine service is ended." In another place in *Pardovan*, is found language which is still retained in many a directory of worship: "Nothing is to be at-

tempted in the worship of God but what has been prescribed in the Holy Scripture."

Before the act of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland quoted from Pardovan, and in 1645, an edition of the *Directory for Worship* was issued in London "for the three kingdoms," in which it is said: "The collection for the poor is to be so ordered that no part of the publique worship is thereby hindered." This identical language found way into the *Directory for Worship* as used in the American churches, and is found in the edition of that book published in 1745, and in the edition of 1789 its place in or after the communion service is stated to be after the prayer which follows the reception of the sacrament.

However we may regard the early rule, which provides only for a collection for the poor, and specifies the time and place of the collection and that it must not disturb or hinder divine service, and which makes a dividing-line between the ending of divine service and the pronouncing of the benediction, yet many of us will recollect that in the American churches, thirty or more years ago, the time immediately before the blessing, or, perhaps, before the last exercise of praise, was the time for all the collections, though probably no one of the worshippers in those times ever consciously drew the line, or thought that the divine services ended until the blessing was pronounced.

The Directory for Worship in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as has been stated, in 1789, or before that date, provided that, upon the celebration of the Lord's supper, after the final prayer, a collection for the poor and to defray expenses of the elements may be made, or at such other time as may seem meet to the eldership. This was before the singing of the final hymn, according to the actual practice. We cannot fail to observe that the great difficulty must have been that to our Scottish and American ancestors the act of Christian giving was not regarded as giving to God. They did not see beyond the immediate purpose for which the money was gathered. Their eyes never went beyond the recipient himself. Hence, they did not, and reasonably could not, regard the act as a gift to God, or as an act of worship. We have seen how it was enjoined in those

times that nothing should be attempted in the worship of God but what has been prescribed in the Holy Scriptures; but evidently no man, or body of men—at any rate, in our Reformed churches—ever set about to search out specially if the giving of our money as believers and as Christians, or Christian giving, was, in fact, giving to God, or if such an act was an act of worship.

But Christian giving in the sanctuary of things of intrinsic value, as an act of worship and as a part of divine service, has scriptural authority.

In later and quite recent times, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has taken, as we believe, the first step in the direction of recognizing this fact, and for the reasons, that the subject has received new examination and attention in the light of new Christian developments; that there is a great call upon Christians of this age to give, and to give systematically and proportionately instead of by fitful, impulsive acts; that the objects to which Christians, as such, have in this century been taught to expend their gifts have been greatly multiplied. That church, having for several years considered the subject by its committees, in the year 1885 adopted the new statement, that "The worship of God by offerings is in harmony with the whole spirit of Scripture worship."

Is this founded on the truth as we read it? Notwithstanding all prejudices and deliverances and customs, all sounding a protest against the collection in the public worship of the sanctuary, when we examine the Scriptures we find that, from the earliest time, according to the custom of the Jewish people, gifts to God of other things than those offered upon an altar were commended and invited. The burnt offering passed away, but the free-will offering always had, and always will have, its place. The altar was not within the holy of holies, nor was the treasury there; but there were cast into the treasury offerings to God by his loving people in all ages, acceptable to him, invited by him, and devoted to him.

The psalmist connects the glory of God, and that, too, in the sanctuary, with an offering in his courts: "Give unto the Lord the glory due to his name; bring an offering, and come into his courts." We have never read that the gift of the gold, frankincense, and

myrrh, which the three kings of the Orient laid at the feet of the infant Redeemer, were rejected, nor that the testimony of the love and the faith of the givers was ever questioned because they were not burnt offerings, or because they were intrinsically valuable instead of being ceremonially valuable. Nor has it ever been suggested that that particular act of giving was other than an act of worship. Though none of us be a "king of Orient," the same act by one of us would have all of the qualities which that act had. The same act of faith by different persons cannot have different qualities.

A study of this subject in the Scriptures will disclose wonderful relations between worship and the collection. But for the arbitrary division into chapters, we should see how Paul, moved by the Holy Spirit, wrote to the Corinthians, in the same message, about the things ordinarily esteemed to be spiritual and also about the collection for the saints, without separation of subject from subject, as to quality and importance. Note his clear words: They are of resurrection, of glory, of victory over the grave, of heaven and immortality, of encouragement to steadfastness, of abounding in the work of the Lord, and last, but not least, of the collection for the saints. The whole message to his mind is equally the message of the Holy Spirit; all equally the word of God; and the time of the gift is the first day of the week, the Sabbath-day, the day of worship, the day of the gathering in the sanctuary. And these things being so, then the act of giving our money ought to be an act of worship, and an offering which becometh the courts of the Lord's house.

Giving is a natural act of worship. True, sincere worship always implies love. We cannot agree that placation of an evil spirit, which arouses apprehension or fear, is properly called worship. But our God is love, and if we love God we shall be found doing those things which the human heart prompts, and the human hand does, not only consciously as a testimony of that love, but also spontaneously. Though the act be intended, yet it will unconsciously come out of the desire of the heart. We all have about us those whom we love. They are in our homes. We are not content with words to assure of affection, but we anticipate

desire. Knowledge, not of a real want only, but of the slightest desire, materializes into a gift which is tangible testimony of love, a gift that fills and ends the desire, and changes thought from the thing wanted to the person of the giver. Words are very cheap. Assurance of affection by the testimony of uttered words costs very little, and words often are as ephemeral as their sound. But not so with the gift. It lasts; it reminds of the giver. Apply these thoughts to the gifts in the sanctuary. God does not need these things, but he has made us as we are, and he graciously permits and encourages the gifts we bring. Our natures are such as he has given, and our love for him is his own creation. That he takes delight in the gifts, the free-will offerings of those who profess their love of him, the whole Scripture testifies. We may, indeed, worship God with gifts, and by them fix our own thoughts upon him, the giver of all good.

Giving to God, to be an act of worship and to have place in the divine service of the sanctuary, should be a thanksgiving. To praise the Lord with a song which is thanksgiving, the Psalmist says, shall please the Lord better than an ox or bullock that hath horns and hoofs. Paul wrote that the gifts of the Corinthians not only supplied the wants of the saints, but were abundant also by many thanksgivings.

To be a gift to God, and to have a place in our divine service as worship, it should be also a cheerful free-will offering. Listen to these inspired words: "He which soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly, and he that soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give, not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver." It is certainly out of harmony with the idea that giving can and ought to be a part of the exercises of public divine worship, to hear from the preacher words of pressure upon the people to give, so prevalent in some places, when the commendation of the Scripture is of the cheerful giver only.

In 1874 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America said, "All giving to our Lord's objects should be from spiritual motives and as an act of worship to almighty God, a grateful gift to our divine Redeemer and a

means of grace to our souls." He who begs from men for the Lord's cause always appeals to the meanest of motives. He must not in his appeal prefer the cause before him whose the cause is. He surely who is shamed into giving is not doing honor to God and is not in his act offering worship. He who gives grudgingly makes no gift at all. In the sum of the commandments we are taught to love the Lord our God with the mind as well as the heart. All needful intelligence to fill the mind with the facts of the need of the Lord's cause, and to convince that it is the Lord's cause, and to show how God will be honored by the gift, is, of course, reasonable, for we can never love a cause we know little about, and our hearts do not respond intelligently or usefully or safely to any cause which does not appeal to our minds so as to move our hearts. So far only may we appeal for gifts in the sanctuary. The worship of God by offerings can only be by the freewill offering. We must not beg. The ambassador of the King of kings cannot be a beggar. He stands before the people the representative of him who says, "Every beast of the forest is mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains, and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, for the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the most High. And call upon me in the day of trouble, I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." Such a king needs nothing. To beg for him is to make little of his character and his relation to his stewards, whom we are.

Christian giving, further, must not be measured by its quantity, nor the gift of one be compared with the gift of another; but in each case the gift should be the best we have. It will never do to bring to God that which we have no need of ourselves. The gifts of the early Christians to the poor were not, as is often the case with us in these times, gifts of cast-off things, which we are ashamed to use ourselves. David refused to offer to God the gifts from others, and declares "neither will I offer to the Lord burnt offerings of that which costs me nothing." In the old Levitical law the burnt offering, the peace offering, the trespass

offering, the sin offering, was in each case required to be of that which was perfect, and without blemish, a type of the perfect sacrifice of the Christ. But not so the free-will offering, which, when not in payment of a vow, might even be a dismembered, deformed, blind, maimed, or broken animal, in fact, whatever the willing, thankful, worshipful heart had to give. So, also, the mite of the widow cast into the treasury, being her all, was more to God than all the gifts of the rich. In each case the gift testified love and thanks, and that is worship.

And as to the form of giving. It will be quite difficult to satisfy the tastes and consciences of all. Human tastes differ, and taste has its place in testing the things that ought to be in the church services. Our church happily clings to the simplicity which cannot offend for what it has, and can only be criticised for what it has not. A happy position.

There is no model in the Scripture for the order of church services. Was it not so left that changing tastes and changing circumstances and the suggestions of the new conditions of church work and life, and the sense of fitness of the Christian people of each suggestive period of church life, should be allowed to influence what shall be acknowledged as proper and helpful to us in the worship of God's house? We shall ever be conservative and plain, and, perhaps, to some, over plain and over cold in this matter. We have, however, the Scripture on our side. There was no biblical authority for the change from the simple garb of the fisherman's coat to the royal purple of the empire. No doubt, it was copied from the empire when the simple presbyter became a bishop and put on the purple of the throne. We shall not make the mistake of providing regalia for ministers, or any other such extreme of formal worship. But we may make the mistake of not coming up to our privilege and not dignifying as we may the free-will thank offerings in the house of God as an act of worship having a proper place in the divine service. Can this service of thanksgiving, this act of making a free-will offering, commended in the Scripture, be so treated and arranged, and given its place in the sanctuary service, as to lead the people to the true appreciation of it as their privilege?

One is most familiar with the ways of his own church, because there he stately worships. In the church which has honored me by naming me one of its delegates to this Council, the subject of the place in the Christian church services of such matters as free-will offerings of money, has had most serious and discriminating attention, as a result whereof its General Assembly in 1885 proposed an overture, which was adopted by the presbyteries in 1886, and which added to the *Directory for Worship* a complete chapter on the subject, called, "Of the Worship of God by Offerings." It provides that the service of bringing such offerings shall be performed as a solemn act of worship to almighty God; that the order as to the particular service, and its place in the service, is left with the session; that it should be made a separate and specific act of worship, to be preceded or followed by public prayer, invoking God's blessing upon the service and devoting the offerings to him.

The details of such a service must differ with every people and perhaps with the different occasions. In the church where I stately worship, the offerings of the people are gathered in the usual way, but by the young men of the church, from whom they are received by two of the elders, and while the young men and elders all stand before the people, the solemn act of devoting the gifts to God's work is done by public prayer. Such an order may be too much for some and too little for others. Each church congregation should so arrange for itself that the object shall be best attained of teaching that the gift is to God, that the same belongs as worship to the divine service of the sanctuary, and of receiving from the exercise the grace which ought to come from every act of worship of our God.

New York.

RALPH E. PRIME.

VI. THE TESTING SYSTEM FOR MINISTERIAL STUDENTS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF IRELAND.

THE testing system for ministerial students in the Southern Presbyterian Church is far from giving universal satisfaction. No proposed changes have met with a favorable reception at the hands of the majority of our rulers. But all parties are ready to admit that practically the examining of our candidates is very often most imperfect and unsatisfactory. Laxity is the common characteristic of most of the examinations conducted by the Presbyteries, while incompetence on the part of the examiners is not unheard of.

We are not concerned here to inquire whether the trouble springs from the requirements of the Book, or from the nature of the personnel of the Presbyteries—whether the standard set up in our Constitution is too high, or the material of our Presbyteries too low. We merely affirm as an acknowledged fact that there is dissatisfaction with the system by which we test the students' qualifications for the work of the ministry.

This being so, it may be fairly assumed that an account of the testing system in application in a sister church of noble repute will be received with interest. We do not think of advocating the adoption of the Irish scheme by our own church. We hope simply to stir up the minds of our brethren, by giving them a new plan to think on, to the bettering, in a way which shall seem good to them, our testing system.

In setting forth the Irish system, we shall quote copiously from the *Book of the Constitution and Government of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland*.

62. SECTION V.—JURISDICTION OF THE PRESBYTERY OVER STUDENTS FOR THE MINISTRY.

299. In the Presbytery is vested the right of receiving under its care students for the ministry, of superintending and directing their education, of deciding as

to the qualifications of candidates for the ministerial office, and of licensing them to preach the gospel.

300. Every student for the ministry should, before entering college, place himself under the care of the Presbytery which has jurisdiction over the congregation to which he belongs.

* * * * *

Education of Students. 302. In superintending the education of students under its care, the Presbytery shall see that the following rules are observed :

1. Students shall attend college at least six complete sessions—the first three to be passed in the undergraduate course, embracing English, Latin, Greek (two sessions), Logic, Mental Science, Mathematics, Physical Science, and at least one of the following subjects: French, German, Geology, Chemistry, Zoology, or Botany; and the last three sessions in the course of theology.

2. Each session in the undergraduate course shall extend over at least five months or two full terms.

3. The General Assembly sanctions the attendance of students during the undergraduate course at the following colleges: The Magee Presbyterian College, Londonderry; The Queen's Colleges in Ireland; Trinity College, Dublin; and also at the Universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews.

4. During the undergraduate course, students shall attend a class of Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics; but in places where there is no such class they must attend, in lieu thereof, the Bible and Catechetical class of some evangelical minister, and produce to the Presbytery a certificate of such attendance.

5. Students may attend a Hebrew class during one session of the undergraduate course.

6. The attendance of a student on a theological class, before he has taken his complete undergraduate course, shall not be sustained by the Presbytery; but this shall not apply to the classes of Hebrew and Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics.

7. The Presbytery shall encourage the student to engage in appropriate Christian work during his undergraduate course; and shall, before he enters the theological classes, satisfy itself that he is manifesting a spirit and maintaining a walk befitting a candidate for the ministerial office.

8. In the theological course each session shall be not less than five months in duration.

9. During the theological course in the GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S COLLEGE, BELFAST, students shall attend the classes in the following order:

First Session.—Hebrew; Christian Ethics, including Natural Theology; Ecclesiastical History; Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics.

Second Session.—Hebrew, if not taken in the undergraduate course; Systematic Theology; Ecclesiastical History, including Church Government and Pastoral Theology; Biblical Criticism; Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics.

Third Session.—Systematic Theology; Biblical Criticism; Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics.

10. During the theological course in the MAGEE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, LONDONDERRY, students shall attend the classes in the following order:

First Session.—Hebrew; Ethics; Church History and Pastoral Theology; Catechetics.

Second Session.—Hebrew, if not taken in the undergraduate course; Theology; Church History and Pastoral Theology; Oriental Literature and Hermeneutics; Catechetics.

Third Session.—Theology; Oriental Literature and Hermeneutics; Catechetics.

11. The General Assembly sanctions the attendance of a student at any fully-equipped theological college of a church which holds the standards of this church; but requires the student to take all the classes and do all the work in each class prescribed by such church for its own students, and to present certificates to the Presbytery showing that he has done so in a satisfactory manner. Should a student take his whole theological course at such a college, he shall attend, for two complete sessions, each of the following classes: Hebrew, Systematic Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Hermeneutics, Pastoral Theology, and Sacred Rhetoric and Catechetics. He shall also attend a class of Ethics for one session.

12. During their theological course in any college, students shall attend an Elocution class for at least one session; and they are strongly recommended to attend a class of Sacred Music.

13. Every student (undergraduate or theological) under the care of the Presbytery shall lay before it, at its first stated meeting after the close of each college session, class tickets from the several professors under whom he has studied, certifying that his attendance, moral conduct, and progress in his studies have been satisfactory; and that he has attended the usual class examinations, performed the prescribed exercises, and passed the examination in each department at the close of the session. He shall also produce from some minister of the Presbyterian Church a certificate of his regular attendance on public worship.

14. Each Presbytery having students under its care shall hold a special meeting on the first Tuesday or Wednesday of September in each year, for the purpose of examining them, either orally or by written papers, and transacting any other business connected with their education. Of this meeting each student shall be apprised when he submits his certificates to the Presbytery. In order to secure an early and continued attention to Scripture and the subordinate standards of the church, every student shall be examined on the following subjects:

(1), After his first session, on the Old Testament, from Genesis to Deuteronomy, inclusive; and the Shorter Catechism, questions 1-38, with the scriptural proofs.

(2), After his second session, on the books of Scripture, from Joshua to Job, inclusive; the remainder of the Shorter Catechism, with proofs; and the *Confession of Faith*, Chapters I.-III.

(3), After his third session, on the remaining books of the Old Testament; the Larger Catechism, questions 1-90; and the *Confession of Faith*, Chapters IV. to X.

(4), After his fourth session (first in the theological course), on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles; the Larger Catechism, questions 91-148; and the *Confession of Faith*, Chapters XI.-XX.

(5), After his fifth session (second in the theological course), on the remaining books of the New Testament; and the remainder of the Larger Catechism, and of the *Confession of Faith*.

15. When, in accordance with paragraph 301, Rule 3, a student is taken

under the care of a Presbytery, during the progress, or at the close, of his undergraduate course, he shall present to the Presbytery the certificates required of students of his standing who have been taken under its care at the beginning of their collegiate course; and shall be examined on the books of Scripture and portions of the Catechisms and *Confession of Faith* appointed for such students.

16. A student from another religious denomination, on becoming connected with a Presbytery, shall present such certificates and submit to such examinations as are prescribed for students of the same standing.

17. The Presbytery shall not, at any one meeting, extend the examination of a student beyond the subjects appointed for a single year; nor shall a student be examined oftener than once in three months.

Trials of Students before License. 303. When a student has passed the prescribed examinations, and has attended one session of the theological course, the Presbytery may take him on trial for license. Before doing so it shall satisfy itself as to his personal religion, and shall put to him the following, or such like, questions:

(1), So far as you know your own heart, have you felt your need of a personal Saviour, and have you been persuaded and enabled by God's Spirit to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to you in the gospel?

(2), Have you been induced, so far as you know your own heart, to seek the office of the Christian ministry from love to Christ, and a desire to promote his glory in the salvation of sinners?

304. The Presbytery shall prescribe to the student the following pieces of trial:

1. A homily on a given subject.

2. An exposition of a portion of Scripture.

3. A critical exercise. In the critical exercise the student shall (1), Establish the correct reading of the text, if that is contested; (2), Critically analyze and expound the text from the original; (3), Point out and remove difficulties of interpretation, if any occur; (4), Paraphrase the text; (5), State the doctrinal propositions contained in the passage; and (6), Discuss one or more of these propositions.

4. A discussion of a controverted question in theology. In this discussion the student shall (1), State the question; (2), Explain the terms; (3), Adduce different opinions held; (4), Support by appropriate arguments the view which appears agreeable to truth, and illustrate it by a portion of Scripture which may be adopted as a text; (5), Answer objections to the view advocated.

5. A popular discourse upon a prescribed text.

305. Of these pieces of trial, the first and second shall be given to the Presbytery by the student before the commencement of his second session in the theological course; the remaining pieces, before the commencement of his third session. The first, third, and fourth may be read; the second and fifth must be delivered without manuscript. The Presbytery shall not accept more than one piece of trial from the student at any one meeting.

306. The Presbytery shall criticise each piece of trial privately, in the presence of the student, that he may profit by its judgment, and may, if requisite, give explanation of his statements.

307. When the student has satisfactorily passed the examinations required

after each of the first five sessions of the collegiate course, has given evidence that he has been engaged in appropriate Christian work, and is manifesting a spirit and maintaining a walk befitting a candidate for the ministerial office, and has delivered the first and second pieces of trial, the Presbytery shall give him a certificate of these facts to the Theological Examination Committee of the General Assembly, and recommend him for its first examination.

308. Every student must, before receiving license, pass two examinations conducted by the Theological Examination Committee.

309. The first examination by the Theological Examination Committee shall be annually held in the month of October, shall be conducted by written papers, and shall embrace the following subjects: (1), A specified portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, with Hebrew grammar; (2), A specified portion of the Greek New Testament; (3), Ethics, from a specified text-book; (4), A specified portion of Church History. Students must pass this examination before they enter on their final session in the theological course.

310. A student coming to the first examination must send to the convener of the Theological Examination Committee, eight clear days before the examination, his diploma of Bachelor or Master in Arts, or the General Assembly's Certificate in Arts; satisfactory tickets from all the undergraduate classes on which attendance is enjoined by the General Assembly; and the proper certificate from the Presbytery with which he is connected, recommending him for examination.

311. When a student has passed all his examinations in Scripture and in the formularies of the church, has delivered all his pieces of trial to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, and has finished the third session of the theological course, he may proceed to the second examination by the Theological Examination Committee.

312. The second examination by the Theological Examination Committee shall be annually held in the month of April, shall be partly by written papers and partly oral—all the students in the oral examination being questioned, as far as possible, upon the same topics—and shall embrace the following subjects: (1), Systematic Theology, from a prescribed text-book; (2), Biblical Criticism and Exegesis; (3), Scripture, including Biblical History and Geography, and Catechetics. Students shall also be examined as to their personal religion and motives in seeking the ministerial office, and shall be asked whether they are prepared to sign the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.

313. A student coming to the second examination must, eight clear days before the examination, send to the convener of the Theological Examination Committee satisfactory tickets from all the theological classes on which attendance is enjoined by the General Assembly, and a certificate from the Presbytery with which he is connected, testifying that he has delivered all his pieces of trial and passed all his examinations in the Presbytery.*

Licensing of Students as Probationers for the Ministry. 314. When a student has delivered all the prescribed pieces of trial to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, has passed all the presbyterial examinations, has presented to the Presbytery the certificate of the Theological Examination Committee stating that he has passed its first and second examinations, and has signified his desire to be licensed,

* He must also furnish certificates of attendance on a class of music and elocution.

the Presbytery shall appoint a minister to address him on his responsibilities and duties.

315. The student, before receiving license, shall be asked the following questions:

(1), Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

(2), Do you believe the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, as described in the *Book of the Constitution and Government of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, Chapter II., paragraph 20, to be founded on, and agreeable to, the word of God; and, as such, do you acknowledge it as the confession of your faith?

(3), Do you approve of the Catechisms compiled by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and received as the catechisms of this church?

(4), Are you resolved, through divine grace, firmly and constantly to adhere to the doctrine contained in the said Confession and Catechisms, and to teach and defend it to the utmost of your power against all errors?

(5), Do you believe the Presbyterian form of church government to be founded on, and agreeable to, the word of God; and do you promise to adhere to and support it, and to yield submission in the Lord to the courts of this church?

(6), Have you been induced, so far as you know your own heart, to seek the office of the Christian ministry from love to God, and from a sincere desire to win souls to Christ and promote the divine glory?

(7), Are you prepared to subscribe to the *Westminster Confession of Faith* in terms of the General Assembly's formula?

316. The student, having answered these questions in the affirmative, shall subscribe the following formula in the minute-book of the Presbytery:

"I believe the *Westminster Confession of Faith* to be founded on, and agreeable to, the word of God; and, as such, I subscribe it as the confession of my faith."

We now have before us the constitutional requirements of the Irish Presbyterian Church on the subject under discussion. It will be of more interest to learn how far these requirements are complied with in practice. Accordingly, we present next a copy of the examination-papers given their candidates on the 17th and 18th of October, 1895, by their Theological Examination Committee.

FIRST THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION,

17TH AND 18TH OCTOBER, 1895.

CHURCH HISTORY—MOELLER.

Examiner—REV. R. T. MEGAW, LL. D.

1. Write brief notes on—

(a), The Shepherd of Hermas.

(b), The Second Epistle of Clement.

(c), The Didache.

2. State distinctly the functions of Evangelists, Prophets, and Teachers, in the early church.

3. Who were the Ebionites?
4. Account for the existence of three superior orders of the clergy (*ordines majores*), Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; and write a note on the "Female Diaconate."
5. Who were the lower grades of the clergy (*ordines minores*), and what were their duties?
6. The Roman Bishop Cornelius praises all ascension "*per omnia ecclesiastica officia sanctis religionis gradibus.*" Explain his meaning.

LINDSAY'S HANDBOOK OF THE REFORMATION.

Examiner—REV. JAMES BINGHAM, M. A.

1. Describe the Revolt of the Nobles and the Revolt of the Peasants, and show the influence of each of them upon the Reformation.
2. Explain what is meant by the Tulchan Bishops.
3. Describe the Consistorial System of Church Government, and state the principles of Ecclesiastical Government and Discipline laid down by Calvin in his *Institutes*. Wherein do the latter differ from the Ecclesiastical Ordinances?
4. State the views held by Zwingli and Luther, respectively, in regard to the Lord's Supper. On what points did both alike differ from the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist?
5. Why did Henry VIII. at first support the Papal supremacy? What reasons have been assigned for the change in his attitude?
6. State briefly the peculiar social conditions amidst which the Reformation arose. How did it affect social and political life?

CHRISTIAN ETHICS (BUTLER'S SERMONS).

Examiner—REV. JAMES LOUDEN, M. A.

1. How does Butler demonstrate the truth of St. Paul's assertion, that every man is naturally a law to himself?
2. "As there is no such thing as *self-hatred*, so neither is there any such thing as *ill-will* in one man towards another, emulation and resentment being away." Explain and illustrate this statement of Butler.
3. Wherein consists the difference between *virtue* and *vice*, according to Butler? And how does he show that virtue coincides with personal happiness?
4. What does Butler mean when he says that *compassion* is preferable to *good-will*? And which of the two, according to him, is productive of the greatest happiness to our fellow-men?
5. What is the ethical significance of the *natural* passion of resentment? Explain the following quotation: "One point in Butler's account of resentment has been admired as happy and novel; I mean the *distinction between sudden anger and settled resentment.*"
6. Butler says that there is frequently a secret prejudice against *public spirit*. What is the occasion of this prejudice? And can you show that there is no foundation for it?
7. What influence do you consider Butler's Sermons to have exerted on modern Ethical Science?

WUTTKE'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

Examiner—REV. GEORGE WOODBURN, M. A., F. R. U. I.

1. What is the relation, according to Kant, between Morality and Religion? Explain fully.
2. Criticise the "Categorical Imperative," and the doctrine that "the good must be done for its own sake."
3. Explain—
 - (a), "Casuistry."
 - (b), "Moral Probabilism."
 - (c), "Romish asceticism simply hides from view the inner lack of a truly evangelical moral depth."
4. (a), State and criticise Augustine's classification of the virtues, mentioning the sources whence he derived his technical terms.
 - (b), What is the relation between Christian Ethics and Dogmatics?
5. (a), Show in what manner the Old and New Dispensations differ in regard to the "grounds," "essence," and "goal" of morality.
 - (b), "Old Testament Ethics must have an historical development." Trace this development briefly.

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK—THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

Examiner—REV. J. HOWARD MURPHY, M. A.

1. Translate:
 - (a), Ἰστέ, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν.
 - (b), οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει, καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν;
 - (c), ἦ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατόπισεν ἐν ἡμῖν;
 - (d), ἐξομολογεῖσθε οὖν ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, ὅπως ἰαθῆτε. πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη.
2. Parse ἀκοῦσαι, ἐξελέξατο, ἐπηγγείλατο, ἀγαπῶσιν, πνεῦμα, κατόπισεν, ἰαθῆτε.
3. What various readings occur in (b) and (d)?
4. In what sense is the word *ψυχικός* used in James and in other parts of the New Testament?
5. Explain τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως, τὸν τρόχον τῆς γενέσεως. In what connection does each phrase occur?
6. In what connection do *συναγωγή* and *ἐκκλησία* occur in this epistle? How do the two words differ in usage in the New Testament?
7. There are three words translated *evil* in the A. V. of this epistle. What are they, and how do they differ in meaning?
8. State the derivation and meaning of *δοκίμιον*, *ἀπλῶς*, *παρακίπτω*, *θρησκεία*, *καθίστημι*, *σώζω*.

9. Retranslate:

- (a), "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God."
 (b), "Do not they blaspheme the honorable name by which ye are called?"
 (c), "And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness."
 (d), "What doth it profit?"
 (e), "Ye have not, because ye ask not."

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK—FIRST AND SECOND PETER.

Examiner—REV. W. J. WARNOCK, B. A., B. D.

1. Mention: (a), The probable date of 1 Peter.
 (b), Place of composition.
 (c), Provinces of the Dispersion (*διασπορά*).
 (d), The bearer of the epistle.

2. Translate:

Διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες, τελείως ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ὡς τέκνα ὑπακούετε, μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ, κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε.

- (a), Parse *ἀναζωσάμενοι, ὀσφύας, χάριν, καλέσαντα, γενήθητε*.
 (b), Remark on *τελείως ἐλπίζατε*.
 (c), Explain the construction of *συσχηματιζόμενοι*.

3. Translate:

ἔγενοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχύνῃ ἀπώλειαν· καὶ πολλοὶ ἔξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀπωλείαις, δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται.

- (a), Give the variant for *ἀπωλείας*.
 (b), The section of 2 Peter beginning with the above passage is parallel with another passage in the New Testament. Mention it. What conclusion do you found on this?

4. Annotate:

- (a), ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή.
 (b), μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων.
 (c), "Looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God." (A. V.)
 (d), ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν.

5. Derive or decompound the following:

ἐλλικρινῆ, προσκόμματος, ἀσωτίας, χορηγεῖ, ἐγκομβώσασθε, γρηγορήσατε, διαβολος, μωπάζων, ἀχμηροῦ.

6. Write a brief note on the authenticity of 2 Peter.

HEBREW—1 SAMUEL xv.—xx.

Examiner—REV. C. C. M. DICKEY, B. A.

1. Translate :

(1) וַיֹּאחֶזֶר שְׁמוּאֵל הַחֹפֶץ לַיהוָה בְּעֹלוֹת וּבִבְחִים
 בְּשִׁמְעַע בְּקוֹל יְהוָה הִנֵּה שְׁמַע מִזְבַּח טוֹב לְהִקְשִׁיב
 מִחֶלֶב אֵילִים :

(2) אֶל־תִּבְטֹ אֶל־מְרֹאֵהוּ וְאֶל־גִּבּוֹתָיו קוֹמָתוֹ כִּי מֵאִסְתִּיהוּ
 כִּי | לֹא אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה הָאָדָם כִּי הָאָדָם יִרְאֶה לְעֵינָיִם וַיְהִי
 יִרְאֶה לְלֵבָב :

(3) וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלֵנִי מִיַּד הָאֲרִי וּמִיַּד הַדָּב
 הוּא יַצִּילֵנִי מִיַּד הַפְּלִשְׁתִּי הַזֶּה :

(4) וַיֵּשֶׁב הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל־מוֹשְׁבוֹ בְּפַעַם | בְּפַעַם אֶל־מוֹשֵׁב הַקִּיר
 וַיִּקָּם יְהוֹנָתָן וַיֵּשֶׁב אֲבִנֵּר מִצַּד שְׂאוֹל וַיִּפְקֹד מְקוֹם דָּוִד :

2. Parse the verbs in (1) and (2), and explain the following words and phrases:
 וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוִיתִי, שְׂרִיזוֹן קִשְׁקָשִׁים, מְנוֹר אֲרָגִים, אֶתְמוֹל שְׁלֹשׁוֹם

3. Write out the perfect Kal of הִזְקֶה and the imperfect Niphal of נִשְׁלַח.

4. What are the chief uses of the perfect? Give the peculiarities of the Lamed He verbs.

5. In what ways are the numerals from 2 to 10 connected with their substantives? Give examples.

6. Express in Hebrew :

(1), An eloquent man, a valiant man, a worthless woman, doomed to die, one year old.

(2), And he said, Surely the bitterness of death is past.

(3), And she said to her, All that thou wilt say to me I will do.

HEBREW—PROVERBS i-v.

Examiner—REV. W. S. MONTGOMERY, B. D.

1. Translate the following passages :

(a) יַעַן קָרָאתִי וַתִּמְאַנֵּי נְטִיתִי יָדַי וְאִין מִקְשִׁיב : וַתִּפְרָעוּ
 כָּל־עֲצָתִי וַתּוֹכַחְתִּי לֹא אֲבִיתֶם : גַּם־אֲנִי בְּאִידְכֶם
 אֲשַׁחֵק אֶלְעַג בְּבֹא פִי־דְכֶם :

(b) כִּי שָׁחָה אֶל-מִוֹת בֵּיתָהּ וְאֶל-רַפָּאִים מֵעִגְלֹתֶיהָ :

(c) כִּי-יִשְׁרִים יִשְׁכְּנוּ-אָרֶץ וְתַמִּימִים יִוְתְּרוּ בָּהּ : וְרִשְׁעִים

מֵאָרֶץ יִפְרְתוּ וּבֹגְדִים יִסְחוּ מִמֶּנָּה :

(d) בַּבֶּד אֶת-יְהוָה מְהוֹנֶה וּמֵרֵאשִׁית כָּל-תְּבוּאֹתָהּ :

(e) וְאֶרֶח צִדִּיקִים כָּאוֹר נִגְה הוֹלֵךְ וְאוֹר עַד-נֶכּוֹן הַיּוֹם :

(f) אֶרֶח תַּיִם בְּן-תְּפִלָּם נָעוּ מֵעִגְלֹתֶיהָ לֹא תִרְעֶה :

2. Parse the verbs in (a) and (c). Give the singular absolute of the nouns in (a) and (b), and the construct of מִוֹת. To what order of nouns does פְּחֻדְכֶם belong, and how is the pointing of the singular absolute accounted for?

3. State the rule for the insertion of Dagesh lene. Explain its omission in the words כָּל and פְּחֻדְכֶם (two omissions) in (a).

4. What objection is there to the A. V. rendering of אֶל-מִוֹת בֵּיתָהּ כִּי שָׁחָה? Another rendering has been suggested. State the various ways in which (f) has been rendered, so far as you know them.

5. Attach the pronominal suffixes to יִרְרֶה.

6. State the peculiarities of Pe Yod verbs originally Pe Vav. Write down third person singular imperfect, Kal, Niphal, and Hiphil of יִלַּךְ.

7. Translate into Hebrew:

(1), For length of days, and years of life, and peace shall they add to thee. (2), Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. (3), The way of the wicked is as darkness; they know not at what they stumble (Niphal of כִּשַׁל).

(4), Give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on. (5), This man is greater than all the sons of men. (6), The lofty mountains shall bear (נִשְׂא) peace to the people.

In order to passing at all, the student had to attain a grade of at least thirty-three per cent. in each study; and the average of his grades in the several departments had to reach at least forty.

This seems, on first sight, a low minimum. But the marking appears to be rigid in exactness. And, by the way, it is much higher than obtains in our presbyterial examinations. It seems

quite probable, too, that the Irish church will, in a few years, require a higher minimum.

Such students as were not able to pass this October examination were given another (known as "the supplemental") in January, covering the same ground, and of about equal rigidity. From these examples the character of the second theological examinations, which are given in April of the students' final term of preparation in the theological schools, may be proximately inferred.

The subjects of all these examinations for the year 1895 to 1896 had been published in the Assembly's Minutes (1895) and otherwise; so that months ahead the students knew what they should need to be prepared on. For example, we take from the "Report of the Theological Examining Committee" to the General Assembly, 1895, the following notice :

"THE FIRST EXAMINATIONS

Will be held in the Assembly's College, Belfast, and in Magee College, Londonderry, on the 17th and 18th of October, 1895, commencing each day at 9:30 o'clock.

SUBJECTS—*New Testament Greek*, The Epistles of James and 1 and 2 Peter. *Hebrew*, 1 Samuel xv.–xx., inclusive; Proverbs i.–v., inclusive; Principles of Hebrew Grammar. *Christian Ethics*, Butler's Sermons, Preface and Sermons i.–xv., omitting iv., vii. and x.; Wuttke's *Christian Ethics*, Vol. I., §§ 27, 29, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43. *Church History*, Moeller's *Church History*, the Ante-Nicene Period; Lindsay's "Handbook of the Reformation."¹

And against the meeting of the Assembly of 1896, the examination papers, offered by the committee during the ecclesiastical year 1895-'96, must have been printed in the calendar of the Assembly's College, Belfast, and in the Assembly's Blue Book. Thus the whole church could see what sort of examinations had been offered their candidates during the year just closed. All who are competent could judge at once of their testing quality and their fairness. The examiners were examined as well as the students by the church at large.

The report of the Theological Examination Committee to the General Assembly brings each student individually before the whole church—gives it an opportunity to see what kind of work he has

¹ See p. 185 Minutes of Assembly.

been doing. The manner in which this is done may be most satisfactorily shown by an extract from the report of the committee in 1895. It is as follows:

The Theological Examination Committee report that during the past year they have held the following examinations:

1. The first Theological Examination on the 18th and 19th October last, when the following students, whose names are arranged in the order of merit, with their respective colleges attached, were adjudged to have passed: James Croskery, New College, Edinburgh; Hamilton Martin, Assembly's College; W. T. Linster, Magee College; Wm. M'Coach, do.; James McLean, do.; R. Anderson, Assembly's College (these two equal); Wm. Smyth, Magee College; Samuel Reid, do.; John A. F. Young, Assembly's College; R. R. Johnston, do.; D. D. Boyle, Magee College; James J. Macaulay, Assembly's College; S. J. Hamilton, do.; John Martin, do.; Wm. Keers, do.; J. Beatty, do.; W. J. Dunlop, Princeton College, New Jersey.

2. The first Theological Examination (*Supplemental*) on the 10th and 11th January last, when the following students, whose names are in alphabetical order, were adjudged to have passed: George Andrews, Henry Dinsmore, James P. C. Glendinning, Thomas J. Harrison, John Omelvena, F. W. S. O'Neill, Thomas Roulston, Samuel D. Stuart.¹

3. The second Theological Examination on the 23rd and 24th April last, when the following students, whose names are in the order of merit, with their respective Presbyteries attached, were adjudged to have passed: Samuel Gillespie, Belfast Presbytery; John Omelvena, Armagh Presbytery (equal); F. W. S. O'Neill, Belfast Presbytery; Wm. M'Coach, Derry Presbytery; Hamilton Martin, Comber Presbytery; William Keers, Coleraine Presbytery; R. Anderson, Belfast Presbytery; John A. F. Young, Route Presbytery; James McLean, Tyrone Presbytery; William Smyth, Derry Presbytery; W. T. Linster, Derry Presbytery; Samuel Reid, Glendermott Presbytery; James J. Macaulay, Ards Presbytery; R. R. Johnston, Belfast Presbytery; D. D. Boyle, Limavady Presbytery; James P. C. Glendinning, Belfast Presbytery; Thomas J. Harrison, Ballybay Presbytery; S. J. Hamilton, Down Presbytery; Thomas Roulston, Donegal Presbytery; R. J. McFarland, Letterkenny Presbytery; Henry Dinsmore, Tyrone Presbytery; W. J. Dunlop, Tyrone Presbytery; S. D. Stuart, Coleraine Presbytery; John Martin, Dromore Presbytery; George Andrews, Banbridge Presbytery; David Browne, Strabane Presbytery.

4. The Oral Examination on 1st and 3rd May last, when the foregoing students, who had passed the second Theological Examination, were examined in Catechetics and Holy Scripture, and as to their motives for entering the Christian ministry, and their approval of the doctrines of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and were recommended to their respective Presbyteries for license, except Mr. W. J. Dunlop, who had to submit class-certificate in second-year Greek, and Mr. S. J. Hamilton, whose case is to come before the General Assembly.

The students who pass successfully the examinations given by the committee are furnished certificates by the committee to their

¹ Supplemental students not classed.

respective Presbyteries, who may then license them to preach the gospel as candidates for the Christian ministry. No Presbytery may license a student without this certificate.¹

The reader will remember that in the Irish church the presbyterial examinations of the candidate embrace only Catechetics and Scripture, personal piety and aims in seeking the ministry, and the pieces of trial. These examinations in Scripture and Catechetics are not very satisfactory. The Irish brethren think that they are not so bad, however, as ours. So, at any rate, writes Dr. Alexander Field, the convener of their Theological Examination Committee.²

Of course, the examinations by the Assembly's Theological Examining Committee no more interfere with the examinations given by the theological faculties of their institutions than our presbyterial examinations interfere with our examinations in the seminaries.

With this exposition of the Irish system and its application, let us now run over its history.

The present scheme of examinations has been in existence since 1885. It originated in this way: The final examinations of the students had been entrusted to a committee of the Assembly since its formation in 1840; and previous to that date to a similar committee of the old Synod of Ulster.

"The examinations of this committee were confined to theology, Scripture, Scripture history and geography. They were oral, and were not conducted on any system. When the committee met, a chairman was appointed; and any member of the committee might be asked to examine a student. It was not known before-

¹ See paragraph 313, quoted above, from the *Book of the Constitution*, etc.

² On the 28th of May, 1895, we had the pleasure and privilege of meeting Dr. Field. It was aboard a train on our way from Giant's Causeway to Larne in Northeastern Ireland. He and his excellent wife refreshed Mrs. Johnson and myself with their conversation during our whirl over some miles. Among other things, Dr. Field told me much of the testing system in his church. What he said was of so much interest that I asked him to send me the literature which would enable me to comprehend fully the whole system. He not only, in the course of time, sent me the accessible printed matter bearing on the subject, but with great kindness wrote a long letter full of historic information of great interest. The reader is really indebted to Dr. Field for anything of interest he may find in this hastily-prepared sketch.

hand what questions this examiner would ask. Sometimes they would be fair and testing. Sometimes they were the reverse. Perhaps the examiner had been reading some theological book before coming up to the examination, and the questions would be taken from it, though the student had never read or heard of it. Sometimes the questions were catching, minute, puzzling, and of no testing value at all. And, then, the course was so wide and uncertain. A man might be taken on some part of it on which he was not particularly well up and fail, though a really good scholar. Then there being no standard but the judgment of the members who were present, a student was in danger of not getting fair play. And an inferior student who did not deserve to pass, by having his own minister present and canvassing other members of the committee and getting them to be present, could by their votes get himself passed. I should state that the constitution of the committee gave facility for this state of things, as it was representative of the church—each presbytery returning annually so many of its members according to the size of the presbytery, or members of the Theological Examination Committee.

“Such a state of things was very unsatisfactory, and caused great complaint. And I have known students who had been rejected come before the Assembly, express their grievance, and turn the examinations into ridicule. Of course, it was only a student of brains and power who would venture to do this. All students disliked the examination for the uncertainty and risks connected with it. A reformation became necessary; and so the present scheme of examinations was inaugurated.

“It is wider in its scope than the old examinations were, embracing the subjects of the whole theological course: Hebrew, New Testament Greek, Christian Ethics, Church History, Systematic Theology, Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, Catechetics, and Holy Scriptures. And they serve the double purpose of keeping the students to their work during the theological course, and also of testing the professional teaching in the colleges.”¹

Dr. Field further says that the present scheme is giving much satisfaction; that the student respects the examinations, and works hard to pass them, which he will never do if the examination is a farce.

“These examinations are testing; and as, in the two regular examinations, in October and April, the students are ranged in order of merit, it is a matter of consequence to them to be well placed. It is also a matter of pride to our two colleges, the places that their students respectively secure.”²

That the examinations will be fair, too, as well as testing, the student feels certain beforehand. The question of their fairness is hardly raised in his mind, since he knows that the questions will be read by all the ministers in the church, and that they would soon call the examiners to account for any injustice.

¹ From Dr. Field's letter, dated Mansefield, Dervock, County Antrim, Ireland, February 17, 1896.

² Dr. Field, *ut supra*.

It has been noted that at the second examination by the committee, in the spring, they conduct an oral as well as a written examination in Scripture and Catechetics. This is in the presence of the committee, and is for the purpose of bringing the committee into personal acquaintance with the young men, that their bearing, and so forth, may be remarked.

“But the examiners in this oral examination must submit their questions to the committee before they are put to the students; so that there is no haphazard in the examination. If a question is considered unfair, or non-testing, or too difficult, another has to be substituted.

“In this oral examination we examine in batches. Say there are thirty men to be examined. We divide them into batches of five each, taking them in alphabetical order. The examiners prepare their sets of questions as nearly as possible of equal value. The members of each batch are called in individually, and the same questions are put to them. The man first of the batch examined is retained in the examination-room. The second of the batch is then called in; the same questions are put to him, and he also is retained in the examination-room; and so on until the whole batch is through. Thus the students hear one another examined by the same questions, and if one or more in the batch answer badly, and one or more answer well, perhaps answer every question, those who answer badly cannot complain that their questions were too difficult; and thus the mouth of complaint, in the case of failure—which, you know, is outspoken enough—is stopped. All this convinces the students of the thorough fairness of the examinations, and wins their respect, and the confidence of the church.

“Also there are very strict rules against copying, using helps, or any unfair means. The student detected in doing so, *ipso facto*, loses his examination, and cannot be readmitted for twelve months.”¹

“After each examination the committee meets to receive the report of the examiners, and the marks obtained decide the issue. There is no use now for a weak man to get his minister to be present to plead his cause, or to canvass the committee to help him. His figures are inexorable, and, if the standard is not attained, he loses the examination. No other consideration is admissible. Nine men failed at the last regular examination out of twenty-seven, and three out of twelve at the following supplemental, who must now lie out for another year, there being only one supplemental to each regular examination.”²

Thus the examinations appear to be pretty thorough as well as in good repute in the church.

Lest some brother be misled into underestimating the tests in the Irish church, let him reflect on this fact. Dr. Field says that some of their students who fail in their collegiate work come across and pass through the theological seminaries in America and

¹ Dr. Field, *ut supra*.

² Dr. Field, *ut supra*.

are preachers before their stronger and successful classmates in the old country have been able to complete their necessary training.

Let us look, finally, at the personnel of the Theological Examining Committee:

Dr. Alexander Field, Mansefield, Dervock, County Antrim, mediates between the committee and the Assembly. He was appointed by the Assembly as this committee's convener in 1885, the date of its inauguration, and has held the position ever since. No doubt he has contributed largely to the success of the committee.

As the term convener is not a common one in ecclesiastical parlance on this side, it may be worth while to say that as convener it is Dr. Field's duty "to summon the committee to meet when required; get them to appoint the examiners in the several subjects, having carefully selected them from the ministers of the church of highest university and collegiate reputation in the respective subjects; communicate with them about their examination papers; get these printed; superintend the examinations at one or other of the two colleges where they are held, getting a reliable man to superintend for him at the other centre; if an examiner from any cause falls out, get a substitute or take his place."¹ To take the place of an examiner is not, however, regarded as desirable, as the convener is the head of the department and brought into intimate relations with all the students by correspondence. To him students apply for admission to examination, and send their degrees and certificates for his examination; and without his approval of these papers no student may sit for examination. After the committee's oral examination, in April, in Catechetics and Scripture, the students are examined, one by one, on personal piety and motives in seeking the ministry. This delicate work falls on the convener.

The convener also presides at all meetings of the committee, to see that all is done decently and in order, and to enforce the rules framed by the committee from time to time, as experience demands.

Finally, he draws up the report for the Assembly and presents it to the Assembly and conducts it through its adoption.

¹ Dr. Field, *ut supra*.

The committee itself is nominated by the presbyteries of the church in the ratio of one to every five ministers in the presbytery. But Dr. Field says, "Many think that it would be much better to have a standing committee composed of the best men of the Assembly and appointed directly by the Assembly itself; and I think that before long this change will be made."¹

The Committee always meets during the meeting of the Assembly, after the annual report is passed. It is at this meeting that the examiners are selected and appointed. They are always appointed a year in advance, so that they may have time to read up anew their subjects and get ready. As a rule, they are appointed for a second year.

The students are not allowed to sit as they please in the examination-rooms. The superintendent places them by affixing to each desk such a card as this:

<p>Presbyterian Church of Ireland.</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> <p style="font-size: 1.5em; font-weight: bold; letter-spacing: 0.2em;">THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATIONS.</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> <p>Candidate's Name,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Candidate's Number,</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin: auto;"/> <p style="font-size: 0.8em;">The Candidate is informed that he is to sit at the place indicated by this card; that he is to use his number only to indicate to the Examiner his identity; that he is to write his number and the subject on the front page of each Examination Book, and write only on one side of the paper.</p>

The student writes his answers "on paper supplied to him," and sewed two sheets together. No other paper is permitted. The students' names do not appear on their papers. They are examined by numbers, so that the examiners have no knowledge who they are, and cannot be influenced in marking by such knowledge.

¹ Dr. Field, *ut supra*.

It is hoped that the reader may gain from this paper a pretty satisfactory view of the tests in the Irish Church which the students for the ministry must pass through.

As we believe that the standard of ministerial education in our church is far too low, we propose to present some reasons for this painful belief in a subsequent article.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

Union Theological Seminary, Va.

VII. NOTES.

A COLLATION OF SOME PASSAGES WHICH SPEAK OF SEEING GOD.

I. THE first passage of which I shall speak is Exodus xxxiii. 20. Moses said unto God, "Show me, I pray thee, thy glory." And God said: "Thou canst not see my face, for man shall not see me and live. Thou shalt see my back; but my face shall not be seen." (Cf. also Ex. xix. 21.)

From this passage we learn two things: (*a*), There are degrees of intensity and completeness in the visible manifestations of God, or theophanies, of which we read in the biblical narratives. Moses realized that there were such degrees. He, like many of the patriarchs before him, had been favored with theophanies. But he knew very well that such a theophany was a very different thing from an actual seeing of God, in any real sense of the word. He was not satisfied with such theophanies as he and the other patriarchs had had. It was a nearer view, an actual seeing of the essence of God. that he desired.

(*b*), Such an actual seeing of God, however, was impossible at that time and under those circumstances. Or, if its possibility was conceivable, it would be attended with fatal consequences.

As the result, however, of his importunity, Moses was favored with a theophany which for intensity and completeness of manifestation surpassed everything that ever took place in the relations of God to man before or since. Although his request was not granted to the full extent, yet Moses was permitted to have a nearer view, if we may so say, of the glory of God, or essential being of God, than was ever permitted to any other man on this side of the grave. See Ex. xxxiv. 29-35 (the shining of Moses' face) Deut. xxxiv. 10, "And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face."

Num. xii. 8: "With Moses will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly and not in dark speeches, and the *form* (תְּמוּנָה) of Jehovah shall he behold."

Now, setting aside the anthropomorphism which speaks of God's *face*, God's *back*, and God's *form*, the question still remains, What sort of a vision of God did Moses desire and expect? Why was such a vision declared to be fatal? And in what sense was the vision of God granted to Moses? What Moses desired was undoubtedly, primarily, some visible manifestation of the divine glory. Did his desire include also the intellectual, moral, and spiritual apprehension of the divine nature, the fulness of the divine being? If it were primarily a visible manifestation of the divine glory, something to be seen with the bodily eyes, why should that be fatal? If it were intellectual, moral, or spiritual, why should that be fatal? Is it that the desire to see God involved the desire to be placed on an equal footing with God, so to speak? And would such a presumption on the part of a sinful man be fatal? But these are questions which cannot be fully answered now. We can speak with more certainty as to what Moses saw. He undoubtedly saw some external visible manifestation of the divine glory. The chief thing that he saw, however, was the intellectual, or, rather, the moral and spiritual apprehension of the divine being, a faint adumbration of which is communicated to us in the *name* which God proclaimed as he passed by. "The Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and upon the children's children upon the third and upon the fourth generation." Note these two elements in name:

1. God as supremely, inherently, or essentially *merciful, compassionate* (placed first).
2. God as judge, *arraigning the guilty*, pronouncing their *doom*.

II. There are passages which show the mistaken inferences which popular superstition drew from this truth, that man cannot see the essential being of God, that the vision of God is fatal. These mistaken inferences resulted largely from neglecting this distinction between an ordinary theophany and the actual vision of God. Thus, in popular apprehension, the appearance of the "Angel of Jehovah" was supposed to entail fatal consequences. (See Judges vi. 22, 23.) "And Gideon saw that he was the angel of the Lord, and Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God, forasmuch as I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face. And the Lord said unto him, Peace be unto thee; fear not; thou shalt not die." Also Judges xiii. 21, 22: "Then Manoah

knew that he was the angel of the Lord. And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die because we have seen God." Even the patriarch Jacob shared this misapprehension. Gen. xxxii. 30: "And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, for, said he, I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved."

As is well known, the expression "to see the face of Jehovah" came to have a technical force in the ancient Hebrew ritual. On this see the note of Dillmann on Ex. xxiii. 15, where it is shown that this expression, with the verb רָאָה in the *Qal*, probably occurred here, and also Ex. xxxiv. 24; Deut. xxxi. 11; and Isa. i. 12;¹ Ps. xlii. 3; Deut. xvi. 16, etc. (See also the note of Baethgen on Ps. xlii. 3.)

In these passages the Massoretic pointing changed the *Qal* into the *Niphal*; so, e. g., Is. i. 12, לְרֵאוֹת, quite probably was originally simply לְרֵאוֹת. If it were intended for a *Niphal* it would have been written לְהֵרֵאוֹת. The expression as changed meaning "to appear before Jehovah," "to allow one's self to be seen by Jahve by coming before him." This use of the *Niphal*, also called *Niphal Tolerativum*, is also found in such passages as Ps. ii. 10, הֲוֹסִיפוּ: "Allow yourselves to be instructed." "Put yourselves in the way of being instructed." The simple passive is an inadequate translation. Ps. xix. 12, נִוָּחָר: "Thy servant lets himself be warned by them."²—(Baethgen.)

The expression "to appear before Jehovah" was deemed more reverent than the old, "To see the face of Jehovah," hence the change was made.

¹ Is it not noteworthy that in this passage, which speaks of the hypocritical formal worship of that generation, mention is made of the עוֹלָה, or whole burnt offering, the חֵלֶב pointing to the זֶבֶח שְׁלָמִים, or peace offering, and the קִטְרֶת, pointing to the מִנְחָה; but no mention is made of the חֲטָאת, or the אֲשָׁם, the sin and guilt, or trespass offerings? In other words, the offerings indicating consecration and communion with God were present, but the offerings indicating expiation and atonement for sin were absent.

² With this use of the *Niphal* may be compared some uses of the Greek Middle, e. g., Thuk. vii. 63: ὧν γὰρ μεμνημένος διαμάχεσθαι ὕσον ἄν δόννησθε καὶ μὴ ἐξωθεῖσθαι ἐς ἀντήγ. "Having these things in remembrance, it is necessary to fight as bravely as possible, and not allow yourselves to be driven against the shore."

It is doubtful whether the passages which speak of the fatal consequences of looking into the ark, or touching the ark, are to be placed in this same category. (1 Sam. vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 7; Ex. xxviii. 35; xxx. 21; Lev. xvi. 2, 13.)

Schultz places them here. (A. T. Theo. p. 511.) But surely, the incautious, or too familiar handling of sacred objects by any but the ordained, consecrated, initiated priesthood, was a very different thing from a presumptuous endeavor to gaze upon God himself. The question arises, however, why was the expression "to see the face of God, or of Jahveh," used at all in the face of the emphatic declarations that man cannot see the face of God and live. The answer must lie in the distinction between the literal and the metaphorical sense of the words. In the face of the direct words of God to Moses, and in view of popular apprehension of the fatal consequences of the sight even of the angel of Jahveh, the expression to see the face of Jahveh used in connection with the sacred ritual could only mean to see the place where God specially manifests himself, where communion of the soul with God can be most vividly realized, then, in general, to engage in the public stated worship of Jehovah at the central public shrine or temple. It is the mark of a later period, mechanical and literalistic in its views, that the change noted above should have been made, and "appear before Jahveh" stand in place of "seeing the face of Jahveh." Of the same sort were also the changes which in Ps. xvii. 15, changed תמונתך into אֲמוֹנָתְךָ, or אֲמוֹנָה, or LXX., τῆρ δόξαν σου; Vulgate, "*apparebo conspectui tuo, satiabor cum apparuerit gloria tua.*"

III. There are passages which set forth this truth in its proper relations as to cause and effect. Such a passage is found in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, the fifth verse: "Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts."

The sight of God is fatal to man not for a physical reason, but for a moral reason. Man cannot see God and live because man is a sinful being, and because God is supremely holy in himself, and requires holiness in those with whom he associates. On the expression "of unclean lips," indicating general sinfulness, cf. James iii. 2: ἐί τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει οὐδὲς τέλειος ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγεῖσθαι καὶ ὄλον τὸ σῶμα.

It is in keeping with the advanced position of Isaiah, both in time and in spiritual rank, so to speak, that he should have a truer apprehension of the real nature, cause, and bearing of this fact than Jacob,

Gideon, Manoah, and even Moses. Jacob, Gideon, and Manoah do not at all connect their apprehensions of the supposed consequences of seeing God with the fact of sin. Even Moses apparently regards the barrier that separates him from the sight of God as a purely physical barrier, a barrier which God can remove at will. Isaiah, however, clearly apprehends that it is specifically his sinfulness that would bring about any fatal consequences which the vision of God might entail. Cf. Dillmann *in locum*. "The ground of the fatal consequences of the sight of God was not the finiteness, but the impurity of man."

IV. But the question may arise, Why should the sight of a holy God be so destructive to a sinful man? The answer is found in those passages which connect the idea of the appearance, or coming of Jehovah with the idea of judgment. So, for instance, Mal. iii. 1-3: "The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, and the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in, behold, he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap."

There were two sides to this coming of the Lord, of which we read so much in the Old Testament, and to which every pious Israelite looked forward with such earnest expectation. On the one hand, it was a coming unto salvation. The Lord was to come to redeem his people. On the other hand, it was a coming unto judgment. It was the "acceptable year of the Lord," but also the "day of vengeance of our God." The ignorant, thoughtless, and perverse minds might rashly long for the day of the Lord, the appearance of God. The thoughtful, spiritual minds knew better. Amos v. 18: "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! Wherefore would ye have the day of the Lord? It is darkness and not light."

The coming of God unto judgment would naturally bring with it the detection, exposure, arraignment, judgment and punishment of that sin of which the spiritual mind was so painfully conscious. In the ordinary intercourse of man with man the moral vision becomes blurred, and moral standards are insensibly lowered. Sinful conduct does not look so enormous, so hideous as it really is. But with the appearance of God upon the scene, all this is changed. The true standard, the standard of absolute, supreme holiness is once more revealed. The discrepancy between the conduct of man and such a standard becomes manifest at once. Hence, when Isaiah saw God

sitting on his throne, and heard the seraphim proclaiming the holiness of God, his first thought naturally was: "The long-expected coming of God *unto judgment* has at last taken place. In this judgment my sins will certainly bring destruction upon me." We now also understand better than we could before the real nature of the vision of God which Moses received, and the significance of the *name* which was proclaimed in connection with this vision: "The Lord, the Lord God, full of compassion and gracious, and that will by no means clear the guilty." It is entirely in keeping with the thoughts concerning the vision of God, brought out in the words of Isaiah, Malachi, and Amos, as quoted, that the vision which Moses saw, and the words which Moses heard, should bring out the idea of God as judge, arraigning the guilty, pronouncing their doom, tempered, as it were, made endurable for sinful, human eyes and ears by the very emphatic preceding declaration as to the mercy of God. Note, also, that passages which speak of the sight of God, of God's face, etc., *e. g.*, Ps. xvii. 15; Ps. xi. 7, *almost invariably are connected with the manifestation of God to bring judgment upon the wicked.* (Compare also Ps. lxxiii.)

We may sum up the results of our investigation thus far in the following propositions:

1. Man cannot see God and live. If God should fully disclose himself the result would be fatal to man.
2. These fatal results would be due to the sinfulness of man. It is impossible for a sinner to see God.
3. The sight of God would have such fatal consequences for the sinner, because the only real appearance of God to the sinner must be the appearance for judgment. To see God would mean to see his judge, the judge who is to bring to light his sin, and pronounce his doom.

To these propositions there are certain corollaries. We have hitherto considered the sight of God as an impossibility. The opposite of the impossible is the possible. The question arises, Is there any condition under which the sight of God would be a possibility? We pass, accordingly, from the vision of God as an impossibility, to the vision of God as a possibility.

V. Sinners cannot see God with impunity, just because they are sinners. Hence, it is reasonable to infer, that those who are free from sin can and will see God. Even under the Old Testament the pious children of God drew this inference, and expressed the hope that some time the vision of God might be granted unto them. (Cf. Ps. xvii. 15:

"As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness," (תִּכְוֶנְתִּי) (same word as in Numb. xii. 8. Cf. also Ps. xi. 7.)

The tone of these words is very similar to the tone of such words as we find in Ps. lxxiii. 23-28. In fact, when we compare the words of Ps. xvii. 15 (already quoted) with the expressions referred to in Ps. lxxiii. 23-28: "Nevertheless, I am continually with thee. Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever"; and many similar expressions setting forth the intense joy of the pious Israelite in the presence of God, or in communion with God (cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 4, 11; Ps. xlii. 5; Ps. xxxiv. 20, etc.), we are naturally led to the conclusion that the expression, seeing God's face, being satisfied with his likeness, is only a stronger and more emphatic expression of the same phenomenon of religious experience. Two things, moreover, are plain. This seeing of God is distinctively a moral or spiritual fact or experience—not physical nor intellectual. The conditions for the occurrence of this fact or experience are moral. Being moral, the believer looks forward to the fulfilment of the conditions, and the attainment of the experience as the greatest joy of his life. To see God, as he understands it, is the very acme of blessedness, because to see God means to have attained to the highest degree of moral perfection to which it is possible to attain.

VI. The words of the Psalmist which we have quoted do not rise above the expression of confident expectation, anticipation. The words of our Saviour (Matt. v. 8) show that this expectation is founded on fact. The Psalmist had a correct apprehension of the fact, *μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονταί.* If sinners cannot see God with impunity, just because they are sinners, those who are free from sin can and will see God.

VII. The Old Testament believers indulge in the hope or confident expectation that some time they may attain to that stage of moral perfection when they may see God. Christ teaches that the ground of the anticipation is correct. They may see God if only they are pure in heart.

Finally, John teaches us that the condition shall be realized. Believers shall become so pure in heart, so like God, that they shall see God. 1 John iii. 2: *ὁπωσπερ φανερώθη τι ἐσόμεθα, ὁδόμεν ὅτι εὖ φανερωθήσονται αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὁφόμεθα ἀπὸν καθὼς ἐστίν.* On this passage,

see especially the full and admirable note of Wescott. Only, as to the question of interpretation which arises here, whether the likeness to God is the necessary condition, or the actual consequence of the divine vision, Westcott is too undecided. I grant that the thought of the transfiguring virtue of the divine vision is familiar. (2 Cor. iii. 18.) But, unquestionably, the thought here referred to is the vision of God attained as the result of likeness to God. Westcott himself notes that the verb is *ἐσόμεθα*, not *γενησόμεθα*—*being*, not *becoming*, a state which marks a co-existence with the divine manifestation at the first.

This fact, taken in connection with the thoughts brought out in other passages bearing on this subject, ought to be decisive of the matter. Spiritual likeness, spiritual sympathy, is a necessary condition of vision.

One word more is necessary to set forth this fact in its true nature. This vision of God will be the vision of God in Christ. Christ is the true meeting ground between God and man. The divine in Christ will then not be hidden, as it was on earth, but a full manifestation of the real divine glory, the essence of the divine being. And man, redeemed in Christ, so that his sins are forgiven, purified, and sanctified in Christ, in one word, recreated after the image of Christ, will see God in Christ. John xvii. 24: "The glory which Christ had with God before the world was" [τῆ δόξῃ ἣ ἔῤῥων πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον ἔνα: παρά σοι]. (John xvii. 5.)

Now we know why Moses could not see the face of God and live. The redemptive work of Christ had not yet been accomplished. In the *name* which Moses hears, however, this redemptive work is plainly hinted at and anticipated. God is merciful and gracious, and full of compassion, and forgiving iniquity, as we now know, on the basis of Christ's obedience and sacrifice. The sight of God, coming to judgment for the arraignment of sin, can be endured only by those who have learned to know and trust in the mercy of God in Christ. For all others the vision of God will be fatal.

In one place (Heb. xii. 14), the seeing of Christ at his appearing is put on a par with the seeing of God, in so far as the moral prerequisite for this seeing is concerned. "τὸν ἁγιασμὸν διώκετε οὐ χωρὶς ὀυδεις ὀφεται τὸν κυριον." "Without sanctification no man shall see the Lord," *i. e.*, "Christ, for whose return in glory believers wait." Unto those who have not this *ἁγιασμός*, accordingly, the appearing of Christ will be an appearing unto judgment, the manifestation of their guilt, the announcement of their doom.

A. H. HUIZINGA.

McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AS TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF
MARK XVI. 9-20.

THE genuineness, and even the authenticity, of this passage being called in question on grounds of external evidence, the internal evidence is worthy of careful attention. This paper aims to indicate, at least, the direction in which this evidence leads.

While no word or expression used in this passage and elsewhere in Mark in the same sense is to be pleaded in favor of the genuineness of this passage, if the word or expression is used also in one of the other Gospels in the same sense (and here belong nearly seventy examples), yet a word or expression used in a certain sense here and elsewhere in Mark, but not in any of the other Gospels, would deserve careful consideration as possibly affording evidence for the genuineness; but the only word occurring here and elsewhere in Mark, but in no other Gospel, is *κτίσις* (Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; xvi. 15); and in this passage it means the (intelligent) *creature*, while elsewhere in Mark it means the *creation*. There is, therefore, the complete absence of linguistic evidence that the same man wrote this passage as wrote the rest of Mark.

On the other hand, of the twenty-two examples of words or expressions of this passage not occurring elsewhere in Mark in the same sense, twelve are not to be pleaded against the genuineness, since Mark had no occasion to use them. Here belong *ἀναλαμβάνω*, *ἀπιστέω*, *βλάπτω*, *βεβηαιώω*, *γλώσσαις λαλέω καιναῖς*, *ἔνδεκα*, *ἐπακολουθῆω*, *θανάσιμος*, *μορφῆ*, *ῥφίς*, *παρακολουθῆω*, *πενθῆω*. This leaves ten examples peculiar to this passage.

For *ἀπας* as an adjective Mark elsewhere uses *πᾶς* or *ὅλος*, cf. especially Mark xiv. 9 ("Wherever the gospel shall be preached in the whole world") with xvi. 15 ("Go into all the world and preach the gospel"), but Mark uses this word as a substantive (certainly in viii. 25), and the adjectival use of it here should not count for much. Instead of *καλῶς ἔχω*, we should have expected him to use the passive of either *σώζω* (as in v. 23, 28; vi. 56) or *ἰαομαι* (as in v. 29) to express recovery from sickness or disease; but he uses the similar *καλῶς ἔχω* (i. 32, 34; ii. 17; vi. 55); and so, although *καλῶς ἔχω* occurs here only in the New Testament, it should not count for much. Rather than *δοτερον* as an adverb with *δέ*, Mark uses the simple *καί* in xiv. 57 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 60), and he nowhere uses *δοτερον* at all. Yet, as it is not a common word, occurring in only nine other places in the Gospels, it, too, should not

be counted for much. As he uses *ἔπιτομαι* in ix. 4 ("there appeared unto them Elias"), we might have expected him to use it in xvi. 9 instead of *φαίνομαι*, and in xvi. 14 instead of *φανερῶομαι*; but we must remember that at ix. 4 was the only occasion he had to use such a word of the appearance of one who had died, and that in xvi. 14 he may have wished to lay emphasis upon the self-manifestation of Jesus to those who were not expecting him. Accordingly, these five examples are none of them of much weight, nor are all of them together decisive, but certainly the concurrence of even thus many in so short a space is suggestive. And the five examples yet to be considered appear to me still more important. Mark vi. 34, parallel with the use of *θεάομαι* in John vi. 5, and Mark ii. 14, parallel with the use of the same word in Luke v. 27, have a form of *δράω*, agreeing in both instances with Matthew. (ix. 36; xiv. 14; ix. 9.) It is, therefore, strange that he does not use a form of *δράω* here like Matthew in the parallel. (xxviii. 10, 17.) His use of *κτίσις* here instead of *ἔθνος*, which he uses in similar instances in xi. 17 and xiii. 10, is not easily accounted for. And it is particularly surprising that he should use the plural of *σάββατον* for *week* in xvi. 2 in contrast with the singular for *Sabbath* in xvi. 1, and then use the singular for *week* in xvi. 9. Mark has never used *ὁ Κύριος* of Jesus. Is it Mark who so uses it in vs. 19 and 20? And when Mark wished to speak of casting a demon out of a person, he used *ἐξ* with the person (vii. 26), and even when speaking of a demon going out of a person (vii. 29), as the other evangelists used *ἀπό* (Matt. xvii. 18; Luke iv. 35, 41; viii. 2, 33, 35, 38); but the writer of this passage uses *παρά*. It was like Mark to use *ἐξ* instead of *ἀπό*, but it would be difficult to account for his using *παρά*. The concurrence of these five cases, any one of which would raise a strong presumption, is as conclusive as this sort of evidence could well be.

A distinct argument against the genuineness is the obvious fact that this passage is not a continuance of the narrative where it occurs. The narrative begins at xvi. 1 by introducing three women going to the sepulchre, and follows these women on till they flee from the sepulchre. If the author is continuing his narrative, why does he drop out of sight all the women but one? Especially is this question pressing when we notice that the author of vs. 9f. is laying emphasis on the failure of the disciples to believe the testimony of those who claimed to have seen the risen Jesus. Why did he forego the strength of the concurrent testimony of three witnesses? Whether Mark

wrote a continuance after vs. 8 that has been lost, or, having stopped there, was accidentally prevented from ever finishing, or stopped at that point on purpose, either to turn his readers to the testimony of living witnesses, or to a second treatise that he intended to prepare, as did Luke, this passage cannot be his continuance of his narrative.

Whatever makes against its genuineness makes also, though with less force, against its authenticity. Were the passage a part of what Mark wrote, that fact would establish its authenticity upon the same basis as the authenticity of the Gospel of Mark as a whole; but the disproof of its genuineness is the destruction of the only sure foundation on which its authenticity can be established in the present state of the external evidence. And now I proceed to arguments that show its lack of consonance with the apostolic tradition and teaching, arguments, therefore, that make as well against its authenticity as against its genuineness.

It deserves serious consideration that this passage contains two statements that contradict the apostolic testimony. The first of these is that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene. According to Matthew, Mark and Luke, he appeared to the company of women as they were running from the sepulchre to the city; and according to these three, Mary Magdalene was in this company when they set out from the city that morning. But according to John, Mary left the sepulchre without hearing of the resurrection of Jesus, and ran and told Peter and John that the body had been taken away. She therefore separated from the rest of the women at the sepulchre before they saw the vision of angels; and she never joined the company of women again before she, by herself, saw Jesus. From the time she left the sepulchre till she saw Jesus there intervened her going to the city and back, coming back after Peter and John had had time to examine the sepulchre and go away; but from the time she left the sepulchre till the company of women saw Jesus there intervened only the vision of the angels to them in the sepulchre, their immediate flight, and their getting back toward the city only a part of the way. Accordingly, he must have appeared to them before he appeared to her.

The other statement is that the assembly of disciples disbelieved the two who reported that they had seen Jesus in the country; but according to Luke, the assembly of disciples were already convinced of the resurrection of Jesus by the testimony of Peter. (Luke xxiv. 33, 34.)

Of equal seriousness is the dissonance between the teaching of

this passage and that of the apostolic writings. It is noticeable what an emphasis is here laid on the wonderful in the miraculous. In mentioning the fact that seven demons had been cast out of Mary Magdalene (a fact which did not belong to this account), the writer says *ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια*, to put the emphasis on "seven" (cf. Luke viii. 2, which has *δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ*). He says that Jesus appeared "in another form," an element of wonder not mentioned in Luke; and he represents Jesus as predicting that his disciples would work wonderful miracles, such as casting out demons, speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents and drinking poison with impunity, and healing the sick by the laying on of hands. Not only does Matthew omit all mention of these predictions in the parallel accounts, but it would have been quite out of analogy with genuine predictions for Jesus to specify that wonder of speaking with tongues so definitely before such a thing had taken place. Moreover, there is no evidence that any of the apostles or any disciple of Jesus has ever been able to drink poison with more impunity than other persons; and he closes with emphasis on "miracles" as the great method of assistance to the apostles as evangelists. This accumulation of emphasis on the wonderful is not consonant with the tone of the teaching of Christ and his apostles.

Perfectly harmonious with this stress upon the wonderful in miracles is the stress upon the sin of unbelief. The writer carefully records (with exaggeration) the unbelief of the disciples as to the resurrection of Jesus, and then introduces Jesus as upbraiding them for this unbelief as a great sin, and continuing into the great commission, by which all who fail to believe (*ἄπιστεύω*) are consigned to damnation, and all this with not a word to suggest that the writer is thinking of anything but the mere absence of assent upon evidence. From this passage one could not learn that trust and consent are essential to evangelical faith; one would rather conclude that credulity is the safe way to escape damnation. Accordingly, the writer reports Jesus as merely sending his disciples out to "preach the gospel," making a proclamation to be assented to. Making disciples and training them in all the teaching of Christ, the growth of character, upon which Jesus did lay the emphasis according to Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, are not within the view of this writer. The fact that so many in the modern church quote this passage much oftener than they quote the parallel in Matthew does not prove the inspiration of this passage.

And finally, here is an unevangelical emphasis upon baptism. Jesus could not have said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be

saved." Such a doctrine could not have come from the lips that spoke those words to the robber on the cross. Such a commission was not given to the other apostles by him who did not send Paul to baptize, but to evangelize. (1 Cor. i. 17.) It is true that in the parallel in Matthew mention is made of baptism; but there the emphasis is not upon the baptism simply, but upon the modifying clause, "into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." And, in general, it is not that the different statements here might not, any one of them, be understood in a sense in harmony with the teaching that is of authority, if they occurred in certain contexts, but that, as they lie here, they together contradict the authoritative teaching.

F. P. RAMSAY.

Augusta, Ky.

EFFECTUAL CALLING—REGENERATION.

SUCH is the title of No. 13 of "The Shorter Catechism Course," by Dr. Beattie, in the *Observer* of July 29th. As we take issue with Dr. Beattie on one point, it is best to have the Catechism citations and the Doctor's own words before us. The *italics* are ours:

"29. We are made partakers of the redemption purchased by Christ by the effectual application of it to us by his Holy Spirit.

"30. The Spirit applieth to us the redemption purchased by Christ by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling.

"31. Effectual calling is the work of God's Spirit, whereby, convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds in the knowledge of Christ, and renewing our wills, he doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ, freely offered to us in the gospel."

"It is *worth while* noting the *fact* that the Catechism does *not* use the term *regeneration*, which theologians use so much in this connection. At first sight this may appear to be a defect in the Catechism, but a little examination of the questions set down at the head of this article will show that what the theologians term *regeneration* is there described under *effectual calling*."

We are glad that Dr. Beattie has called attention to the *fact* that the Catechism does not countenance the use of the word "regeneration" as a synonym for effectual calling. Nor can we look upon this omission as a defect in the Catechism. Neither the Catechism nor the Scriptures identify regeneration and effectual calling. In Question 31

the Catechism defines effectual calling, and does not define regeneration.

Let us note a few propositions :

1. By natural birth a soul is in Adam.

2. Only that soul has been regenerated which is in Christ. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." (2 Cor. v. 17.)

3. A soul is in Christ only when it has been baptized into Christ.

4. The soul is baptized into Christ with the Holy Spirit by Jesus himself. "One baptism." (Ephesians iv. 5.) "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Mark i. 8.) "Baptism doth also now save us." (1 Pet. iii. 21.) "By (with) one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) "Baptized into Jesus Christ." (Rom. vi. 3.)

5. This one only baptism takes place at the moment when the Spirit finishes the work of effectual calling by working faith in us.

"We are all the children of God *by faith* in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 26.) "To as many as received him to them gave he the right to become the *sons* of God, even to them that *believe* on his name." (John i. 12.) "This spake he of the Spirit which they that *believe* on him *should receive*." (John vii. 39.) "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of *faith*?" (Gal. iii. 2.)

Effectual calling precedes regeneration.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Savannah, Ga.

[NOTE.—The above anticipates a very full treatise on the subject, which has been for a short time in the hands of the editors of the QUARTERLY awaiting publication.]

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DU BOSE'S ECUMENICAL COUNCILS.

THE ECUMENICAL COUNCILS. *By William P. Du Bose, S. T. D. Author of Soteriology, etc.* 12mo, pp. xi. and 350. New York. 1896: Christian Literature Co.

This is the second volume issued by the Christian Literature Company of their series, *Ten Epochs of Church History*. Like its predecessor, the volume presents a very pleasing appearance. The binding, paper, and printer's work are all excellent. Sales must be very large in order to justify the publishers in selling such volumes at one dollar, the subscription price per volume.

The volume before us is not properly a history of the Ecumenical Councils. "It is properly an historical study of the growth and formation of the catholic doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ; that is to say, of that personal union of the divine and human in our Lord which makes him the supreme object of our spiritual and religious interest." (Preface, p. ix.) The aim is "distinctly christological." It is intended to present the truth of Christology which the church has reached in the past; to discriminate this truth from error into which the church is ever in danger of falling, and to indicate wherein our own age should add to the doctrine of Christ.

Certain assumptions with which the author sets out touching New Testament Christology are, we believe, correct. But in their exhibition he betrays the reckless disregard of the value of inspiration in its bearing on that Christology which a sober judgment does not approve. The Christologist is deeply concerned with the character of the New Testament record. The history of modern German rationalism is a proof of this. Baur, and Keim, and Schenkel holding such loose views of inspiration, not unnaturally held a Christology which our author would repudiate. And his effort "to get behind the records and see him as he must have been in himself" (p. 2) is inadequately done. Nay, it is impossible to do it. One must either assume or prove the historical validity of the records.

Nor do we agree with the author when he teaches that every succeeding age of Christianity, because it had in it neither "the plastic capacity, nor the creative power to take for itself a living form such as Christianity easily, freely, and naturally assumed," in the apostolic age, therefore accepted, "as an act of practical wisdom," that first embodiment and expression of it "as in principle, at least, and in substance, final and irreformable." (P. 25.) We believe, on the contrary, that the absolute sufficiency of the New Testament Scriptures was the occasional cause of their acceptance by the later church, in part; and, in part, that the apostolic testimony to the absoluteness of the gospel which they preached has caused men to receive it as "final and irreformable" in all respects. When the author goes on to assert, "In this way" ("as an act of practical wisdom"), "actually, the church did adopt its primitive liturgical norm, its episcopal

organization, and its canon of Scripture" (pp. 25, 26), we object to his statement, not only because it does not do justice to the New Testament Scriptures, but because it asserts a falsehood if we understand his terms. "Episcopal organization," in common parlance, has a given accepted signification. It stands over against Presbyterian organization and Congregational organization. The author seems to assert here that the apostolical church was organized, not after the Congregational order, not after the Presbyterian, but after the Episcopal. This is an assumption, or an assertion, in the face of historic fact, leading Church of England scholars being judges.

In treating of the natural basis for a scriptural and catholic theology, our author does some good thinking. But he not only throws no light on inspiration; he gives a one-sided and imperfect view of it. (See p. 39.) His remarks on the subject, moreover, bear the tone of the inspired prophet. He speaks with the assurance that his partial vision is the whole. He reminds one of the German speculative philosopher. He talks of what he thinks he sees as if he saw all. And he magnifies the intuitive reason as over against the logical. But on the subject of inspiration we need to-day an inductive study, not a declaration.

The chapter on Ebionism and Docetism is very fine. There may be an incidental statement or two that will not bear investigation. But we have not seen a better discussion of this subject. The style, too, is admirable. While dignified, it is clear, direct, and spirited.

After such an excellent treatment of Ebionism and Docetism, we were greatly disappointed in the chapter on "Sabellianism and the Beginning of the Trinitarian Discussion." The naturalness of the rise of Sabellianism is well brought out; its motive, the preservation of the monarchia of God against dualism and the emanation theories; and the difficulty of the Trinitarian problem is justly exhibited; but the author's writing, when he begins to speak of the relation of God and the world, nature and the supernatural, and Christian pantheism, is confusing, muddy, and, if we apprehend him correctly, at times incapable of proof and incorrect. For example, in speaking of God's immanence in the world, he says: "Our works, therefore, may live after us and be quite independent of us; but God's works, which are the real products or creation of his thought, will, or word, can have no existence, or continue to exist, after or apart from his, or himself, thinking, willing, and speaking." (P. 74.) Again: "God was not merely objectively to himself to express or reveal an impersonal wisdom or goodness; he was to embody himself, in a sense to realize and fulfil himself as Father and as divine love in the personal life of his personal children." (P. 74.) Again: "The whole creation is already, in its idea and intention, and is predestined to become actually, as well as ideally, the living body of the living God—the outward form and perfect expression of his divine *Logos*, his personal Reason, Wisdom, and Word." (Pp. 74, 75.) Again: "It is his *Logos*, his personal Thought, Will, and Word, who is himself to the extent of identifying him in person with the world, but not himself to the extent of making him identical in substance with the world." (P. 75.) Again: "For the true, better, higher, eternal, divine self of every man, that selfhood which it is the infinite and eternal aim of every man to realize and attain, is God." (P. 82.) Again: "He, then, who, as incarnate, is in the church and in each regenerate soul as the inner and divine self it is predestined to become, is he also who is in every human reason and conscience, and who is in irrational and inanimate nature as its ideal principle

and law." In speaking of nature and the supernatural, he says: "To the Christian reason, conscience, experience, which sees the profoundest exhibitions of the love of the divine Father in the very cross and agony of the infinitely and divinely beloved Son, there is no longer a mystery of evil. . . . The cross that exalted Jesus the Son of God to the right hand of the Father is the Christian's assurance that God and love are at the heart of all natural so-called evil; that there is no evil but sin, whose essence is ignorance and unbelief of God and love." (Pp. 84, 85.) "We hope to realize more and more, as we proceed, that it was the eternal divine nature and predestination of the *Logos*, through nature and through grace, to become man—to become, as we have said before, not only alike in nature, but one in person, with every man." (P. 87.) In speaking of Christian pantheism, the author further says: "The true Christian consciousness knows no operation, influence, or presence of God that is not God himself; whatever is divine is personal, is God. To it nature is God, events are God, everything is God, save those finite spirits to whom, in the free will, God has given power to be other than him himself, and even contrary to himself. So grace is God, not an impersonal, dead influence separate and apart from him, but he himself become human, and so capable of becoming as man to every man." (P. 89.)

We would do no man any injustice. But who can talk after this fashion save a believer in pan-Christism? Dr. Du Bose fights pantheism; he shows very clearly what it is; then falls into something closely akin to it. If we have misapprehended him, we cannot regard ourselves as wholly to blame. The man who sets out on such a task as that undertaken in this book should learn how to talk plainly, else his study will be of little practical worth. But we cannot think that we have misapprehended him. We suppose that in spite of all his fight against pantheism he would avow himself a Christo-pantheist. We do not feel called upon in this notice to refute Christo-pantheism. Nor is such a task necessary in the review of such a work. There is no proof. We have in support of these views only the customary use of the "*intuitive reason.*" Fancies are affirmed as facts. There is the turgid and strained style sometimes accompanying speculative thought. But that is all. Where nothing is established, there is nothing to refute.

The author is much more satisfactory in treating the origin and rise of Arianism. However, when we read, "God could never have been without self-expression or active will, and so his *Logos* is a coeternal and necessary part of himself of his very nature and being" (p. 103), we are not prepared for the logical corollaries! Does the author mean to assert that God has no "self-expression or active will" in the person of the Father and in that of the Spirit? Has the Father no intelligence and no will? Has the Spirit none?

The account of the Nicene Council is eminently satisfactory, saving one blemish, to be noted later. We regard the exhibition of the party led by Eusebius of Cæsarea, in the Council, as singularly happy. The author justly characterizes them as the "Conservatives" as well as "the party of compromise." The party of Athanasius was an aggressive party. It wished the Council to frame a creed that would condemn error as well as confess the truth. The feature to which we object in this chapter is found in the author's exposition of the argument of Athanasius in support of the *Homoousion*. He says that Athanasius, in virtue of the possession of an "intuitional spiritual faculty," saw that the *Homoousion* was required by "the very nature of an absolute religion." Athanasius made a powerful argu-

ment from the admitted end of Christianity that Christ must be essentially divine. He, however, used a reason no whit different from the logical in this argument. The faculty of rational intuition gives nothing but the norms of thought. Athanasius got through his intuitional faculty of the reason just what other men get, no more. He saw thus that every phenomenon has a cause; that like causes, like effects, etc., etc. The author has a false psychology, and it vitiates his whole book.

In the chapter on "Arianism after the Council of Nicea," we have a well-constructed and able summary, spoiled only by rejoicing that the church of the Nicene age adopted the Nicene creed before it had thought much about it. There is sense and nonsense, too, in the following assertion about the Council of Nicea: "Compelled, however, thus to define the object of its faith, it did so immediately and on first thought, with a clearness, certainty, and decision of which it would have been more and more incapable the longer it was allowed to reason and reflect." (P. 136.)

The treatment of the first general council of Constantinople is excellent. Especially is the work of the great Cappadocian bishops well brought out, except as marred by the outcropping of the author's Christo-pantheism, or pan-logism, to speak more precisely, in such statements as the following: "That is to say, it is not the divine *ousia*, but the divine *Logos* which is revealed in creation. Just as it is not a man's being, but his thought, or mind, or will, which is expressed in those productions of his which are from him, but are distinguished from himself, only with this difference, that while in man's productions the objectified thought or will becomes separated and ceases to be living and personal, that of God can never be so, but is always personal and himself, though it may need equally to be distinguished from himself." (P. 167.) Again, "all works of God, like creation and redemption, are in a true sense outside of him, and must be distinguished from him. They are revelations or manifestations not of his *ousia* or being, but of his *Logos*, or objective self-expression; not of himself, but of his personal wisdom, power, and love." (Pp. 168, 169.)

In addition to the falsehood of the whole Christo-pantheistic position, we may submit further that the author is wrong in denying that the divine *ousia* is to no extent revealed in creation. It is a matter of revelation, at least, that "God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being," as the *Shorter Catechism* affirms. Again, is it right to speak of the *Logos* as the objective self-expression of God? God expresses himself through all the activities of the Father and the Spirit as well as through those of the Son.

In the study of Apollinarianism, the author again does some good work, but spoils it by confounding ideal and substantive existencies, after the fashion of the ancient Greek and modern German idealistic philosophers, and by passing from the *Logos* viewed as having ideal existence to the *Logos* viewed as having personal existence, without recognition of the passage, with the result that his syllogisms have four terms.

The following quotations will illustrate: "Through the evolution of the universe God comes to himself in man; there is no lower selfhood or personality in which he could manifest himself personally. Fulfilling himself through all, he only fulfils himself in that in which it is possible for him to be himself. For God is essentially not substance, or force, or energy; all these he could be in an impersonal and inanimate world. He is reason, freedom, love, and personality,

and all these he could become in a world of reasonable, free, and loving persons, who are his children, and in whom he reproduces and fulfils himself." (P. 183.) Again, "When Christ is complete, the teaching of Christianity is that God will be all in all, and all will be in God, and yet not cease to be itself, but only truly begin to be itself in him. . . . And in humanity, as a whole, God will incarnate himself in the redemption, sanctification, and exaltation of itself, and not merely in activities in or through it which are not itself." (P. 183.) Again, "What was the *Logos* in the universe but the ideation of man? What was man but the actualization of the *Logos*? The *Logos* was eternal humanity, the eternal idea of humanity which was to be actualized in time through the creation. The true end and destiny of man is that which the *Logos* will become when he shall, through the creation have actualized himself in time. The *Logos* and man are then the eternal and the temporal of one and the same thing. The *Logos* is man, the eternal of him; and man is the *Logos*, the temporal of him. . . . The incarnation is accidentally, because of the fact of sin and the fall, human redemption; it is essentially, and would be if there were no sin or fall, human and cosmical completion." (Pp. 184, 185.)

It seems to us that these passages make valid the charges which we have already made against Dr. DuBose, and that they show, too, that he misrepresents the essential nature and purpose of the incarnation. He or his language, one is wrong. No more can we approve of his view that the humanity which the *Logos* took into personal union with him in the man Jesus Christ was "poor and sinful humanity." (P. 191.) He speaks with a sort of good-natured contempt of the view "that the Holy Ghost was sent before, mechanically and miraculously to prepare it [human holiness] for him in our flesh before he came." And therein he betrays not only unfairness in stating the position which he antagonizes, but also a feeble and unsound psychology, and an irreverence for the Bible, or a false exegesis. The angel declared unto Mary, "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

We have next a good chapter on Nestorianism, with at least nothing new that is objectionable.

The account of the Council of Ephesus is one of the best summaries we have ever read.

The treatment of Eutychnianism and the Council of Chalcedon is not so able. As a whole, it is good; but injustice is done Leo I. in making him hold neither a real duality of nature nor a true unity of person in Christ. (P. 260.) The arguments by which the author tries to prove this position are too much *e silentio*.

Again, on page 259 his assertions as to what is necessary to constitute a dogma are rationalistic. Not all dogmas can be understood by the most spiritual understanding on our planet. Not all dogmas of physical science can be understood by a Lord Kelvin. The most profound theologians, Dr. DuBose excepted, have found in the Trinity and hypostatic union great mysteries.

The chapter on the Monophysites and the Second Council of Constantinople is a very good historical picture. The same may be said of the account of Monothelism and the Third General Council of Constantinople, save that where the author attempts to explain how there can be a unity of the two natures in Christ he gives no light, yet pretends to do so. (See p. 296.) The human nature does

not become divine, nor the divine nature become human, as the author asserts.

The chapter on Adoptionism is the most objectionable one yet covered. The author espouses adoptionism as substantially correct. He misinterprets Scripture in support of it. He uses his confusion of ideal and substantive existence in support of it, and all that false philosophy which one would expect in the philosophical and theological child of Dorner, Schleiermacher, and Hegel. But few paragraphs in the entire chapter are unobjectionable. We cannot quote. (See pages 301-319.)

The last chapter is devoted to an exposition of "The Christological Goal." Along with a considerable show of thinking power, we find the faults recurring which have been noted in the preceding chapters. There is a confounding of the existence of qualities with substantive existence, of ideal and substantive existence. There is a sort of Christo-pantheism, or pan-Christism, or pan-Logism, vague talk about Christ's personality being the personality of every man. Moreover, there is criticism of the dominant soteriology, as making too much of God's part in redemption, and too little of man's part. We have wondered all along just what theory of the atonement our author holds. He tries to tell us, but it is difficult to ascertain just what his meaning is. One thing is certain, however: if his words mean what they mean in common theological parlance, he does not mean that God came down in the person of his Son, was incarnated, and stood in the sinner's stead to bear the penalty due to sin. It was man, rather, that, by the law of self-sacrificing love, made his way back to God. The incarnation was a progressive act, going on during all Jesus' earthly life, and only made complete on his resurrection from the dead. He worked himself up to God. One must wonder, too, about the work of the Spirit on Dr. DuBose's scheme. There seems to be little for him to do.

One must read the whole chapter to see fully the justice of these remarks; the following quotations will give the necessary basis for a judgment to those who have not access to the work.

"Humanity as our Lord received it was not what it is as he has made it. His conquest in it of sin and death, his own human death to sin and life to God, have constituted it at least actually, what it was before only potentially, Son of God through personal participation in the divine nature, character and life. All this in him was strictly a human act, and was only what it was the nature and destination of humanity in and through him to do and become." (P. 324.) Again, "Why, then, should we hesitate as the Adoptionists did to call even the human Jesus not only adopted, but also essential and proper, Son of God. It was because in their vindication of his particular manhood and his adopted Sonship they lost sight too far of his universal manhood and in that of his essential and divine Sonship." (P. 327.) Again, "But he who is *Logos* of God is *Logos* of all else; he exerts a cosmical function as reason, will and energy of the whole creation. All things come into being through him; and without him, apart from or outside of him, nothing is that is. He is the rational or ideal world of which all things are but outward appearances or phenomena. Whatever there is rational or free, spiritual or moral - in a word, personal—in the universe is he. Whatever is not is at least symbol, sensible expression or phenomenon of him. The only thing

in the universe that in its inner essence or universal form is not he is the possible and actual free activity of the finite personal spirits that are made to be free images of himself, of his personality, but that are free also to distort and destroy that image. The only thing in the world that is not in a sense God is sin." (P. 328, 329.) "Again, now we must remember that incarnation is a universal process. It is the nature of him who is the universal reason and principal of things to be the mediator, the bond of union or element of unity between God and man. He is God in the universe and the universe in God. The universe in fulfilling him fulfils both God and itself." (P. 329.)

Again, "We need to remember that the incarnation is an incarnation not of the physical properties, but of the spiritual, moral, and strictly personal qualities of God. It is God in man in the sense and manner in which it was the nature of God and man to be one in the other. It was not the nature of man to share the natural or physical, but only the spiritual and personal qualities of God. . . . We saw something better and higher than that (omniscience and omnipotence), even the divine love that is not any property of God, but God himself, and that we saw raised to its highest power in the incarnation and the cross. That can be in man, and was in man, and only makes him infinitely more man. But omniscience or omnipotence cannot be in man and he remain man. All the personal, spiritual, moral qualities can incarnate themselves, but the physical or natural properties of God cannot be incarnate, because it is not of the nature, or within the potentiality of man to contain or possess them." (Pp. 332, 333.) "It is absurd, therefore, to speak of the omniscience or omnipotence of our incarnate Lord as though they were a part of the incarnation." (P. 333.) "It is necessary for us to see in our Lord not only the *Logos* personally present and expressed in manhood, but also a manhood which by the spiritual and personal act of its whole life incarnates and expresses the *Logos*. This requires an extension of the act of the incarnation over the whole human life of our Lord, and makes only the resurrection and ascension the completion and consummation of it." (Pp. 337, 338.) "In spiritual or personal nature there is no essential difference or mutual exclusion between God and man. The same love that is the nature of God is the nature of man; the divine reason, will, and character may become ours also, and must become ours if we are truly to become ourselves." (P. 338.)

The book shows much strength in the author, but also a deal of confusion. It betrays Greek realism, German idealism, and rationalism. It gives us a Christ in whose divine nature are only certain divine qualities. What do they inhere in? How much more divine is he than the Christ of modern Unitarians? He seems to give this Christ a double self-consciousness. The efficient agent of the incarnation is humanity in Jesus of Nazareth, rather than God primarily. This is utterly unbiblical. This Christ shows the rest of humanity how to get back to God. We have not only another Christology which is so close akin to Nestorianism or to Unitarianism as to make one stare, but a new soteriology, a new doctrine of sin, and, of course, a new doctrine of the divine justice, a new doctrine of God, a new doctrine of the universe—pan-Christism. And yet it is not new. We have shown the author's mental ancestors.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sidney, Va.

GORDON'S "HOW CHRIST CAME TO CHURCH."

HOW CHRIST CAME TO CHURCH: A Spiritual Autobiography. *By Rev. A. J. Gordon, D. D.*, Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1895. Pp. xxiii., 123. Price, 25 cents.

This brief volume is, we believe, the last production from the pen of this gifted and lamented man of God. Though written in the form of a dream, it is really a modest statement of the convictions and principles of his ministerial life, and a brief summary of the amazing but well-known results that crowned it. We can say to all, of whatever age or occupation, but especially to ministers, get it and read it, for it will prove more than a compensation for the small price and time. What a fitting culmination, both in matter and beauty of style, to the labors of a noble life! What a graceful period at which to lay down the pen forever! Though dealing with doctrines, principles and matters of fact, it is really a poem; and nothing short of a complete transcription can ever lay claim to being its just encomium.

The dream fills only about half of the published book. Dr. Arthur T. Pierson, the intimate and admiring friend of the author, contributes the first and third parts, entitled, respectively, "The Life-story," and "The Dream as Interpreting the Man." Dr. Pierson writes with his usual insight and clearness, coupled with that clever use of apt illustration which constitutes one of his chief charms as a writer. His words breathe and his thoughts burn with more than an ordinary love for his subject, while portrayal of character and recital of incident excite interest in the author and help to a better understanding of his dream.

The subject-matter of the book revolves, as it were, around two poles, a realized sense of the personal presence of Christ in his church to-day, and the future glorious coming of the Saviour in his second advent, on which subject the author was a conspicuous premillenarian. Recognition of the presence, and submission to the guiding power, of the spirit of God in all things connected with his house constitute an under-current, but a dominating one, which pervades the entire book.

Of the two general themes treated, that of the presence of Christ in his church, the power it exercised upon the pastor and through him upon his people, when consciously realized, is by far the more interesting and profitable. With the desire of pleasing the present Christ, the plain service and congregational singing were substituted for the musical attractions of paid choirs and other devices appealing to the æsthetic taste. More dependence was placed in the power of the Spirit working through the ordinary and Scriptural agencies of the church, and less in multiplied and lifeless ecclesiastical machinery. His dream carried him back nearer the apostolic usage, and certainly the sequel justified the change. In our judgment this great and good man has sounded here a note of warning which God's people will do well everywhere to hear.

It has been characteristic of premillenarianism to manifest an intolerance for those who cannot subscribe to the doctrine that is anything but commendable. A doctrine about which they are so sure ought to be allowed to rest on its merits. When we saw that this saintly and modest man meant to discuss the subject we squared ourselves for a calm and dispassionate treatment of the question. We were rather disappointed; for while there is nothing new in the argument, there

is a decided tendency toward impatient declamation against brethren disagreeing with him. A question so beclouded with uncertainty does not justify such an attitude. We have had no time for investigation justifying a decided opinion, but in one's heart there is naturally a predisposition in favor of the blessed hope that the Master will come quickly, and gloriously put an end to the conflict. But in its present shape we are satisfied that it claims too much. It not only makes the system of Christian belief Christo-centric, but it puts his second coming in the centre. This is the mountain top from which the whole landscape of the gospel is to be viewed. This is the Rome to which all roads of gospel truth lead. This is the one need of the church to set it on fire and enable it to take the world for Christ, burying a thousand leagues beneath the debris of the fallen walls of Satan's palace the Higher Criticism and all else hostile to, and hindering, the march of truth and righteousness. Surely this is claiming everything in sight.

Nevertheless, we recommend this book as an able and very fair presentation of the subject. If less full than the much-read book of Dr. Munhall, it is, all things considered, more satisfactory. Taking it altogether, it is a valuable production, and we close with our opening advice: get it and read it.

Chester, S. C.

D. N. McLAUCHLIN.

CROCKETT'S "MEN OF THE MOSS-HAGS."

THE MEN OF THE MOSS-HAGS, Being a History of Adventure taken from the Papers of William Gordon, of Eadstown in Galloway, and Told Over Again by S. R. Crockett. New York and London: Macmillan & Co. 1895.

We have just read half-a-dozen of the more notable novels of the year 1895. But from Mr. Richard Harding Davis, from Mr. Chauncey Hotchkiss, from Mr. F. Marion Crawford, and even from Mr. Frank R. Stockton, we have turned with a vast increase of delight to *The Men of the Moss-Hags*. The work of Mr. Davis has a light and airy charm. Mr. Crawford has strength of conception and literary skill, which tend to make the reader forget his deficient sense of moral responsibility for the creatures of his pen. Mr. Hotchkiss is a very entertaining storyteller, whose work leaves a wholesome impression on the reader. Stockton's stories are delightful. But not one of these writers is comparable to Mr. S. R. Crockett in the single product of his pen with which we are acquainted. He has as much charm as Mr. Davis, as much strength and literary skill as the author of "The Ralstons," is more entertaining than Mr. Hotchkiss, and surpasses very far a quondam favorite, Stockton, in the interest of his stories.

If we compare this work with that of the leading contemporary Scotch novelists, we believe that even "Ian Maclaren" must yield the palm to the author of *The Men of the Moss-Hags*. The Liverpool pastor has given us some wondrously bright, sweet, humorous, pathetic stories. The *Beside the Bonny Briar Bush* is a sheaf of them. But in that book there is nothing more pathetic than Crockett's account of the "some thirty bairns" huddling and frightened before Johnstone of Westerhall; not even the death of Margaret Howe's scholar son, nor the death of the man who had educated George Howe, Margaret's unspoken lover through three decades of years. These are the stories of a master workman; but they do not surpass the story of Mr. Crockett just referred to. We read that story the other night to a six-year-old boy. He broke into weeping and wailing

more than once, and finally became uncontrollable. To the question, "What's the matter, Tom?" he said, "Oh! it's so pitiful; it's so pitiful." And half-an-hour later he would break out, "Oh! I can just see those cruel men. It's so pitiful." Such a testimonial to the truly pathetic character of the story may not be the highest desirable; but we imagine that the author would not be displeased at it.

Scarcely inferior to this is our author's tale of the drowning of Margaret Wilson in the waters of the Blednoch, the doing of a young lass "to death in the flower of her youth, in the untouched grace and favor of her virginity." In the whole story there is that which appeals to us as much as anything in Mr. John Watson's work, or in Barrie's. No true man could read of the woe of Hendry McQumphra when Jess was supposed to be grievously sick with the diphtheria without swelling emotion, but it comes short of that with which we are affected as we listen to Margaret Wilson singing for the last time the twenty-sixth Psalm, the waves lapping her breast, neck, and finally cheeks, the while.

We are unable to name a single respect in which the work of "Ian Maclaren" or Barrie surpasses that of Mr. Crockett. On the other hand, we think the writer of *The Men of the Moss-Hags* displays a complement of qualities not equalled by either of his much-admired contemporaries as a novelist.

We believe, indeed, that this is one of the novels of the century. It is pleasing in a very high degree. It is elevating in its moral tone. It is rarely instructive. It betrays extraordinary literary powers. These are four qualities that are necessary to work of the highest order. Being found, the reader is fortunate.

The work is so pleasing that even such a reader as Mr. Crawford ought to set a high value on it. He is carried through shifting scenes of the pathetic, the heroic, the grewsome, the "fearsome," the ludicrous, the romantic, the humorous. How rich the several scenes are! We have already referred to pathetic scenes. What could be more heroic than the death of the lion of the covenant, Richard Cameron, at Ayrsmoss, indeed than his whole life as recorded in these pages? What more splendid than the courage of old Anton Lennox on many occasions, but particularly when he gave himself, on the day of the fight in the Enterkin, for the young baby-faced officer of the red coats, who would have blown his own brains out rather than have lost all his prisoners? What more ludicrous than the account of Birsay's tumble out of old Anton's kitchen loft, with the effect upon Jock Webster and the rest of the household? What more grewsome than William Gordon's hour in the House of the Black Cats, with Gash Gibbie? What more fearsome than the account of "The Thing that Fell from the Traitor's Gate," or than "The Nick o' the Deid Wife"? The whole book is brimful of romance. Wit and humor cause every page to sparkle. On many pages all the qualities which make attractive blend to give the highest and most varied attractiveness.

This novel is elevating. The meanness of degraded characters is made to appear mean. Meanness is never glossed and made to pass for something else. The youngster in the plastic state who reads this book will be more tender to the weak; more courageous in defence of what is believed to be true; readier to see the good even in an enemy; readier for Christlike sacrifice—a nobler being—as surely as there is anything good in him to respond to the good set forth in the book in a way to win love for it. Any book may be abused. Some readers turn light to

darkness. But we know few novels which tend to form a higher ideal of manhood and womanhood than this one.

The book is also a very instructive one. It gives a much clearer notion of the personality of such men as Richard Cameron and John Grahame, of Claverhouse, than some professed historians. It is, we believe, a fine historic picture. And it vivifies the reader's historic knowledge of the times between the restoration of the Stuarts and their expulsion in the person of James II. It does for most historians of the time what is done by Lew. Wallace's *Ben Hur* for New Testament times, or by Wallace's *Prince of India* for the later years of the Greek Empire, at Constantinople.

The work is specially valuable, therefore, as a corrective of the false impression given of the Covenanters by the great Sir Walter. Our admiration for "The Wizard of the North" is very great. In our boyhood days we went through his stories as through a paradise. We have read some of his masterpieces half-a-dozen times. He holds a place among the stars in our literary world which none can ever dispossess him of. He is as knightly a character as any he ever sketched. He was a high man and handled high things. We are sorry that he is not more read in our own day. We are glad that he is as much read; that he cannot be covered up completely by the flood of less worthy stuff coming from the presses. But while we have such high regard for Scott, we have long mourned his injustice to the covenanting bodies of Scotch Presbyterians, especially to the Cameronians. The Rev. Gabriel Kettledrummle and the Rev. Ephraim Macbriar are no fair types of preachers of the Cameronians before the Revolution of 1680. Nor is old Mause Headrigg a proper representative of their mothers. The Cameronians are caricatured and pilloried in *Old Mortality*.

Scott was the literary father of the Oxford movement. He was daft on the subject of beauty. The very bareness of the covenanting worship, the Covenanters, contempt for ornament in worship made them repellant to him. He could not do them, historically, justice. In the work before us, a man full of sympathy for their faith and life writes of these sternest of the Puritans. He sees the sweetness of their lives, their beauty, and their heroism, and records it sympathetically. At the same time, by reason of the years that have elapsed, and the cooling of the passions of parties, the author can do justice to the enemies of his people. Claverhouse appears every whit as well in the book before us as in *Old Mortality*.

There is no home-life so beautiful as that of the Puritans. I do not mean the New England Puritans, I mean the English Puritans of pre-Cromwellian times—when the Puritans were such from conviction—I mean, also, the Puritans in Scotland during all the later years, in case of persons Puritans from conviction. I mean, also, Puritans from conviction in our own land and time. This beautiful home-life we get glimpses of in *The Men of the Moss-Hags*. The purity, sweetness, perfect confidence which characterize such lives give them a beauty rarely found in homes of another manner.

We think so highly of this book that we, in spite of the numerous notices of it which have already appeared, take pleasure in commending it to all parents as suitable for themselves and their young folks.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Orlando, Fla.

CROCKETT'S "THE STICKIT MINISTER."

THE STICKIT MINISTER. By S. R. Crockett. Author of "The Raiders," "The Lilac Sunbonnet." New York: R. F. Fenno & Company.

Dr. Peck used to say that the young preacher ought to read Butler's *Analogy* once every year. If that work is of such importance, a reviewer ought to notice it at intervals, that the minds of our young ministers may be turned towards it.

This fact suggests that a reviewer need not apologize for noticing a book already well known, if it has distinctive merits, and it explains the present notice. *The Stickit Minister* is not like Butler's *Analogy*, indeed. It is not hard to comprehend. It does not convey an extraordinary amount of important truth. It affords no great mental gymnastic. But it is a book of wholesome stories.

The demand for fiction is one of the great demands of our age. When any part of the supply is excellent in quality, it ought to be made widely known. Young men and maidens, and tired people, who need amusement, should be made acquainted with it.

This little book is full of stories—simple, pathetic, humorous; and their moral character is excellent. It is a work which a Christian man may gladly see in the hands of his children. By the way, the meaning of the word "Stickit," in the phrase *The Stickit Minister*, is not "little," though this was asserted not long ago in our hearing by a very distinguished divine. A stickit minister in Scotch parlance is a man who set out to be a minister, but who stuck at some point in his course—who could not pass his college examinations, or his presbyterial trials. The title of our book is taken from the subject of the first story in it. Robert Fraser was no stickit minister in reality, however, but one who saw it to be his duty on the death of his father to give up his preferred work for the sake of helping a younger brother. He was known in "three parishes" for six years as the stickit minister, but God knew that he was not only clever in mind, but a hero in character.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sidney, Va.

IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE ELEMENTS OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM. *By Andrew C. Zenos, Professor of Biblical Theology in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.* 12mo, 268 pp., \$1. New York, London, Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1895.

The author's purpose in this admirable work, which is just what it purports to be, is to give a clear and precise answer chiefly to the question, What is the Higher Criticism? and secondarily, Is there a legitimate sphere for such a thing as the Higher Criticism? The work is simply an expository and non-controversial attempt to describe the science and art of Higher Criticism. It has nothing to do with the problems which that science presents. By proper definition and exposition it shows what is meant by the term, how misunderstood on the one hand and misapplied it can be on the other, and especially how it is not proper to associate the term with that attitude of mind towards the Bible which subjects it to the human reason, or with those philosophical and religious views or principles commonly known as rationalism. We have so often felt that the unthinking denunciation of all Higher Criticism has put the opponents of advanced or rationalistic or destructive criticism at a disadvantage, that we hail with pleasure this clear statement of the subject from the pen of a thorough conservative. Dr. Zenos first discusses the name and place of the Higher Criticism, then its objects, then its methods, as the literary, the historical, the theological, then the relation of the science to oriental archæology, the use of postulates, its doctrinal aspects, and its history and present status. In these last chapters, on its history and present status, he merely states the facts of the case, and passes no judgment upon them. The whole work is judicial and judicious, and familiarity with it would be of service to any one. Shorter treatises on the same subject will be found in a pamphlet by our own Dr. F. R. Beattie, and by Dr. Tillet, of the Methodist Church; but the fulness of the present volume makes it more valuable.

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY. *By the Rev. Andrew Harper, B. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Ormond College within the University, Melbourne.* Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 491. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1896.

Like almost all the volumes of the series called *The Expositor's Bible* which deal with the Old Testament books, this commentary or exposition is along the lines of advanced criticism. The author thinks that Deuteronomy's spiritual elevation and the moral impulse it gives will always be present, no matter what supposition may be held as to its origin and authorship—a view which the critics are very fond of urging along with their theories that this and that book of the Bible is a forgery. He makes an elaborate argument for the study of the critical questions connected with Deuteronomy. Of course, he denies its Mosaic authorship, except as respects a few fragments of the book. He asserts that the only generally known scholar who denies the existence of JE is Professor Green, of Prince-

ton. The date of the book he seeks to prove, by the development of the elaborate system of worship of the Jews, to be certainly post-Solomonic, certainly post-Hezekian, and with great likelihood was suggested and called out by the need of guidance which emerged in Hezekiah's reforms. His effort to legitimize the forgery which is involved in this date and authorship is as follows: "If we take into account the character of Deuteronomy as only an extension and adaptation of the Book of the Covenant set in a framework of affectionate exhortation, and that all men then believed that the Book of the Covenant was Mosaic, we can see better how such action might be considered legitimate. . . . At that early time and in the East, literary methods and literary ideas were so different from ours that there may have been customs which made the publication of a book in this way not only natural but right."

THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR. *By George Adam Smith, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow.* In Two Volumes. Vol. I., Amos, Hosea, and Micah. With an Introduction and a Sketch of Prophecy in Early Israel. Cr. 8vo, pp. xviii., 440. \$1.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1896.

In four introductory chapters Dr. Smith discusses the relation of the twelve prophecies usually called "Minor" to each other and to the greater prophets, the position and work of the prophet in early Israel, the eighth century in Israel, and the influence of Assyria upon prophecy. In dealing separately with the three prophets examined in this volume, he leaves undisputed, as do all the critics, we believe, the early date of Hosea and Amos, and the genuineness of the bulk of the prophecy of Amos. He parts company with Grätz and other critics who assign Hosea to two authors. He discusses at considerable length the date of the different parts of Micah, and thinks it not improbable that Micah uttered both the threat and the promise found in the prophecy attributed to him. The author's position, in general, seems to be a mediation between the so-called traditional and the most advanced critical schools. The exposition of the text is, as in most of the volumes of this series, delightfully suggestive and helpful, though in this volume more critical than in most of the others. The author's interpretation of the marriage of Hosea is that the wife whom by God's command he took was pure when he took her, else she could not have served as a type of the Israel whose earliest relations to Jehovah he describes as innocent. This was the theory of W. Robertson Smith.

THE GOSPEL IN ISAIAH. Illustrated in a Series of Expositions, Topical and Practical. Founded upon the Sixth Chapter. *By Charles S. Robinson, D. D., Pastor of the New York Presbyterian Church, New York City.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 280. \$1.25. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1896.

With all the fervor and unction for which he is so well known, Dr. Robinson here preaches to a congregation far wider than that which first heard them a series of thirty sermons, unfolding the gospel as it is so strikingly set forth in that familiar passage so fully quoted, and so often, in the New Testament, the sixth chapter of Isaiah. He maintains that the entire revelation of God's plan of redemption is contained in this passage, from the first disclosure of human sin to the last awakening and final ingathering of the nations. The volume is richly spiritual and helpful.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. Popular Sketches from Old Testament History. By *Carl Heinrich Cornill, Doctor of Theology and Professor of Old Testament History in the University of Königsburg.* Translated by Sutton F. Corkran. Crown 8vo, pp. xvi., 194. \$1.00. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1895.

A general conception of the spirit which animates this author can be had from the following passage: "It is no easy matter to obtain such a thorough and complete command of the religious and secular history of the Israelites. This goal is to be reached only by much labor and on circuitous paths; for the Israelitish narrative, as it lies before us in the books of the Old Testament, gives a thoroughly one-sided and, in many respects, incorrect picture of the profane history, and, on the other hand, an absolutely false representation of the religious history of the people, and has thus made the discovery of the truth well-nigh impossible." Of his belief we can judge from the following in his treatise on the religion of Moses: "And now I must make an admission to you which it is hard for me to make, but which is my fullest scientific conviction, based upon the most cogent grounds, that in the sense in which the historian speaks of 'knowing' we know absolutely nothing about Moses; . . . even the celebrated ten commandments are not from him, but, as can be proved, were written in the first half of the seventh century, between 700 and 650 B. C." Of Samuel, he says that the assertion of a reforming and organizing efficacy of that prophet "is a legend of a later period, which cannot stand before a methodical historical criticism." Of Amos, he says, "His God is essentially a criminal judge, inspiring fear, but not love; and on fear alone neither the heart of man nor religion can exist." Even that mythical personage, in whom he believes most heartily, Deutero-Isaiah, while he has given the most magnificent theology of history, is, in his sublimity, unable to withdraw himself altogether from the influence of the time, and begins the declining line of prophecy. These specimens of the author's principles and views are sufficient to indicate the general character of his work.

CORONATION OF LOVE. By *George Dana Boardman, D. D.* Square 12mo, pp. 58. Price, 75 cents. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut St. 1895.

A most beautiful unfolding and exposition of the thirteenth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, considering the words of that well-known passage under the four heads of Love the Indispensable Grace, Love the Exquisite Grace, The Immortality of Love, and The Coronation of Love. "The Coronation of Love as the empress over sister-queens Faith and Hope" suggests the title of the four discourses. The book is daintily bound in white, and is as pure and sweet within as without.

IN THE TIME OF JESUS. Historical Pictures. By *Martin Seidel, D. D.* 12mo, pp. xxiii., 192. Cloth, 75 cents. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. (incorporated). 1896.

In this brief hand-book, excellently translated from the German, the author seeks to give less elaborately, and in a manner better adapted to ordinary readers than the larger works on the subject, the leading facts of the circumstances and

times of Jesus. The value of a clear knowledge of that world in which Christ lived none can question. This subject together with the definition of terms, and the determination of the chronology form the body of the introduction to this book. The author then considers the union of the peoples in the Roman Empire, the religious life in the heathen world, the state of morals among the Gentiles, the land and the people of Israel, the political government of Palestine, the sanhedrin, high priests and scribes, religious life among the Jews, parties, the Messianic hope, and Judaism in the Dispersion. An appendix contains the notes, chronological tables, and index.

THE LAST OF THE PROPHETS—A Study of the Life, Teaching, and Character of John the Baptist. *By Rev. J. Feather.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 157. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The meagreness of the record concerning John the Baptist and his proximity to the greatest world-character of all, to whom John gave testimony, are assigned by the author as the reason for a somewhat marked neglect of study of this great prophet. In the volume before us there is an attempt to go behind the few brief notices in the gospels, and the allusions in Josephus, to reach the springs of John's character, and to exhibit the relations he held to the world of his day. The controversial features of a study of John's life are carefully avoided, and the meaning of his baptism alone is set forth, except so far as we may conclude from the author's maintenance that it was not a new or unfamiliar ceremony which he performed, but one in use long before, not only among the Jews in their divers washings, but also among the Gentiles in lustrations known to have been performed even among the ruder nations of the world.

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE BIBLE. An Account of the Leading Forms of Literature Represented in the Sacred Writings. *By Richard G. Moulton, M. A. (Camb.), Ph. D. (Penna.), Professor of Literature in English in the University of Chicago; late University Extension Lecturer (Cambridge and London).* Pp. xii., 533. \$2.00. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1895.

The inspiration of this book is that admirable fact that there has been of late years a remarkable impulse towards a fuller study of the English Bible. The inauguration of English Bible courses in schools, colleges, and universities is one of the features of the day in educational development. It is coming to be regarded as essential to a liberal education that one be as familiar with the Scriptures as with mathematics or the classics. The author of the work before us, in defining the term "the literary study of the Bible," while acknowledging what he calls the "splendid processes" of modern Biblical criticism, avers that he will enter a distinct province from it, and will deal, not with the question *how* the books reached their present form, but with *what* we have in them, the common ground upon which all can meet. At certain points, indeed, as, for instance, the analysis of Job, and, in general, the divisions of the texts of various books, he disagrees with the majority of the advanced critics, or assigns certain phenomena to causes diverse from those usually given. Incidentally, he makes a noteworthy plea for the unity of several of the disputed books of the Bible. The work is intended for English readers. It is itself a specimen of very fine English, though at times we think of almost too ornate a style to adapt the work to popular use, or text-book

purposes. The following sentences will both illustrate this and show the author's plea for the study of the Bible as literature: "It is surely good that our youth, during the formative period, should have displayed to them in a literary dress as brilliant as that of Greek literature, in lyrics which Pindar cannot surpass, in rhetoric as forcible as that of Demosthenes, or contemplative prose not inferior to Plato's—a people dominated by an utter passion for righteousness, a people whose ideas of purity, of infinite good, of universal order, of faith in the irresistible downfall of all moral evil, moved to a poetic passion as fervid, and speech as musical, as when Sappho sang of love, or Æschylus thundered his deep notes of destiny."

EDEN LOST AND WON. Studies of the Early History and Final Destiny of Man as Taught in Nature and Revelation. *By Sir J. William Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., etc.* 12mo, pp. viii., 226. Cloth, \$1.25. New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1896.

All who are troubled by the aspersions cast upon those who cling to the conservative views of science and faith will rejoice in this work from Principal Dawson's hands. No scientist of modern times stands higher than he, or is more a recognized authority. His purpose in this book, which is a collection of papers, enlarged and revised, appearing originally in the *Expositor*, is to show that an enlightened natural science and an intelligent and reverent study of the Bible will not only hold our faith against the aggressive forces of agnostic philosophy and destructive criticism, but will also manifest the beautiful congruity of the Old and New Testaments, and of both with nature and the human heart. He divides his discussion into two parts. In Part I. he considers the bearing of physical and historical facts upon the problem of the authorship and authority of the Mosaic books. He shows the necessity of the integrity of these books and their authority to mankind and to our faith, and declares that the attitude towards them which is willing to admit fraud and conspiracy to the authors of the early books, and yet attaches a certain religious value to these forged documents, is a "moral obliquity," a "two-edged sword, cutting every way against the interests of society." To this position he attributes to a large extent that moral disintegration which science and humanity have so much reason to dread. "I am not unaware," he writes, "of the evils that threaten humanity from agnostic evolution, and that this has been too much fostered by scientific men; but the advanced evolutionists and the advanced critics have long since united their forces, and true Christianity and true science are now face to face with both. It is not necessary, however, to take a pessimistic view of the situation. The observation and study of fifty years have shown me the rise and fall of several systems of philosophy and criticism, and the word of God still abides and becomes wider in its influence." In the development of the subject of Part I., Dr. Dawson shows conclusively that the natural conditions and a scientific use of the facts of history, archæology, ethnology, geology, etc., prove the personality of Moses, the historicity of the records of the Book of Genesis, the account of early man and Eden, the account of the antediluvians and the deluge, the account of the dispersion and the career of Abraham. He applies his tests with special force and success to the Book of Exodus, which he regards as "the main stem of the Pentateuch, that to which its roots in Genesis converge, and that which supports its branches, foliage and fruit in Numbers,

Leviticus and Deuteronomy." In Part II., which is less full than the preceding discussion, the author considers man and nature, fallen and restored, showing the condition of primeval man, the fall and its consequences, and the restoration through the scheme of redemption. A book of greater strength, force of argument and philosophical acumen we have rarely seen. We could wish a copy of it placed in the hands of every inquirer after truth, and of every one who is troubled by the science, falsely so-called, which sets itself in the form of advanced criticism against the truth of God.

THE WONDERFUL. A Story for Young People. *By Wm. E. Sloane.* Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 223. \$1.25. New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1896.

EZEKIEL OF BETHLEHEM; or, From Bethlehem to Calvary. *By Fanny Alricks Shugert.* Illustrated. 12mo, pp. 281. \$1.00. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

These are stories in which the life and words of Christ are woven in just as they are recorded in the Gospels. Other characters besides Christ are presented, such as are thought to be, while fictitious, by no means improbable. The stories are written clearly and simply, and manifest a reverent spirit and earnest purpose on the part of the authors, but we cannot agree that there is a need for a life of Christ which combines the qualities of accurate history with the fascination of fiction in order to catch and retain the interest of young people.

BETTER THINGS FOR SONS OF GOD. *By George T. Lemmon.* 12mo, pp. 184. Cloth, 75 cents. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

Five discourses on the text, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." They perhaps sounded better than they read, for they seem, in style, well adapted to declamation. The social principles of which George D. Herron is the apostle underlie the author's words. The volume is one of that class which enjoy a very ephemeral life.

TALKS FROM THE WORD OF GOD. *By E. Fairley Cunningham.* 12mo, pp. 156. Cloth, 75 cents. Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

This volume consists of twenty-six short, practical "talks" by a layman on Bible themes. They are direct and practical, well illustrated by incident and history, and full of spiritual force. The book deserves a wide circulation and use. It will be found of special value and adaptability in Sabbath-schools where the superintendent cannot speak; and from it many a leader will learn how to address others.

RULING IDEAS OF THE PRESENT AGE. *By Washington Gladden, D. D., Author of "Applied Christianity," "Tools and the Man," "Who Wrote the Bible," etc.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1895. 16mo, pp. vi., 299. \$1.25.

This volume is the author's answer to the question, "In what ways ought the conception of personal life and duty to be modified?" and was awarded the Fletcher Prize in 1894. Dr. Gladden does not claim to have defined all the ruling ideas of the present age, but believes that he has pointed out the most important

ones. The first that he considers is the present-day progress in thought, or "change of mind," a plea for new conceptions of truth in the progress of the kingdom of Christ. The doctrine of the divine Fatherhood is the doctrine next considered, and to it are attributed the undermining of feudalism and slavery, and the leading in of democracy. The law of brotherhood, showing itself, as the author claims, in Christian social equality, charity, and proper relation to our fellowmen's sufferings, is next treated. The independence of the individual and the solidarity of society, favorite ideas with advanced thinkers, are the next topics. The infusion of the principles of the kingdom of God into the relations of life, with a broadened ministry, institutional churches, and such like, will, he thinks, shortly obliterate the distinction so long maintained between things sacred and things secular. The remaining chapters on the law of property, religion and politics, public opinion, pharisaism, the duplex yet united character of the human organism, are of the same general type as those which we have named. There is a decided flavor of up-to-dateness about the book, and an implied depreciation of the work and results of the past. The sympathy of the author is with those who think they have discovered things new, and who parade them as though they had not been known or delivered to us ever since we had a Bible.

ADONIRAM JUDSON GORDON. A Biography; with Letters and Illustrative Extracts Drawn from Unpublished or Uncollected Sermons and Addresses. *By his son, Ernest B. Gordon.* Cr. 8vo, pp. 386. \$1.50. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1896.

The many admirers of Dr. Gordon, including all who loved him for his works as well as those who were under the spell of his magnetic personality, will welcome this biography. It is written by his son, and embraces many letters and papers which are now for the first time given to the public. The career of Dr. Gordon is so recent and so well known to most of our readers, and his works so familiar, that we need only to commend this biography of him for its fulness and charming style. The opening chapter gives us the secret, we think, of Dr. Gordon's power. He was born and reared in a Christian home, and to parents whose firm belief in the strong principles of Calvinism resulted in producing that robust and stalwart faith and beautiful consecration which characterized this grand soldier of the cross.

THE STORY OF MARCUS WHITMAN. Early Protestant Missions in the Northwest. *By the Rev. J. G. Craighead, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 211. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school work. 1895.

The sub-title of this interesting book describes its nature and contents much more fully than the leading title. It is an account of the early development of Oregon under the influences of the missionaries who first carried civilization there. These missionary efforts resulted, not only in carrying blessings to the Indians of the Northwest, but also in laying the foundation of orderly and law-abiding communities, the rallying-points for the immigrants who began soon afterwards to pour into that region. The early history of the country, the first explorations of it, the futile attempt under Mr. Astor to establish settlements on the Pacific coast, and other matters of great interest, are traced in this book. Its chief attention, however, is given to the missionary enterprises which were so intimately connected with this history, and in which Dr. Marcus Whitman was the most active figure.

SUNSET MEMORIES. *By Rev. Nicholas Vansant, of the Newark Annual Conference, Author of "The Life and Character of Rev. H. Mattison, D. D.," "Rachel Weeping for Her Children," "Entire Holiness," etc. With an Introduction by General James F. Rusling.* 12mo, pp. 271. \$1.00. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1896.

An autobiography of one who has passed the fifty-first year of his ministry for Christ, giving, not only his own life, but also describing, to some extent, the stirring events and stupendous changes which have occurred in his church within the past seventy years. The personal features of the book will adapt it specially to the people of the many charges which the author served in his long and useful ministry.

OUTLINES OF GERMAN LITERATURE. *By Madame M. Jeif. Teusler, Teacher of German in the Richmond High School, Richmond Seminary, and Miss Johnson's Select School for Young Ladies.* 12mo, pp. 238. Richmond: B. F. Johnson Publishing Co. 1895.

Madame Teusler makes claim to having given here nothing more than mere outlines of the great field of study which German literature affords. Her book is an attempt to supply that which in ordinary schools and private classes is desirable to be known, but not the mass of information which a profounder study would suggest or demand. The volume is to be commended for its brevity and clearness, and for the interest with which the subject is sustained.

THE *Scientific American*, of New York, has signalized its 50th anniversary by the publication of a very handsome 72-page special number, which consists of a review of the development of science and the industrial arts in the United States during the past fifty years. It was an ambitious undertaking, and the work has been well done. The many articles are thoroughly technical, and they are written in a racy and popular style, which makes the whole volume—it is nothing less, being equal to a book of 442 ordinary pages—thoroughly readable. It is inclosed for preservation in a handsome cover, and is sold at the price of ten cents.

THE REVIEW OF REVIEWS. New York.

In the September *Review of Reviews* the editor discusses different phases of the Presidential campaign, especially the revolt of the gold-standard Democrats, the attitude of Eastern wage-earners toward Mr. Bryan, and the spread of free-silver doctrine among the farmers. Another important topic of discussion in the department of "The Progress of the World" is Lord Salisbury's Venezuelan proposition, in connection with the general scheme for a permanent tribunal of arbitration. The editor also covers most of the striking developments of the month in British and European politics. Theodore Roosevelt contributes to the same number a characteristic study of "The Three Vice-Presidential Candidates and What They Represent." The time is peculiarly opportune for a re-examination of the Vice-Presidential office, and Mr. Roosevelt offers some pertinent suggestions as to the proper status of the Vice-President in our scheme of government. He believes that the Vice-President should represent the principles on which the President was chosen to office, that he should have a seat in the Cabinet, and that his official power should be increased in several directions. Mr. Roosevelt's comments on the personalities of the three candidates now conspicuously before the country are direct, pointed, and decidedly Rooseveltian.