

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

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

MANAGING EDITOR: S. C. BYRD, A. M.

VOL. XII.

1898.

JANUARY—APRIL—JULY—OCTOBER.

Columbia, S. C.:

THE BRYAN PRINTING COMPANY.

NEW YORK: A. D. F. RANDOLPH COMPANY, LT'D.

1898.

PRINTERS,
THE BRYAN PRINTING COMPANY,
COLUMBIA, S. C.

9/22/30
Budget fund
\$4.00

X
RW
Pg 28-4
v. 12

CONTENTS.

VOLUME XII.

	PAGE.
Abbott's <i>Soul's Quest After God</i>	A. B. Curry..... 461
Action of the Synod of South Carolina, Complaint Against	W. M. McPheeters et al. 323
Alexander's <i>Presbyterian Digest and Supplement</i>	480
<i>American Monthly Review of Reviews</i>	132
Ames' <i>The Revelation of St. John</i>	312
Amis' <i>Camping on the Blue Ridge</i>	132
Ancient Hebrew Polity, The.....	B. M. Palmer..... 153
Assembly, The General, New Orleans, 1898.....	W. A. Alexander..... 571
Assembly, The Northern, Winona, 1898.....	609
Assembly, the Westminster, The Personnel of.....	J. M. Mecklin 72
Authority, Preaching with.....	L. B. Turnbull..... 38
Bacon's <i>History of American Christianity</i>	Robert Price..... 114
Banks' <i>The Christ Brotherhood</i>	127
Banks' <i>Heroic Personalities</i>	474
Barrett's <i>Story of Christian Missions</i>	D. J. Brimm 659
Bartlett's <i>Veracity of the Hexateuch</i>	123
Battershall's <i>Interpretation of Life and Religion</i>	A. D. McClure..... 464
Behrends' <i>The Old Testament Under Fire</i>	124
Bibliography.....	316, 481, 671
Bliss' <i>History of Missions</i>	James E. Fogartie ... 304
Boise's <i>Notes, Critical and Explanatory</i>	479
Booth's <i>Did the Pardon Come Too Late?</i>	670
Boynton's <i>Real Preaching</i>	S. C. Byrd..... 458
Brewer's <i>How to Make the Sunday-School Go</i>	W. D. Hedleston..... 465
Brown's <i>Two Parables</i>	665
Bruce's <i>Apologetics</i>	E. Daniel..... 274
Bruce's <i>With Open Face</i>	J. W. Lafferty..... 445
Budde's <i>Das Buch Der Richter</i>	W. W. Elwang..... 627
Campbell's <i>After Pentecost, What?</i>	R. A. Webb 108
Carus' <i>Chinese Philosophy</i>	664
Carus' <i>Homiletics of Science</i>	D. J. Brimm 471
Chisholm's <i>The Daughters of the Parsonage</i>	306
Chisolm's <i>The Gospel in Gold</i>	G. R. Brackett..... 662
Christ, The Personal, the Gospel for Our Time.....	J. T. Plunket..... 542
Christmas Days, Two Famous—496 and 800.....	E. D. Warfield..... 231
Church Union, The First Attempt at, in America.....	James I. Good 618
Clark's <i>Schwester Anna</i>	Louis Voss..... 470

	PAGE.
Comings of Our Lord, The.....	<i>W. A. Alexander</i> 187
Complaint Against the Action of the Synod of South Carolina	<i>W. M. McPheeters et al.</i> 323
Cornill's <i>Prophets of Israel</i>	<i>W. M. McPheeters</i> ... 468
Coun's <i>The Holy Land</i>	669
Cowl's <i>Digging Ditches and Other Sermons to Boys and Girls</i>	473
Criticisms and Reviews.....	98, 265, 436, 627
Crockett's <i>Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles</i>	477
Crooks' <i>Story of the Christian Church</i>	<i>Robert Price</i> 456
Dabney's <i>Christ Our Penal Substitute</i>	<i>B. B. Warfield</i> 440
Dabney's <i>Practical Philosophy</i>	<i>C. W. Humphreys</i> ... 98
Dawson's <i>Relics of Primeval Life</i>	<i>S. S. Laws</i> 265
Defence of the Synod of South Carolina.....	<i>C. W. Humphreys</i> ... 405
Dennis' <i>Christian Missions, etc</i>	120
Diatessaron, The, of Tatian, and Its Evidential Value...	<i>Parke P. Fournoy</i> ... 24
Dickson's <i>Howard McPhlinn</i>	131
Dickson's <i>Truth That Saves</i>	<i>J. I. Vance</i> 161
Dorr's <i>In Kings' Houses</i>	666
Dowkontt's "Tell Them"	664
Eclogue, The Fourth, of Virgil.....	<i>Julia McN. Wright</i> ... 421
Education, The Religious Element in—Parochial Schools	<i>R. P. Kerr</i> 215
Episcopate, The Historic	<i>B. C. Reed</i> 57
Federal Principle, The, in the Westminster Standards...	<i>W. T. Hall</i> 378
First Attempt at Church Union in America.....	<i>James I. Good</i> 618
Foot's <i>The Librarian of the Sunday School</i>	475
Foster's <i>God: Nature and Attributes</i>	<i>R. A. Webb</i> 436
Fourth Eclogue, The, of Virgil.....	<i>Julia McN. Wright</i> ... 421
Freytag's <i>Martin Luther</i>	128
Gaines' <i>Bible Course</i>	665
General Assembly, The, New Orleans, 1898.....	<i>W. A. Alexander</i> 571
General Assembly, The Northern, Winona, 1898.....	609
"Gerome's" <i>Christ and the Critics</i>	668
Giberne's <i>Everybody's Business</i>	131
Gilbert's <i>The Student's Life of Jesus</i>	314
Gordon's <i>The Twofold Life, or Christ's Work in Us and Christ's Work for Us</i>	312
Gospel, The, for Our Time.....	<i>J. T. Plunket</i> 542
Griffith's <i>An Hundred-Fold</i>	473
Gulick's <i>Growth of the Kingdom of God</i>	121
Harland's <i>Ruth Bergen's Limitations</i>	126
Hawes' <i>Bible Church Studies</i>	117
Hebrew Polity, The Ancient.....	<i>B. M. Palmer</i> 153
Hedleston's <i>Lamp Oil</i>	<i>W. McF. Alexander</i> , 291

	PAGE.
Hillis' <i>The Investment of Influence</i>	313
Hillyer's <i>Manual of Bible Morality</i>James E. Fogartie...	303
Historic Episcopate, The.....R. C. Reed.....	57
Hobson's <i>Christian Baptism</i>	664
Homer, A Poetic Myth?.....E. L. Patton.....	243
Hope, The Blessed, of the Lord's Return.....A. W. Pitzer.....	83
Horton's <i>The Memoirs of Jesus</i>	307
Hurlbutt's <i>Illustrative Notes</i>	130
Imprecatory Psalm, The.....J. A. DeBaun	45
Inspiration	Joseph A. Vance..... 491
Iverach's <i>St. Paul, His Life and Times</i>	128
James' <i>Alaska</i>	667
James' <i>Essays in Popular Philosophy</i>	W. J. Wright..... 442
Jevon's <i>Introduction to the History of Religion</i>F. R. Beattie.....	639
Johnson's <i>Miscellanies of Rev. Thos. E. Peck, D.D., LL.D.</i>	309
Jones' <i>Primeval Revelations</i>	314
Jowett's <i>College Sermons</i>	127
Jordon's <i>Tales of the City Room</i>	474
Kennedy's <i>Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned</i>	309
Kennedy's <i>Publication</i>G. A. Blackburn.....	663
Kent's <i>History of the Hebrew People</i>George Summey	297
Kirlew's <i>Story of John Wesley</i>	670
Lang's <i>The Making of Religion</i>W. J. Wright.....	635
Lea's <i>History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church</i>	129
Leavitt's <i>Christian Democracy</i>J. D. Tadlock.....	300
Lindsay's <i>Recent Advances in Theistic Philosophy of Re- ligion</i>	F. R. Beattie..... 650
Logia, The, of Jesus	G. F. Nicolassen..... 93
Loughridge's <i>Sprinkling</i>	473
Lowe's <i>Bible Questions and Topics</i>	130
Mackensie's <i>Manual of Ethics</i>W. W. Harsha.....	282
Mariolatry, A New	Wm. P. McCorkle..... 510
Martin's <i>Apostolic and Modern Missions</i>	474
Maxwell's <i>Three Old Maids in Hawaii</i>	473
Merneptah, The Israel Tablet of.....W. W. Moore.....	1
Meyer's <i>A Castaway and Other Addresses</i>	308
Meyer's <i>Paul, A Servant of Jesus Christ</i>D. J. Brimm	466
Meyer's <i>The Secret of Guidance</i>	311
M. I. A.'s <i>Sir Evelyn's Charge</i>	131
Mitchell's <i>The Westminster Assembly</i>	126
Moore's <i>Presbyterian Digest of 1898</i>	478
Mott's <i>Strategic Points in the World's Conquest</i>	129
Mudge's <i>Best of Browning</i>	667
Murray's <i>The Spirit of Christ</i>	310

	PAGE.
MacNeil's <i>The Spirit-Filled Life</i>	310
McLennan's <i>In His Footsteps</i>	307
Nave's <i>Topical Bible</i>	S. C. Byrd..... 659
New Mariolatry, A.....	Wm. P. McCorkle..... 510
New Pneumatology, The.....	R. A. Webb..... 133
New Scientific Religion, The.....	W. P. McCorkle..... 344
Nicoll's <i>Incarinate Saviour</i>	478
Noble's <i>Our Redemption</i>	476
Northern General Assembly, Winona, 1898.....	609
Notices of Recent Publications.....	123, 306, 473, 664
Ogilvie's <i>Presbyterian Churches</i>	477
Olmis' <i>Over at Little Acorns</i>	131
Olmis' <i>Theodora and Other Stories</i>	131
Orr's <i>Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith</i>	F. R. Beattie..... 453
Osborne's <i>The Crucifixion</i>	126
Our Lord, The Comings of.....	W. A. Alexander..... 187
Our Time, The Gospel for.....	J. T. Plunket..... 542
Parker's <i>Tyne Folk</i>	475
Parochial Schools.....	R. P. Kerr..... 215
Paton's <i>Autobiography</i>	669
Peabody's <i>Mornings in the College Chapel</i>	127
Perry's <i>Gist of Japan: The Islands, Their People and Missions</i>	D. J. Brimm..... 299
Pentecost's <i>Birth and Boyhood of Jesus</i>	127
Personal Christ, The, The Gospel for Our Time.....	J. T. Plunket..... 542
Personnel, The, of the Westminster Assembly.....	J. M. Mecklin..... 72
Pierson's <i>Seven Years in Sierra Leone</i>	308
Pilgrim Fathers, The, of the West.....	H. E. Dosker..... 391
Pitzer's " <i>The Manifold Ministry of the Holy Spirit</i> ".....	J. F. Cannon..... 119
Pneumatology, The New.....	R. A. Webb..... 133
Preaching with Authority.....	L. B. Turnbull..... 38
Principle, The Federal, in the Westminster Standards..	W. T. Hall..... 378
Psalms, The Imprecatory.....	J. A. DeBaun..... 45
Ramsay's <i>Church in the Roman Empire Before 170</i>	T. C. Johnson..... 450
Reed's <i>The Gospel as Taught by Calvin</i>	124
Religion, The New Scientific.....	W. P. McCorkle..... 344
Religious Element, The, in Education—Parochial Schools.....	R. P. Kerr..... 215
Revell's <i>New Illustrated Catalogue</i>	130
Revivals.....	B. P. Fullerton..... 561
Robinson's <i>Ministerial Directory</i>	478
Romanes' <i>Darwin and After Darwin, Part III</i>	476
Rotherham's <i>The Emphasized New Testament</i>	D. J. Brimm..... 643
Sallmon's <i>Culture of Christian Manhood</i>	128
Scientific Religion, The New.....	Wm. P. McCorkle..... 344
Sell's <i>Bible Study by Doctrines</i>	306

	PAGE.
Sienkiewicz's <i>Quo Vadis</i>George Summey.....	301
Smith's <i>The Children of the Future</i>	476
Smith's "Zephaniah," <i>Etc.</i>George Summey.....	463
Spurgeon's <i>Autobiography</i>	666
Standards, the Westminster, The Federal Principle in... <i>W. T. Hall</i>	378
Synod of South Carolina, A Defence of the..... <i>C. W. Humphreys</i>	405
Synod of South Carolina, Complaint Against the Action of the	<i>W. M. McPheeters et al.</i> 323
Tablet, The Israel, of Merneptah	<i>W. W. Moore</i> 1
Tatian, The Diatessaron of..... <i>Parke P. Flourney</i> ...	24
Temple's <i>The Covenanter, The Cavalier, and The Puritan</i> <i>J. M. P. Otts</i>	286
The Lord's Return, The Blessed Hope of..... <i>A. W. Pitzer</i>	83
Tischendorf's <i>When Were Our Gospels Written?</i>	306
Torrey's <i>How to Obtain Fulness of Power</i>	125
Two Famous Christmas Days—496 and 800..... <i>E. D. Warfield</i>	231
Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary Addresses.....	120
Tyler's <i>Affusion</i>	669
Vance's <i>Pioneer Presbyterianism in Tennessee</i>	474
Vance's <i>Predestination</i>	<i>G. A. Blackburn</i> 653
Vance's <i>The Westminster Assembly and Its Con- fession for God</i>	125
Virgil, The Fourth Eclogue of..... <i>Julia McN. Wright</i> ...	421
Warfield's <i>Significance of the Westminster Stand- ards as a Creed</i> <i>W. T. Hall</i>	294
Warren's <i>Among the Forces</i>	668
Was Homer a Poetic Myth?..... <i>E. L. Patton</i>	243
Weekes' 'H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ..... <i>D. J. Brimm</i>	643
Wenley's <i>Preparation for Christianity in the An- cient World</i> <i>F. R. Beattie</i>	665
Westminster Assembly, Personnel of the..... <i>J. M. Mecklin</i>	72
Westminster Standards, The Federal Principle in the... <i>W. T. Hall</i>	378
Wildeboer's <i>Proverbs and Duhm's Job</i> <i>W. W. Elwang</i>	110
Wells' <i>Sunday-School Success</i>	307
West's <i>Daniel's Great Prophecy</i>	<i>A. W. Pitzer</i>
656	
West, The Pilgrim Fathers of the..... <i>H. E. Dosker</i>	391
Williams' <i>The Old Testament and the Critics</i>	668
Wilson's <i>The Family Altar</i>	306
Wilson's <i>True Story of a Jewish Maiden</i>	131
Wright's <i>Cardiff Estate</i>	131
Wright's <i>Illustrated Bible Treasury</i>	129

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 43.—JANUARY, 1898

I. THE ISRAEL TABLET OF MERNEPTAH.

EVER since the Rosetta Stone unlocked the Egyptian hieroglyphs scholars have eagerly searched these ancient records for some mention of the Israelites, who, according to their own Scriptures, sojourned in the land of the Pharaohs for four hundred and thirty years, being cruelly oppressed during a portion of this period, and forced to build for the government the great store cities of Rameses and Pithom, and who then marched out of the country under the human leadership of Moses and with the miraculous assistance of the Almighty. But, although Pithom itself has been unearthed and identified beyond question by its own inscriptions found on the spot, and although the monuments and papyri have given us abundant proofs of the correctness of the biblical references to Egyptian manners and customs, once impeached by a rash criticism, and although the political conditions of the country in the several stages of its history were closely connected with the fortunes of Israel for several centuries and with the outworking of its predicted destiny (Gen. xv. 13-16), yet until last year there has never been found a single clear reference in the Egyptian records to the children of Israel. Neither the brick-makers, who are represented on the well-known wall-painting of a Theban tomb, and who were once supposed to be the enslaved Hebrews, nor the Habiri of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, who are described as having stormed various cities of Southern Palestine in the time of Khuenaten (fifteenth century, B. C.), and whom Haynes and Conder still take to be the invading He-

brews under Joshua, nor the people whom the inscriptions call "Aperu," and who were employed in conveying stone from the desert quarries for the public buildings of Egypt under the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, can with any certainty be identified with the Hebrews of the Book of Exodus. It was, of course, not at all likely that the Pharaohs would record on their monuments such an event as the exodus itself, since that was to them a personal humiliation and a national disaster. It is well known that misfortunes and reverses find no place in their boastful inscriptions, but only such events as they can in some way twist to their own credit. But why should there not be reference to the Hebrews as one of the subject races of the kingdom? The answer to this is, that the Egyptian records, which are, for the most part, inscribed on the walls of tombs and temples, and are of a religious or funerary character, contain very little historical matter of any kind. Therefore, while scholars did not abandon the search, but continued to scrutinize carefully every inscription that was brought to light, it was with no real expectation that they would find any reference to a people whom the Egyptians must have regarded as only a body of despised serfs. Last year, however, Prof. W. M. Flinders Petrie, while working at Thebes, had the extraordinary good fortune to discover a monument on which there is an unmistakable reference to the Israelites by name. The interest of this discovery is enhanced by the fact that the king who made this inscription is no other than Merneptah, who for some time has been regarded by nearly all Egyptologists as the Pharaoh of the exodus. At the time of Merneptah's accession half of Egypt was overrun by the Libyans, and all his resources were required to rid his territory of these invaders, so that neither men nor means could be spared to quarry and convey stone for the building of splendid temples, such as had been reared in great numbers by his father, Rameses II., and his more remote predecessor, Amenophis III., the two most sumptuous of Egypt's monarchs and builders. In this strait Merneptah, when erecting his funeral temple, such as every Pharaoh built for himself, selected a site quite near the magnificent funeral temple of Amenophis III., and proceeded to demolish that for material to

build his own, destroying ruthlessly the most beautiful statues, sphinxes, sculptured blocks and inscribed columns, either pounding them to pieces for his foundations or splitting them into slices and laying them down in the ground, or, as in the case of the tablet under consideration, turning them face inwards, and using the outer surface for inscriptions of his own. On a splendid slab of black syenite which he thus stole from the temple of Amenophis, Merneptah placed a long inscription, which makes fourteen hundred words in the translation. The opening lines of it inform us that it was set up in the fifth year of Merneptah's reign. It is a triumphal hymn, written by some court poet, and gives a glowing account of the overthrow and expulsion of the invading Libyans, of the consternation and dejection in Libya, and of the consequent security and tranquillity in Egypt, and winds up with a description of the relations existing after Merneptah's conquest of the Libyans between Egypt and a number of her former enemies and dependencies. It is in this closing paragraph that the matter of chief interest is found:

1. "For the Sun of Egypt has wrought this change;
2. "He was born as the destined means of avenging it, the King Merneptah;
3. "The chiefs bow down, making their salutations of 'Peace';
4. "Not one of the peoples of the bow lifts up its head;
5. "Vanquished is the land of the Tahennu (North Africans);
6. "The land of the Khita (Hittites) is quieted;
7. "Ravaged is the land of Pa-Kanana (in South Palestine)¹ with all violence;
8. "Carried away is the land of Ashkelon (on the Philistine coast);
9. "Seized upon is the land of Gezer (in Northern Philistia);

¹ Petrie says Pa-Kanana appears most likely to be the modern Deir Kanun, five miles southeast of Tyre, or else the village of Kana, a little further southeast. But Conder, Sayce, and Maspero (*Struggle of the Nations*, p. 370), all agree that it was Khurbet Kanaan, south of Hebron.

10. "The land of Yenuam (near Tyre) is brought to nought;
11. "*The people of Isiraal is spoiled; it hath no grain (or seed, or exodus);*¹
12. "Kharu (Southern Palestine) has become as (helpless) widows before Egypt;
13. "All lands—together they are in peace;
14. "Every one that was a rebel is subdued by the King Merneptah, who gives life like the sun every day.²

As to the meaning which we are to attach to the statement concerning Israel, there are seven possible interpretations, the first two of which, however, are so improbable as to be hardly worthy of mention:

1. The view that the name should be read *Jezreel*, and not *Israel*, so that after all there is no reference to the chosen people.

2. The view that the inscription describes an early subjugation of Israel in Palestine by the Egyptians, out of which the later Israelites spun a legend concerning a long bondage of their forefathers in Egypt, no actual sojourn there having ever occurred.

3. The view that it refers to the destruction of the male children of the Israelites in Egypt.

4. The view that it refers to a military conquest of the Israelites as a nation long after their sojourn in Egypt and their settlement in Canaan (both of which, according to this theory, occurred in the fifteenth century B. C.).

5. The view that it refers to a defeat inflicted upon a portion of the Israelites, who had either (1) remained in Canaan when the main body of the people went down into Egypt with Jacob, or

¹This important line is variously translated: Sayce, "The Israelites are minished so that they have no seed"—similarly Griffith and Petrie; Budde, "Israel is a eunuch without posterity"; Spiegelberg, "Israel is a barren land without fear"—whatever that may mean; Müller, "Israel hath been torn out without offshoot"; J. Hunt Cooke, "The Israelites are crushed; they will have no exodus."

²The inscription is given in full in Prof. Petrie's article on "Egypt and Israel" in *The Contemporary Review* for May, 1896. The introductory statements above made are mostly taken from my article on "The Latest Light from Egypt" in *The Union Seminary Magazine* for September, 1896. But the discussion of the inscription here given is entirely different.

(2) who had returned thither before the exodus, or (3) who, after the exodus, but before the general invasion, had penetrated and conquered a portion of the country on their own hook.

6. The view that it refers to the suppression of an incipient revolt of the Israelites in Goshen in connection with the Libyan invasion shortly before the exodus.

7. The view that it refers to a defeat inflicted upon the Israelites within the first two or three years after the exodus in the Sinaitic peninsula, or while they were threatening the southern frontier of Canaan.

I. That the first view is wrong, and "that the name here is that of the people Israel, and not of the city Jezreel, is shown by the writing of it with *S*, and not *Z*," and by its having the expressly added word "people," unlike the other names in the passage, which are those of places, as the determinative shows.

II. The second view is equally wide of the mark. According to it, the early Israelites in Palestine suffered a great defeat at the hands of the Egyptians under Merneptah, the memory of which gave rise to the legend concerning a sojourn in Egypt. Merneptah is the king during whose reign Old Testament scholars, after weighing all the probabilities, had fixed the exodus. If this same king defeated the Israelites in Palestine, as the inscription seems to state, is it not clear that the Israelites were never in Egypt at all? So the advocates of this view would reason. And it is well known that Stade, Meyer, Winckler and others do deny that Israel ever sojourned in Egypt, and hold the biblical account to be purely legendary. Heretofore it has been argued against their hypothesis that "it could not show a plausible genesis of such a legend. But now it would seem to have such an one."¹ Out of this crushing defeat which the Israelites suffered at the hands of Merneptah, out of the slaughter of their young men in battle, and out of the carrying away of some of the people as captives of war from their own country to Egypt, the Israelitish romancers spun their legend that the *whole people* had once been in bondage in Egypt, and that their male children had been killed by order of the Pharaoh. To some this may seem too absurd for discus-

¹ Sellin, *Neue Kirch. Zeitsch.*, VII., p. 507.

sion, but it is in just this way, only with a far smaller kernel of fact in many cases, that Wellhausen has produced much of that extraordinary volume which, for some inscrutable reason, he has been pleased to call *The History of Israel*. We will therefore pause a moment to indicate, however briefly, the impossibility of such an explanation of the Hebrew story of the sojourn. There will be some advantage in citing against this wild theory the arguments of two German scholars, who, though accepting the modern analysis of Old Testament books in one of its fashionable forms, nevertheless reject unequivocally this legendary theory of the sojourn. Prof. Kittel says: "There is no event in the entire history of Israel that has more deeply imprinted itself in the memory of later generations of this people than the abode in Egypt and the exodus from the land of the Nile. Samuel, Saul, Solomon, almost David himself, stand in the background, compared with the Egyptian house of bondage and the glorious deliverance thence. Evidently we have here no mere product of the legends of the patriarchs, but a fact which lived deep down in the consciousness of the people in quite early times, from Hosea and the Book of Samuel onwards, a fact graven deep in their memory. It would betoken a high, a more than normal degree of deficiency of historical sense in the Israelite national character, if a purely mythical occurrence gave the key-note of the whole national life, and formed the starting-point of the entire circle of religious thought as early as the days of the first literary prophets."

In like manner, but with even more emphasis, writes Dr. Selin: "It cannot be denied that throughout the whole ancient history of Israel there is a vivid recognition of an actual sojourn in Egypt. . . . Now, let some one explain (1) whence comes the surprising familiarity of J and E with Egyptian customs, which shows conclusively an actual personal knowledge of them. Let some one explain (2) whence date the most ancient reminiscences of single events that happened during the migration from Egypt to Canaan—of Sinai, of Kadesh. Above all, let some one show the 'genesis' of the poem in Exodus xv. (3) Finally, let some one answer the following question: How was it that this people, who quietly handed down to posterity even the worst defeats in

its own country, but who, on the other hand, considered banishment from its own land, from the land of its God, the greatest shame and dishonor, against which their whole being revolted—how was it that such a people came to make out of such a defeat a fiction about the bondage in a strange country and to put this at the head of their whole history? This might be called hanging up a hundredweight by a thread. One could only decide to accept this desperate hypothesis if every other way out had been cut off.”¹

III. The third view is that our inscription refers to the inhuman attempts of the Pharaohs to suppress the swarming numbers of the Israelites in Goshen by means of infanticide. “The people of Israel is spoiled; it hath no seed.” Translated thus, and taken by itself, this statement inevitably brings to mind the measures taken by the Pharaohs for the destruction of the male children of the Israelites as described in the first chapter of Exodus. But there are three objections to this view.

(1), We are confronted with the fact that this policy of suppression, which the Bible describes in connection with the infancy of Moses, must have been inaugurated nearly a century before Merneptah’s victory over the Libyans and his erection of the tablet to commemorate it, for Moses was about eighty years of age at the time of the exodus. (Exodus vii. 7.) In other words, if Merneptah was the Pharaoh of the exodus, occupying the throne when Moses was some eighty years old, how could he claim, in the fifth year of his reign, and in connection with his conquest of the Libyans at that time, to have diminished Israel by means of the persecution which was visited upon them during the infancy of Moses? It was not he who “diminished” that people by infanticide, but his father or grandfather. To this objection it might be replied that there is no improbability in supposing that Merneptah revived the murderous edict of his predecessors, especially if, at the time of the Libyan invasion, the Israelites showed any disposition to improve this opportunity to revolt. An aggravation of their sufferings shortly before the exodus seems to be implied in the Scriptural narrative. (Exodus ii. 23.)

¹ *Neue Kirch. Zeitsch.*, VII., 6.

Another answer to this objection might be made. The account is highly poetical, and Merneptah's exploits are no doubt greatly exaggerated. The poet is not careful to ascribe to him only what were really his own victories.¹ In celebrating Merneptah's overthrow of the Libyans, he speaks of certain exploits of his father, Rameses II. (for it was he who "tranquillized" the Hittites). So the "diminishing" of Israel here referred to may also be a measure inaugurated by that Pharaoh or his father.

(2), The second objection to the view that the inscription refers to the destruction of the male children of the Israelites in Egypt is that as Pa-Kanana, Askelon, and Gezer are places in Palestine, and as Israel is mentioned between Yenuam, in the north, and Kharu, in the south, Israel, too, must be thought of as in Palestine. To this it may be replied that the order of the names in the list is not strictly geographical. The writer passes from the Libyans in North Africa to the Hittites in North Syria, then to Pa-Kanana, in southern Palestine, and after mentioning Gezer, Askelon, and Yenuam in their proper order from south to north, he jumps back again to "Israel" and Kharu, in the south, whereas the geographical order of the places in Syria from north to south would have been Hittites, Yenuam, Gezer, Askelon, Kanana, and Kharu. (Cf. Acts ii. 9-11.)

Furthermore, as we have seen, while all the other names in the text are followed by the determinative of "land" or "country," the name *Israel* is not. This would seem to indicate that they were not yet identified with any country of their own, but were either a mere body of desert wanderers or a subject race in Egypt. That the writer had the collective people in mind is further shown by the fact that he refers to "Israel" by means of the masculine pronoun "his" (in "his grain is not"), for "had he meant the land, the pronoun would have been feminine."²

(3), The third objection to the view under consideration, and the one of greatest weight, is that the word (*pri*) translated "seed" cannot here mean offspring, but must mean "grain," and therefore the phrase does not refer to the diminishing of Israel by infanticide, but merely to the loss of their supplies of grain or

¹Sayce, *Hom. Rev.*

²*Bib. World*, January, 1897, p. 67.

produce.¹ It is not denied that the word rendered "seed" has this figurative meaning in some places. It has just the same range of meaning as in English, seed being generally used for seed-corn, but poetically used for posterity, as we say "the seed of Abraham."² But it is denied that it can have that meaning here, since the phrase in which it occurs is shown by its usage to be "a conventional, stereotyped phrase, which could be and was applied to any conquered and plundered people." Breasted³ cites five other occurrences of it, in each of which the meaning of destroying or carrying away provisions seems to be required by the context, and in two of which it is associated with destruction by fire. Thus: (a), "Their cities are turned to ashes, destroyed, desolated: their grain is not." (b), "The fire has made entrance to us; our grain is not" (words of defeated Libyans). (c), "The Seped are desolated; their grain is not." Exactly like this last example is the statement under consideration, "The Israelites are desolated; their grain is not." It must be conceded, therefore, that Breasted has made out a strong case for his view, that the meaning of the statement is that "Israel had suffered defeat and been spoiled of her provisions and produce."⁴ He thinks this occurred in Palestine after the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. He says: "It is perfectly clear that the author of the text thinks of Israel as in Syria, among the Syrian peoples and places mentioned with her." This brings us to the fourth interpretation of the inscription:

IV. The view that it refers to a conquest of the twelve tribes after their settlement in Canaan. Those who take this view hold, of course, that the exodus had taken place long before the time of Merneptah. (1), Some would put it near the end of the eigh-

¹ Breasted, *Bib. World*, January, 1897, pp. 66, 67.

² Petrie, *Cont. Rev.*, May, 1896, pp. 623, 624.

³ *Bib. World*, January, 1897, p. 66.

⁴ Cooke makes the point against Breasted's view that the word for seed is accompanied by a plow or hoe for a determinative, whereas in our inscription the word has no such determinative, but only a circle. He concludes that "seed" or "grain" is not the meaning here, and cites an example of the word with the circle determinative in the Book of the Dead, where, he says, it has unquestionably the meaning of going out. Hence his translation: "The Israelites are crushed; they will have no exodus."

teenth dynasty, reminding us that, according to the Tel-el-Amarna letters, written to Amenophis IV. about 1400 B. C. from various places in southern Palestine, a people called *Habiri* had come from the desert, attacked Jerusalem, seized the country around Ajalon, wrecked the temples, and killed the chiefs who remained faithful to Egypt. All these facts fit well the theory that these *Habiri* were no other than the *Hebrews* who conquered Canaan under Joshua.¹ An additional argument in favor of this view might be based on the fact that more than a century after these invasions of the Habiri both Seti I. and Rameses II., in their Syrian campaigns, had to fight against a tribe in northern Palestine called in the Egyptian records *Aseru*, and believed by some (e. g., W. Max Müller, *Indep.*, July 9, 1896) to be identical with the tribe of Asher. (2), Others are disposed to place the exodus at a still earlier period, under Ahmosis, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, and to identify the Hebrews with the Hyksos whom that monarch expelled; for, not to mention other reasons, the names "Jacob-el" and "Joseph-el" are found as names of Palestinian towns in the list inscribed by Thotmes III. (c. 1450 B. C.) at Karnak. These facts are thought to raise a strong presumption that the descendants of Jacob and Joseph were already in Canaan in the time of Thotmes III., and that the exodus had taken place at the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, to which he belonged. But this particular argument has been greatly weakened by the discovery of the names "Jacob-el" and "Joseph-el" in Babylonian contract tablets of the age of Abraham.

To say nothing of other enormous difficulties connected with this hypothesis (IV.), it is almost inconceivable that, if the exodus had taken place at any time during the eighteenth dynasty, there should be no mention in the Old Testament of the frequent invasions of Palestine by the kings of the nineteenth dynasty; no reference to the campaigns of Rameses II., which extended over Moab, Judea, and Galilee; no allusion to the undisputed domination

¹ A very strong presentation of this view may be seen in *The Expositor* for March, 1897, from the pen of Prof. James Orr, of Edinburgh, who accepts 1445 B. C. as the approximate date of the exodus, makes Thotmes III. the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and identifies the *Habiri* of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets with the invading Hebrews under Joshua.

of the country during the last fifty years of his reign; no trace of the conquest by Merneptah, which, according to this hypothesis, is described in our inscription, nor any intimation of the several subsequent campaigns of Rameses III., which also went through Judea as well as the north; not the slightest reference in the Book of Judges to any Egyptian influence in any part of the country, though the book is full of detailed accounts of the various subjugations of Israel by the surrounding peoples. Is it possible that these long and desolating Egyptian wars, extending over centuries, could have been waged against the Israelites after their settlement in Canaan without leaving a single trace in their national literature? If it be replied that we are using the *argumentum e silentio* which the historical researches of our times, including the discovery of this Israel tablet itself, have shown to be peculiarly untrustworthy, and that, as a matter of fact, all Israelitish reverses in war are not explicitly set down in Scripture, as the Moabite stone shows, we answer that the argument from silence in the case before us has a peculiar validity and force for two reasons: (1), Because, as already intimated, while much less serious reverses at the hands of comparatively insignificant adversaries are described in detail, these repeated and overwhelming conquests by their old enemies and oppressors, the Egyptians, are not so much as alluded to. Dr. Sellin says in regard to the non-mention of alleged Palestinian conquests by Merneptah: "About their rescue from Egypt, and all the fights connected with it, the Israelitish people possess a very exact tradition; about the campaigns against the Midianites, Amorites, and Philistines, they possess the same, as they do also of their defeats; and yet here they would not possess a *trace of a reminiscence* that in the midst of these [campaigns] a hot battle against that arch enemy had taken place in their own land—not a single intimation that once more after the exodus and before the time of the kings there had been another encounter with that enemy. Such a sudden break of the thread in the Israelitish reminiscences would be hardly imaginable." (2), The other reason for our confidence in the argument from silence in this case is that the silence of Scripture is confirmed by the silence of the monuments. The Egyptian records know as little of

Israelites in Canaan as the Hebrew records do of invading Egyptians. The inscriptions of Seti I. and Rameses II., though giving full accounts of their campaigns in Canaan, and mentioning in detail the various enemies they encountered and the various places they conquered, never mention any Israelites there. If the Israelites had occupied the country to the extent described in the Books of Joshua and Judges, it is perfectly clear that some mention of them by these conquering Pharaohs would have been inevitable. Our conclusion, then, is that the reason why the Pharaohs do not speak of Israelites in Canaan is that there were no Israelites there. The exodus had not yet taken place. Therefore the inscription before us cannot refer to an Egyptian conquest of the twelve tribes after their settlement in Palestine.

For the same reasons we must reject the modification of this view proposed by Prof. W. Max Müller, viz., that Merneptah's inscription is simply an echo of a conquest of Israel by his father, he himself having never made such a campaign in Syria. He says: "It cannot be concluded from the new text that King Merneptah waged war with the Israelites (according to Erman, in a note of 'Spiegelberg's publication). The vague poetical phrases simply extol his power by describing the state of fear, subjection, and misery of the various Northern nations. As far as we know, Merneptah possessed his Syrian provinces in perfect peace, owing to his friendly relations to the powerful Hittites in northern Syria. The Pharaoh who had to defend his Asiatic possessions in a long and desperate war, both against the attacks of the warlike Hittites and the revolts of the Palestinians themselves, was Rameses II. It was he who stormed Ashkelon (Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III., pl. 145), who ravaged Galilee in his eighth year (pl. 156), touching Yenuam (text of Luxor), who plundered western Ephraim and Dan (pl. 144), and thus really could claim to have 'plucked off Israel.' Merneptah's security rests upon the merits of his father, or he even copies out a hymn describing his father's victories, as we know him to have done repeatedly. My conclusion is, therefore, *already Rameses II. found Israel in Palestine.*"¹ We have shown above that, in view of the silence of

¹ *Independent*, July 9, 1896.

both sets of records in regard to any such collision between Rameses and Israel in Palestine, this conclusion is impossible. All Israel could not have been in Palestine before the time of Merneptah. Hence the fifth interpretation of our inscription:

V. The view that it refers, not to a conquest by Merneptah of the whole people in Canaan, but to a defeat inflicted upon a *portion* of the Israelites, who had either (1) remained in Canaan when the main body went down into Egypt with Jacob, or (2) who had returned thither before the exodus, or (3) who, after the exodus, but before the general invasion, had penetrated and conquered a portion of the country by themselves. The advocates of this view say that there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the original migration into Egypt was only partial. We know that when Oubacha started on January 5, 1771, with seventy thousand families of Calmucks (four hundred and twenty thousand persons) from the banks of the Volga for China, fifteen thousand families remained behind.¹ May not some branches of the Israelites have remained in like manner in the northern part of Palestine, where they are known to have roamed as shepherds (Gen. xxxvii. 14-17), and where the famine may not have been so severe as it was in the dry south nearer the rainless region of Egypt? This supposition seems still less violent when their disposition is considered: "A people who were so incessantly at feud with one another—the brethren of Joseph, of Aaron, of Korah, the slayers of Benjamin, the chiders of Gideon—are not particularly likely to have held together on all occasions, and never to have had family differences and separations. Such a 'stiff-necked and rebellious' people could scarcely hold together for many centuries, and migrate to and fro as one body, without some split being likely to occur."²

But, even supposing they held together at that crisis and went down in a body with Jacob into Egypt, is it not possible that some of them may have gone back into Canaan soon after the famine? "That they travelled there readily," says Prof. Petrie, "is suggested by the burial of Jacob at Machpelah (Gen. l. 13);

¹De Hell, *Trav. ls in the Steppes*. p. 227.

²Petrie, *Cont. Rev.*, May, 1896, pp. 624, 625.

and there is absolutely no evidence that they all remained in Egypt until the exodus. That there was a continuity of tradition in Palestine during all the Egyptian period is strongly shown. Not only was the cave of Machpelah known, but the burial place which Jacob bought in Shechem is also said to be known. (Josh. xxii. 32.) How many Australians or Americans would know, in the absence of pictures, how to identify ground bought eight generations ago in England? Can we suppose that the hostile inhabitants of Palestine would maintain such inconvenient traditions, and obligingly tell—to a race who came to destroy them—what rights the invaders legally had? Such an assumed knowledge of the old landmarks strongly indicates that some of the family remained, or soon returned, to keep up the local knowledge.”

This last supposition receives support from 1 Chron. vii. 21, 22, where we are told that certain Ephraimites, during the lifetime of their father, Ephraim, went on a marauding expedition from Egypt into Canaan to take away the cattle of the men of Gath, and were slain there. If the Ephraimites, who, as descended from Joseph and an Egyptian mother, had a slighter connection with Canaan than the other tribes, made such expeditions into the promised land, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the others did likewise, and in some cases, doubtless, with better success, and that thus occasional detachments of them settled there and took root long before the main body effected the exodus under Moses. And so it should not surprise us that Merneptah, even if contemporary with Moses, found them there. We may compare the case of Heber, the Kenite, who settled in the far north, though the great body of his tribe settled in the south. (Judg. iv. 11, and i. 16.)

Against this view, which has the powerful support of Prof. Petrie himself, we argue with Dr. Sellin (1), that our inscription says the “*people of Israel is spoiled.*” All Israelitic sources agree perfectly that the *people* was in Egypt, so that there could not have been at the same time a *people* of Israel in Canaan. (Of. Gen. xlvi. 1; xlvii. 27; l. 14; Exod. i. 1, etc.) (2), That no remembrance has been preserved of a kindred people whom the

tribes found there at their invasion of Canaan and with whom they allied themselves, as they would have done, against the Canaanites. (3), That, as to the branching off of one of the tribes at Kadesh to make conquests on its own hook, the supposition is contrary to the whole narrative. But, if such a detachment had left the main body of the people at Kadesh and undertaken the conquest of the country single-handed, it could never have penetrated as far as the northern part of Canaan, where, according to Petrie's interpretation, the inscription seems to place them. "For, with regard to that, a vivid recollection has been preserved that the one tribe of Judah was not able to conquer *alone* the Canaanites of the southern part. Much less would such a detachment have been able to fight its way [through the whole length of the land] to northern Palestine. (Cf. Judg. i. 3, 19.)"

Additional reasons for the rejection of this theory (V.), as well as the preceding one (IV.), that the inscription refers to a conquest of the twelve tribes occupying Central Palestine, will be given below (VII.).

VI. The sixth view, that it refers to the suppression of an incipient revolt of the Israelites in Goshen in connection with the Libyan invasion, shortly before the exodus, is the one advanced by Principal Dawson.¹ He does not believe that Merneptah was the Pharaoh of the exodus, but one of the Pharaohs of the oppression. He thinks the exodus took place in the short and inglorious reign of Siptah, the third successor of Merneptah, the last king of the nineteenth dynasty, and the immediate predecessor of the time of anarchy recorded by Rameses III. in the "Harris Papyrus," and which led to the rise of a new dynasty. He says:

It is evident that the inscription before us "relates chiefly to the war against the Libyan invaders, which is treated in great detail, and with the usual grandiloquence of Egyptian official bulletins. The part relating to Palestine and to Israel is quite subordinate and supplementary, and relates to the sequel of the great war."² It was not unnatural that certain of the Canaanite depend-

¹ *Expos. Times*, October, 1896.

² This is an important fact. It can be properly appreciated only by reading the whole inscription.

encies of Egypt should take advantage of the Libyan invasion either to assert their independence or to inaugurate revolutionary disturbances which had to be quelled on the expulsion of the Libyans.

“The reference to Israel is even less definite, and may well have applied to the people when resident in Goshen, and its eastern extension to the head of the Red Sea.

“During the Libyan war, if there was excitement among the Canaanites, this must have been felt even more strongly by the Israelites on the eastern frontier, who would watch the conflict with hopes of deliverance from their bondage, either by the victory of the Libyans or by the weakening of the Egyptian power, and may even have been tempted to overt acts of rebellion or to treasonable plots. At the close of the war, and after the suppression of the Canaanite revolts, these would be punished, possibly, by the execution of some of the head men, and by the plundering of some of the Israelite settlements supposed to be most disaffected, and not improbably by the revival or re-enactment of some of the old edicts of Rameses II. respecting the destruction of the male children, as well as by the increase of the forced labor required of the people, a measure the more suitable, because of the necessity of repairing the damage caused to towns and temple enclosures by the Libyan invasion. . . . We may thus read Merneptah’s statement as referring to incipient rebellion among the Hebrew population in the eastern part of Lower Egypt, consequent on the Libyan invasion, and to its suppression and punishment when that invasion had been repelled. We may further regard these events as producing that general and bitter cry which entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts, as it will always do in such cases, and which is assigned as the immediate cause of the divine interference in their behalf.” (Ex. ii. 23, see p. 18.)¹

We think this theory would gain in force if it were modified so as to accept Merneptah as the Pharaoh of the exodus, and to make the line concerning Israel refer not to the destruction of their offspring, but to the plundering of their towns and the destruc-

¹ It will be remembered in this connection that Mr. Cooke’s reading is, “The Israelites are crushed, they will have no exodus.”

tion or confiscation of their stores of grain in Goshen. But there is a better theory still, viz.:

VII. The view that it refers to a disaster which befell the Israelites shortly after the exodus, either (1), While they were in the Sinaitic peninsula, or (2), More probably while they were threatening the southern frontier of Canaan.

The former (1) seems to be the view of Professor Hommel,¹ though he does not express a positive opinion as to what the disaster to Israel was. He renders the line in question thus: "*Isir'al* is *fekt* (a 'waste,' or possibly a 'horde'), he has no fruit more. Literally, 'his fruit exists not,' *i. e.*, he has fruit no more (either literally, alluding to the Sinaitic peninsula, or figuratively)." He says that as Merneptah himself was never in Palestine, and that as his immediate predecessors in describing their Palestinian campaigns make no mention of Israelites there, we must think of the Israelites of our text "as not yet settled in Palestine at the date of the inscription. In other words, the exodus must have taken place shortly before, favored probably by the complications which arose upon the death of Rameses II." (Ex. ii. 23.) By a comparison of the new inscription with the parallel account of the events of Merneptah's fifth year given in an inscription at Karnak, which has long been known, he shows that it is strongly improbable that Merneptah had ever actually engaged in war with the places and peoples mentioned in the closing paragraph, in which the name of *Israel* occurs. This paragraph is purely subordinate and supplementary, describing in a brief, general, and poetic way the sequel of his Libyan victory in its effect upon certain Palestinian fortresses and certain peoples of Palestinian origin or affinities who were in some way implicated in, or at least sympathizers with, the Libyan attack upon Egypt. If the Hebrews had taken advantage of the confusion and weakness caused by the Libyan invasions, and "the consequent withdrawal to Memphis of the troops previously stationed on the east of the delta" (Maspero), to urge their demands and effect their escape as described in Exodus, any military reverse sustained by them while marching through the Sinaitic peninsula might naturally be mentioned by the

¹ *Expos. Times*, October, 1896.

Pharaoh in the terms of our inscription as a part of the sequel of his Libyan victory, and a part of the proof that all former adversaries or rebellious subjects of Egypt were now powerless to do her harm, thanks to his masterly management of the war against the Libyans.

To us, however, it seems more likely that (2) the Israelites had made good their escape, after the Libyan troubles began indeed, but a year or two before their culmination in Merneptah's fifth year (the thickening of those troubles accounting in part for the fact that there was no further pursuit of the Israelites after the disaster to the regiment of chariotry at the Red Sea), and that they had arrived at Kadesh-Barnea, on the southern frontier of Canaan, and suffered the repulse described in Deuteronomy i. 44, at the hands of the Pharaoh's subject-allies, the Amorites, just about the same time that Merneptah succeeded in repelling the Libyan invasion at home, the other Syrian abettors of the movement against Egypt, such as Pa-Kanana, Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenuam, suffering in like manner at the hands of their Canaanite neighbors, who remained loyal to Egypt. This delivers us from the necessity of supposing that Merneptah himself was ever in Canaan, and that his own troops inflicted these defeats upon the Canaanitish peoples. And Merneptah, in celebrating his defeat of the Libyans and their allies from Asia Minor and the Mediterranean islands, having devoted nearly all of his inscription to that, adverts briefly in his short closing paragraph to these successful operations of his subject-allies in Syria, as supplementary proof of the fact that since his great victory all the troubles connected with the Libyan invasion had come to an end, and peace reigned throughout his entire domain.

Thus everything seems to fall into place, and only thus apparently can all the requirements of both the Egyptian and Hebrew records be met. This, then, would be our rendering of the inscription:

"1. For the sun of Egypt has wrought this change.

"2. He was born as the destined means of avenging it, the King Merneptah.

"3. The chiefs bow down, making their salutations of 'peace.'

“4. Not one of the peoples of the bow (*i. e.*, hostile foreigners) lifts up its head:

“5. The Libyans are vanquished;

“6. The Hittites keep peace;

“7. Ravaged is Pa-Kanana (in Southern Palestine), with all violence.

“8. Carried away is Ashkelon (on the Philistine coast);

“9. Seized upon is Gezer (in Northern Philistia);

“10. Yenuam (near Tyre) is brought to nought;

“11. The Israelites are spoiled, they have no grain;

“12. Southern Palestine has become as [helpless] widows before Egypt;

“13. All lands together are in peace.

“14. Every one that was rebellious is subdued by the King Merneptah, who gives life like the sun every day.”

But there are three objections that may still be made to this solution of the question:

(1), If the Israelites were still in the wilderness, with their headquarters at or near Kadesh-Barnea, where they suffered this defeat, how could they have lost a crop of grain? Are we to suppose that they cultivated any part of this wilderness in which they lived for thirty-eight years, and that the manna supernaturally given was only supplementary to the insufficient supplies which they raised in this way? In order to answer this question aright, we must call to mind the testimony of contemporary Egyptian records to the general fertility of this district in ancient times. Its present condition is no index of its former condition. The process of denudation by the elements and of neglect, misgovernment, and spoliation by Turks and Arabs, has continued without cessation for ages. And yet, when Niebuhr visited the peninsula at the beginning of the last century, “large supplies of vegetable produce were exported regularly to Egypt, showing that the original fertility was not even then exhausted,” though those supplies have ceased since. As to the region around Kadesh-Barnea, Dr. H. Clay Trumbull testifies, as an eye-witness, that large portions of it are arable. Canon Cook says¹ of the state-

¹ *Bible Commentary on Exodus*, p. 320.

ment that "the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited" (Ex. xvi. 35): "This does not necessarily imply that the Israelites were fed exclusively on manna, or that the supply was continuous during forty years; but that whenever it might be needed, owing to the total or partial failure of other food, it was given until they entered the promised land. They had numerous flocks and herds, which were not slaughtered (see Num. xi. 22), but which gave them milk, cheese, and, of course, a limited supply of flesh. Nor is there any reason to suppose, that during a considerable part of that time, they may not have cultivated some spots of fertile ground in the wilderness." But we are not dependent upon such inferences as these, sound as they are. We have the direct testimony of Seti I., in his account of his Syrian campaign on the wall of the great hypostyle hall at Karnak, that he first marched due east into the heart of this wilderness to attack the insurgent Bedouin, that he carried off their flocks, cut down their trees, *destroyed their harvests*, and captured their strongholds.¹ If these wanderers in the wilderness were thus "spoiled" by Seti I., so that they "had no grain," it is not at all improbable that the larger, stronger, and thriftier body of wanderers under Moses were "spoiled" in like manner in the time of Merneptah, so that they "had no grain."

Further, if Libyans, on the march, and so unconnected in any way with agriculture, could, after a defeat in the enemy's country, use this expression, "the fire is come unto us, our grain is not"; there is no reason why it should not be used of the defeated Israelites, also, even though they were not yet actually cultivating grain in the wilderness.

(2), The second objection to making Merneptah the Pharaoh of the exodus is, that the Hebrew records seem to indicate that he was drowned in the Red Sea, while the Egyptian records seem to indicate that he died a natural death several years after his repulse of the Libyans. To this we reply, it is nowhere stated in Scripture that the Pharaoh himself entered the Red Sea and was drowned, nor any of his infantry, but only the picked body of chariotry and cavalry detailed for the pursuit of the fleeing Israel-

¹ Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 370.

ites. It is almost inconceivable that the historian in Exodus should not have made special mention of the fact if the king himself had been drowned. The only passage that seems to intimate such a thing is the brief poetical *resumé* of Psalm cxxxvi., where in verse 15 the poet says that Jehovah "overthrew (Hebrew, 'shook off') Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea." But if a poet of modern times were to say that Napoleon Bonaparte and his army were overthrown at Waterloo, or that General Lee and his army were overthrown at Appomattox, we should not understand that in either case the commander himself lost his life; and the point we make is not affected by the fact that the word used in the poetic statement before us contains a suggestion of the precise manner in which the charioteers were "overthrown."

Mariette, in his *Outlines of Ancient Egyptian History*, says, p. 49: "A papyrus in the Berlin Museum states that Merneptah lost a son by a very sudden death. He appears to have been a great coward and very cruel. Lenormant says of him: 'He was neither a soldier nor an administrator, but a man whose whole mind turned upon sorcery and magic.' The probability is, that Merneptah himself did not take the field on this occasion."

(3), The only remaining objection to the identification of Merneptah as the Pharaoh of the exodus is a chronological one, viz., that if we place the exodus so late, it leaves too short a period for the age of the judges. The objection is answered by Professor Petrie as follows:

"By astronomical festivals the reign of Merneptah is fixed at about 1200 B. C. as its middle point; that the history of the Egyptian kings between him and Shishak well agrees with this date within a few years; that the genealogies of the Levites agree also within a few years of the same interval; and that the history of the judges, when carefully separated into its triple strands of north, west, and east, shows a complete history of each division of the country, covering just about the same period as indicated by each of the other methods. We are thus led to see that there is nothing inconsistent with history in placing the exodus under Merneptah, as is usually supposed; and that so there remains no difficulty in accepting the obvious conclusion that the last Egyp-

tian raid was over before the twelve tribes entered Palestine in a body."

This question of the chronology is a thorny one which we cannot now discuss. It is worthy of notice that if we adopt this view of the date of the exodus, to-wit, that it occurred early in Merneptah's reign, when the northern allies of the Libyans from the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean Sea were pushing their devastating way into Palestine, we have a natural explanation of the statement that God did not lead Israel by the way of the land of the Philistines, though it was near, lest they should repent when they saw war and return to Egypt. (Ex. xiii. 17.) "To proceed straight to Canaan by the beaten track would have been to run the risk of encountering there these moving hordes, or of jostling against the Egyptian troops, who still garrisoned the strongholds of the Shephelah,"¹ or were being recalled to reinforce the army of defence in the delta. These sea-peoples from the north "gave a fatal shock to the influence of the Hittites, and began a series of devastating attacks on the flourishing communities of the Canaanites, which, probably, contributed more than anything else to the anarchy that afterwards rendered that people unable to make successful combined opposition to the invading Israelites."² Their first fierce attack upon Egypt in company with the Libyans was repulsed, as we have seen, by Merneptah, but "the energy of the Egyptian power seemed to exhaust itself in the effort. The throne fell into the hands of usurpers, and the house of Rameses was swept away by civil war and anarchy."

Such being the conditions in Egypt during the period of the wilderness wanderings of Israel, it is not difficult to see why there should have been no protracted and destructive war made by the Egyptians upon the escaped Hebrews.³

One campaign in Syria, however, or rather one raid, was made about the close of their wanderings, by Rameses III., "the last of the conquering Pharaohs."

¹ Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 444.

² McCurdy, *Hist., Proph. and the Mon.*, Vol. I., p. 203.

³ "The Egyptians, indeed, absorbed in their civil discords, or in wars with foreign nations, soon forgot their escaped slaves."—*Musp.*, p. 448.

The campaign of Rameses III. in Syria was "little more than a raid, but it left no permanent results behind it, and all traces of Egyptian authority disappeared with the departure of the Pharaoh's army. Canaan remained the prey of the first resolute invader who had strength and courage at his back."

This article, of course, is tentative, as we said before when writing of this inscription in another place. As it was discovered only last year, and as the exact meaning of its most important passage is still in dispute, it may seem premature to make any use of it at this time. But, while we cannot yet speak positively, it has seemed not improper to show that the most probable interpretation of it may be made to dovetail with that scheme of the history which is now adopted by nearly all Egyptologists. Whether our attempted adjustment of this new matter to the knowledge we already possess be accepted or not, it seems increasingly probable that the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan took place in the declining period of the nineteenth dynasty, since it was only then that all three of the indispensable conditions of their occurrence seem to be found. Those conditions were: (1), A time later than the Syrian campaigns of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, since, if the exodus had taken place before those campaigns, there must have been some mention of them in the Hebrew records, as well as some mention of the Hebrews in the Egyptian records, whereas there is neither; (2), Political disturbance and military weakness in Egypt; and (3), Division, disorganization, and disharmony in Canaan, and no single strong power in possession there to repel an invasion.

W. W. MOORE.

Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.

II. THE DIATESSARON OF TATIAN, AND ITS EVIDENTIAL VALUE.¹

THE fact that a popular monthly magazine has lately contained an article on the question, "When Were the Gospels Written?"² is significant. Such themes are not generally discussed in these purveyors of pleasant pabulum for the palates of the lovers of light reading; and the publication of a discussion of this sort through this sort of a medium is a very sure indication that such questions are now "in the air," and that the general public are feeling a keen interest in them. The time has been when the words "genuineness and authenticity" have made theological classes yawn, and many a one, apparently, would have been perfectly willing to leave the discussion of the subject in which these terms were employed to the dry-as-dust professors of Evidences, while he gave his energies to the investigation of living themes and the acquisition of practical knowledge. Now, all this is changed, and questions like this are the questions of the hour. Why is it that while, in a past generation, Horne's *Introduction*, with its facsimiles of old manuscripts and its endless discussions about them, was the *bête noir* of the theological student, in our day, facsimiles of Syriac Gospels and so-called 'Logia' are found on the pages of our most popular daily newspapers and magazines, while discussions about them are eagerly read, not only by theologians, but by that great mass of the public, to the individuals composing which we give the

¹ "The Diatessaron of Tatian," by Rev. Hope W. Hogg, B. D., in the recently published volume (ix.) of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*; Allan Menzies, D. D., editor. Original supplement to the American edition. Christian Literature Company, New York. 1896. "The 'Diatessaron' of Tatian," Walter R. Cassels, *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1895. "The Diatessaron: A Reply," J. Rendel Harris, *Contemporary Review*, August, 1895. Articles on Tatian, by M. Maher, in *The Month*, London, November and December, 1892. A resumé of these two articles of Maher first called the writer's attention to this subject, and he is indebted to them for many interesting facts.

² By F. G. Kenyon, M. A., assistant keeper of the manuscripts in the British Museum, in *McClure's Magazine*, September, 1897.

name of "the general reader"? The answer to the question is that, as the president of Princeton University has impressively said, "The question of the day is, What is the Bible?" But a further question is, How did it come about that this is the question of the day? The answer to this is, that the hosts of unbelief have made a combined attack on the Bible, such as scarcely any other age has ever witnessed. The unprecedented development of human knowledge in our nineteenth century, especially as regards the physical facts and potencies of the world we live in, the great achievements of discovery and invention, and the overturning of so many old theories and beliefs about these things, seem to have set in motion a skeptical, revolutionary process of overturning and investigation in all other departments of knowledge. The result, in the case of a vast multitude of the writers and readers of our day, is something like an "eclipse of faith," and many have been in the habit of speaking of the simple and happy faith of the days of our fathers and grandfathers as a thing utterly unattainable by the well-informed of our times. However dark, cold, and cheerless may be the way of the skeptic, and however painful the chill about the heart of the orphaned unbeliever, their lot seems to be regarded as one of the inevitable results of that disillusionment which comes from the letting in of modern light.

The combined influence of Darwinism¹ and Higher Criticism is undoubtedly responsible for this questioning of the truth and divine origin of the Scriptures; but while these two great movements have promoted the growth of skepticism about the Bible in general as a revelation from God, four men, two of them Germans, another a Frenchman, and the fourth an Englishman—or, at least, an English writer who wrote anonymously, have made an attack upon the central shrine of divine truth, the Gospels which give us those facts about Christ which form the basis of the Christian's hope. Strauss, Baur, Renan, and the unknown author of *Supernatural Religion*, all striving to eliminate the supernatural from the Christian religion, have, perhaps, done most to bring about this state of mind in a part of the reading public and among the writers of our time.

¹The writer uses the term "Darwinism" as a popular name for atheistic evolution.

Of these four, Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school, is *facile princeps*. According to his theory, the synoptic Gospels were not written till the period extending from 130 to 150 A. D.; and he held that the Gospel of John was not written earlier than the decade ending with 170 A. D.

This, if proved, would show that all the Gospels are spurious productions, as their reputed authors, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, were all dead long before these dates.

Baur's position, like that of Strauss, who was his pupil, and then his instructor through his *Leben Jesu*, is one of the many illustrations of the fact that the greatest minds, when infatuated with theories which they themselves have originated, become oblivious of patent facts and incapable of reasoning. In the words of an able writer:¹ "The only reason why Strauss and Baur stopped at the last half of the second century was simply that no degree of audacity could ascribe them (*i. e.*, the Gospels) to a later period. The volumes of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian" (he might have added those of Hippolytus), "written before or immediately after 200, proclaim from the shelves of every theological library that the Gospels were as universally accepted and venerated by the entire church in A. D. 190 as in A. D. 1890."

To these have now been added a notable work of a still earlier writer, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, by the discovery of which the theory of Baur has been utterly exploded.

I. THE DISCOVERY OF THE DIATESSARON.

The anonymous book just referred to, which was published in England in 1875 under the title *Supernatural Religion*, had great influence with a large section of the educated men of the country. It is said to have been so popular that it passed through a half-dozen editions in as many months. The most prominent feature of the book was its denial of the existence of any supernatural quality in the Christian religion, and, of course, in the Scripture on which it is founded. The book, with much show of learning, aimed especially to disprove the genuineness and authenticity of

¹ M. Maher in *The Month*, London, November, 1892.

the four Gospels. Its great popularity was, doubtless, due to the fact that it seemed to prove just what quite a large proportion of the most cultivated class of Englishmen wished to see proved, and was an able utterance of the unspoken thought and wish of many who had become skeptical as to the divine origin and character of Christianity under the influence of the scientific theories of Darwin and his followers, and the critical theories of the Tübingen school. It was published at the time when atheistic evolution was rife and destructive criticism was boldest. Men who had already become skeptical rejoiced in the rise of a sturdy champion who, they thought, furnished them with ample proof of the spuriousness of the fundamental records of Christianity, and freed them from the shackles of that religion which stood in the way of their mad rush toward atheism.

The author took the extreme position of Baur, and denied the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels. Among other sarcastic expressions was this: "No one seems to have seen *Tatian's Harmony*, probably for the reason that there was no such work." Now, much as this anonymous writer thought that he knew, he was unable to read the secrets of the future, and did not dream of what was going to happen the very year after he wrote these words.

Lightfoot wrote a reply in which he proved, from quotations from the *Diatessaron* by Syriac authors in different ages, that such a work certainly did exist; but the impossibility of presenting the book itself left it uncertain as to what was the exact nature of the work, and what was the precise amount of its value in establishing the genuineness of the four Gospels.¹

All doubt was soon to disappear. Many references of Syriac literature showed that the eminent and saintly Ephraem Syrus (d. 373) not only knew of the existence of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in his day, but, as it was very extensively used among the churches

¹ Even such a scholar as Neander seems to have been in doubt on this point. In speaking of the character of another lost book attributed to Tatian, and especially discussing the question whether it was founded on the four Gospels alone or partly on Apocryphal Gospels, he remarks: "We should know more of this matter if the *Εὐαγγέλιον διάτεσσάρων* had been preserved."

of Syria, wrote a commentary on it. Now, it so turned out that in 1876, the very year after the bold assertion of the author of *Supernatural Religion* just referred to was made, Dr. Georgius Moesinger, of the University of Salzburg, published Ephraem's commentary at the request of the Mechitarist Fathers at Venice. Forty years before, the Armenian Mechitarist Fathers had published, in the Armenian language, an edition of the works of Ephraem Syrus, including his commentary on the *Diatessaron*; but the learned world had been oblivious of its existence all this time. Even after Dr. Moesinger gave it in a Latin version (which was a revision of the earlier one of Aucher) in a new edition, separate from the other works of Ephraem, in which it had so long lain concealed, it attracted no attention and was not generally known for several years. Dr. Ezra Abbot, the greatest American critic, had the honor of calling the attention of scholars to its value in his *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, in 1880. Lightfoot, writing in May, 1877, was in entire ignorance of the ally that had risen up the year before for the establishment of his contention and the refutation of his antagonist.

The author of *Supernatural Religion*, of course, came to know of this publication of Ephraem's commentary on the *Diatessaron*, but he was in for denials now, and, poor man, not knowing what he did, in an edition of his work issued in 1879, ventured to say: "It is obvious that there is no evidence of any value connecting Tatian's Gospel with those of our Canon." He most certainly would not have said this if, by any means, he could have foreseen what was to happen two years later.

Professor Zahn of Erlangen, with the help of Moesinger's Latin version of Ephraem's commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron* and of the *Homilies* of Aphraates, which were based on the *Diatessaron*, and, perhaps, from other sources, reconstructed the *Diatessaron* as far as he could, and published it in 1881. It was now seen that the *Diatessaron* was composed of our four Gospels.

These were notable collisions of boldly uttered fancies with hard and stubborn facts, which served to demonstrate their falsity, and to proclaim it as if from the very housetops. But the evidence was to be made still clearer and fuller.

By this work of Zahn, attention was drawn to an Arabic MS. in the Vatican library, marked No. XIV., which purported to be a translation of the *Diatessaron* itself. There was brought from the East to Rome by Joseph S. Assemani, about the year 1719, an Arabic manuscript which was described by Stephen E. Assemani, Rosenmuller, and Akerblad, and, a few years ago, again, by Ciasca, a learned orientalist connected with the Vatican library. "It consisted of one hundred and twenty-three folios, of which the first seven were somewhat spoiled, and two were missing." Ciasca was urged to translate and publish this MS., and fully intended doing so; but the pressure of other work caused him to delay it from time to time. This enforced delay, like many another, was overruled for the best result in the end. There was in the library one day, the "Visitor Apostolic" of the Catholic Copts in Egypt, the Most Reverend Antonius Marcos. The "Visitor" was invited to examine the MS. by Ciasca, and immediately told him that he knew of another like it in the possession of a gentleman in Egypt, and that he could have it brought to Rome. The MS. was sent according to promise. It bears upon it the name of the donor in the following inscription at the end: "A present from Halim Dōs Chālī, the Copt, the Catholic, to the Apostolic See, in the year of Christ, 1886."

This codex is described as follows: "The codex consists of three hundred and fifty-three leaves. There is no date attached, but the MS. seems to belong, at the latest, to the fourteenth century. The pages are nine by six and one-quarter inches, inclosed in an illuminated square of golden, red and purple lines, with an ornamentation of golden asterisks."¹

This MS. was of great service in supplying the two lacunæ in the first, caused by the loss of the two folios just mentioned, and in determining doubtful readings. It is described as being better than the first, in text and other respects, but quite inferior to it in orthography.

It was deposited in the Borgian Library, and, from this fact, has been named the Borgian MS., while the other is called the Vatican, because it has long been, and still is, in the Vatican Library. It

¹ Maher, as above.

is entirely clear that these MSS. are not copied the one from the other, nor from any common exemplar, though they have a common Syriac remote ancestor.

In speaking of the great interest excited by the discovery of the "New Syriac Gospels," by Mrs. Lewis, in 1892, Prof. Rendel Harris says, that "one of the first questions that will be asked will be, 'Why have you not done it into English?'" This has, at last, been done in the case of Tatian's great work, and we have *the Diatessaron done into English*. We now have it in the recently published ninth volume of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, translated, according to the statement of the title page, by Rev. Hope W. Hogg, B. D., though he informs us that his wife translated the larger part for him. The statement of the title page is, then, made on the principle, *Qui facit per alium facit per se*, only the *alium* should be *aliam* in this case.

It is in keeping with the great trend of our times that we find the Cambridge ladies, Mrs. Lewis and her sister Mrs. Gibson, going to the St. Catherine Convent at Mount Sinai, and discovering the Syriac Gospels, and then see this Oxford lady working side by side with her husband in giving the *Diatessaron* of Tatian to the English-speaking world. But an interesting question is, what of the form and contents of the *Diatessaron*?

II. THE DIATESSARON AS WE NOW HAVE IT.

Harmonies are made in two forms, either in parallel columns (where the subject is mentioned by more than one evangelist), or with all the gospels interwoven, so as to give a continuous narrative of events and utterances. The *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of Tatian is of the latter kind.

(a), *A Continuous Account.*

The narratives of all the evangelists are combined so as to give an account of our Saviour's life and teachings in chronological order, so far as the compiler could determine this order. In this respect it is like the late Dr. William M. Taylor's *Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Four Evangelists*, and other harmonies which might be mentioned. Hence, some old writers speak of it as the "Gospel of the *combined*," as distinguished from the *distinct* Gospels.

(b), The Genealogies Omitted.

Tatian omitted the genealogies. Theodoret intimates that this was due to a heretical tendency, and says that he also omitted everything which indicated that our Saviour was descended from David. That the last accusation is due to the prejudice of the heresy hunter is made clear by an inspection of the *Diatessaron*. No such omissions are to be found. On the other hand, in the very first section, Christ is spoken of as the son of David. "The Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David"¹ is the expression which, above all others, would have been omitted in such a case, but it is found here, coupled with the announcement that "this shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High." He did omit the genealogies, but so does Dr. Taylor, who surely will never be accused of Docetism. The omission was evidently due to the fact that it would be difficult to fit them into a continuous narrative.²

(c), The Diatessaron is Divided into Fifty-five Sections.

It is only in comparatively recent times that our Bibles have been divided into chapters and verses for convenience of reference, and it is altogether probable that this division of the *Diatessaron* into sections was made for the convenience of those who read it in public services in Syria for several centuries. The division could not have been made by a man of Tatian's sense. It looks like the work of an idiot in many places, as there is no regard whatever for the subject, the division often coming in the middle of a narrative. Rendel Harris suggests that this division into fifty-five sections was made in order that the whole might be read in churches during the year on the Sabbaths and principal feasts. This seems altogether probable; but it is time to look at—

(d), Some Peculiar Readings of the Diatessaron.

We should remember that it was almost inevitable that there should be many expressions which would sound rather strange to

¹ Luke i. 32.

² The two Arabic MSS., the Vatican and the Borgian, have the genealogies, the first side by side in the narrative, and the latter appended at the close. They have evidently been added by another hand after Tatian's day.

ears accustomed to the rhythm of the familiar words of King James' Version, which we have heard from our childhood. Even the Revised Version sometimes surprises us with an unfamiliar expression, though that is professedly not a new translation, but a revision of that of King James. The *Diatessaron* was, as far as we can trace it, a Syriac version. On the other hand, we have had the Greek text, the nearest to the original that could be determined by all the critical means available, and from it our English version was made, and the Revised Version was based chiefly on the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, the greater correctness of which was secured through many sources unknown when King James' Version was translated.

It is necessary to remember that the *Diatessaron* was almost certainly composed in Syriac. In spite of its Greek name and other reasons which Harnack urged for thinking that it was originally composed in Greek, Syriac scholars who have examined the question with great care pronounce it as certain that it was a Syriac book. At any rate, we know that from the early dawn of Syrian Christianity it was used in the churches in Syria. Therefore, when we read the *Diatessaron* in the English version just published, we are reading the translation of a text that branched off from the Greek very early, and that has passed through many vicissitudes, and may have suffered changes by the mistakes of copyists, by mistranslations in passing from version to version, and that has been influenced, as we have clear evidence, by contact with different versions which are well known. The accretions, and other changes from such sources, are noted by the learned editor of the *Diatessaron* in abundant foot-notes. This being so, we need not expect the version before us to tally exactly with either our Authorized or Revised Version. In spite of all this, it is seldom that the meaning is affected to any marked degree. Some of the most singular turns of expression will be given, though, of course, the space allowed will not admit of any full display of these peculiarities. Here are some examples :

Old Simeon was preserved till he had "seen with his eyes the Messiah of the Lord." And in this form we have his "*Nunc*

Dimittis," "Now loosest thou the bonds of thy servant." We are rather surprised at the expression in the account of the offering of the Magi (which seems natural enough, however, when we remember that the camel was then, as it still is, the ship of the desert), "They opened their saddle-bags and offered to him offerings of gold, frankincense, and myrrh" (Matt. ii. 11.) In the account of the visit to Jerusalem during our Saviour's childhood, we are told that Joseph and his mother "supposed that he was with the children of their company." (Luke ii. 44.)

The version of John i. 18, giving a glimpse of the inscrutable relations of the Father and Son, is, "the only Son, God, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath told of him." In that scene in which John pointed out Christ to his own disciples, as John saw Jesus coming unto him, we hear him saying: "This is the Lamb of God that taketh on itself the burden of the sins of the world." (John i. 29.) When his family could not understand the change that came over him when he began his public ministry and spoke his wonderful words and did his wonderful deeds, we are told, "And his relatives heard, and went out to take him, and said, He hath gone out of his mind." We find the *Diatessaron* following the Greek more closely and translating it more literally than our own English versions in the account of the thronging of the multitude about him when he was healing many, "so that they were, *almost falling upon* (*ἐπιπίπτειν*) *him*, on account of their seeking to get near him." (Mark iii. 10.) The two sparrows are spoken of as "sold for a farthing *in a bond*." The meaningless phrase "in a bond" seems to have crept into the text by the similarity of the Syriac word for "farthing" and that for "in a bond." Indeed, a footnote tells us that the two phrases are but different explanations of the same Syriac consonants. In the account of the giving of sight to the blind man, Bartimeus, we have one of the many indications of the line of descent—the family genealogy, so to speak—of the *Diatessaron* text. When our Saviour asks the blind man what he wishes him to do for him, the *Diatessaron* represents him as replying, "My Lord and Master, that my eyes may be opened, *so that I may see thee*." This remarkable addition to our Greek text is found, like many of the peculiar read-

ings of the *Diatessaron*, in the Curetonian Syriac manuscript. Several of these, too, are found in the "New Syriac Gospels," as Rendel Harris calls them, discovered by Mrs. Lewis at Mt. Sinai in 1892. These peculiar expressions indicate a relationship between the *Diatessaron* and the Curetonian and Lewis texts. But more of this anon. Passing on to the betrayal of our blessed Lord, we find the expression in reference to the thirty pieces of silver, "the thirty pieces of money, the price of the precious one." The seamless robe is thus referred to: "And his tunic was without sewing, from the top woven throughout." Our Saviour's cry from the cross to his Father is given in a strange form: "Yāil, Yāili, why hast thou forsaken me?" In a footnote the translator says, "The syllable 'Ya' is, doubtless, the Arabic interjection 'O!' so that it is 'O God! O my God!' etc." The centurion who, at the crucifixion, commanded the guard, is called "the officer of the foot-soldiers," and this the editor considers a mistake of the translator into Arabic. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to give more instances of peculiar readings. These, as has been intimated, are such as we might very naturally expect to find in a text which was translated from the Greek at a very early day, and had been retranslated into Arabic, and, of course, recopied a number of times.

We are familiar with the sight of a large ball of snow rolled on the ground in various directions, with one object after another adhering to it, having been picked up in its course, while, perhaps, a bit of color on its surface here and there shows the kind of soil on which it has been rolled. It is liable to be somewhat thus with a text that has been translated and copied over and over again. Some accretions will stick to it, and it will take the color of the life and habits and modes of speech of the people among whom it is translated or copied, and the peculiarities of versions with which it has come in contact. A remarkable thing about the *Diatessaron* is, that its text is so pure that no doctrine or fact of the New Testament is at all distorted in it;¹ and the characteristic to which attention should be drawn is, that *Tatian*

¹ Yet, when read at family prayers, its peculiar expressions enchain the attention of young and old, throwing, as they sometimes do, new light on the narrative.

gave only the words of the four evangelists. No word of explanation connects the phrases that are carefully woven together to set forth the wonderful life and words of Christ. No attempted reconciliation of apparent discrepancies is given; and there is nothing answering to the headings of chapters in our English Bible, even. In the words of the last writer who mentions the *Diatessaron* as a work which he knew, before its disappearance, Abd Ischō (or Ebed Jesu), who died early in the fourteenth century, "With all diligence he attended to the utmost degree to the right order of those things which were done and said by the Saviour; of his own he did not add a single saying."¹

While the *Diatessaron* gathered some accretions, on the other hand we find that it escaped some corruptions that are found in our Greek received text. One such case, at least, and that a notable one, may be seen in the omission of the account of the woman taken in adultery, which, by the almost unanimous consent of critics, is now considered spurious. It crept into the text very early. But it evidently was not considered a part of the Holy Scripture (though it may have been known as a verbal tradition) in the time of Origen. In his commentary on John, just published, in the same volume with the *Diatessaron*, that account (John vii. 53—viii. 11) is omitted. The fact that Tatian omits it indicates that he wrote before it had gotten into the text. The *Diatessaron*, does, however, include the gloss (as it almost certainly is), about the angel descending and troubling the water in the pool of Bethesda (John v. 3, 4), and this is an indication of the very early introduction into the text of these words, which were probably written as an explanation by some transcriber who lived early enough to know of this as the traditional belief of the Jews about this pool.

¹ It seems impossible to account for Harnack's charge of freedom in the handling of the Gospels by Tatian in making his harmony, unless he considers the very act of making a harmony one of freedom. No harmonist from Tatian's day to our own, it may safely be said, ever handled the Gospels with more reverence. He seemed to refrain, indeed, from putting in one word of his own, even as a connective, or for purposes of reconciliation of accounts or of explanation of obscurities. One does not like to think that the exigencies of Harnack's critical creed may have influenced his judgment.

No description of the Arabic version of the *Diatessaron* would be at all complete without mention at least of *the notes prefixed to the Vatican and Borgian MSS.*, and the *subscriptions appended* at the close of each. We need not dwell on them at any length, yet it is curious to note that in the subscription of the Borgian, the name of Tatian is written Tatianus, while in the introductory note it is written Titianus. Another matter of interest is that both notes of the Borgian manuscript give the name of the translator, and both assert that it was translated from the Syriac. This information is given in the following quaintly reverential and prayerful terms in the subscription :

“It was translated by the excellent and learned priest, Abu'l Fārāj 'Abdulla ibn-at-Tayyib (may God grant him favor) ; from Syriac into Arabic, from an exemplar written by 'Isa ibn-'Ali al-Motatabib, pupil of Honain ibn-Ishak (God have mercy on them both). Amen.”

This Honain, the English editor and translator speaks of, in his learned introduction, as “a famous Arabic physician and medical writer of Bagdad (died 873), whose school produced quite a number of translations and translators.” The “excellent priest” Ibn-at-Tayyib, the Arabic translator, who died 170 years later, was “a well-known man, Nestorian monk and scholar, secretary to Elias I., Patriarch of Nisibis.”

But the most interesting and important thing about the *Diatessaron* is that *it is composed of the four canonical Gospels, and of these alone*, thus showing that these Gospels were in existence, and had been gathered together and translated into Syriac, and that they must have been for a long time fully recognized as the authoritative records of the life of Christ. That none of those later forgeries, the apocryphal Gospels, were used, is indicated not only by an inspection of Tatian's work, but by the very name which he gave it, the *Diatessaron* (through four), showing that at the time when Tatian composed the *Diatessaron* (probably soon after 150 A. D.), our four Gospels, *and these alone*, were recognized as the authentic and authoritative records of our Saviour's life. This will be more fully discussed under another head, but it is not superfluous to remark here, that *the Diatessaron of Tatian is, in*

itself, a positive proof of the spuriousness of all the apocryphal Gospels.

It is proposed to present, in another article, a biographical sketch of Tatian, the first harmonist, to trace the footprints of the *Diatessaron* in literature through the ages since it was composed, and then to show its evidential value in establishing the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels.

P. P. FLOURNOY.

Bethesda, Md.

III. PREACHING WITH AUTHORITY.

WHEN Christ stood before Pilate on trial, like his forerunner, "He confessed, and denied not." He denied not that he was a king, but confessed, "to this end was I born and for this purpose came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." In this confession he indicated the character of the kingdom he came to establish and the weapon he employed in its establishment. His was a kingdom of righteousness to be built upon the foundation of truth. Christ, its founder and king, was pre-eminently a preacher of the truth. While he wrought many wonderful works, these were but the illustration and confirmation of the truth he proclaimed. "Thou art a teacher come from God" was the impression his ministry, *i. e.*, his teachings and his miracles, made upon the thoughtful mind. Nor did he seek to correct this impression as false or misleading; but availing himself of it as an intended introduction, he verified the title by amplifying and developing and enforcing the truth as the people were able to bear it.

The title given to Christ by Nicodemus, a "teacher come from God," discloses to us, not only the impression he made, but also the character of his preaching—it was with authority. It commanded attention, carried conviction, appealed to the conscience. His method of presenting the truth was unique. He never appealed to any superior authority. He made a bold announcement without even argument to support or to prove the truth of the same. He rested simply upon the authority of him who announced it for belief of and obedience to the truth declared. "He always spoke as though his word was enough." "Verily, verily, I say unto you." "Again I say unto you." At times he seems even to supplant the teachings of the Old Testament, as in the Sermon on the Mount, and in his teachings concerning marriage and divorce. Nor was this claim and tone of authority assumed. Had it been, such blasphemous assumption would have soon been

detected, and his ministry have failed utterly. The effects produced demonstrated the genuineness of the claim, the weight of the authority claimed.

What was the secret of this feature of Christ's preaching, of the influence exercised and the impression made by his preaching? It lies in nothing incidental or accidental as in the place from which he spoke, as "Moses' seat," nor yet in the time, nor the attitude and frame of mind of the people. It is found in his own spiritual experience—it lies in a profound and abiding conscious conviction of, 1st, His divine origin and commission. When his words aroused the anger and opposition of the teachers of the day, and they challenged his authority and questioned the truth of his words, he appealed to his divine mission and commission: "Though I bear record of myself, my record is true; for I know whence I came and whither I go." (John viii. 14.) "Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God: neither came I of myself, but he sent me." (John viii. 42.) Had he not heard the voice of God testifying to his divine Sonship and to his commission, superior in authority to either Moses or Elijah, the very chiefest of the prophets? And were not the many and mighty miracles that God wrought through him the unquestionable testimony of the Father to the truth of his teachings and the confirmation of the authority he claimed? "For the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father himself which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me." (John v. 36, 37.) 2nd, Of the divine origin, and hence absolute truthfulness of his message or teachings. His own consciousness told him they were not the theories of his own fertile brain, nor yet that they were revelations of angel or archangel. He distinctly repudiated all claim to his teachings as distinctively his own, "The word which ye hear is not mine," and he traced them all directly to God, "but the Father's which sent me." (John xiv. 24.) "He that sent me is true: and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him." (John viii. 26.) "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of

myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." (John viii. 28.) "I speak that which I have seen with my Father." (John viii. 38.) "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." (John xii. 49.) 3rd, Of his Father's abiding presence and approval. "And he that sent me, is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him." (John viii. 29.) His Father was with him bearing witness to and with his Spirit to the truth of the word he declared. "And if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me." (John viii. 16.) The inwrought, abiding conviction of these three facts so energized his mind, inspired his heart and intensified his utterances, that his word was with power, carrying conviction to the minds of the hearers that he was both "a man of God," as the prophets of old, and that his message was a "thus saith the Lord." It was his own intense conviction, projected into and impressed upon the minds of his hearers, that convinced them of the truth of his words and the reality and justness of his claims. "As he spake these words," wherein he had claimed direct personal instruction from God, and the abiding presence of and companionship with God, "many believed on him." (John viii. 30.)

Upon Christ's ascension his mantle fell upon his church. His mission and commission were transferred and transmitted to his people, and especially to his ministers as his successors. "As the Father hath sent me into the world, so send I you," John xx. 21, is the record of the transfer of his mission; "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," of his commission. (Mark xvi. 15.) This latter describes and limits the office and function of the minister. His work is to "preach" the word, or the gospel. His commission, as stated in these words, is both inclusive and exclusive. It includes all that he is commanded to do, and excludes everything else. It leaves him no option; it allows him no liberty or license. To preach the gospel is the one function of his ministry, the one duty of his life, excluding everything else as militating against the fulfilment of his divine commission. By rea-

son of the divinity of his commission, he is to preach the word with authority, not with apology. Herein lies the fault and the failure of the modern preaching of the gospel, it is apologetic, hortatory, persuasive. It appeals only to the heart, the mind, the selfish interests of the hearer, and not directly to the conscience. It courts the faith and commands not the obedience of the sinner. It leaves it optional with the sinner to believe or not to believe; to repent, to obey, or not. By reason of the close competition and slight differences in denominations, the preacher seeks to secure and to retain the good will of the attendant upon his church, and is tempted to court him, instead of in the name of his Master to command him. Again, by reason of the diversity of teachers and of teaching, men are at a loss to know, to decide, which have the imprimatur, the appointment, and consequent authority from God. Men are perplexed, as were the disciples of John the Baptist when Christ began to preach, and, through his disciples, to baptize. In their perplexity, often unreasonably plead as an excuse for unbelief and disobedience, men are drawn by the more attractive preacher, who stands upon his own merits and attractions, who in consequence loses his position as an ambassador of and from Christ, as also his authority and that of his words over the conscience of his satisfied and delighted hearer.

The preacher of the word must magnify his office as an ambassador commissioned of Christ, to propose unalterable terms of peace to the sinner in rebellion against the authority and government of God, and to demand immediate acceptance of the same. He must speak in the name of his Master with authority, not assumed, not arrogated, but delegated, and, hence, as real and obligatory as that of Christ himself. "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." In point of authority the preacher of to-day differs not in the least from the prophet of old. The difference in the manner of his call and appointment affects not his authority, or the authority of his message. Like the prophet, he is the voice of God to the people, and can and ought to enforce all his utterances by "thus saith the Lord." As the prophet was the "servant of the Lord," so the preacher is "the servant of Jesus Christ."

To enforce his authority and that of his preaching, and to carry conviction of the reality thereof, the preacher must, like his divine Master and prototype, have a personal experience and conviction of the three cardinal factors and features of his ministry.

1. Of his divine call as a son, and commission as a servant. The great apostle to the Gentiles repeated more than once, and apparently irrelevantly, the story of his remarkable conversion. Yet it was not for the sake of parade or display. His conversion was to him the impelling and compelling reason and cause of his preaching, and hence, when his right and authority to preach was challenged, he offered the history of his conversion as the only satisfactory and all sufficient explanation and defence of his course in preaching the gospel. When he indited his epistles, in every one it was as "a servant of Jesus Christ," which was his claim for a hearing, and for obedience to the message he sent. He besought men as an ambassador for Christ, "as though God did beseech you by us. We pray you in Christ's stead." He claimed his authority direct from God, and not through medium of man. "I conferred not with flesh and blood," he declares. So deeply inwrought into the fibre and blood of his being was this conviction of his divine call and commission, that he was oppressed with a prospect of a certain woe if he preached not the gospel.

2. Of the divinity of the gospel, and hence of its absolute truth. Divine because he received it direct from God. Here, again, the apostle to the Gentiles is the example to the ordinary minister of the word. Paul frequently emphasizes his teachings by the declaration, "For that which I have received of the Lord, declare I unto you." Like his Master, he repudiates the human origin of his gospel, and declares it was by the direct personal revelation of Jesus Christ unto him. "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. i. 11, 12.) So strong was his conviction of the truth and divine origin of the gospel which he preached, that Paul invoked a dual curse upon himself or an angel from heaven who preached any other gospel. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which

we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8, 9.) While the canon of revelation has long since been closed and a curse has been pronounced upon any one presuming to add to it, so that no one can look for or claim any new and separate revelation direct from God, yet no man can preach the word with authority or with power to whom the Holy Ghost, the abiding Teacher, has not verified the Scriptures in his personal experience, and who does not thus know the absolute truth of the word of God, who in word is not assuredly convinced that "all (every) Scripture is given by inspiration of God." Anything short of this conviction must of necessity weaken, if not vitiate, the authority with which a minister preaches the word.

3. Of the abiding presence and approval of his divine Master. In this lies the inspiration and the power of a successful ministry. This presence is not to be in the preacher's experience a mere figment of a holy imagination, but a solid fact of a strong faith. It was the promise of his abiding presence which the Master gave as the basis of the preacher's authority and of his courage to preach or to declare the gospel. "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the age." When the minister of the word, with the eye of faith which recognizes and realizes this promise, sees the unseen, ever-present Christ, then will his words, like those of the witness Stephen, "cut to the heart"; then will men recognize, not that he has been with Christ merely, but that Christ is with him and that he speaks the words of Christ.

The crowning feature and factor in Christ's preaching was his anointing or baptism of the Holy Ghost, and his abiding consciousness of that anointing. He waited and made application for this before he entered his ministry. Having received it he returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee and preached, possibly, his first sermon, at his early and only home in Nazareth, where he had been brought up. And his text was, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel." The anointing of which he spoke was more than an appointment; it was a preparation; God's qualification of his Son

for the office of the sacred ministry. That anointing nor his consciousness of the same was ever withdrawn. It rested upon and with him, the secret and source of the marvellous power and influence of his ministry. It was because of this that even his enemies confessed, "Never man spake like this man."

If Christ transmitted his commission, he has also his power to his ministers. When Elijah threw upon Elisha his mantle, he promised him with it a double portion of the Spirit in and by which he had fulfilled and finished his mission as a man and prophet of God. Likewise Christ, when he had commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel, promised that they should be baptized, endued with the power of the Spirit. But they were to wait, to look for the baptism like Elisha. Commission to preach the word does not carry with it necessarily the power to preach it. The appointee must wait upon the Lord for this. The preacher of the truth who would imitate his Master, catch inspiration from and reproduce the ministry of Christ, must seek and receive this anointing of the Holy Ghost, and carry with him the abiding consciousness of this blessed Paraclete. Then will his preaching be in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; then will he "so preach that many shall believe."

L. B. TURNBULL.

Durham, N. C.

IV. THE IMPRECATORY PSALMS.

THIS topic, often and long discussed, and perhaps trite by repetition of old arguments on all sides of it, is, nevertheless, not settled by a general understanding, and is too important a factor, both in the question of inspiration and in the principle of legitimate interpretation, to be allowed to drop into weary desuetude.

A few years ago a scholarly and devout man was casting about for a subject for a series of theological lectures, when it was suggested that he should expound the theory of inspiration. "But," said he, "I have no theory." "What! You have no theory in regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures?" "No," said he, "Not when I read, 'Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.'"

We have in mind, now, one particular family, among many in the United Presbyterian Church, who, no doubt, do the same thing, who sing the Book of Psalms through in course at family worship. "But," one ventured to inquire, "What do you do when you come to the imprecatory psalms?" "Sing them as we do the others." "But with what understanding and application?" The answer was an amused, perhaps a compassionate smile.

These psalms are mingled with others in a book which is well-nigh universally regarded as a very important part, and the only inspired part, of the hymnody of the church in all generations. And they stand in the midst of that Scripture which is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine. Are they, like the rest, and in the same sense, inspired? And, if so, how are they to be understood and interpreted?

That we may rightly understand and fairly face the difficulty, let us first recount the manner and special points of imprecation:

Psalm lix. 5: "Thou therefore, O Lord God of Hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen, be not merciful to any wicked transgressors. . . . 10. God shall let me see my desire

upon mine enemies. Slay them not, lest my people forget! Scatter them by thy power, and bring them down, O Lord our shield. . . . 13. Consume them in wrath, consume them, that they may not be, . . . and at evening let them return, and let them make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city. Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge, if they be not satisfied."

Psalm lxix. 22: "Let their table become a snare before them, and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened, that they see not . . . pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. . . . 27. Add iniquity unto their iniquity, and let them not come into thy righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous."

⁴ Psalm lxxix. 6: "Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon thy name. . . . And render unto our neighbors sevenfold into their bosom their reproach, wherewith they have reproached thee, O Lord."

Psalm cix. This is the special psalm of curses, a series of imprecations which, in their reduplicated intensity of bitterness and hatred that not only calls down deepest woe upon the enemy's head, but follows up his children and his children's children with curses, and goes back to defile the memory and the graves of his fathers, may well make one's flesh creep with horror and fear. Verses 6-20: "Set thou a wicked man over him: and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned: and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few; and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds, and beg: let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labor. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him: neither let there be any to favor his fatherless children. Let his posterity be cut off; and in the generation following let their name be blotted out. Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the Lord; and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out. Let

them be before the Lord continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth. Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones. Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually. Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul."

Psalm cxxxvii. 8, 9: "Happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones."

All this, and such as this, in the midst of the hymns of the church! This to be sung in the closet, and in the family circle, and in the sanctuary of God! If one has a personal enemy, with what zest may he roll out the curses which damn body and soul, and family and memory, and father and mother before him, and the grave which shall hold his hated ashes!

All this to be sung by those who have sat at the feet of Jesus, and have heard him say, "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. . . . Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. . . . I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. . . . Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your

Father which is in heaven is perfect." Our blessed Lord said: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart"; and he left us an example that we should follow in his steps; "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously"; praying, even in the last moment, for them that crucified him: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." By his apostle, also, he has taught us the spirit of his true disciples: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Here are the imprecatory psalms, and here is the teaching and example of the High Priest of our profession, and both in the one Bible which is the only rule of our faith and practice. Perplexedly, we read the words of the Apostle James, designed, indeed, for other application, but not here to be ignored: "Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not so to be. Doth a fountain send forth in the same place sweet water and bitter? . . . The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."

Of this we must be sure: the word of God is one word. He is the Lord; he changeth not. But how shall we understand him when there seems to be such diametrically opposite spirit in his word? "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." That fixes the standard of truth and of right for us. How are these imprecatory psalms to be conformed to and reconciled with it? or are they to be cast out as irreconcilable, and, therefore, manifestly intrusive? or are we to discredit the pre-emptory authority of the Scripture because they are part of it and degrade and disgrace it? Do they disprove inspiration by their presence in the sacred volume, or prove that inspiration is consistent with very human and unholy utterance? or is there

an understanding which shows these worthy to stand beside the very words of Christ in the blessed and perfect revelation of God?

If we turn, now, to see how these psalms have been understood and interpreted by those who have given them attention, we find, first, certain scoffers who say, "This is the spirit of your pious people when men and things do not please them, and this is your Holy Bible, which breathes peace and good-will when stroked the right way, and threatenings and slaughter when crossed and offended."

We lay aside such criticism, which shows its animus on its face, until we can give due consideration to respectful comment.

Dr. Hessey, in the Boyle Lectures for 1872, gives two very elaborate lectures, in most reverent and excellent spirit, on the imprecatory psalms. They will abundantly repay very careful reading, and it is not easy to do them justice in summarizing their conclusions. Still, it can be done, in his own words, without doing him essential injustice. His principles are, "*First*, That the Psalms are, under one of their aspects, unrestrained expressions of the feelings of their respective writers, and his discussion shows that he means to include their unjustifiable and unholy feelings; and that this fact, at least in part, at once explains and condemns their imprecations. *Secondly*, That, this being so, we should naturally expect to find in them a reflection of the writer's passing moods of thought . . . not always with a single eye to God's glory. *Thirdly*, That if this be granted, it is not to be anticipated that we should approve of every such expression, or expect it to approve itself to our moral sense."

To this we must reply that the psalms, in their main purpose, are didactic and devotional, not historic, even in the sense of history of the emotions of their writers. And, in as far as they are didactic, their place in God's book makes them the teaching of God, not of their respective writers. Further, the psalms are each one complete in itself. While, therefore, there may properly be record of a passing emotion of the writer, that emotion, if faulty, must be corrected in that same psalm if it is to have a worthy place in the teaching of God; *e. g.*, as when the psalmist

says: "So foolish was I, and ignorant; I was as a beast before thee." These, it seems to us, are natural and necessary principles in the interpretation of any complete and separable part of the holy word. Otherwise we are compelled to judge as to the judiciousness and moral and religious quality of every teaching of the Bible; in other words, we are deprived of the unmistakable indorsement of "Thus saith the Lord," and are thrown back upon our own judgment of what is right and good. With that understanding, the Bible, from beginning to end, would be *history*—history of events, and history of mental and moral emotions and experiences, out of which we must construct our own principles and system of righteousness. Then we are all at sea, and—without sight of land or star—have a compass which points everywhere, and we are left to reason or guess which is north.

Professor Mozley, in his *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, founds his book upon the principle of the progressive revelation of righteousness. His explanation of the imprecatory psalms is substantially that the psalmists had got little further than the precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." He grants that they had learned, if their hatred was to be indulged, that they must identify the enemy with the enemy of God, and with this religious light thrown upon the precept, must understand it to say, "Thou shalt love the good and hate the bad." But they still applied this to persons, and cursed with all their might. This was in the spirit of the anomalous and romantic justice of the old religious type. The new code of the gospel changed all that. So the imprecatory psalms, all right in their day according to their standard, are antiquated, outgrown, and superseded. But what a pity, then, that Providence had not allowed them to be lost, with the book of Jasher! How unfortunate that they should stand in the ritual of the church, out of which our Lord sang a hymn just as he went out for his last solemn journey to the Mount of Olives! And again, how shall we judge between what is antiquated and what is enduring? Our compass needing correction in this deflection, how shall we certainly know when it points to God's appointed place in the heavens? Were God's people divinely taught to sing inspired im-

moralties in his temple, his better-informed people of to-day being judges? Is morality—righteousness—then a fast and loose matter, not in the knowledge and experience and practice of his only partially-instructed and partially sanctified earthly servants, but in the law and the testimony which holy men of old spake and sang as they were moved by the Holy Ghost? Surely, there must be other interpretation than this.

In 1874, Professor Swing, then a Presbyterian minister in Chicago, was arraigned before his Presbytery for unsoundness in the faith. The twenty-third specification of the second charge against him is based mainly upon a sermon he had preached and published on Psalm cix., and on certain articles of his in the *Interior*, in which he was charged with referring to Psalm cix. as “a battle-song”—as “the good of an hour”—“a revenge,” and with using the following and similar language: “The prominence given to Psalm cix. in my remarks arises only from the fact that it has long been a public test of the value of any given theory of inspiration. This is one of the places at which the rational world asks us to pause and apply our abundant and boastful words. Most of the young men, even in the Presbyterian Church, know what the historian Froude said of this psalm a few years since: ‘Those who accept Psalm cix. as the word of God are already far on their way to *auto-da-fés* and massacre of St. Bartholomew,’ and while they may for a time reject these words, they will soon demand a theory of inspiration very different from the indefinite admiration of the past.” That we may be just to Professor Swing’s memory, even at the risk of a little prolixity, we quote from his published sermon on Psalm cix.: “These thoughts bring me now to the structure of the psalms of David. Many of them being deeply religious, and suitable to all religious hearts everywhere, there are others that belonged only to the days when they were sung. If it was permitted the Israelites to destroy their enemies, and thus establish the better their monotheism, it was necessary they should sing battle-songs, and that much of their hymnology should be military. In days of American struggle with England, the song of ‘The Star-spangled Banner’ might be useful and truthful. It might impel men along the best path of the period. In France,

a few years, the 'Marseillaise' was rising with power, for it was necessary for the people to check the reckless ambition of Louis Napoleon. These hymns might be confessed to possess a temporary inspiration. That is, their good is unmistakable. But let the world and civilization advance, let war become a crime and barbarism, let peace become not only an article of religion but a policy of all nations, let all disputes be settled by arbitration and payment of damages, and in their golden age the war-songs of America and France become a poor dead letter, and no heart remains so warlike as to sing them. Thus with such psalms as the six. They had a temporary significance, depending altogether upon the kind of work the Hebrews had to perform. If it was necessary for them to go to battle, it was desirable they should have a battle-song, a 'Marseillaise.' If their hands must do bloody work they were entitled to sing a terrific psalm. But the moment the Hebrew method of life passed away, the moment their war for national existence ceased, that moment Psalm six. lost its value. For if the bloody Hebrew war is over, so is its battle-song. There is no logic in perpetuating a war-cry after the war itself has passed away."

We have quoted Professor Swing thus at length in order to do justice to his most peculiar theory of the imprecatory psalms. We do not know, indeed, what to say of such interpretation, except that it is hardly conceivable to us as the theory of more than one man in all the generations of expositors. Meantime, no wonder that, with such idea, he relegates his only conceivable method of treating the Old Testament to *eclecticism*. On that basis, of course, every man is to have his own Bible, and be a law unto himself. How soon and how sadly would the whole church of God cry out for some positive "thus saith the Lord"!

A very frequent exposition of the imprecatory psalms by commentators and theologians is as *prophetic*; *i. e.*, the Psalmists sing of what shall be to the wicked, in the just judgment of God. It is not the curse, nor the prayer, nor the wish of the psalmist, but a declaration of the divine purpose. This principle of interpretation is favored, at least partially, by Calvin, Gill, and Addison Alexander. Now, that at any rate a part of Psalm six. was thus

prophetic is made certain by Peter's declaration of its fulfilment in the person and fate of Judas: "This Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas." But it is evident that many declarations of the holy word have at once a historic and a prophetic application, and at once touch objectives retrospective, present, and prospective, and have temporal and corporeal, and at the same time, spiritual or remote, but none the less designed fulfilment. Those who most devoutly recognize the fulfilment of Psalm cix. as a prophecy of Judas, nevertheless look for David's nearer object in Saul, or Absalom, or Ahithophel, or Doeg the Edomite, and might well anticipate the application also to persons yet to be born. So may this psalm also be at once a prophecy and a denunciation, a curse, and a declaration of the vindictive will of God. And in linguistic, grammatic, and rhetoric form, it certainly is, *primarily*, a series of denunciations and curses, as are the other imprecatory psalms. Moreover, the psalmist frequently and emphatically avows the vindictive spirit which lies behind imprecations. "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? . . . I hate them with perfect hatred; I count them mine enemies."

There certainly seems to be a manifold element here. These psalms are the expression of divine indignation and wrath; they are the prophecy of divine judgment, and they are the outpouring of the emotions of the Lord's indignant servants. And these three agree in one; the Lord's expressed indignation results in the Lord's temporal and eternal judgments, and the Lord's servants say, Amen. And this is the eternal principle of the divine righteousness. Even in heaven is heard, amid the songs of everlasting praise, the echo of the imprecatory psalms: "The souls of them that were slain for the word of God cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? . . . We give thee thanks, O Lord, God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come, because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants . . . and shouldst

destroy them which destroy the earth. . . . And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia, salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God, for true and righteous are his judgments, for he hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. ' And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up forever and ever."

Now perhaps we have partly cleared the ground for some principles of interpretation.

First, These psalms are, each one, complete in itself. They are not, therefore, to be expounded as, for instance, the speeches of Job's friends, which are counterbalanced and corrected by subsequent utterances of the same book.

Second, Standing in the midst of the holy word, they are part of the Scripture, which is all given by inspiration of God.

Third, Their utterances, therefore, however characteristic of their writers and moulded by circumstances, are the word of the Lord, and entitled to utmost reverence as true and righteous, though we might be at entire loss as to their interpretation.

Fourth, These things being so, they were not only entirely proper in the mouths and at the hands of their original writers, but those writers could not have been justified in not writing them as they are.

Fifth, Neither can they be the utterance of unworthy or unholy passion.

Sixth, There must be such a thing, therefore, as holy indignation and holy vindictiveness; but, of course, only when the human passion is in full accord with the divine mind and will.

Seventh, As they are in a divinely-inspired and ordained ritual for the church of God, they may be, and ought to be, used by his saints under appropriate circumstances and in a proper spirit. Not, of course, for the expression of unsanctified resentment, as in the case cited by Calvin, *in loco*: "How detestable a piece of sacrilege," says he, "is it on the part of the monks, and especially the Franciscan friars, to pervert this psalm by employing it to countenance the most nefarious purposes! If a man harbor malice against a neighbor it is quite a common thing for him to engage

one of these wicked wretches to curse him, which he would do by daily repeating this psalm. I know a lady in France who hired a parcel of these friars to curse her own and only son in these words." But it is altogether proper, and by the very fact of these psalms is *enjoined*, to unite in the will of God in cursing his determined and irreconcilable enemies, root and branch. He has put the word into our mouths for use only when he has put a holy disposition thereto in our hearts. If we never learn to do it in this world with the right spirit and the true understanding, we certainly will do it when we join in the songs of the redeemed in heaven.

Eighth, We have here a fearful illustration of that just now much-belabored doctrine of reprobation.

Ninth, If these imprecatory Psalms have now no other use or meaning for the worshipping church on earth, they are a most solemn warning against persistent enmity to God, and against apostasy.

Tenth, The imprecatory psalms are a standing protest against the "universal Fatherhood of God," as that phrase is all too generally understood to mean that he is too unjust to judge every man according to his works, and too soft-hearted finally to condemn unreconciled sinners.

Eleventh, Unless he be divinely inspired, let no man presume to identify his personal enemy, or any man personally, with the reprobate enemy of God, lest haply he be found to curse him whom the Lord hath not cursed. Stephen might well have thought himself justified in praying concerning Saul of Tarsus, when he stood consenting unto his death, "Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand," when Saul was, nevertheless, a chosen vessel unto God. When we make the imprecatory psalms our own, let us have in mind only generally the irreconcilable enemies of God, leaving him who knows to make the personal application.

In the early days of the civil war, while still under the intense excitement of the recent occurrence, the present writer heard John B. Gough say, from a lecture-platform in Troy: "If it be true that the disaster at Ball's Bluff and the death of Colonel Ba-

ker occurred through the treachery of General Stone, I would walk from here to Boston to see him hung, and then pray that he might go to purgatory afterward"; and his fierce denunciation received the tremendous applause of a vast audience. There was Psalm cix. in a sentence; but utterly unjustifiable, even with its qualifying "if." What did any of us know of General Stone's ultimate standing, even if a traitor, before God?

And yet we are inclined to think with Dr. Chambers (*Vedder Lectures*, 1876), that the opening words of Milton's fine sonnet on the Vaudois are natural and proper:

"Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;"

and that Lord Macaulay spake well when he said, in relation to the Sepoy rebellion: "I, who cannot bear to see a beast or a bird in pain, could look on without winking while Nana Sahib underwent all the tortures of Ravallac." What would he have said now as to the unspeakable Turk? Dr. Alexander Duff, the eminent missionary, said: "I could never fully understand how the so-called imprecatory psalms could be consistent with the teachings of the New Testament, until the Sepoy rebellion broke out with such terrific fury, and foes sprung up filling the land with violence; shaking the foundations of society and of government; threatening towns and cities with pillage, fire, and sword; murdering the innocent and defenceless; persecuting unoffending Christians with especial malignity; making unresisting missionaries a sacrifice to brutal lust and deadly torture, and thus rolling back the tide of Christian civilization, that iniquity might come in again like a flood, and heathenism with all its horrors and idolatry once more set up its seats in the land."

Reverently, and with a deep sense of the infinite distance between his knowledge and ours and between his right and ours, we remember that the compassionate Jesus said, looking into the faces of living men: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell"! J. A. DEBAUN.

Fonda, New York.

V. THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.¹

IN his preface the writer defines his purpose as follows: "The purpose of the volume is not to dim the glory of any church. Its real object, no matter what its apparent aim may seem to be, is to defend the principles of the Reformation relative to church government, to lay bare the grounds of Anglican claims to an historic episcopate, to set in clear light once more the validity of Methodist orders, and thus by breaking down some middle walls of partition to contribute something to the tendency toward unity and peace in the church of Jesus Christ."

In carrying out this worthy purpose, Dr. Cooke has given us an instructive and readable book. He has traversed quite carefully the period of history during which the Anglican Church severed its connection with Rome, and started on its independent career. His object is to show how much foundation there is for the claim that in severing this connection the Anglican Church did not sever the continuity of the historic episcopate. It did not fall within the scope of his purpose to go back of that period to inquire whether or not the line of succession had been preserved intact by the Church of Rome up to the time when the severance took place. Granting that Rome had the apostolic succession when Henry VIII. divorced himself from the papacy that he might divorce himself from Catharine, did the refractory king break the sacred chain that linked the bishops of the Anglican Church with the twelve primitive bishops known as the apostles? This is quite an interesting question in ecclesiastical surgery. It is to be borne in mind that the operation was performed against the will of the pope, who was losing part of his body, and chloroform had not yet been discovered. It is also to be borne in mind that the burly king was not skilful in the use of the scalpel, and was in no mood to be particularly tender. It should not surprise

¹ *The Historic Episcopate.* A Study of Anglican Claims and Methodist Orders. By R. J. Cooke, D. D., Professor of Exegetical and Historical Theology. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1897. 12mo., pp. 224. Cloth, \$1.00.

us, therefore, if in severing all other ligaments and tissues, the rough surgeon, dealing with a restless patient, severed this bond also. He was thinking more about Anne Bo'eyn than he was a'out how deep his knife was going, and what havoc he was playing with the delicate little tendons and cartilages that enter into the cellular structure of apostolic succession. There is a very wide and warm difference of opinion as to what Henry and his successors did. That slice of the papacy which they severed from the parent body, and which now constitutes the Anglican Church, insists that while it is entirely independent and enjoys complete autonomy of life, yet this subtle tie, this umbilical cord, was never cut. "Had it been cut," say the Anglicans, "we should have died at once, for no church can live unless linked by the chain of tactual succession through its bishops to the apostles." As they can only prove that they are living by proving that this cord was never cut, they grow very warm over the question of the surgery performed by Henry and his imperious daughter, Elizabeth.

The pope has recently been consulted, and he says, with strong emphasis, that every cord, ligament, and link of every kind was severed; that a broad gap was made between the parent body and the separated part, and that no vital current flows across this gap. What! is the Anglican Church no church? So says the infallible pope. He has held a coroner's inquest over it, and he says it is as dead as a door nail; that it really has no vital organs, and never had; that the contumacious king and queen cut it off from all contact with head and heart and lungs, and so it has never had anything but the semblance of life. Such is the verdict also of the Greek Church and other bodies whose vital connection with the apostles has never been disturbed.

Protestant sects are not supposed to be experts in such matters, and it must be confessed that they are somewhat perplexed and bewildered as they study the question. They are disposed to think there is something seriously wrong with the Anglican Church. It behaves in a manner which is hardly consistent with the supposition that it has fallen heir to the spiritual heritage of the apostolic church. Its bishops bear no strong family likeness

to the humble fishermen. We cannot conceive of Peter and John as lords spiritual, occupying seats in the highest council of the nation, sitting in judgment on the affairs of Cæsar, and living in a style that rivals the splendor of the haughtiest nobles of the realms. Think of Peter in full canonicals! It would take him a fortnight's hard study to learn the names and uses of all the variegated toggery that goes to make up an Anglican bishop's habit. But the difference between the apostles and Anglican bishops lies deeper than clothes. They differ in their way of estimating persons and things. Peter and Paul and John say: "Look at the doctrine of those who preach to you; see whether they are sound in the faith. If not, though they should be angels from heaven, hold them to be accursed of God. If any one comes to you, no matter where from, nor with what credentials, if he does not preach a pure gospel, shut your door against him." Anglican bishops say: "Look at the ordination of your teacher. If that be regular, defer to his authority, no matter much what he preaches. But if he be not in the line of succession, however pure his doctrine and devout his spirit, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican." Apostles and bishops lay stress on different things. The former exalt doctrine; the latter, order. The former glorify truth; the latter, fiction. When the Protestant sects note this strong contrast, they are disposed to side with the pope and say that the tie was broken, and that there is no longer any medium conveying apostolic influence to Anglican bishops. On the other hand, when we look at Rome and note the strong likeness that still exists between the Anglican Church and the papacy, we are disposed to take the other side. Surely, the severance could not have been perfect; the operation could not have been thorough. Especially does this conclusion seem forced on us when we note the growing likeness. The same life is still in the two bodies. Now, if, as the Anglicans claim, the life is in the historic episcopate, if life depends on the continuous flow of the grace of orders, then Henry and Elizabeth did not entirely check it. That there is some kind of life in the Anglican Church, Rome denies in vain. Growth implies life; and as the growth brings out even more clearly the likeness of the severed

part to the parent body, the presumption is almost a demonstration that the same life exists in both.

If we had to decide this question by an off-hand guess, we should say that whatever the papacy has, the Church of England has, but in an attenuated or emaciated form. If the papacy has the small-pox, the Anglican Church has the varioloid; if the former has scarlet fever, the latter has scarlatina. Perhaps the best way to decide this whole controversy is by an off-hand guess. It is a waste of energy to enter into a serious argument to refute the Anglican claims. Dr. Stuart Robinson used to say that reason can never get anything out of one's head that reason did not put in. Reason played no part in putting apostolic succession into the heads of our Anglican friends. It got in through the door of a disordered fancy. The way to get it out is to work on their hearts.

If, however, any one wishes argument, he will find it, clear and strong, in Dr. Cooke's volume. After a general survey of the doctrine of apostolic succession, he states as a historical fact that the claim to this succession rests upon the validity and sacramental character of Matthew Parker's consecration to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury. "He is the head of the stream. From him the English episcopate is derived." Starting from this premise, he lays it down as his purpose to show—1, That the fact of Parker's consecration is at least doubtful; 2, That if he was consecrated, the consecration, on Anglican principles, was invalid; 3, That if valid it did not continue the apostolical succession; 4, That the Church of England, when established by law in the Reformation, utterly rejected the theories and principles now maintained by high church teachers as the original doctrines of the Church of England.

It is not necessary, and would neither be profitable nor edifying, to follow our author through all the process of his arguments, but we may, perhaps, interest the reader by culling out a few points and presenting them to his attention.

1. It is made evident that the dominant power in giving being and shape to the Anglican establishment was the power on the throne. By the Act of Supremacy, Queen Elizabeth was put in the

place of the pope, and whatever the bishops possessed in the way of authority, they got from her. Here is a section of the Act of Supremacy: "Such jurisdiction, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority have hitherto been, or may lawfully be, exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, shall forever, by the authority of the present Parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm." Now, it would seem, that whatever apostolical succession was brought over from Rome was "united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm," the wearer of which, at that time, happened to be the Virgin Queen. Elizabeth was constituted "head over all things to the church." It was not her nature to be a figure-head. She was disposed to magnify her office. When the Bishop of Ely refused compliance with her command, she wrote him the following note: "Proud Prelate, you know what you were before I made you what you are. If you do not immediately comply with my request, by G—d, I will unfrock you." It is evident from this that she could dispense the disgrace of orders; and it would seem to follow, logically, that she possessed the "grace of orders." As she was made head of the church, it is charitable to suppose that she was credited with possessing some grace, and she gave proof of possessing no other grace except the grace of orders. Our author tells us that "in her speech to Parliament in 1584, her majesty informed the bishops that if they did not amend their ways, she would depose every one of them. 'For there seems to have been,' says Hallam, 'no question in that age but that this might be done by virtue of the crown's supremacy.'" Elizabeth understood that the cleavage between the papacy and the Church of England was absolute; that no bond of spiritual or ecclesiastical power of any kind remained intact, that no bishop or archbishop in her realm was authorized to perform any ecclesiastical function in virtue of an ordination previously received from Rome. They were all required to take oath acknowledging her supremacy. Those who

refused were no longer bishops. Apostolic succession, apart from the oath, availed nothing. Not merely theoretically, but practically, authority to discharge spiritual and ecclesiastical functions proceeded from the throne. Elizabeth claimed to be the repository of all kinds of power. When Matthew Parker was to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, there was a doubt whether the persons named in the queen's mandate for his consecration were canonically qualified to act. The queen commanded them to go forward, promising to supply, "by our own supreme royal authority, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, whatever, either in the things to be done by you, pursuant to our aforesaid mandate, or in you, or any of you, your condition, state, or power for the performance of the premises, may or shall be wanting of those things, which either by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws, are required, or are necessary on this behalf, the state of the times and the exigency of affairs rendering it necessary." The queen virtually says: "When your own qualifications are exhausted, draw on me for whatever is still wanting." One point in dispute was whether two of those appointed to consecrate Parker were *bona fide* bishops. "If not," says the queen, "we will supply the defect by our supreme authority, of our own mere motion." She was equal to the occasion. She was like the pedler's mill, of which we used to hear in our boyhood. The pedler went from house to house grinding out pepper, spice, salt, or any kind of condiment called for, in any quantity demanded. The queen, out of her inexhaustible resources, "of her mere motion," supplied any and all kinds of deficiencies. Froude is quoted as saying of the Anglican hierarchy: "It drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The image in its outward aspect could be made to correspond to the parent tree, and to sustain the illusion it was necessary to provide bishops who could appear to have inherited their powers by the approved method as successors of the apostles." Elizabeth cared nothing about the inner nature of ecclesiastical things. Her whole concern was to so shape the outside as best to promote the interests of her throne. Green, in his short history of the English people, says: "No woman ever

lived who was so totally destitute of the sentiment of religion. While the world around her was being swayed more and more by theological beliefs and controversies, Elizabeth was absolutely untouched by them. Her mind was unruffled by the spiritual problems which were vexing the minds around her; to Elizabeth, indeed, they were not only unintelligible, they were ridiculous. She looked at theological differences in a purely political light. She agreed with Henry IV., that a kingdom was well worth a mass. It seemed an obvious thing to her to hold out hopes of conversion as a means of deceiving Philip, or to gain a point in negotiation by restoring the crucifix to her chapel." Such was the woman who did more than any and all others to fix the metes and bounds of the Anglican hierarchy, and to determine the extent of variation between the English church and the papacy.

2. One of the most telling points made by Dr. Cooke against Anglican pretensions is in connection with the refusal of the Anglican authorities to recognize the validity of the orders of the Reformed Episcopal Church. In 1873, during a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, Dr. Cummins, then Assistant Bishop of Kentucky, partook of the Lord's supper in a Presbyterian church. This was a heinous offence in the eyes of the high churchmen. They were more incensed at this act of fraternity than they were at Dr. Heber Newton for preaching the baldest rationalism. Bishop Cummins withdrew from the Episcopal Church, and united with a few kindred spirits in founding the Reformed Episcopal Church. What about his apostolic succession? He had been regularly ordained a bishop in the Episcopal Church. His ecclesiastical pedigree was as pure as that of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Had any one called in question the validity of his orders, every man of the high-church persuasion would have risen up to defend it. His title to the true apostolic succession was without a flaw at the time he withdrew. What became of it then? Did he lose it, or was he deprived of it by the church whose communion he had renounced? Could they deprive him of it? Did he not, by his ordination, receive the *character indelebilis*? This is an interesting question. If he did, then the discipline of the Anglican Church is a mere *brutum fulmen*.

That church tried to obliterate the mark, and claimed that it had succeeded. The Anglican Bishop of St. Albans warned his flock against the new bishops as "intruders in the guise of real bishops," and denied that they had any valid jurisdiction. Bishop Gregg, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, wrote a note to the Bishop of St. Albans, in which he said: "The bishop through whom the historical succession reached me had his connection directly through the Anglican communion, and had not been deposed when the succession was transmitted through him to the three bishops by whom I was validly and canonically consecrated." To this the Bishop of St. Albans replied: "Reverend sir, you assert that the bishop through whom the historical succession reached you had his consecration directly through the Anglican communion, and had not been deposed when the succession was transmitted. I presume the bishop to whom you refer was Dr. Cummins. This bishop, though not yet formally deposed, lay under prohibition from performing any episcopal act, which prohibition was publicly notified December 1, 1873, just a fortnight before he proceeded to consecrate that bishop through whom, as you say, you received the historical succession. I have authority to state that none of the American bishops have ever recognized the act of pretended consecration performed by Dr. Cummins, or any act growing out of it." What became of Bishop Cummins' apostolic succession? The church that gave it to him claimed to take it away from him, or, at any rate, to deprive him of the power of transmitting it. When that church laid its prohibition on him, forbidding him to perform any episcopal act, at that very moment his power to confer the grace of orders was paralyzed. He could not add another link to the chain of historical succession. He could do the same things and say the same words which before this had resulted in making successors to the apostles, but the things and words have been deprived of their efficacy. His consecrations are "pretended" consecrations; his bishops are "intruders in the guise of real bishops, but having no jurisdiction."

It seems very reasonable that a church should be able to depose its officials and strip them of every prerogative with which it had invested them. The power that can make can destroy. But if

this holds good as between the Anglican Church and its deposed officials, why should it not hold good between the Church of Rome and her deposed officials? How happens it that the papacy could not stop the flow of the grace of orders? When she laid her prohibition on the English prelates who dared to disobey her voice, why did not this paralyze their power to transmit apostolic succession? Rome did not spare her excommunications and anathemas. She hurled them thick and fast on the heads of her revolting subjects. Were not her interdicts as powerful as those of these same revolting subjects? If we are to believe our Anglican friends when they profess to deprive refractory bishops of the power to impart valid orders, are we not bound to believe our papal friends when they profess the same thing? But if we believe our papal friends, then we must believe that our Anglican bishops never had any power to impart valid orders.

Look at the position of the Anglican Church. It looks down on the Reformed Episcopal Church, and says: "You are no church. Your bishops have no apostolic succession. When they rebelled against me, I at once severed the tie that bound them to the apostles." At the same time the Church of Rome is looking down on the Anglican Church and saying: "You are no church. Your bishops have no apostolic succession. When they rebelled against me, I at once severed the tie that bound them to the apostles." In the meantime the Protestant sects stand off and wonder what the dear Lord thinks, and whether the apostles know what folly is being perpetrated in their name.

3. We will mention but one other point insisted on by our author, and that is that the noble reformers of the sixteenth century did not wish to bring over any apostolic succession or grace of orders from the Church of Rome. They wanted to separate themselves from the papacy by a "great gulf fixed," across which there should remain no single strand of vital connection. Perhaps the shortest and surest way to get at what the English reformers thought of the Church of Rome is to look at the Homilies, appointed to be used by the clergy of that time. There were two Books of Homilies, the first published under Edward VI. in 1547, the second under Elizabeth in 1563. We have an

official declaration of the value and design of these Books of Homilies in the thirty-fifth article of the Thirty-nine Articles, in the following language: "The Second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which was set forth in the time of Edward VI., and, therefore, we judge them to be read in the churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." Let us read one or two extracts from these Homilies "diligently and distinctly," and we shall understand that if Rome transmitted any apostolic succession to the first Anglican bishops, she did it not only against her own will, but against theirs also. We read from the second part of the sermon for Whit Sunday "in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory:" "But to conclude and make an end, ye shall briefly take this short lesson; wheresoever ye find the spirit of arrogance and pride, the spirit of envy, hatred, contention, cruelty, murder, extortion, witchcraft, necromancy, etc., assure yourselves that there is the spirit of the devil and not of God, albeit they pretend outwardly to the world never so much holiness. Such were all the popes and prelates of Rome for the most part as doth well appear in the story of their lives, and therefore they are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets and false Christs which deceived the world a long time. The Lord of heaven and earth defend us from their tyranny and pride, that they may never enter into his vineyard again, to the disturbance of his silly flock; but that they may be utterly confounded and put to flight in all parts of the world; and he of his great mercy so work in all men's hearts by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable gospel of his Son Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the beating down of sin, death, the pope, the devil, and all the kingdom of anti-Christ." This is what the Anglican Church of Elizabeth's day called "godly and wholesome doctrine." The sermon from which the extract is taken enters into an elaborate argument to show that the Church of Rome was no true church of Christ, that it had none of the marks of the true

church, that it was the kingdom of antichrist, and that the pope was an incarnation of the devil. In the homily against idolatry, the Church of Rome is described as "being indeed not only a harlot (as the Scripture calleth her), but also a foul, filthy, old withered harlot (for she is indeed of ancient years), and understanding her lack of natural and true beauty, and great loathsomeness which of herself she hath, doth (after the custom of such harlots) paint herself and deck and tire herself with gold, pearl, stone, and all kinds of precious jewels, that she, shining with the outward beauty and glory of them, may please the foolish phantasy of fond lovers, and so entice them to spiritual fornication with her, who, if they saw her (I will not say naked), but in simple apparel, would abhor her as the foulest and filthiest harlot that ever was seen; according as appeareth by the description of the garnishing of the great strumpet of all strumpets, the mother of whoredom, set forth by St. John in his Revelation, who by her glory provoked the princes of the earth to commit whoredom with her." This sounds like the rugged severity of "honest Hugh Latimer," but whoever first wrote or spoke these scathing words, they were officially adopted by the Anglican Church of Elizabeth's day as "godly and wholesome doctrine," and ordered to be read to the churches by the ministers "diligently and distinctly." Is it conceivable that the Anglican bishops who could express their judgment of the papacy in that style staked their right to be regarded as a true church of Christ on the validity of orders brought over from Rome? Perish the thought! They claimed no relationship with, much less direct descent from, the "foul, filthy, old withered harlot." Their sentiment is expressed with more force than elegance by Dr. Fulke when he says, writing to papists: "You are most deceived if you think we esteem your offices of bishops, priests, deacons, any better than laymen. Again, with all our hearts, we defy, abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, antichristian orders."

We admit that this is not the most mellifluous language, but we have not seen anything that comes more nearly doing justice to the subject. Dr. Fulke was a rhetorician for the times, and did the best he could without doing violence to the third com-

mandment. We bow our thanks, and cherish his memory. Cranmer with almost equal strength, but with somewhat chaster language, says, "But if we allow the pope, his cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, canons, friars, and the whole rabble of the clergy, to be this perfect church of God, whose doings are clean contrary, for the most part, to the will and commandment of Christ, left and expressed in his word written, then make we him a sinner and his word of no effect. For as sweet agreeth with sour, and black with white, and darkness with light, and evil with good, even so this outward, seen and visible church, consisting of the ordinary succession of bishops, agreeth with Christ." Men who talked in this strain could not account it a blessing that the hands of Rome's apostate bishops had touched their heads. They gloried in no grace that was transmitted by such polluted touch. Calhill, bishop elect of Worcester, proposes a method by which the taint imparted by the bishop's fingers may be obliterated. He suggests to the papists that they had better use in their anointing the oil which the "greasy merchants will have in every mess, for the *character indelebilis*, the 'mark unremovable,' is thereby given. Yet there is a way to have it out well enough; to rub them well—favorably with salt and ashes, or if that will not serve, with a little soap." Now considering that the Church of Rome neither desired nor intended to transmit the succession, of whatever kind it was which she possessed, to the excommunicated and anathematized Anglican bishops and through them to their successors, and that these same excommunicated Anglican bishops neither claimed nor desired such succession, is it wise on the part of the high-churchmen of our day to suspend the existence of their church on the fact that the succession was transmitted nevertheless? If we had no more substantial basis than that on which to rest a claim to be the true church of Christ, we should not put forth our claim with any great blare of trumpets. We should be rather disposed to enter our closet and shut the door, and pray to our Father which seeth in secret.

4. Our author spends more time than the importance of the subject warrants, in the closing chapters of his book, in proving that Mr. Wesley had authority to ordain, and originate an episco-

pany. Mr. Wesley's acts, in providing for the necessity of the churches that resulted from the spiritual awakening that originated with him and a few other kindred spirits, need no defence. Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander lays down the true principle: "All valid powers are derived from Christ, and not from the apostles, or from any intervening men whatever. The agency of men in ordination is a simple, natural, and efficacious method of perpetuating the ministry without disorder, recommended by experience, sanctioned by apostolical practice and approved of God, but not essential to a valid ministry, when Providence has made it either not at all attainable, or only at the cost of greater evils than could possibly attend the violation of external uniformity." Why should Wesley be dependent for authority on the will of men who gave no evidence of being so near to the great source of all authority as Wesley himself? It is preposterous to think about the spirit-filled Wesley deriving power for the performance of valid ministerial acts from the Lord Jesus Christ through the round-about way of the apostles and their successors in the papal and Anglican churches. He had the living and reigning Christ with him all the time. It was so much easier and more certain to apply to him directly. As the writer from whom we have just quoted says: "The doctrine of succession seems to place the Saviour at the end of a long line, in which the generations of his ministers follow one another, each at a greater remove from him than that which went before it, and consequently needing a still longer line to reach him." Away with such a conception of Christ and his relation to his ministers! His last promise was, "Lo, I am with you alway, unto the end of the world." He is in his church to-day, and we do not have to grope our way across the track of weary centuries through the darkness of gross superstitions to find him by way of Palestine. We receive not our apostleship from man, and it matters little whether we receive it by man. For the sake of decency and order, it is altogether proper and right that the church have a regular method of recognizing and setting the seal of her approval on those who furnish the proof that they are called of God to the office of bishop. But the call of God is the essential thing, and if a lukewarm or apostate church refuse to

recognize this call, then he who receives it is bound to obey God rather than man. He must go forward in defiance of the voice of the church, discharging the functions of his high calling.

What does God want with a ministry? An exhaustive answer is given in the last command that Christ laid upon his apostles: "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." God perpetuates the office of the ministry for the sole purpose of perpetuating the teaching of what Christ taught. Paul writes to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses commit to faithful men who shall be able to teach others." Paul was making arrangement to transmit, not an office or an order, but the very same doctrines which he had taught. Is it possible to secure the perpetual teaching of what Christ taught, the perpetual preaching of pure doctrine, by means of a mere outward, historical, tactual succession of bishops? Supposing such succession to exist in the Roman Catholic Church, and to have been transmitted to the Anglican Church, has it accomplished what God designed? Have Peter's successors in the See of Rome maintained and propagated all the teachings which Christ commanded his apostles? Have they preached the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? We will let an Anglican bishop of Queen Elizabeth's day answer: "The great antichrist of Europe is the king of farces, the prince of hypocrisy, the man of sin, the father of errors, and the master of lies, the Romish pope." It would seem, then, that apostolic succession failed to secure the end which God had in view. Did it fail only in the case of the pope? "He is the head of the said pale horse, whose body are his patriarchs, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, fat prebends, doctors, priests, abbots, priors, monks, canons, friars, nuns, pardoners, and proctors, with all the sects and shorn swarm of perdition, and with all those that consent with them in the Romish faith, obeying their wicked laws, decrees, bulls, counsels, and constitutions, contrary to God's truth. The wickedness of these hath so darkened the blind world that scarce was left one sparkle of the verity of the true Christian faith. No-

where can men dwell to greater loss to their souls' health than under their abominations." Not in one case, but in all cases, the historical succession failed to secure the succession of sound doctrine. At best, it can only be regarded as a means to an end; and, failing to secure the end, "it is fit for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Its absolute and appalling failure brands it as a mere human invention. God could not have committed so egregious a blunder. Instead of perpetuating truth, it has murdered truth, enthroned fraud, and canonized crime. It spread a pall of darkness over the earth, and, to use the language of Froude, "the so-called horrors of the French Revolution were a mere bagatelle, a mere summer shower, by the side of the atrocities committed in the name of religion, and with the sanction of the Catholic Church." The voice of history unites with the silence of the Bible in assuring us that God never intended to secure a continuance of apostolic teaching by means of apostolic succession, in the sense defined. Where we find the succession, the teaching is wanting; and where we find the teaching, the succession is wanting. God never joined them together.

R. C. REED.

Nashville, Tennessee.

VI. THE PERSONNEL OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

IN the investigation of such a subject as the above we find outspread a wide and interesting field. It can be treated here only in the most general way. From the frequent and lengthy debates and intellectual tilts that took place between the members of opposing parties in the Assembly we are enabled to form some idea of their views, their learning, and relative ability. Yet to understand the doctrines and principles for which the leading men stood we must think ourselves back into the age in which they lived, and must become a party to their spiritual and mental development. Religious as well as philosophical or historical truths are never more interesting to us than when studied in the characters of individual men who illustrate them. If we would seek to understand the great doctrine of the Trinity embodied in the Nicene Creed, we would study it as illustrated through its champion, Athanasius. If we would understand the prominence given to justification by faith in the doctrine and preaching of the Reformation, we would study it as represented by Luther. If we wished to find the much-abused doctrine of predestination as it is offered to the world in its clearest form, we would trace its development in the logical mind of Calvin. And so, if we wish to understand the Calvinistic doctrines which moulded England and Scotland, and, through their sons, have left a strong impress upon our own land, we would study them as they wrought themselves out in the minds, and were embodied in the creed, of the Westminster Assembly of divines.

The Westminster Assembly is the most important council ever held in the Reformed Church. When we consider the small number who constituted it, and the far-reaching influence which they have exerted, we must pronounce it one of the most important councils of Christendom. The Council of Nicea (325 A. D.), the most important council of the church after the council at Jerusalem, had from fifteen hundred to two thousand attendants;

the Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.) numbered six hundred and thirty bishops and deputies; but the Westminster Assembly never numbered, at any of its sessions, more than ninety-six or one hundred divines; and the average attendance, so Baillie tells us, was about sixty.

The Westminster Assembly was no exception, in many things, to the other great councils of the church. As soon as it convened in Westminster Abbey, we become aware of the fact that it is composed of different, and in some respects conflicting, elements. An earnest effort had been made by the king (at first) and by the Parliament to make the Assembly a fair representation of the religious ideas of all the land. The bill of Parliament abolishing the hierarchy, though never receiving the royal sanction, was virtually an abolition of the existing religious system. In calling the Assembly, then, the purpose of Parliament was twofold: (1), To vindicate the doctrines of the Church of England from misrepresentations, and to show that it was in conformity with the other Reformed churches; (2), To effect those changes in her polity and worship which would bring her into closer union with the churches of Scotland and of the continent. In the royal ordinance for assembling the council, the language was to the effect that each county should send two delegates. All parties and all sections were to be fairly represented. At the first meeting there were present several Episcopalians, and at least one bishop, Non-conformists, Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians. It will be remembered that, after the king opposed the session of the Assembly and issued his condemnation of it, the Episcopalians, who were almost all royalists, left the Assembly. Dr. Featly alone remained, though he also left afterwards. There can be no doubt that the larger element of the Assembly was Presbyterian, yet the tenor of the Assembly was at first by no means decided. It can scarcely be said, with Hetherington, that the "native aim and tendency" of the Assembly was to establish the Presbyterian system in England. English Presbyterianism was, it is true, strong among the more conservative Puritans. Presbyterianism was, perhaps, the predominant system of the Reformed churches of the continent; but the Presbyterian bent given to the Assembly

was largely the result of political complications. It is by no means certain, as Hetherington affirms, that Pym and Hampden favored Presbyterianism by their free choice. It is more probable that Pym was led to favor it from his desire to secure the cooperation of Scotland with the Parliament against the king. This is, doubtless, the reason why the Scottish commissioners were admitted to their seats, and the Scottish League and Covenant was sworn to by both houses of Parliament and by the Assembly. This religious and political league between the two nations brought English statesmen and divines to look with favor on the Presbyterian system, then in operation in Scotland; and this, together with the influence of the Scottish commissioners, gave the dominant Presbyterian tone to the Assembly.

English Presbyterianism was represented in the Assembly by such divines as Gataker, Calamy, Palmer, Vines, and Reynolds. In the House of Commons the chief promoters of Presbytery were William Waller, Stapleton, Clotworthy, Rudyard, Massey, Maynard, and Glynn; but of these only Clotworthy, Glynn, Maynard, and Rudyard were members of the Assembly. By far the most influential commoners who were also members of the Assembly were John Selden, Pym, Sir Oliver St. John, and Sir Harry Vane; and these were opposed to Presbyterianism. Beside the Presbyterian party there was also the Independent element. They were few in number, but shrewd and learned, and of undoubted piety. Altogether they numbered ten or eleven. The leading Independents were Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, Burroughs, Bridge, and Simpson. Of these the most learned and influential was Thomas Goodwin. He was a rigid Calvinist and a fellow of Cambridge University. During the persecutions of the Puritans under Charles I. he fled to Arnheim, Holland, where he preached until his return to England at the calling of the Long Parliament. Goodwin was a great favorite with Cromwell, and was influential in the army. He and the famous John Owen were called "the two Atlases and patriarchs of Independency." Philip Nye was the next in influence in the ranks of the Independents. He was originally a Presbyterian, but is accused of deserting to the Independents as they grew in power. He was a famous de-

bater and ecclesiastical politician, and was in constant touch with Harry Vane and Pym and the other influential Independents of the army. While in the Assembly it was hinted that he was somewhat of a cat's paw in the hands of political leaders. Burroughs was a gentle, lovable man; Bridge was studious and learned; and Simpson was a better preacher than he was a scholar or debater. These were all men tenacious of purpose, often unscrupulous, and, from their political support in Parliament, were far more of a power than would appear from their small number. The Independents were Calvinists, the chief point of difference between them and the Presbyterians being one of polity, not of doctrine. At first the Independents and the Presbyterians were very near together, both being members of the great Puritan party; but the Parliament insisted that the question of church government should be first settled, and this was where they differed. As the controversy increased, the line of demarcation between them grew more and more distinct, until, in February, 1644, the Independents came out in a pamphlet addressed to parliament, and entitled *An Apologetical Narration*. This was understood to be an attempt to win over Parliament to their view, and it deepened the Presbyterian opposition. They made a brave fight, but were overruled in almost all their points.

There was another party in the Assembly who gave rise to another controversy. They were called the Erastians, so named from Erastus, a physician of Heidelberg, who held peculiar views on church government. He taught "that the pastoral office is only persuasive, like that of a professor over his students, without any direct power; that baptism, the Lord's supper, and all other gospel ordinances were free and open to all; and that the minister might state and explain what were the proper qualifications, and might dissuade the vicious and unqualified from the communion, but had no power to refuse it, or to inflict any kind of censure" (Hetherington's *History of the Westminster Assembly*, p. 120); that the punishment of all offences belongs exclusively to the civil magistrate; that the church is simply a "creature of the state." In the Assembly there were only two divines who championed these ideas, the learned John Lightfoot and Thomas Cole-

man. Both were famous oriental scholars and Hebraists. Their influence would seem small amidst the Presbyterian and Independent majority; but we must remember that, though only two of the divines were Erastians, almost the whole of Parliament was of this belief, and in the Assembly they were led by the learned and influential commoner, John Selden, backed by Whitelocke and Sir Oliver St. John. No member of the Assembly was better known, or enjoyed a wider reputation for scholarship, than John Selden. He was called the most learned man in England. The places he filled in the public service and the amount of literary work done by him are amazing. He was a lawyer, and, though he rarely went into court as an advocate, yet he accumulated a considerable fortune from his practice. His literary labors include works on English history and English law, mythology, literary criticism, theology, and oriental antiquities. He published a work on *Titles of Honor* and another on *Syrian Mythology*, which, though two hundred and fifty years old, are still the best of their kind. His work *De Jure Naturali et Gentium juxta Disciplinam Ebræorum* (A. D. 1640) Mr. Hallam pronounces "among the greatest achievements in erudition that any English writer has performed." (*Literature of Europe*, Part III., pages 145, 146.) During these labors he held a seat in Parliament, under the king and afterwards; was active in the impeachment of Buckingham, and in drafting the resolutions against illegal tonnage and poundage. He was a member of the committees which arranged for the impeachment of Stafford and Laud; was twice committed to the Tower himself, and during one imprisonment there wrote a book on a manuscript borrowed from his jailer. Any cause that he might champion could well be thought strong; and he threw all the weight of his vast erudition and political influence in the scale for Erastianism.

It will be seen, then, that these three parties—Presbyterian, Independent, and Erastian—were more equally matched than would at first appear. The Presbyterians were strong numerically, and besides Gataker, Calamy, Palmer, Vines, and Reynolds, any one of whom could be called a "walking library," they had the undivided support of the Scotch commissioners. The Inde-

pendents, though few in number, were supported by the powerful Lords Say, Brooke, and Manchester, of the House of Peers, besides Pym and Vane, of the Commons; and all these were members of the Assembly as well as of Parliament. We have already noted the strength of the Erastians. Their doctrine appealed to the political leaders, for it gave them that control in matters ecclesiastical which they had just wrenched from the king in civil matters. We cannot, even in this short sketch, fail to note four other commissioners, who, while having no vote in the Assembly, exerted a great influence in all its debates and decisions. "The four Scotch divines," says Hetherington, with pardonable pride, "were in every respect distinguished men, and would have been so regarded in any age or country." Of these, Alexander Henderson was, perhaps, the most influential. His learning was general rather than minute, and he was characterized by the two qualities of dignity and comprehensiveness. His influence on his time was far-reaching. He was twice Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and was made rector of the University of Edinburgh. He went with the commissioners of the Scotch Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge and Newcastle. He was the framer of most of the constitution of the Church of Scotland, and "the Solemn League and Covenant was his own composition." "He wrote the principal part of the Confession of Faith with his own hand. The Directory was formed under his eye," and the Form of Government adopted by the Westminster Assembly was a transcript of the one which he had previously drafted for the Church of Scotland. As long as Presbyterians respect their symbols of faith and government, as long as the Presbyterian system is more than a memory or a name, as long as the historian shall still chronicle for us the story of the stormy times of Charles I. and Cromwell, the memory of Alexander Henderson will be revered. He was of the stuff that martyrs are made of. Scarcely less prominent was the figure of George Gillespie. His learning was less comprehensive, but more accurate, than that of Henderson, and his intellectual power and keenness in debate were undisputed. Though but twenty-nine years of age at the time he was sent to the Assembly, and the youngest

man there of any prominence, his learning and brilliance speedily won for him a place among the recognized leaders. He vindicated his powers by holding his own in debate against such men as Selden and Lightfoot, Goodwin and Nye. Both Baillie and Lightfoot, in their journals, seem to acknowledge that he alone fully met Selden's learned argument to prove that the word "church," in Matthew xviii. 17, referred to a temporal and civil, not a spiritual, organization. The tremendous strain of his work told on his constitution, and he left the Assembly, and returned to the land of his fathers to die, in 1648, being just thirty-four years of age. Samuel Rutherford was also eminent as a controversialist, and was twice invited to a professorship in Holland. Robert Baillie, the fourth and last of the Scotch divines, was a man of learning and versatility. He has left, in his journal, a most interesting account of the Assembly's proceedings, written during its sessions.

This is but a brief glance at the main parties and the leading minds of the Assembly. It is through a careful study of these men and of their mental and spiritual development that we get a proper idea of the spirit of the Assembly.

We are told by modern writers that this Assembly was sectional in its character, and that from it we can expect nothing but a sectional creed. We are informed that the culture and intellect of England were not represented in it. We have already mentioned the fact that every effort was made both by the king, before his change of mind, and by the Parliament to secure a fair representation. Every county was to elect two delegates. Mitchell, the very highest authority on this subject, says: "If ever an attempt was made to bring together a synod of men of different judgments in all non-essential matters, it was in the case of the Westminster Assembly." It is argued that there were better men in England, outside of the Assembly, for drafting a representative creed. The most learned man in all England at that time was, doubtless, Archbishop Ussher; and, though not in attendance upon the council, he was invited to a seat; and he, together with Whitgift, Abbott, and Tyndale, was practically in agreement with all their conclusions. Chillingworth and Ralph Cudworth were not there, but both were alluded to approvingly,

and one was appointed to a place in Cambridge University. The Assembly had no lack of learning or culture so long as Twisse, Lightfoot, Coleman, Gataker, Gillespie, and Selden were there. Hallam himself, though prejudiced in favor of episcopacy, said that this gathering was "equal in learning, good sense, and other merits to any Lower House of Convocation that ever made a figure in England." It was ridiculed in the popular doggerel:

"Pretty Synod, does it sit,
Voyn of grace as well as wit,
And makes no canons!

"From the Synod's nonsense and their treason,
And from their catechistic reason,
Good heaven defend us!"

Even men like Milton and Clarendon spoke of it with lofty scorn. But Milton only differed from them in their ideas about divorce, and when we remember the poet's domestic life, perhaps we can excuse him. Clarendon was very careful not to censure them until he had gotten their aid to put Charles II. back upon the throne, and discovered that by neither threat nor promise could he bind them to his will. Nobler than either of these, trustier than them all, is the testimony of the gentle Richard Baxter. He said that, though not learned or worthy enough to be a member himself, he could testify that so far as he was able to judge, never since the apostolic days had a synod of more excellent divines sat in Christendom than this Assembly in Westminster Abbey.

But these Westminster divines rise still higher in our estimation when we remember the fearlessness with which they expressed their convictions, and the consistency with which they lived up to those convictions in after life. There had been other councils in the history of the church, and many noble creeds had been formulated, from the Creed of Nicea to the Creed of the Synod of Dort; but the Westminster Assembly was the first to embody in its canons the great principle which was, indeed, the very root and foundation of Puritanism, namely, liberty of conscience. I know of no nobler declaration in any creed, of no more fearless assertion of religious truth, than is contained in the second section

of the twentieth chapter of the Confession of Faith: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also." Language like this sounds strange in the midst of our civil and religious liberty; but to the men who penned these words they contained living, precious truths. Goodwin and Nye and Bridge and Burroughs learned to love them and battle for them as they lived expatriated in Holland or were deprived of their livings in England. Good old Dr. Twisse could die for them without a living, in almost abject poverty. John Selden felt their force when twice thrown into the Tower for alleged treason in his writings. And the descendants of Henderson and Gillespie and Rutherford and Baillie were willing, if need be, to seal their allegiance to them with their own blood during the bitter persecutions of the Covenanters.

We have been told these men were intolerant. Perhaps many of them were. Baillie thought every one a fool or a knave who did not believe in the divine right of presbytery. We must remember that the act of Parliament for the burning of heretics was still upon the statute books of England. If Presbyterians were intolerant, so were the Independents, as was proven in the early history of New England. And be it remembered that though Presbyterianism was in the ascendancy at this time in England, yet no attempt was made by the Presbyterian majority in the Assembly to force their polity upon the people as was afterwards done by Laud in Scotland. We can, in large measure, forgive the intolerant spirit of some of the members when we remember the spirit of their age. The spirit of the Westminster Assembly was the spirit of Puritan England. The Puritan had witnessed the dissipation of his dream of a universal and tolerant church at the death of Elizabeth. He had watched the lines closing about Protestantism in Germany and France and Holland. He saw with a sinking heart the drift of the religious spirit of the

Stuarts, and as hope died in his soul his mood became hard and stern. In his bitter struggle with the papacy he saw no room for compromise, no place for tolerance. The danger threatening, the precious interests at stake demanded that the line be drawn clearly and strongly between truth as he understood it and loved it, and what he held to be error. This stern, uncompromising spirit told upon his theology. The liberal spirit of the renaissance was crushed. More and Colet were forgotten or ignored, and the men who met in Westminster Abbey were determined to give to the world a system of dogma which, if it partook of their own rigidity, might, at the same time, stand as the bulwark of Protestantism against Rome and the salvation of their distressed church.

Finally, in our study of the spirit and work of these men, one fact cannot escape us. It has been contended that their spirit was the spirit of Augustine and Ambrose, and perhaps it was, but more distinct than the influence of either of these master spirits, overshadowing all else, and like a mighty undercurrent, shaping the drift of the Assembly, was the genius of the great John Calvin. "An original and immortal man," the greatest theologian of the Reformed Church, as he was, I find his imprint upon almost every member of that Assembly. We must remember that though differing in polity and worship, and many minor particulars, yet almost to a man the Assembly was Calvinistic.

Their theology wears the unmistakable stamp of the scholar of Geneva. Like him, they were no fencers in sophistry. Like him, they neither defied, nor destroyed reason. Like him, they took Christ as the supreme head of the church, and the Scriptures as their last authority, and with a logicalness as fearless as it was resistless, they drew their conclusions. Like Calvin, too, their theology radiates from one great central truth—the sovereignty of God. They have stated this in its clearest, most unequivocal terms, and though this doctrine, with its conclusions, has never commended itself to a large part of the Christian world, yet, after all, it is perhaps the most logical of all the systems of religious truth men have ever framed. To these men, as to Calvin, God is always a personal and immanent being. He is not the God of the pantheist revealed in nature's glories; he is not the

God of the deist beyond nature, but the God of the believing saint in every age, who holds in his hands the reins of human destiny. Few men who know anything will dare ridicule the Westminster divines. They were cast in no common mould. Whatever may be the honors the future holds for Presbyterianism they must come in for their share. Whatever contributions to national greatness the Puritan brought to Holland, or England, or America, they must claim as partly their work. So long as the world respects loyalty to conviction, faithfulness to trust, profound learning, and exegetical ability, their memories can never die. An unthinking and frivolous soul may find no charm in their brilliant intellectuality, and the stern logic by which they settled some of the mysteries of divine providence and human destiny. The generation of to-day will hardly build a monument to their memory. Their work, however, will remain as a rich legacy to the world of the loftiest religious enthusiasm of the Reformed Church. They will be revered as the founders of a system of religious dogma, which, in spite of the death knell repeatedly sounded by its enemies, still lives and counts in its train some of the brightest intellects and noblest institutions of learning in this country and Europe. From the rock-bound coasts of New England to the long wash of Pacific Seas, we still mark the imprint of their genius upon the thousands of sturdy yeomanry who are our nation's hope and pride. We know a living church is a growing church, yet we believe that beneath all surface changes lie the foundations of eternal truth. We will receive what these fathers have bequeathed to us; we will construe their message with due regard to the prejudices of their age; yet will we reverently guard the imperishable truth it contains. And when the world has produced another school of scholars as ripe as they, as capable of handling fundamental truth, and as reverent in their dealings with God's inspired word, it will be time enough then to think of replacing their creed with one abreast of the modern world.

JOHN M. MECKLIN.

Dalton, Ga.

VII. THE BLESSED HOPE OF THE LORD'S RETURN.

A PREMILLENNIAL Conference was held in the church of the Holy Trinity in the city of New York, October 30, 31, and November 1, 1878.

Three members of that Conference from the Southern Presbyterian Church prepared a "Declaration of Principles" as held by Premillennarians, which was adopted by a rising vote of more than 2,500 persons, members of and in attendance on the Conference.

That "Declaration" was reaffirmed by the great Conference in Chicago in November, 1886, and has been generally accepted as a correct statement of the principles held and advocated by those who are looking and praying for the return of our Lord in visible bodily presence.

The "Declaration" is as follows:

1. We affirm our belief in the supreme and absolute authority of the written word of God on all questions of doctrine and duty.

2. The prophetic words of the Old Testament Scriptures concerning the first coming of our Lord Jesus Christ were literally fulfilled in his birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension; and so the prophetic words of both the Old and the New Testaments concerning his second coming will be literally fulfilled in his visible bodily return to this earth in like manner as he went up into heaven; and this glorious epiphany of the great God our Saviour Jesus Christ is the blessed hope of the believer and of the church during this entire dispensation.

3. This Second Coming of the Lord Jesus is everywhere in the Scriptures represented as imminent, and may occur at any moment; yet the precise day and hour thereof is unknown to man, and known only to God.

4. The Scriptures nowhere teach that the whole world will be converted to God, and that there will be a reign of universal righteousness and peace before the return of our Lord, but that

only at and by his coming in power and glory will the prophecies concerning the progress of evil and the development of anti-christ, the times of the Gentiles and the ingathering of Israel, the resurrection of the dead in Christ and the transfiguration of his living saints receive their fulfilment and the period of millennial blessedness its inauguration.

5. The duty of the church during the absence of the Bridegroom is to watch and pray, to work and wait, to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and thus hasten the coming of the day of God; and to his latest promise, "Surely I come quickly," to respond, in joyous hope, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

It must be affirmed in advance that there are no "arguments" in support of this doctrine except the teachings of sacred Scriptures.

As man knew nothing whatever in regard to the first advent except what God revealed in the Old Testament, so he knows nothing whatever as regards the second advent except what is revealed by God in both the Old and New Testaments.

In common with our fellow-Christians of all communions, our appeal is to the infallible word of God; apart from this, we have no doctrine to state, no arguments to advance.

1. As a matter of fact, the religion of our Lord and Saviour has at no time prevailed supremely in any one community or country, or city, or race, or nation. It has not prevailed universally on any island, or continent, or hemisphere; nor has it prevailed universally in any one generation. It is an unusual event when all the members of even one family are saved.

God, in sovereign grace, under every dispensation has visited a lost race to take out of it a people for himself. Thus far salvation has been by remnants, and so a remnant shall be saved; the little flock does not win the kingdom and bring the world to Christ, but the Father gives them the kingdom, and for the coming of that kingdom the universal church continues to pray. We may be assured that that kingdom will not come without the bodily presence of the King. He will not be crowned Lord of all unless he is here in person to be crowned. The kindreds and the tribes on

this terrestrial ball will not and cannot crown him until the Lord himself is here.

Where in God's great universe will the coronation of the King take place? Not in some far-off star-world in infinite space; not in some other planet of this solar system; but here on this earth where he was born, and lived, and taught, and died, and was buried, and from which he rose, and to which he will surely come back in like manner as he went up into heaven—whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things.

2. As a matter of fact, the kingdom of heaven has at no time in human history, in no spot on earth, in no community, been so manifested and realized that the prophecies concerning the glories of the coming kingdom have been fulfilled even in any one locality and for one short hour.

The statement just made must be modified. Jesus said to his disciples, "Some standing here shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom"; and after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James and John up into a high mountain and was transfigured, and the kingdom was manifested in power and glory for a short season on that high mount; and then and there our Lord gave the type and first-fruits of what the millennial kingdom will be; but the Lord was there as Son of God and Lord of all worlds in visible bodily presence, and without that presence there was neither visible kingdom nor glory.

When premillennarians talk of the coming kingdom, they mean that the transfiguration scenes will be enacted and multiplied all over the globe, with the Lord himself the great central person, around whom two worlds, the visible and invisible, gather to hold converse and adore. Moses, the representative of the dead in Christ who shall be raised in glory; and Elijah, the representative of the living saints who will be transfigured in a moment at the coming of the Lord, the Father looking down with delight on his beloved Son, and the shekinah glory enfolding all. Anything short of this or less than this is not that kingdom for whose coming our Lord taught us to pray.

The evolution of humanity and the Christianization of the

nations fall immeasurably below the object-lesson of the kingdom as presented by the King himself on the mount. Transfiguration and glorification will be the essential characteristics and qualities of the millennial kingdom.

Dr. Nathaniel West says: "Christian chiliasm or premillennarianism is the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ upon earth one thousand years after the Beast, False Prophet, and Apostate Christendom have been judged and punished in a common doom. It is the doctrine of a visible and external sovereignty of Christ upon earth as the outcome of history, the redeemed church of all ages rejoicing in the fulness of a resurrection life, in the actual presence of him who is the Prince of the kings of the earth," a kingdom of outward glory, established upon the ruin of the polities of all nations, wide as the canopy of heaven. It is a kingdom spiritual, in which carnal beatitudes have no place, the beggarly elements of Judaism no honor; a kingdom terrestrial and yet celestial, not of this world but of heaven; one in which Jew and Gentile incorporated together share the victory, blessedness, holiness, dominion and communion of their Lord.

3. As a matter of fact, the Old Testament contains many predictions of the visible bodily advent of the Son of God on this earth of ours; these predictions extend over four thousand years, and embrace details of time, place, circumstances, nations, race, tribe, etc., etc. No Christian interpreter of Scripture has had the temerity to assert that these predictions were fulfilled at the flood, or the call of Abram, or the giving of the law, or the conquest of Canaan, or the establishment of the monarchy, or the Babylonish captivity, or the return of Israel from exile—they were fulfilled literally and exactly in the coming into this world of Jesus of Nazareth, Son of Mary, Son of God, the promised seed of the woman, and in his life, death and resurrection; and men saw and heard and handled this Eternal Life.

So the Scriptures of both Testaments contain many predictions of a second advent of this same glorious person. One verse in every three hundred and twenty-five out of a total of seventy-nine hundred and fifty-nine verses of the New Testament, or one verse in every twenty-five, speaks directly or indirectly of this

second coming. This same Jesus who is taken up into heaven is to return in like manner to this earth.

How ineffable the folly of that Biblical exegete who vacates these Scriptures of all significance by spiritualizing them into the day of Pentecost, the destruction of Jerusalem, the spread of Christianity, the death of the believer. As well teach that the promise of the seed of the woman was fulfilled in the destruction wrought by the deluge, or that it was fulfilled in the death of Moses, or the conquests of David, or the translation of Elijah.

The same canons of interpretation that allow such amazing liberties with the predictions of Scripture as to the Parousia of our Lord would, if applied to the Old Testament prophecies of the advent of the Messiah, rob the human race of its Divine Redeemer, and enthrone Death, the last enemy, as the supreme object of hope to all believers under both dispensations.

We insist that the same rules of interpretation must be applied to the entire series of prophecies which speak of the personal Christ. If all predictions concerning his first advent found a literal fulfilment in his bodily presence, so will all those as to his second coming find the same kind of fulfilment.

4. As a matter of fact, the church is to-day, as for eighteen centuries past, praying "thy kingdom come." The kingdom is here now in germ, in individual hearts, but not yet come in visible sovereignty, in power and glory; nor will that kingdom ever so come until the King himself returns.

There is no faintest hint in the New Testament that the world or the church will be essentially different from what they are now until he comes, who shall make all things not "better, but new."

The phrase, "the conversion of the world," is slowly but surely giving way to the phrase, "the evangelization of the world." The conversion of this world under this dispensation is nowhere predicted in the Scriptures or promised in the New Testament. Before the return of our Lord, the gospel of the kingdom will be preached among all nations as God's witness. The nations or the Gentiles will be visited, and God's people "taken out."

The present mixed condition of light and darkness, good and

evil, belief and unbelief, salvation and damnation, will continue until the end of the age. The gospel net is still taking fish, both good and bad; the wheat and tares in the same field are both growing, and growing together. The great Teacher tells us this will continue until the Son of man shall send forth his angels and make the final separation at the end of this dispensation. "The harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels."

The parables of our Lord, setting forth the essential principles of the kingdom of heaven, find their solution in the return of the Lord himself. The nobleman who went into a far country to receive a kingdom "returned"; the ten virgins, the five wise and the five foolish, hear at midnight the cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him"; the seed sown by the children of the kingdom is caught away by the devil until the end of the age; the devil continues to sow tares until the time of the harvest, when the tares shall be bound in bundles for the burning.

No candid and honest man can deny that the present mixed condition of all human affairs will continue until the return of the Lord himself at the end of the world (age).

The return of Christ is not only "the" hope, but "the blessed hope," of the believer and of the church during these wilderness days, when the Bridegroom is absent.

These are the time, and times, and half a time of the prophet Daniel; the forty and two months of the downtreading of the holy city; the twelve hundred and sixty days of the Apocalypse, when the bride laments the absence of the Bridegroom and prays for his coming; when the little flock is awaiting the return of the great Shepherd; and when, because iniquity doth abound, the love of many has waxed cold. The Chinese empire and the Romish hierarchy claim that the kingdom of heaven is realized in millennial splendor, within the limits of their respective jurisdictions, here on earth and at present; and that nothing more is to be desired than the extension of these empires. Postmillennarians seem to think that the extension and establishment of the church of to-day is all that is necessary to inaugurate the kingdom of heaven here on earth. In view of this theology, the absence of

The King himself has nothing whatever to do with the establishment of the kingdom, or the coronation of the King. Postmillennarians say, The kingdom without the King; premillennarians say, No kingdom without the King.

“And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.”

He would be a rash man who should assert that “this gospel of the kingdom” either had or had not, at this day, been “preached in the whole earth for a testimony unto all nations.” The nations of Asia heard it from Solomon, Jonah, and Daniel, and other prophets; the nations of Greece and Rome heard it from the lips of Christ and the apostles; the Queen of Sheba and the chamberlain of Candace took it with them to their homes in the uttermost parts of the earth; North Africa was the home of flourishing missionary churches as early as the third century; the nations of Europe have all been evangelized; at this moment mission stations and gospel lights girdle the globe, while millions of copies of this gospel of the kingdom, in three hundred and seventy-five of the languages and dialects of the earth, proclaim, as with tongues of fire, “Watch therefore: for ye know not what day your Lord cometh.” What is necessary to the fulfilment of this prediction? (Matt. xxiv. 14.) Who shall tell?

5. The condition of the church and of the world at the return of the King.

If the present dispensation is to end in universal righteousness and peace, then how shall one interpret those Scriptures that describe the condition of the race as one of apostasy and abounding iniquity at the Parousia of the Lord Jesus Christ?

The great Teacher sent from God foretold this condition in language that cannot be misunderstood. He selects two events of Old Testament history as unmistakable examples of the condition of the world at his coming, the destruction of the world by the flood, and the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah. Luke xvii. 26–30: “And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed

them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

The days immediately preceding the coming of the Son of man are described in language of dread sublimity: "Iniquity shall abound; the love of many shall wax cold"; if possible, amid the multiplicity of antichrists, false teachers, and false prophets, the very elect shall be deceived. The apostles repeat the solemn warnings of their Master, and tell us of the man of sin sitting in the temple of God, opposing, and exalting himself above God, with power and signs and lying wonders; of the perilous times of the last days, the seducing spirits, the teachings of demons, the forms of godliness without power; of scoffers and antichrists and persecutions and apostasies. When John, in the seventeenth chapter of Revelation, sees the woman of the twelfth chapter, the symbol of the church, arrayed in purple and scarlet, decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, riding forth on the scarlet-covered beast with seven heads and ten horns, the symbol of the "world-power" in its totality, no wonder that, as he beholds the horrible transformation of the woman into the harlot, he wondered with great amazement.

"Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"

6. The doctrine of this blessed hope has suffered much at the hands of its advocates. Some premillennarians have attempted to fix the times and dates of the future events connected with the return of our Lord; and some have even arranged the exact order in which these events will occur, and have affirmed that they cannot occur in any other. Elaborate charts and diagrams showing the precise chronological succession of the "last things" have been laboriously prepared and triumphantly exhibited; and the "propheic times" have been calculated to the day and the hour. These attempts at prophecy have tended to bring the "blessed hope" itself into disrepute with thoughtful Christians, who are unwilling to be taught by those who are wise above what is writ-

ten. Of that day knoweth no man; and the times and seasons the Father hath reserved to himself.

The "day of the Lord" is a definite period of time—definite in its *a quo* and *ad quem*, but, most probably, not a day of four-and-twenty hours, but a period of very considerable duration.

If the coming of Christ is to close this dispensation, and with it to settle all of its unsolved problems, namely, the Restoration of the Jews, the Times of the Gentiles, the development of Antichrist, the Apostasy of the visible church, the Evangelization of the nations, the Resurrection of the righteous dead, the Transfiguration of the living, the Creation of the New heavens and the New earth, it is manifest that nothing less than omniscience can give us an infallible order; and this order is not revealed in the word of God. All efforts to find an "order" in the Scriptures must bear constantly in mind the law of prophetic perspective. The prophet, looking down the centuries and across continents and oceans, sees two or more objects of prophetic revelation in the same line, and apparently in immediate proximity; but when the traveller draws near the first object he finds that the second and third are still far off in the distance.

The day of the Lord is "near" or remote, according to the standard or scale by which we measure duration. "It is plain that that period which is distant in one scheme of things may be near in another, where events are on a vaster scale and move in a mightier orbit. That which is a whole life to the ephemera is but a day to the man; that which in the brief succession of authentic human history is counted as remote is but a single page in the volume of the heavenly records. The coming of Christ may be distant as measured on the scale of human life, but may be 'near' and 'at hand' and 'at the door' when the interval of the two advents is compared, not merely with the four thousand years which were but its preparation, but with the line of infinite ages which it is itself preparing."

The Scriptures represent the Parousia of Christ as always imminent. "Imminence is the combination of two conditions, viz., certainty and uncertainty. An imminent event is one which is certain to occur at some time, uncertain at what time." The

event of our Lord's Return is certain; the precise time of that Return is uncertain. He may come at any moment.

The entire teachings of Christ and the apostles were intended and calculated to produce in the hearts of Christians the hope and the expectation of his return. They were exhorted to wait for the Son from heaven, to watch for the coming of the Son of man, to be ready for him at any moment. The time was so absolutely uncertain that none but a wicked and slothful servant would say, "My Lord delayeth his coming." And this method of teaching did keep alive in the hearts of apostolic Christians the eager expectation and the longing desire and hope for their Lord's return. Believers this day are eighteen centuries nearer this coming than were the men who lived in the first century. What is the attitude of the church towards his second advent? Is there, throughout the church, the eager hope, the longing desire, for the Lord's return that characterized the church of the first three Christian centuries? Do the ministers hold up, according to the proportion of faith, the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ? Is there, on the part of believers, a waiting watchfulness for the coming of the Son of man?

Surely the heart of every saint ought to thrill with unutterable joy at the thought of beholding the glorified form of the Son of man. It is not yet manifest what we shall be; but when he is manifested, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.

The world once saw him in the shame and the agony of the cross; the world shall once again see him coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. Surely I come quickly, saith the Lord. Let our hearts and lips respond, Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

A. W. FITZER.

Washington, D. C.

VIII. ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ.

SAYINGS OF OUR LORD.

THIS is the title given by the discoverers to a recently-found Greek manuscript.¹ Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, working last winter under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, selected as the scene of their operations a village on the edge of the Libyan Desert, one hundred and twenty miles south of Cairo, bearing the modern name of Behnesa. This village occupies a part of the site of Oxyrhynchus, a flourishing town in Roman times, and one of the chief centres of early Christianity. It declined rapidly after the Arabian conquest, and for centuries its buildings had been used as a quarry for bricks and stones. Hence, it was probable that papyri, if found here at all, would be, not in houses, but in heaps of rubbish, where old documents had been thrown out. Search was made in one of the mounds, and was richly rewarded. In some cases documents were found by the basketful, occasionally even in the original basket. Two men were kept busy making tin boxes for the reception of the papyri, as it is important, in studying any particular manuscript, to know what documents were found together. The boxes were necessary, also, for the safe transportation of the papyri, as the condition of those found in rubbish heaps is generally very fragmentary, and at the best there is often a good deal of which nothing can be made.

The manuscript in question is a single leaf, $5\frac{3}{4} \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ inches, written on both sides in Greek uncials, or rounded capitals; there are

¹ *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ*, SAYINGS OF OUR LORD. *Edited, with Translation and Comments, by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt.* From this pamphlet have been derived the Greek text and the translations given in this article, together with many of the comments. The pamphlet can be obtained from Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press (American Branch), 91 and 93 Fifth avenue, New York. It is published in board covers, with two collotypes, for fifty cents. There is a very satisfactory edition in paper covers, with two plates, showing the two sides of the manuscript, for fifteen cents.

about forty lines of text in all. Attention was first drawn to this leaf by the word *κάρφος* (mote), which one of the explorers noticed. This at once suggested the passages in Matthew and Luke about the mote and the beam. Further study of the document led to its prompt publication as containing matter of unusual interest.

We subjoin the corrected Greek text, omitting a few letters of words which have not been entirely made out. Letters in square brackets have been restored by the editors. Accents, breathings, and punctuation marks are entirely wanting in the manuscript.

THE LOGIA.

1. καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
2. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὕψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.
3. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἔ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶρον πάντας μεθύνοντας καὶ οὐδένα εἶρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοὶ εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν.
4. πτωχία.
5. [λέ]γει [Ἰησοῦς ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ᾤσιν . . . καὶ . . . ε[. . .] ἔστιν ὁ μόνος . . . ἐγὼ εἶμι μετ' αὐτ[οῦ]. ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθον κακεῖ εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ ἐκεῖ εἶμι.
6. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[οῦ], οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.
7. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, πόλις ἠνοδομημένη ἐπ' ἄκρον [ῶ]ρους ὕψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηρικμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε χρυ[β]ῆναι.
8. Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἀκούεις

TRANSLATION.

1. And then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.
2. Jesus saith, Except ye fast [to] the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.
3. Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart.
4. poverty. . . .

5. Jesus saith, Wherever there are and there is one alone I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me: cleave the wood, and there am I.
6. Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him.
7. Jesus saith, A city built upon the top of a high hill and stablished can neither fall nor be hid.
8. Jesus saith, Thou hearest

Logia 2, 3, and 5 contain matter not found in the New Testament; 4 and 8 are almost entirely illegible.

Logion 1 resembles Luke vi. 42 and Matthew vii 5. In Logion 2 the accusative *κόσμον* with *νηστεύσητε* seems very harsh. Professor J. Rendel Harris quotes a passage from Clement of Alexandria in which this verb is used with the genitive—"fast *from* the world." The same passage of Clement refers to keeping the Sabbath by *refraining from sins*. Professor Harris concludes that both parts of this logion are to be taken in a spiritual sense, and strengthens this position by reference to Justin, who says: "Learn to fast the *true fast*, . . . [and do not] think yourselves pious if you are idle for one day. . . . If there is an adulterer, let him repent, and thus he has *sabbatized the true* and delightful *Sabbath of God*."

Logion 3 recalls the lament over the city. (Matthew xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34.) The word "athirst" is found in Matthew v. 6, and the general tenor of the logion in John i. 10.

Logion 4 is almost entirely illegible. The word *πρωχσία* (prowerty) does not occur in any saying of Christ recorded in the Gospels, so this logion seems to be new.

The first part of Logion 5 is mutilated, and it is doubtful how it should be emended. One suggestion is to read *εἰς* before *ἐστίν*, and the meaning may then be that wherever there are several believers, or even only one, Jesus is present; and this part affords a general parallel to Matthew xviii. 20. The second part is the most striking in the whole document. It may be a statement of the presence of Christ in all things. "Raise the stone" and

“cleave the wood” may refer to the common vocation of the laborer, and would give the promise that Christ is ever present, even with the humblest believer. Other interpretations have been suggested, but they are more or less fanciful.

Logion 6 suggests Luke iv. 24 and parallel passages in the other evangelists. The last part reminds us of verse 23 in the same chapter of Luke: “Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country.”

Logion 7 is like Matthew v. 14, with additions that seem to be borrowed from the parable of the house built upon a rock (Matt. vii. 24, 25); but, as the editors say, there is no real fusion of the passages, since there is no reference to the rock, which is the essential point of the parable.

Logion 8 is too defective to afford any clue as to its meaning.

The papyri found in the immediate vicinity of this fragment belong to the second and third centuries of our era. This fact, with the character of the handwriting, fixes 300 A. D. as the lowest date at which the papyrus could have been written. The fact that the manuscript is a leaf from a book and not a part of a roll, together with other signs, puts the upper limit at about 150 A. D. The discoverers are inclined to date the manuscript not long after 200 A. D., thus placing it a hundred years before our oldest manuscripts of the Gospels. The date of the *composition* may be earlier. “Since the papyrus itself was written not much later than the beginning of the third century, this collection of sayings must go back at least to the end of the second century. But the internal evidence points to an earlier date. The primitive cast and setting of the sayings, the absence of any consistent tendency in favor of any particular sect, the wide divergencies in the familiar sayings from the text of the Gospels, the striking character of those which are new, combine to separate the fragment from the apocryphal literature of the middle and latter half of the second century, and to refer it back to the period when the canonical Gospels had not yet reached their preëminent position.” The editors suggest that the fragment may be what it professes to be, a collection of some of our Lord’s sayings, and they may embody a tradition independent of those which have

taken shape in our canonical Gospels. Paul, in his address to the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 35), gives us a saying of Christ not found in the Gospels, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"; and Luke, in his preface, and John, in his conclusion, both intimate that there were things done and said by Christ which they have not recorded. It is possible that we have here a concrete example of what was meant by the Hebrew Logia, which Papias, a bishop of the first half of the second century, tells us were compiled by Matthew, and the *λόγια κυριακά*, upon which Papias himself wrote a commentary, though there is no actual connection of this fragment with either.

Many interesting questions are raised by this discovery, for the solution of which the data are as yet insufficient. In the words of another: "It may be that this is a stray leaf from the collection of some early Christian, such as any one might gather either for private or public use. The fact that we have here a small collection of sayings differing from any of the recorded sayings of Christ in the canonical or the apocryphal Gospels favors the supposition that the ancient collectors used considerable liberty in the selection and wording of their material. Indeed, these sayings may have fallen from the lips of early Christian teachers whose identity is now unknown. Be that as it may, the wise thing at present is to wait for further light; for he who now speaks most dogmatically concerning the Logia may soon have abundant reason for changing his opinion." G. F. NICOLASSEN.

Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DABNEY'S PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY.

THE PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY; being the Philosophy of the Feelings, of the Will, and of the Conscience, with the Ascertainment of Particular Rights and Duties. By R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., late Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia. Edited by Rev. S. B. Ervin, Mexico, Mo. Published by the Crescent Book House, Mexico, Mo. 1897. Pp. 521.

The writer, in common with a host of others, hails with delight the appearance of this most interesting and wonderful book. It is the latest, ripest, and best fruit of the great author's consecrated, laborious life. For practical uses to the busy pastor Dabney's *Theology* will for ages be, in its line, of incomparable value. In its own sphere a like eminence is predicted of his *Practical Philosophy*. It will mark an epoch in moral science. It will forge its way to the forefront and claim the chief place in the class-room as a text-book, not only in the conservative South, but, also, wherever men are found who love the truth, who want to walk in its light, and desire to be guided by its counsels. The material and mechanical parts of the work are poor, affording but a homely body for a grand soul. This, however, is not the subject that concerns us.

The volume is made up of four books. The first book, consisting of ten chapters, treats of the *psychology of the feelings*; the second, consisting of three chapters, treats of *the will*; the third, containing seven chapters, treats of the *theories of the ethical sentiments*; and the fourth, containing nine chapters, treats of *applied ethics*.

Let it be understood, at once, that our author "ploughs with no man's heifer." While the reader who is conversant with the literature of this science will see on every page proof of elaborate reading and profound acquaintance with the great masters of the science, he will find that our author has thought for himself, and preferred to express his thoughts in words of his own choosing. As, at once, evidence of this and an introduction to the book, we quote the following, which explains itself :

"Let the word *feelings* stand as the universal term, including all forms of sensibility and of desire and of emotion. Let the word *sensibility* stand for our passive feelings in which the soul is simply subject and not agent. Let the word *desires* or *appetencies* stand for those opposite feelings, in which the soul acts from within outwards, by the outflow of its own spontaneity. It will be understood that we include under the term *appetencies* those repulsions which are really the counterparts of appetencies, and are yet equally with them the outgoings of the subjective spontaneity."

The distinction here clearly stated between sensibility and appetency has its parallel in anatomy, in the two sets of nerves; one extending from the surface of

the body to the nerve-centres, to carry impressions inward, and another extending from the nerve-centres to the muscles, to carry impressions (or expressions?) outward—the sensitive nerves, and the motor nerves. This distinction pervades the entire book. It is psychologically sound and bears a conspicuous part in determining many questions of ethical science. The sensibilities (passive feelings) are not discussed at any great length, because they seem to be better understood, and there is less controversy about them, or about questions arising out of them. What our author means by “appetencies” and dispositions out of which desires arise needs to be carefully considered. Dispositions are fixed properties of the soul, their stability giving continuity to character. As soon as a man discloses to us any depraved disposition we henceforth expect on suitable occasions that he will act as prompted by it, because we know dispositions abide the same unless they are changed by Almighty grace. It is the common sense of mankind that dispositions do not change. Yet, each disposition is the source of its own appetite; and this, in turn, predetermines what is pleasing or repulsive to it. Such, stated as accurately as can be done in a few words, is the general foundation and starting-point of the book. In the classification of feelings the author justly criticises the distribution of some to the category of pleasure, and the rest to that of pain, as if this were a scientific distinction; whereas, it is only to state a contrast of result, so to speak, from rousing them into activity. They may be different in nature (a beautiful scene—a grand exhibition of moral courage) and give us pleasure, or different in kind and cause us pain. Yet loose and unscientific as this classification is, life is made up of pleasures and pains. Another distribution is into desires and aversions. This is the echo of the other, for we desire the pleasures and are averse to the pains. A third classification is on the ground that some are corporeal, and some are spiritual. Instinctive desires are referred to the corporeal, and rational to the spiritual. In regard to the moral faculty, our author says: “We apply the term ‘conscience’ to that power by which we judge our own affections and actions as right or wrong.” The general analysis or exhibition of how this faculty or power is brought into play is excellent. We prefer, however, a more analytic statement of this power. Conscience, in our opinion, is not technically a faculty. It is the joint product of the intellectual and emotional powers. In it the mind sees and the heart feels, concurrently and harmoniously. It is a complex exercise of the soul. We see this plainly brought out a few lines below, in this question: “Are not self-approbation and remorse far keener than the moral feelings for our neighbor’s virtue or sin? They are, usually; but this is sufficiently explained by these facts: I know that I am responsible for my own virtues or vices, as I am not for my neighbor’s; and the emotions of desire for my own well-being combine their force with the moral emotion.” The intellectual part is brought out in the words “*I know*,” and the emotional part is expressly mentioned. We should not have remarked on this slight divergence of views, but for the fact that psychologists so commonly treat the head and the heart, the intellect and the emotions, as if they were totally separate and madly hostile. We are aware that sin has set a man at war with himself and broken up that uniform concurrence of our whole nature in all truth, duty, and righteousness, but the destruction is not complete, and the harmonies yet left are numerous and happy, pleasing relics of ancient glory, while the discords are terrible premonitions of the chaos and wretchedness of the lost. The general view of the writer hereon does not diverge from the gen-

eral position taken in this treatise. On the contrary it often says, "Feeling is the temperature of thought": *i. e.*, where the feeling arises from thinking.

Just here we want to say we regard the book before us as uniquely and immensely valuable for this reason. that it founds its theoretical psychology on the human soul as it is now in its fallen estate, and not on an ideal conception of what it ought to be, and perhaps was before sin entered into it. To assert an absolute and uniform harmony between the intelligence and the feelings, or between the feelings themselves, is to contradict the plainest testimony of consciousness and the voice of God at the same time. It may be splendid theorizing, but it is not in accord with the facts. Conscience could never bear witness against us if something were not wrong, and its smitings are God's own refutation of our pretended innocence.

We hasten on now to the examination of the second book, treating of the will. We regard our author's discussion of this subject as being as nearly perfect as anything we ever read in the way of solidity and strength. The diction is easy-flowing, graceful, and clear, while the logic is irrefragable.

The act of willing in the author's view is substantially the parallel of the act of conscience as held by the writer, a joint act of appetency and intellection. Where an act of body is spontaneous, unimpeded, and complete, it is the outward expression, the echo, the exact disclosure of the precedaneous act of will, and as we may gain a very full and clear idea of an unseen man from the study of his well-executed photograph, so may we form a very accurate idea of the act of will, *Τὸ θελεῖν*, from a study of its execution. Here, *e. g.*, is a happy young man pursuing the peaceful and honorable avocation of farming. Suddenly a call is made for soldiers to repel an invading foe. He leaves his plow in the field, bids farewell to mother, father, and all the endearing ties of home, and takes his place in the ranks of his compatriots, and soon we see his transformed, manly person leading and cheering while together they rush upon the foe. We now inquire, was there not some time a definite act of will that transformed our farmer boy into a patriotic, heroic soldier? Granting that there were thousands of other and less important acts, we limit our inquiry to the one when, as we say, he decided to abandon the life of a farmer for that of a soldier. Was that act of will as devoid of rationality as is the motion of a weather-cock? Was it equally devoid of patriotic emotion? Was not this judgment powerfully opposed by his knowledge of the happiness of his home, the grief his course would bring to his mother and the rest, and the horrors of a soldier's life, and also by the cruelty of his calling? Was there no conflict of feelings? Was his will completely divorced from his intelligence and emotion, and was that act of will an uncaused phenomenon? It would seem a rational impossibility for one to form an erroneous judgment on so plain a matter, and the affirmation that the will must be undetermined absolutely by either or both reason and feeling demonstrates the great power of prejudice (itself a feeling, and not a very creditable one) in coercing the conclusions to which men will come. The man who is thus deprived of his reason and controlled by passion is nearer than any other man to being deprived of that very free agency which he abnegates his reason to sustain, and a slave of the very mechanical impulses which he feigns to abhor—in a word, is a low order of man. But, to return: The will of the young man, or the specific act of deciding what he should do, was the outcome of much earnest thinking and of many conflicts of feeling,

was the concurrent aggregate result, expressing at once the prevailing judgment of the mind and the dominant set of emotions of his soul. The act of will was the resultant of many causes coöperating or conflicting, and *was determined*. If it is attempted by juggling with words and enveloping the subject in fog to reply by saying the same facts were brought to bear on all the young men of that State, and should have had equal weight with all, should equally have determined all, the answer is: All were not equally intelligent, emotional, patriotic. The endless diversity of conduct, of course, discloses an equal diversity of acts of will, but this diversity of acts *results from the same in the young men*, and not from an automatic, arbitrary, senseless will. We confess our inability to conceive of a rational, moral agent, fallen or unfallen, over whose volitions his intelligence and emotional nature, native or concreated, had absolutely no control. An act of willing is mainly an act of choosing, but choosing is an act of the mind, implying two or more objects of choice, or at least the privilege of accepting or rejecting if but one object is presented. An act of choice also always presupposes an act of desire, a feeling. Even when the thing chosen (say one egg from many in a dish), where the question, "Which one shall I take?" has no weight, the party must, at least, desire an egg, or he will say, "No, I thank you!" Desire, strong or weak, simple or complex, must be present. There is often a conflict between the judgment and the feelings, and we say truly of some, they have their feelings under the control of a clear strong judgment, and of others, their better judgment was dominated by their feelings. If the judgment rules, where is the will found—hid away in the reason? If the passions rule, where is the will—hid away in them? Is the faculty a peripatetic? Is it behind the intellect, telling it when to act and when to be inactive? or behind the emotions, dominating them? or does it antecede dispositions predetermining what shall, and what shall not, be agreeable to them? or does it wait till all rational, moral, and emotional matters have had their say, and then determine the volition irrespective of all that has gone before? If so, how can the fact be explained that the soul always acts according to laws? How can a man's volitions be anticipated? How can he be a free agent? How can he be responsible? His volitions are the progeny of his will, and he has absolutely no control over it; in what sense, then, are they his, and how is he responsible for them?

Dr. Dabney takes the ground that man's native dispositions are the respective fountains of his appetencies, that these dispositions are primary, elementary, radical, constitutive, originating, but not originated; that emotions flow from these fountains rationally, *i. e.*, under the control, to some extent, of the judgment, and spontaneously, *i. e.*, free from every kind and degree of compulsion, and also orderly, that is, each one toward its own object seen to be such, and under the regulative laws for its rise and flow. Let him speak for himself:

"Our deliberate volitions are always conditioned on objects. Only such outward things can be objects to our volitions as have a relevancy to our own appetencies and are apprehended as attainable in our own judgment. Our appetencies are subjective. To sum up: Our own rational preference (*libentia rationalis*), the conjoined function of judgment and of appetency, prompts our own volition. It is then neither the work of intelligence nor of the feeling separately, but of the spirit acting in both these concurrent modes." (P. 141.)

We have long felt that too much stress has been laid on the word *faculty*.

The conception that the faculties of the soul, like the organs of the body, are separate, distinct powers, having nothing in common, is far beyond the truth. The soul must not be thought of as a medley of faculties, each to be treated as an individual. Dr. Haven says:

“A faculty is the mind’s power of acting; . . . the mind has as many distinct faculties as it has distinct powers of action. . . . As its capabilities of action and operation differ, so its faculties differ.” (*Ment. Phil.*, p. 29.)

He immediately warns his readers against pushing these faculties so far as to militate against the unity of the mind. Our author disposes of this point thus:

“Faculties act upon faculties efficiently and according to their regulative laws as thought upon feeling and judgment, and appetencies upon volitions. But faculties are not parts or members of the spirit; the spirit has no parts. What we call thought, if not a mere abstract notion, is the soul thinking: feelings are the soul feeling; judgments are the soul judging; appetencies are the soul craving, and volitions are the soul willing. But this soul is all the time the indivisible unit.”

These are wise and weighty words; and we take the liberty of adding that these modes of action blend into each other much after the fashion that the colors of the rainbow shade into each other, and find their unity in the soul just as these colors do in light.

Dr. Dabney has done psychology great service in sharpening and emphasizing the distinction between “free agency” and “free will.” One of the greatest, best, acutest living writers says:

“I shall not pause here to discuss the unnecessary question, whether there is not a difference between the freedom of the will and the freedom of the man; but shall assume that there is no such difference worth contending about, since the will is precisely the power through which the freedom of the man expresses itself. To affirm or deny the freedom of the will is the same thing as to affirm or deny the freedom of the man.”

Side by side with this strong language by a strong man, we shall put these words:

“Consciousness, their rationality, our foreknowledge of them and power of influencing them, the bias to the *summum bonum*, the analogy of other just beings and of God, all prove that the will is determined by motives and subjective determination or free agency.”

If an unimpeded, complete action is the exact counterpart or echo of the volition, and if the faculty of will was determined by precedaneous motives and a judgment of the mind to make that volition, however spontaneous it may have been in doing so, the real cause of the volition lies back of the will in the intellect and the appetencies. We deny vehemently that freedom or spontaneity is localized in one faculty, called the will, and affirm that it is common to every active spiritual function. We must here let Dr. Dabney speak for himself:

“Another ambiguity still more mischievous is found in the current phrase, ‘the freedom of the will.’ Locke has very clearly raised the question of the propriety of this phrase by asking whether freedom or liberty is not always thought of as the attribute of a personal agent, and not of a faculty or power. This question discloses the confusion of the statement. It is the human spirit that is free in all its responsible volitions, and not the faculty of will. Were freedom ascribed to any other faculty or power of the spirit the absurdity would be at once apparent. Who talks of the liberty of sense-perception, or of association

and memory, or of deduction, or of the freedom of pain or pleasure? The only sense in which the question can be entertained whether 'the will is free,' is whether the person is free who wills. The only result which has followed from this deceptive statement is a deplorable confusion of two opposite theories, of which the one asserts the self-determination of the soul in its volitions, and the other asserts the self-determination of the faculty of volitions, as related to the other faculties in the soul. Well would it be for philosophy had the misleading phrase, 'freedom of the will,' never been written, and had all agreed to call this prerogative of the rational spirit 'free agency.' This we propose to do henceforth. Turretin, indeed, while anticipating Locke in his objection, consents to retain the phrase 'free will,' though under protest, because of its obstinate currency in philosophy. But he stipulates that it shall mean no more than the freedom of the spirit willing. Far better would it be to expel this fountain of errors from our nomenclature. The confusions of view it introduces are well illustrated by another favorite phrase, 'free thought.' A certain class of men profess to glory in free thought. But common sense asks: Is thought free? or is it the man who thinks that is free? This very class of writers deny with emphasis that thought is free. For in passionately asserting their irresponsibility for their opinions (the fruits of their thinking) they always base that claim on the doctrine that opinion is psychologically necessitated, and that belief follows the intellection of evidence by an inevitable law of the reason, which, they say, is as truly above the control of the will as the motions of the planets in their orbits. So after founding their license in dogmatizing upon the assumption that rational thought is necessitated, they still boast in their 'free thought.' This absurdity is no greater than the parallel one so often met with in the sophistical assertion of free will."

Bene sapienterque dixisti, magister, nam verum verbum est hoc. The whole fabric of free agency, of accountability, and of psychology itself stands, if volitions are caused phenomena, tumbling, if they are not. A will has no intelligence of its own. If the soul's intelligence does not affect its determinations, they are irrational, and, therefore, non-moral. Conduct dictated by an irrational volition must itself be irrational, and, therefore, non-moral. The man's conduct is neither self-expression, nor self-assertion. Alas! how much mischief there may be in a little word or phrase.

In bringing our review of the second book, the one on the will, to an end we wish to commend these three chapters without any limit. They are worth the book many times over. They accurately expound the psychology of the will, immutably ground a sound ethical or moral science, and beautifully quadrate with every demand of orthodox theology, or of divine revelation.

We now take up the third book, which treats of *theories of the ethical sentiments*. In chapter I. the "ethical functions are described," and "the *a priori* character of the intuition of right and wrong" is affirmed and contrasted with rival theories. We quote:

"The moral sentiments are those expressed in the following terms, which we hear everywhere, and which all of us use. We speak of feelings and actions which are right, and of others which are wrong. We say that we approve the former while we blame the latter. We contrast virtue with vice, or righteousness with sinfulness. Some men we call good, and others evil. We speak of loving the former and disliking the latter, sometimes with stronger emphasis, as despising, or hating, or abhorring them. We call the good man deserving, and the evil, undeserving, or positively ill-deserving. We call the one class meritorious, and the other guilty. We speak of our rights, by which we seem to mean our possessions and privileges, to which we are morally entitled. To respect these rights, we call justice; to disregard them, we call injustice. We speak of duty and obligation: duty being some action which is due (*debitum*); and obligation a species of bind-

ing (*obligare*) to the conduct which is due. We say of right actions, that we are bound to do them. We use of these actions the verb 'ought,' and of their opposites the negative 'ought not.' We often speak, as of a faculty of our spirits, of our consciences; and while the word is from the Latin *conscientia*, from which we derive our term 'consciousness,' the subjective faculty of universal apperception, by which the soul knows every distinct process, whether of cognition, feeling or volition, which has place within it, we limit the term 'conscience' to this moral consciousness. By it we mean this particular faculty, which judges of all the concepts and sentiments described above. We speak of our consciences as commanding us, as obliging us, as constraining us, as forbidding, as approving or condemning; we speak of the whole class of its judgments as a law. We intuitively expect reward when conscious of doing right, and punishment for doing wrong. We always impute to our fellow-men a title to the one or to the other, as we judge their feelings and actions to be right or wrong. . . . It is the feelings and actions which we judge right, and these alone which we deem obligatory and approvable, and virtuous, and meritorious of reward; and the wrong feelings and actions are the logical contraries to those, and are what we deem vicious, forbidden, blameworthy, and deserving of punishment.

"The question of origin. Are they distinct products of an intuitive faculty?"

"The questions concerning these sentiments, which have been discussed for ages, are those of their nature and source. Is there an original moral faculty in the human spirit, one of the fundamental constituents of its *essentia*? Are these moral sentiments the immediate product of such a faculty, and our simpler moral judgments primary intuitions thereof? Or, are these moral sentiments derived modifications of some other and lower functions of our spirits, which have been described in our previous psychology; as, for instance, of our self-love, or pride, or love of applause? In a word, are these moral sentiments made up of such elements, modified and combined by habit and association, reappearing under the apparently new and more impressive forms? The first answer is the one which appears clear to the unperverted common sense as almost self-evidently true. Had there been no histories of perverse philosophies, sensible people would ask: Why not accept it at once and without question? Our consciousness seems to tell us that our primary moral judgments are as rational, as intuitive and as immediate as our other axioms of thought; and the moral feelings which imbue them as evidently distinct as any other classes of feelings. Especially does this familiar but commanding judgment of obligation seem to stand by itself, differing in one respect from all other judgments, and superior to them all in that it carries a universal imperative. Has not all our psychology proceeded on this obvious postulate, that when we find in consciousness a class of mental processes which are not modifications of some other known class, we assign them as products to their own peculiar faculty in the mind? And if they are universally found in all men's experience, we judge the faculty which produces them a fundamental and constitutive part of man's nature. Thus, we are conscious of acoustic phenomena and of visual phenomena; and the one class cannot be resolved into the other. Melodies and harmonies are not modifications of light and color, nor lights and colors modifications of those; accordingly, everybody assigns to normal minds a visual faculty and a hearing faculty, and we find in the human body their separate organs. Why have not all men, then, simply settled this moral question by concluding that the moral sentiments are the distinct products of an original moral faculty in the soul? . . . Man's sense-impressions give him several different classes of pleasurable and painful sensibilities. We anticipate, accordingly, that one of these theorists will adopt one or another of them as giving the original elements of our so-called moral sentiments. But their theories will all have this common structure. Some of them will be less odious than others. But they will all prove mischievous by degrading, more or less, the beauty of virtue and the authority of moral obligation. In each of them their erroneous first-principle will compel them to discard the essential distinction between the general concept of natural good and that of moral good, as between natural evil and moral evil. They will all be found explaining this highest and noblest concept of the moral good by reducing it to some combination or reproduction of some of those sense-

impressions which make up our concept of natural good, brought about by some jugglery of association, habits, self-interest, love of applause, sympathy, or some non-ethical process. . . . Are the two general concepts essentially distinct and opposite elements? Our concept of the general natural good is so perspicuous that there is little danger of mistaking it or differing about it. Various impressions on our sensibilities, both corporeal and spiritual, are conspicuously attended with instinctive pleasure. The opposite impressions are usually attended by instinctive pains. . . . Here good and evil connote qualities which confer natural gratification or take it away. But the things which furnish us the general concept of the moral good are generalized upon a totally different common attribute. Let us ask our consciousness: we perceive that we have gathered into this concept several voluntary principles of action and a multitude of various voluntary acts. In this sense of the word we say that benevolence is good, that disinterested rational sympathy is good, that forgiveness is good, that acts of justice are good (the direct tendency of many of which is to inflict pain), that honest actions are good (though they often cost the agents more pain than they excite pleasure in the object), that truth-telling is good (while often the truth told excites acute distress) . . . Here are things exceedingly diversified. What is the common attribute which colligates them? I assert that no man would ever dream of saying that the common attribute was the same with that which appears in the natural good if his common sense had not been sophisticated. I ask the question of every plain mind: Do you think that the goodness you see in a virtuous action is the same with the goodness of a peach or a melon? Do you mean that the evil you see in a falsehood or injustice is the same with a bad apple or with bad weather?" (Pp. 194-200.)

We have made this lengthy extract for several reasons: First, to whet the intelligent reader's appetite for the whole book; second, to give him a sample of the author's original and striking way of treating the subject; third, to put him in possession of the general matter discussed in this third book; fourth, that the writer may have the advantage of stating his own case; and fifth, because we wish to push the inquiry on some points beyond the position taken by him.

Before indicating the point of our divergence, to prevent misunderstanding we wish to say this book (third) is of inestimable value, far in advance of any treatise on its subject known to us, and in its main contention as sound as a dollar. Its refutation of the sensualistic psychology of the moral sense is complete. We do not, however, accept the view that the "moral sentiments are the products of an original moral faculty in the soul"; but do accept the conclusion quoted from Alexander, Price, and Butler, "that the moral faculty is no other than the reason itself, with its peculiar spiritual sensibility to moral beauty annexed to it." We are not sure we fully comprehend our author's meaning, and regret having to go into print only a few days after receiving this volume "hot from the press," so to speak. But to proceed: Our concepts of the natural good and of the moral good are generically different, essentially distinct, as truly so as the distinction between the moral and the natural. This Dr. Dabney has made too clear to admit of rational dispute. But he seems to teach that they are both concepts, and, as such, formed by colligations each of examples of its own kind. "Conception is that act of the understanding or thinking faculty whereby we unite similar objects into one class by overlooking their points of difference and forming their common attributes into one concept," or class-notion, or general idea. A concept does not and cannot come to us from without. It is a mental creation or connotation.

A concept may be formed or derived from a single specimen of a previously unknown class after the mind has acquired the habit, and, for that matter, might

do so at once. But it is rationally impossible to derive a concept from nothing. A percept must always precede a concept. The instances of generalization in the above quotation illustrate how the general idea (concept) arises. But we do not admit, yea, we stoutly deny, that the moral idea or concept is derived in that way or *in any way*. The moral faculty (intellective and emotive) is already there, and passes judgment at once on the first example involving its action as vigorously as ever it does thereafter, perhaps more vigorously. *How did it get there?* This is the core of the matter in debate. Conscience discloses two elements, intellection and emotion. Are they coördinate? or is the mental act caused by the emotional, or the emotional dependent upon the mental? As we understand it, the moral-sense theory makes the mental act wait on the moral emotion, and our author's theory makes the moral emotion wait on the mental judgment. Undoubtedly the emotional nature cannot be reached from without except through the intelligence. In morals the function of the mind in the first instance is to perceive the facts in a given case. It presents the case to the court of reason for judgment. In this it acts in the main passively, but enough actively to affirm a correct presentation of the case. Thus it acquaints the emotional nature with the kind, character, etc., of the matter here and now to be passed on. In this sense the emotional is subsequent to and dependent on the intellectual. In our opinion, however, the mind does not terminate its action at this stage, but reacted upon and whetted by a strong moral emotion, joins with it and flows out in it in the one common verdict. We do not care by what name this power that puts forth the feeling, the moral feeling, is called, whether it be denominated a moral sense, an emotional faculty, a native disposition, or an ethical sensibility, or a supersensuous sensibility. Our answer is that the two elements of intellection and emotion, as expressed in conscience, are coördinate; that the one is not a function of the other; that they are joint powers of the soul in this department of its agency.

Our view has several advantages to recommend it. It brings the head and the heart together in a joint decision of all moral questions according to the universal demands of mankind. It explains how man is furnished already with the powers of forming moral judgments when the first case is submitted to him. It affords a complete *rationale* of the original vividness, strength, and accuracy of moral judgments, and of how they grow blunted by the benumbing of the moral emotion. It takes away altogether the question about forming a moral concept by generalization, or of having an innate concept. It brings this question into harmony with all others relating to psychology.

In taking our leave of this part of Dr. Dabney's treatise, we wish to commend its careful study to all sincere lovers of truth. The extent and thoroughness of his labors shine in every paragraph, almost in every line. It evinces great natural aptness for and ability in such studies, along with a life-long industry in the prosecution of its preparation. He is a benefactor of all students of this noble science, and he who ventures to differ with him needs to beware where he plants his feet, lest he find the ground going from under him by one mighty jerk. The seventh chapter, on "The Extent of Moral Obligation," leaves nothing to be desired on that subject. We now turn to the fourth and last book, which treats of "APPLIED ETHICS."

Chapter I. treats of "*the first principles of social ethics.*" Happiness, in the author's opinion, is man's "natural personal end, rational, self-calculated, but

neither essentially sinful nor virtuous. On the one hand, the agent is conscious that no blame attaches to his pursuit of that end, under proper limits; and on the other hand, that he can claim no moral merit or title to approbation in the pursuit of that end. But as he compares and exercises his observation and comparing power, he learns that each fellow-man has similarly his natural good the object of his desires, means of his happiness, and thus equally his self-calculated end. By whatever reason I am entitled to possess those means and to pursue that end, by that same reason (*ceteris paribus*) that fellow-man is equally entitled to pursue his. As soon as the reason has made this judgment, it has the concept of the equitable moral order as between man and man. Its premise is of self-evident equity. What entitles me to my end? The same reason entitles my fellow to his end. If I may rightfully obstruct his end, he may obstruct mine; but the latter I judge to be a natural injustice." In comparing the *ego* with the rest of mankind in feelings and nature and rights he develops the universal principle stated in the Golden Rule, and declares that it rationally interpreted is the principle of all duties between man and man. The whole argument is crowned by the fact that the sovereign Creator who endowed me with being, capacities of desire and happiness, and a natural right to pursue my destiny, also endowed each of my fellows with similar being, nature, rights, and end. It is shown that by whatever arguments we are bound to seek our own good, by the same we are bound to seek their equitable good; that the obligation is not simply negative, requiring us not to injure our fellows, but also positive, binding us actively to promote their welfare in all ways proper for us; that the modes in which this obligation may bind are as various as the relations, general or special, temporary or permanent, into which one may fall with his fellow-creatures.

Next, the duties of charity are taken up and considered, under the following heads: (1), Duties of succor and almsgiving; (2), Duty of forgiveness; (3), Responsibility for influence. The next chapter treats of the duties of the family. This chapter ought to be put in pamphlet form and spread broadcast over our entire country. There is always and everywhere great need of such wholesome instruction as it contains, but especially is that need great at this time in the South. The degrading effects of a long, barbarous war, of final disaster in battle and a lost cause, of hostile legislation by the conquering government, of burdensome taxation, and of a royalty paid to Northern trusts and millionaires, bounties they exact under the disguise of protecting infant industries, and of imposing on us a government administered by the recent slaves from the lowest type of the human race, all working together at once, cannot but be great, and need to be checked by every available influence. Utilitarianism, of the most approved, that is, of the most godless type, has already induced our people to surrender to the state the God-given duty of educating their children, and, if we mistake not, would cheerfully turn over their religion to be supported in the same way. Our author quotes Thomas Jefferson as doubting extremely whether our institutions made by and for a nobler type of mankind than we are will meet the demands that are on us. The writer's opinion is that our institutions are all right, that what we need is Christian family training and Christian education. Let the marriage tie be held sacred and inviolable. Let the youth be educated in sound principle of domestic, social, civic, and Christian honor. Let self-dependence and self-confidence, with God's blessing, supplant the present tendency supinely

to look to the government to supply our wants. Let every one feel that his life under God is just what he makes it, and that if it is a failure, he made it so. The most hopeless feature of our age is the snappish impatience with which men listen to instruction that runs counter to their bias. Few men will listen to arguments against state education. The few advantages, real or fancied, that they see in compelling other people to pay for the education of their children, and in forcing an unsatisfactory school on folks countervail, in their judgment, all the requirements of duty to God and obligations to children. How can sensible men expect sound ethical principles to be taught in an institution, the fundamental principle of whose existence is communistic?

The chapter on civic ethics from Dr. Dabney is rich and racy reading. The great theologian, who is also a profound philosopher, appears to no less advantage as a statesman and a patriot. Much that he says will be unpopular; some will provoke angry criticism, in certain quarters. Little effort, however, will be made to controvert his positions by honorable and rational arguments. We must bring our article to a close. We regret the brevity of time—only a few days—allowed us to study our author before going to print. There are a few points we should like to have looked into more narrowly. But perhaps enough is said. This work is without a peer in its department, and deserves to be read and studied most carefully throughout our country, and especially in the South. Let no man, however, fancy that it is play to read and understand the book. In it we are often told that feeling is the temperature of thought. He who reads it intelligently may, therefore, expect to have a pretty hot time of it.

C. W. HUMPHREYS.

Lancaster, S. C.

CAMPBELL'S AFTER PENTECOST, WHAT?

AFTER PENTECOST, WHAT? A Discussion of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in its Relation to Modern Christological Thought. *By James M. Campbell.* Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Toronto, Chicago. 1897. Pp. 297. \$1.

Mr. Campbell writes quickening sentences. His style possesses epigrammatic brilliancy, nervous energy, richness of figure, and fervidness of spirit. It is a popular and declamatory treatise rather than a scientific and theological discussion. His design is the laudable one of stimulating interest in the Holy Spirit, and giving deeper and more mystic interpretations of Christian life. He excites his reader, makes his blood flow faster, his eye open wider, and his heart reach higher. He is intensely devout, but his soundness depends upon the "personal equation" of his reader.

It is painful to find fault with a book so beautiful, so earnest, so kindling. One feels like half a culprit when he sets down a single word against a movement which seeks to centre the gaze of the church upon the Holy Spirit, and to carry the life of Christians to higher and wider planes. Nothing can excuse the critic but his desire to direct the movement, and so aid it to land upon the true doctrine of the Spirit.

These sixteen chapters of Mr. Campbell were delivered before the summer school of the University of Chicago and the Macatawa Park Assembly, Michigan. The declared object of their author is "to bring the doctrine of the Holy Spirit into harmony with the enlarged christological thought of the present day." While he does not say so, this "enlarged christological thought" is pantheistic. He thinks

the doctrine has suffered a "complete eclipse"; that metaphysics is the cause of the obscurity; and that it began to go under the cloud when Augustine forced the idea of the immanence of God to give place to the idea of his transcendence. "Not as a question of polemics, but as a question of experience; not as a question of dogma, but as a question of life must it be re-examined by the church of to-day."

When he comes to make this examination, our author first interprets Pentecost, and then traces the great events which ensue upon it. "It (Pentecost) was the culminating act in an æonial process of redemptive activity. It was the final descent of the divine into the human." Up to this point God has been emptying himself, depotentiating his deity into humanity. From Pentecost on the process is the reverse, the impotentiation of humanity, its movement outward, onward, higher, towards God. "The world is coming to its best. Under the favoring skies of spiritual privilege and power its richest vintage is ripening. The dispensation now running its glorious course is the harvest time of all the ages." The advent of Christ was the beginning of a theanthropic life; the advent of the Spirit is the continuation and perfecting of this new life. Pentecost introduces a new force into the evolving world. That new force is the Holy Spirit, immanent in the heart of redeemed humanity.

After defining Pentecost we find our author answering the interrogative "What?" in his title. "A Spiritual Christ," "A Spiritual God," "A Spiritual Worship," "A Spiritual Apprehension of the Truth," "An Influx of Spiritual Life," "The Spiritual Man," "Spiritual Holiness," "Spiritual Authority," "The Distribution of Spiritual Gifts," "Spiritual Operations," "The Impartation of Spiritual Power," "The Production of Spiritual Works," "The Formation of a Spiritual Society," "The Inauguration of Spiritual Movements," "The Establishment of a Spiritual Kingdom"—these are the luscious headings of his various chapters.

Now let us track the author far enough to see how mystical he is. Take, for example, the chapter on "Spiritual Authority," where he says: "Pentecost marks advancement from outward to inward authority; from outward obedience to inward obedience; from outward restraint to inward constraint; from a law written upon parchment to a law written in the heart. . . . A centre of authority is set up in the kingdom of the soul. We are governed from within. We do not carry in our hands a code of rules." The objective authority of the Scriptures is thus set aside in the interest of the mystic's "inner light," and the most curious fact of all is that this author quotes the Scripture as his authority for thus setting aside their authority.

In the chapter on "Spiritual Gifts" this idea is still more vigorously advanced. He is commenting on 1 Cor. xii. 8-11, and says: "To one is given through the Spirit *the word of wisdom*, that is, the gift of spiritual illumination and intuitive perception, which enables him to apprehend truth at first hand, and become the organ of its revelation. . . . The men of to-day are inspired for the work of to-day." All Christians are inspired and the organs of divine revelation. To know creed and duty they are to look within.

In his chapter on "Spiritual Operations," he distinctly and formally contends for the full and proper inspiration of Christians to-day. "We have been afraid to think that we might be inspired; afraid to think that the Spirit of God might have something to say and do through us. Inspiration is unquestionably a per-

petual fact and experience. It is not something that was for the ancient Hebrew, and is not for the modern Anglo-Saxon. . . . He is inspiring men to-day to declare God's message. . . . The inspiration of Mr. Moody."

Our book, then, so entertaining and so unctious, turns out to be genuinely mystical. Much Scripture is quoted and commented upon, but with the view of showing that the post-Pentecostal Christian has a final rule of faith and practice in his own heart. The highest achievement of evolution up to this time is the Inspired Nineteenth-century Christian!

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

WILDEBOER'S PROVERBS AND DUHM'S JOB.

Die Sprüche, erklärt von Dr. G. Wildeboer, Ord. Professor der Theologie in Groningen.

Das Buch Hiob, erklärt von Dr. B. Duhm, Ord. Professor der Theologie in Basel.

There is issuing, from the press of J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), in Leipsic, Germany, what promises to be a notable "Handy Commentary to the Old Testament." Dr. Karl Marti, of Bern, is the editor-in-chief. He is assisted by such men as Benzinger, Berthelot, Budde, Duhm, Holzinger, and Wildeboer, all of them representative scholars of the moderate historico-critical school of thought. The editor's preface announces the purpose of the series to be the defence and illustration of "*die grosse Umwandlung der Anschauungen, die sich hauptsächlich in den letzten zwanzig Jahren in der alttestamentlichen wissenschaft vollzogen hat*"; that is to say, that the new critical, philological, archæological, theological, and historical views of liberal Germany are to be championed in these commentaries.

Two volumes have come to hand—*Proverbs*, by Dr. Wildeboer, and *Job*, by Dr. Duhm. We have examined them with great interest. Familiarity with Dr. Wildeboer's previous works prepared us for his scholarly and always reverent exposition, as well as for his critical position toward this quite exceptional book of the canon. He divides the contents into eight unequal parts, following, in the main, the now conventional cleavage lines; and dating its origin, as a whole, upon what he terms "formal and material grounds," in the latter half of the Greek period. The "formal" grounds are mainly lexicographical, such as late Hebrew words, Aramaisms, Grecisms, and Arabisms. Among the late Hebrew words he enumerates קָבֵל. It is curious to note that Dr. Duhm, in his work on *Job*, the second number of the series, of which Wildeboer's is the first, finding this very word in what he is pleased to consider the most ancient portion of the poem, comments as follows: "*Sonst nur in späteren Schriften, durch unser Buch als alt erwiesen.*" Dr. Wildeboer, finding this word in *Proverbs*, writes it down as late; Dr. Duhm, discovering it in *Job*, insists that it is ancient. The "material" grounds for the late date are (1), Monogamy is throughout assumed; (2), There are no animadversions against idolatry; (3), Religion is no longer a national matter, but entirely a personal affair; (4), The point of view is universal; (5), The law and the prophets are presupposed. All of which is supposed to suit the *zeit-geist* of the post-exilic period only.

Familiar heretofore only with Dr. Duhm's name as that of one of the leaders of the liberal forces in Germany, we turned with special interest to the pages of his book on *Job*. It is characteristically German in all but its style, which, in

spite of compression, is charmingly clear. The scholarship revealed here is undoubtedly of the highest order, but with it there is displayed, too, that almost obstinate addiction to a particular fashion that marks the pedant. There is too much of the *quod est demonstrandum* without elucidating or even supplying the middle terms.

Thus we have, at the very outset, the now-a-days seemingly inevitable division of every biblical document into any number of bewildering fragments. There are, first, the mutilated remains of the original Volksbuch, or popular legend, of Edomitish origin. These are discovered in the first two chapters, in xxxviii. 1, and in xlii. 7-9, x. 11-17. Then there are, secondly, the parts that belong to the first poetic author. They form the bulk of our present book, chapters iii.-xxxi. and xxxviii.-xl. A later poet is said to have added the Elihu speeches in chapters xxxii.-xxxvii. and a few odds and ends elsewhere. Lastly, there are a large number of interpolations that have found their way into the work in the course of years through one cause or another.

The date of the Volksbuch is set down as prior to the effects of the activity of the great prophets upon the popular thought and life, in a period when, though sacrifices were still looked upon as efficient, the technical sin-offering, the central sanctuary, and the divinely-appointed priesthood of the Thora were unknown. It is, therefore, a predeuteronomic production. This conjecture is supposed to be confirmed by Ezekiel's reference to Job. (Ezek. xiv. 14.) Just why this reference does not apply to the entire book does not appear.

The poetic author of iii.-xxxi. is said to have looked backward upon the great wars and world empires of the Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians, as well as upon the catastrophe that overwhelmed his own nation. He wrote at a time when Palestine was under Persian vassalage, about the first half of the fifth century.

Dr. Duhm's method is best exhibited when the reader seeks the premises of the confidently-announced conclusions. When it is asserted, for instance, that the earlier of the two poetic authors lived in a land like Palestine, we would like to know why Dr. Duhm thinks so. In reply, we are referred to xii. 17-19, with Dr. Duhm's comment that "that kind of thing was familiar enough to a post-exilic author, either from personal experience or from hearsay. Post-exilic Jews knew royalty only as a tyranny." And that is all, except a further far-fetched conjecture or two on ix. 24 and xxi. 32. Whatever of weight may attach to these comments in the way of proof of the Palestinian residence of the author is completely neutralized by the admission to which we call attention by the italics. Again, Dr. Duhm asserts that this author belonged to the humbler civilian class of his day, what are now called the laboring people, for he had to toil hard for his daily bread. Why such an assertion? Because, forsooth, he makes his hero, in xvii. 1, exclaim in despair: "The graves are ready for me," the emphasis being upon the plural קְבֻרִים, showing that the poet fancied Job as a simple citizen, not as a great lord, who would be buried בְּבֵיתוֹ! That he worked for a living is inferred from vii. 1-3, in which the hardships and anxieties of an hireling are portrayed.

Now, we suppose Dr. Duhm is here proceeding upon a critical principle, which, when applied with a reasonable amount of common sense, is really the basis of all historical research: that a book always bears the stamp of the time and circumstances in which it was produced. To understand a book properly it must

be treated as a bit of the life of the author and his time. From the book we can know the man. But that does not mean that a writer must be bound down unconditionally to the circumstances and surroundings of his own brief day and limited life. To treat a dramatic author like the writer of these "streit-reden" in such a way is utterly uncritical and arbitrary. It is to erect at the very outset an insurmountable barrier to the full comprehension of his work. It strikes us that many of Dr. Duhm's conclusions are fine examples of the critical pretensions to determine dates and circumstances from the most obscure passages and the most occult references. One is really led to doubt whether they are put forth seriously by the learned author, or are only offered as examples of what critical skill can accomplish in an emergency. It is a decided overdoing of the critical process.

Dr. Duhm, as we have pointed out above, distinguishes what he calls the Volksbuch from chapters iii.-xxxi., and the Elihu speeches from both. His reasons for so doing are: (1), The Volksbuch naïvely permits its hero to speak of the Deity as Jahwe, although Job, either as an Edomite or an Arab, could not be familiar with this name of Israel's God; the author of chapters iii.-xxxi. never falls into this error; (2), The Volksbuch postulates the evil suspicions of Satan as the occasion of Job's trials; the poet finds no place for such a mediate cause in his discussion of the problem; (3) In the Volksbuch Job submits with patience and wisdom, but the poet pictures him as anything but patient, permitting him even to hurl the sharpest invectives against God; (4), In the Volksbuch Jahwe's anger is said to burn against Job's three friends, but the poet makes them talk as eminently pious men, who recommend, in the main, the selfsame wisdom and patient submission which, in the Volksbuch, secures the praise and reward of Jahwe. This latter consideration is held to be conclusive. It is, therefore, unnecessary to enumerate three or four minor arguments offered by way of emphasis.

The spurious character of the Elihu speeches, says Dr. Duhm, is now universally acknowledged. It is self-evident to any one not altogether incapable of appreciating the "*eigenartige Dichtung des Hiobs*"—an indefinite phrase, which may mean either the particular kind of poetry, or the peculiar subject of the book—and this despite of the fact that the most recent attempt to defend the authenticity of these speeches emanated from his editorial confrere, Dr. Budde! Their language, says Dr. Duhm, is prolix, the style bombastic, the thought fatuous. All that poor Elihu says may be omitted without in the least disturbing the connection. He is not mentioned either in the prologue or the epilogue.

But the case is not quite so simple. Much may be said in rebuttal of all this. We are forcibly reminded of Matthew Arnold (quoted by Dr. Robertson in *The Early Religion of Israel*), who tells us of a mechanical criticism which "takes for granted that things are naturally all of a piece, and follow one uniform rule; and that to know this is so, and to judge things by the light of this knowledge, is the secret of sure criticism. People do not vary; people do not contradict themselves; people do not have undercurrents of meaning; people do not divine. If they are represented to have said one thing to-day and its seeming opposite to-morrow, one of the two they are credited with falsely. If they are represented as having said what, in its plain, literal acceptation, would not hold good, they cannot have said it. If they are represented as speaking of an event before it happened, they did not so speak of it; the words are not theirs." And it is against this *woolen* way

of treating the finest and profoundest product of the Jewish Wisdom-Literature that we enter an emphatic protest.

In the first place, we readily confess that the language and style of the so-called Volksbuch differ widely, and of the Eihu speeches somewhat, from the language and style of the body of the poem. But what of it? To us it would be very surprising indeed if such differences did not appear at all. Were they even more pronounced than they are, they would still be precisely such variations as a skilful dramatist would employ to differentiate the several parts of his work and his characters. The things in the speeches objected to by Dr. Duhm are precisely the things that fit such a character as Dr. Duhm himself declares Eihu to be. Then why cannot Eihu have been a free creation of the author's fancy, supplementing the characters which he found ready to hand in some ancient legend? It almost makes one doubt his own sanity to note the tiresomely persistent effort of our modern critic to crowd a biblical author into some narrow, mechanical groove, and in the next breath laud him to the skies as possessed of "the dauntless spirit, dramatic energy, and creative phantasy of a great poet, who can always find at the right moment the most expressive term for the mighty struggle going on within him." If our poet was such an one—and Dr. Duhm says that he was—why could he not have described a man whose childish egotism and notably empty speeches involuntarily amuse us? The attempt to deny such ability to any but a biblical author would be laughed to scorn.

Again, admitting the possibility—yes, the probability—of interpolations here and there, it certainly does not follow that a passage is spurious simply because it seems to a modern critic to break the connection, as chapters xxvii. and xxviii. are said to do; or because, in the critic's opinion, it may be spared without affecting the value of the poem either logically or artistically. After all that can be said, this amounts to a mere question of taste, not only between the critics, who differ *toto celo* here, as in most other things, but between the critics and the ancient author. And suppose that a lynx-eyed German professor does really and truly discover inconsistencies here and there, what of it? As a matter of fact, Eihu is strangely overlooked both in the prologue and the epilogue; but Thackeray, in one of his stories, "killed and buried old Lady Kew, and later brought her again on the scene for the purpose of rounding off a corner of the story"; Amelia B. Edwards, in *Hand and Glove*, describes her hero as "passing backward and forward like an overseer on a Massachusetts cotton plantation"; Scott, in *The Heart of Midlothian*, makes the Duke of Argyle's groom of the chambers speak of that nobleman's seat of Roseneath as an island, "a kind of mistake never committed by a biblical writer." But does any one therefore cast suspicion on any of these works? Certainly not, for he would be hissed from the scene by an incredulous and indignant public. But when such vandalism is perpetrated upon the Bible it is "criticism," "historical insight," "scholarship." Doubtless, if Donnelly's "fearfully and wonderfully made" cryptogram had been worked out upon the Hexateuch instead of upon Shakespeare, it would have been hailed as a triumph of the "higher" learning. As it was, it fell dead from the press.

Is it not a simpler theory, one more in harmony with the facts, and, therefore, more easily defended, that our Book of Job is a more or less coherent and logical whole, the work of one author? In the prologue and in the epilogue we have an ancient legend worked over to suit his plans. In chapters iii.—xxxi. and

xxxviii.-xl. we have the first draft of his strictly original work. In chapters xxxii.-xxxvii., the Elihu speeches, we have an afterthought, an addition which he never thoroughly homologated to the other parts. Minor interpolations can easily be accounted for.

Both Wildeboer's *Proverbs* and Duhm's *Job* are treasures of philological and archaeological information. Once used by the student of the original, they become indispensable.

W. W. ELWANG.

Orlando, Florida.

BACON'S HISTORY OF AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY.

A HISTORY OF AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY. By *Leonard Woolsey Bacon*. New York: The Christian Literature Company. 1897. \$2.00.

While the history of the several churches in our country was being written under the auspices of the Christian Literature Company, it was natural and eminently desirable that the history of the introduction and progress of Christianity as a whole should be undertaken by some competent hand. Such is the purpose of this volume.

The circumstances under which the Christian religion was established in America were peculiar. They have no parallel in the history of the world; and the same is true of the character which it has assumed and the institutions which it has founded in the course of its development. Christianity was introduced into the Roman Empire by the apostles and their co-laborers before divisions into sects had arisen. In the Middle Ages it was propagated among the Teutonic tribes from Rome as a centre, the temporary prevalence of Arianism and the competition in Germany between British and Roman missionaries being the only exceptions. In Anglo-Saxon Britain the church assumed at the outset the form which it has maintained ever since—that of a state institution. In all the countries of Europe the alliance of church and state came to be most intimate. This relationship was not entirely changed even by the Protestant Reformation. The rule adopted in the Peace of Westphalia for the settlement of Germany was, that the civil authorities of each state should determine the religious connections of the people, *cujus regio ejus religio*. Saxony was Lutheran, Hesse was Reformed, England was Episcopal, Scotland was Presbyterian. But America was settled, not only by many different nationalities, but also by many different sects, all competing and sometimes violently clashing, as well as all contributing to the general work of evangelizing the continent. Consequently the author of a book like this labors under two disadvantages. In the first place, he must divest himself, in a great measure, of his denominational prejudices in order to be able to do justice to all; and in the second place, he encounters the difficulty of securing for his story that unity without which no literary performance can possess the highest excellence. In both of these particulars, however, Mr. Bacon has achieved remarkable success. It is not too much to say that he comes as near being absolutely impartial as is possible under the circumstances. We feel sure that it would be impossible from this work to infer his church connections. In fact, the suspicion is likely to arise that, in his large catholicity he attaches too little importance to questions of Christian doctrine and church polity. He

deals out praise and blame with an impartial hand to sects the most opposite in their principles and influence. And it may be said also that there is a substantial unity in the narrative, the unity of progress. The impression made upon the mind of the reader is, that while the divisions are many, their equipments various, and their relations not always harmonious, yet the army is one and its advance real. Ample evidence is afforded that the church of God, under his guiding hand, has been doing a great work in this land for the cause of Christian civilization and the salvation of the world. It is not to be expected, of course, that all the statements of facts which are made in this volume will be accepted by every reader as historically accurate, or that all the author's judgments will be approved. On these points there is room for differences of opinion, not greater, however, than would be unavoidable in such a work.

We will call attention to a few particulars in order to illustrate the scope and spirit of the narrative.

Christianity was first introduced into the territory now occupied by the United States by Roman Catholic missionaries, in connection with their conquests during the sixteenth century. It was a part of the ruthless despotism, which they established over the poor Indians, and, while the immediate results seemed to be great, nothing was accomplished of permanent value. A Catholic historian is quoted as saying: "It was a glorious work, and the recital of it impresses us by the vastness and success of the toil. Yet, as we look around to-day, we can find nothing of it that remains. A few thousand Christian Indians, descendants of those they converted and civilized, still survive in New Mexico and Arizona, and that is all." The labors of the French Jesuit missionaries among the Indians within the territory of the United States, are described as characterized by an energy, daring and heroic devotion, almost unequalled, but their fruits were equally evanescent. They perished with the fall of the French empire in America. In the orderings of divine providence, it was not intended that the Roman Catholics should lay the foundation of American Christianity.

The colonists of Jamestown, Va., in 1607, brought with them their chaplain, the Rev. Robert Hunt, a low church Episcopalian, and they are entitled to establishing the first permanent Protestant church in America. The Virginia Company, under whose auspices the colony was sent out, was a Puritan corporation, that is, its members belonged to the Puritan wing of the Episcopal Church. Consequently, that type of religion prevailed in the new settlement at first. But in 1624, the company was dissolved, and the subsequent administration of the church in Virginia, during a large part of the colonial period, was not favorable to toleration, or to evangelical religion.

The colony of Maryland was founded by Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic. It is sometimes mentioned, as creditable to the Catholic Church, that religious liberty was recognized in this colony from the beginning. Our author gives a different interpretation of "the curious paradox that the first experiment of religious liberty and equality before the law among all Christian sects should have been made apparently under the auspices of that denomination, which alone, at the present day, continues to maintain in theory that it is the duty of civil government to enforce sound doctrine by pains and penalties." It

was stipulated in the charter granted by the Protestant king in England that the settlement should be open to all the king's subjects. On no other condition could Lord Baltimore have had a colony at all. "Nothing would have brought speedier ruin to his enterprise than to have it suspected, as his enemies were always ready to allege, that it was governed in the interest of the Roman Catholic Church. To discriminate against any religious body in England would have been for the proprietor to limit his hope of rapid colonization and revenue, and to embroil himself with political enemies at home." So much for the absurd claim of religious toleration on the part of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Puritan immigration to New England began in 1620. The Plymouth colony was composed of pronounced Independents. It was not altogether so, however, with the colonies which followed them in subsequent migrations. Our author does not allude to the undeniable fact, so interesting to us, and which, perhaps, exerted a silent influence on the history of the church a generation or two later, that many of the immigrants were Presbyterians in their preferences. Previously to the year 1640 about twenty-one thousand immigrants had arrived, at least four thousand of whom were recognized Presbyterians. The system of church government generally adopted was a mixture of Congregationalism and Presbyterianism. The office of ruling elder was in use by very many, perhaps at first by most of the New England churches, and synods or councils were held. In the Cambridge Platform, adopted in 1648, it was provided that "the ruling elder is to join with the pastor and teacher in those acts of spiritual rule which are distinct from the ministry of the word and sacraments." In one of their councils it was ordered "that synods, being of apostolical example, recommended as a necessary ordinance, it is but reasonable that their judgment be acknowledged as decisive in the affairs for which they are ordained." These are the two fundamental elements of Presbyterianism, namely, government of the church by ruling elders, and the authoritative action of councils. New England, however, drifted eventually into pure Independency and Congregationalism. But many of the churches formed in New York and New Jersey by emigrants from New England were organized on the Presbyterian system.

It was, however, from the Scotch-Irish immigration, in the latter part of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries, that Presbyterianism derived its greatest strength. Says our author: "The greatest in its consequences, both religious and political, of the great beginnings in the early part of the eighteenth century was the first flow of the swelling tide of the Scotch-Irish immigration." This movement gave us Mackemie, to whose labors and influence the organization of the scattered Presbyterian congregations into Presbyteries was due. It is only of late that the indebtedness of American Christianity and civilization to the Scotch-Irish element has come to be somewhat adequately understood.

The Great Awakening, first under Edwards, and afterwards under Whitefield and the Tennents, is well described, and its excellencies and faults judiciously pointed out. The first schism in the Presbyterian Church was partly the result of this revival. Happily it proved to be only temporary. Towards

the close of the colonial period Methodism was planted in America, and after the Revolution spread rapidly. The growth of the New England theology, with which the author seems to be in sympathy, dates from this period. The second Great Awakening, about the beginning of the present century, was as remarkable as the first. Out of this the Cumberland Presbyterian Church arose. As to the agitation in church and state produced by the slavery question, our author's sympathies are strongly with the abolitionists. The opinion which came to prevail in the South, that the institution of slavery was not condemned by either the Old or the New Testament, he regards as a new discovery, made by the Rev. James Smylie, of Mississippi, in 1833, and its general adoption he styles the "Southern Apostasy." In regard to the "Plan of Union" and the division of the Presbyterian Church into the New and Old School bodies, his sympathies, as we would naturally expect in a New Englander and a disciple of the New England theology, are with the New School.

The division of the Presbyterian Church at the time of the civil war is regarded by him from a Northern point of view, and is briefly, but not unkindly, noticed. The alleged reason on the part of the Southern Church for *continuing* the separation is, he says, "the difference on the subject of the right function of the church, but the working motive for it was more obvious in the unfraternal and almost wantonly exasperating course of the National (Northern) General Assembly during the war; but the best justification for it is to be found in the effective and useful working of the Southern Church. Considering the impoverishment and desolation of the Southern country, the record of useful and self-denying work accomplished by this body, not only at home, but in foreign fields, is, from its beginning, an immensely honorable one." These are kind words, and are in keeping with the candor manifested throughout the whole volume.

Clarksville, Tenn.

ROBERT PRICE.

HAWES' BIBLE CHURCH STUDIES.

BIBLE CHURCH STUDIES. *By Rev. Herbert H. Hawes, D. D., Bluefield, West Virginia.* An Independent Course of Bible Study, Apart from Former Studies and Beliefs, and Exclusive of All Sources of Information Save the Word of God. 8vo, pp. xviii., 398. \$1.50. Published by the author. 1897.

Dr. Hawes has made a request that is very difficult to comply with: "Can you not give a notice of my book which will have something severe to say of it?" The unstinted and deserved praise which it has received from all sources where thus far noticed has evidently palled upon the Doctor's taste. As a break in even a pleasant monotony, he seems to desire and will relish something contrariwise. So here goes, to do the best that can be done for him.

And first, in typography the book is a failure. The pages appear crowded, the type used being rather large and not sufficiently "leaded" to produce a pleasant impression upon the eye. The margins are very narrow. There are many errata. The binding is extremely poor. The whole air of the book, as to its mechanical features, is, unintentionally, that of cheapness, altogether unworthy of the theme and contents, and altogether avoidable in this day when

the printer's art is, if properly sought out, as beautiful as it is moderate in price. The Whittet & Shepperson press, of Richmond, or that of the Revell Company, of New York and Chicago, would have produced a book which, as to its form, would have been more attractive than this one, and which probably would have cost less.

Next, in style, the work is heavy. The movement is not marked, though the author and the theme are full of progress. There is too much swinging back and forth, like the motion of a door upon its hinges. There is a certain prolixity of style which makes the book less readable than it would otherwise be. The sub-title may be taken as a specimen of this. It reads like the titles to some of the works of the old Puritan divines. The author makes too free a use of the interrogative and exclamatory method for a work of the kind. There is an impression of too much "padding" in these interrogations and exclamations, and in a kind of soliloquizing in which the author frequently indulges. Large sections are wholly catechetical. The method would suit the pulpit or lecture platform admirably, but is not so well adapted to such a study as this book professes to be and really is. It is altogether out of place in an effort to draw out, directly from the Bible, what God thinks and says, and not what man thinks or is persuaded to be true. And there is too much "we" in the book. Sometimes this pronoun and its corresponding "our" are found twelve or fifteen times in one short paragraph. And it is the editorial "we" quite as often as it is the "we-all we." It has been told of the late Dr. Thomas E. Peck, doubtless with truth, that no one ever heard the first personal pronoun, either singular or plural, fall from his lips in preaching or ever saw it appear in his writings. It was a noble example, well worth following. Again, there is over much "dash" in the writing of this book, but it is not the kind of dash which attracts and excites admiration; it is that which is by many writers, Dr. Hawes not among them, used out of the poverty of their knowledge of punctuation. Many a magazine editor could tell of many an article which he has received from some of the most noted men of the land, accompanied with the request, "Please punctuate it for me before it is published"! In Dr. Hawes' case the use of the dash is to introduce explanatory or hortatory or parenthetical matter. It weakens many of his sentences. As a minor criticism, it may be noted that there is no index to the book, either analytical, topical, or scriptural, a serious lack in a work of its kind. In a future edition of the book, which its worth will surely call for, these defects will be remedied.

The purpose of the book is to answer the question, What is God's own idea of his church? In seeking an answer to this question, the author undertakes to divest himself entirely of all preconceived ideas, preferences, and prejudices, and of traditions or creeds of history, that the answer may be simply that which God himself gives in his word. To this end he puts away all visible companions and helps, save the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, and English. How far such a plan is practicable, or proper, each reader will judge for himself. It need only be said here that the author comes out of his work, even if he entered it colorless, with a shade of Presbyterian blue which is about as deep and intense as one has ever seen. In the midst of a busy life he worked

at the pleasant task until the result of it was ready in this volume. He manifests great faithfulness in the study of the Bible, and accurate scholarship in the use of the original tongues. While it is his purpose to develop simply the ecclesiology of the Bible, many other doctrines are brought in incidentally. The author's plan of carrying out his purpose does not appear to be altogether definite. The several parts do not seem to grow logically out of one another. The unity of the book is one of theme rather than of development. There is gathered together here a large amount of valuable information and exposition. Indeed, there is so much of the latter as at times to obscure that which the author assumed in the beginning, viz., that he would let the answer be simply God's. The meaning, origin, membership, and sacraments of the church are thoroughly studied and elaborated from the Bible. The government and officers of the church, while considered, are not so fully brought out as might be desired, or as might have been practicable. The subjects of the support of the church and of the mission of the church as a witness and a means of propagandism are passed over very lightly. Here and there are views which some may question, as, for instance, the author's interpretation of the meaning and purpose of the Passover, his treatment of Matthias' apostleship, his belief that they were not "deacons" who were chosen as recorded in Acts vi., etc.; but they are so insignificant as compared with the accuracy and soundness of the work as a whole that it is hardly needful to notice them. For, in spite of these criticisms, which are made in all affection for the author, and in full recognition and appreciation of his evangelistic and literary labors, the book contains a vast amount of most useful matter, strong argument, and profound study, and is suffused with a spirit which is both attractive and beautiful. What other busy evangelist, toiling in the roughest regions of the Southern highlands, carrying into the remotest recesses of the mountains the glorious gospel of Christ, and winning many souls to his Lord, could have found time and inclination to add this work to his many other labors of love?

PITZER'S "THE MANIFOLD MINISTRY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT."

THE MANIFOLD MINISTRY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. *By Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D.*
Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.

Among the numerous works that have been issued in recent years on the person and work of the Holy Spirit, this little book by Dr. Pitzer holds a distinct place. Like everything else from his pen, it is marked by sound judgment and fidelity to Scripture. Its plan is simple. First, there is a concise statement of what the Bible teaches concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit as a divine person. Then his ministry is discussed under seven heads:

1. His Ministry in Creation.
2. His Ministry in Providence.
3. His Ministry to the Son of Man—The Mediator.
4. His Ministry to the Writers of the Sacred Scriptures.
5. His Ministry to Believers as Individuals.
6. His Ministry to the Church as the Body of Christ.
7. His Ministry to the World.

These discussions are brief, but satisfactory and edifying. They are not controversial. The author is content to give a clear, positive statement of what he believes to be the truth, after all the best safeguard against error. To all who wish to get, in concise form, a comprehensive view of what the Scriptures teach on this important subject, we cordially recommend the book.

St. Louis.

J. F. CANNON.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY ADDRESSES.

MEMORIAL VOLUME OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY, 1647-1897. Containing Eleven Addresses Delivered Before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, at Charlotte, N. C., in May, 1897, in Commemoration of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, and of the Formation of the Westminster Standards. Published by direction of the General Assembly of 1897. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1897. 12mo, pp. xlii., 297. \$1.50.

The readers of the QUARTERLY are already so familiar, through our own pages and the weekly religious press, with the matter embraced within this volume that it is deemed needless to do more than advertise the fact that in this volume the splendid addresses delivered in Charlotte are given in full and permanent form. In addition there is an introduction by Dr. Beattie, the chairman of the committee which had charge, by the Assembly's appointment, of the work of publishing the addresses. This introduction recites the facts connected with the commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, and also gives an outline of the history of the period of which the Westminster Assembly was both the culmination and the foundation, and adds a brief bibliography of the subject. We congratulate the committee and the church on the success accomplished so speedily in issuing this volume. Its attractive form, clear printing and handsome binding are in keeping with the matter which they enclose. We could wish, however, that some happier title had been fallen upon. The present day associations of the phrase "memorial volume" make it unhappy and misleading as the title of a volume recounting the splendid, living achievements of the Westminster divines and of the life and character and work which have grown out of the principles formulated by that grand body of men.

DENNIS' CHRISTIAN MISSIONS, ETC,

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. A Sociological Study of Foreign Missions. *By the Rev. James S. Dennis, D. D., Students' Lecturer on Missions, Princeton, 1893 and 1896; author of "Foreign Missions After a Century"; Member of the American Presbyterian Mission, Beirut, Syria.* In two volumes. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. xvi., 468. \$2.50. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897.

In this volume are embodied, with great enlargement and profuseness of illustration, the author's lectures on missions, at Princeton Seminary, in the

spring of 1896, repeated at Auburn, Lane, and Allegheny. Each part is accompanied by a bibliography, which for completeness and fulness we have never seen surpassed. Taken together, the lectures furnish a magnificent and inspiring vindication of the social value of missions, and thus supply us with a new line of apologetics of a positive kind, whose value one can hardly over-estimate, and which is yet, with all its present development and force, only in its very beginning. They show how mighty a force the Christian religion has already proved in penetrating, transforming, elevating the life of heathen society. The power of this force is shown in comparison with the social results of the ethnic religions. In dealing with this aspect of his subject, the author has been fair and just, and has duly recognized whatever of good and truth he could find in these religions. He is faithful in this study to the principle of the supernatural, and the place which it occupies in any true theory of social development. The topics of the several chapters or lectures are as follows: The Sociological Scope of Christian Missions; The Social Evils of the Non-Christian World—(1), The Individual Group; (2), The Family Group; (3), The Tribal Group; (4), The Social Group; (5), The National Group; (6), The Commercial Group; (7), The Religious Group; Ineffectual Remedies and the Cause of their Failure; Christianity, the Social Hope of the Nation. Each lecture is preceded by a well-prepared synopsis, which will greatly aid the careful student. The illustrations, many of them full-page, are most attractive, suitable, and suggestive. Dr. Dennis' own long and successful experience in the foreign field, and his well-known powers of observation, fit him in a peculiarly happy way for the work which he gives us in this splendid volume.

GULICK'S GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

THE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. *By Sidney L. Gulick, M. A., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Japan.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. xvi., 320. \$1.50.

The germ of this book, the author tells us, was an address delivered to an audience of wide-awake Japanese young men, the aim of which was to show them the growth and influence of the Christian religion in the world, and to study the transformation which it had wrought in the life and thought of the western nations. His aim was practical rather than theoretical, and this shaped the book. It therefore furnishes a valuable, practical "apologetic" of a positive kind. After some preliminary statements of the problem, the method, the standpoint, the purpose, and the sources, he gives definitions of Christianity, the church, and religion. He then enters upon that which forms the great inquiry of the book, viz.: Whether or not the kingdom of God is growing. The answer to this question is found, first, in a growth in numbers. This is clearly set forth by a series of striking charts. It is also shown in connection with the financial prosperity and educational developments of the world. It is next traced in various countries, as England, and Wales, and the United States, and its influence proved by its development of different forms of activity, as Sunday-schools, organized charities, university settlements, education, etc. A chapter is devoted to the growth in understanding Christianity, another to growth in practical forms of religion, another to growth in

influence upon social order, respect for life and property, marriage, Sabbath observance, etc. A few paragraphs in the last chapter contain some sentences on the subject of slavery which are of the Wendell Phillips order, evincing more rhetoric than intelligent grasp of the facts and principles.

The book is valuable and suggestive, and especially so in its practical features and use of statistics. While as a philosophical study it falls far short of Dr. Dennis' work, described above, it shows the trend of thought of our missionaries and the character of work which they feel they must perform. Each book is in its way an adaptation of the form of answer which the Master gave to John's disciples: "Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard."

X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE VERACITY OF THE HEXATEUCH. A defence of the historic character of the first six books of the Bible. *By Samuel Colcord Bartlett, D. D., LL. D., Ex-President of Dartmouth College.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1897. 12mo, pp. 404. \$1.50.

In this most timely and ably prepared work the author not only overthrows the main position of the destructive critics, but gives strong, affirmative proof of the soundness of the old views of the historicity of the record of the Hexateuch and of the contemporaneousness of the writing of all but Genesis with the facts recorded. He first states the case, reducing the positions of the critics to three, namely, the analysis of the record into the writings of from eight to eighteen or twenty discernible hands, the assignment of late dates to all these writers, and a denial of the truth of much of the early narrative as being tradition modified or colored by the judgment of the writer as mythical and unhistorical. It is with the latter that the author deals in this book. His method is to begin with the book of Joshua and move backward. He proves the trustworthiness of this book by showing how baseless and unreasonable is the theory of its late authorship; by showing the proximity of the date to the events recorded; by setting forth the life-like minuteness of the narrative, and the proof therefrom of its original and contemporaneous origin, and by the authenticity indicated by the minute and exhaustive description of the land in conquest, and of its distribution among the tribes; by the portraiture of Joshua himself; by the confirmation derived from recently discovered documents, such as the Tel el Hesi and Tel el Amarna tablets; by the corroboration of the account of Joseph's burial; by the references in later Old Testament books to events related in Joshua as unquestionable facts of history. Having thus substantiated the veracity of this book, the author traces the testimony backward. He holds that the statements and allusions of Joshua are inseparably interlocked with the previous history. The salient points of this history, such as the period from the Exodus to the Conquest, the residence in Egypt, the patriarchal history, the table of nations (Gen. x.), the deluge, antediluvian life, man's primitive condition, temptation and fall, and the creation narrative, are studied scientifically, and with special reference to those aspects of them in which the critic's denial is so bold. The use of monumental evidence here is very full and forceful. The remainder of the book, about one-third of the whole, is then devoted to the more direct evidence, or positive lines of proof. He studies the nature of the historic basis upon which all writings of ancient times must be judged, illustrating his position, happily, by the history of the criticism of the *Æneid*, Horace, Livy, and other classical writings. The literary problem and analysis are then luminously discussed and illustrated, and in terms rather more popular than usual or practicable in

works of this kind. That common, universal trait of the new criticism, its assumptions of theories and subsequent accommodation of the facts to these unfounded assumptions is next admirably characterized as it deserves, and the unwarrantableness of some of the assumptions clearly shown. An appendix contains much valuable matter, and the whole is well indexed. Throughout, the work is strong, clear, popular, scholarly and fair, and deserves well to take its place by the side of Dr. Green's, Dr. MacDill's, and other works of the same kind.

THE OLD TESTAMENT UNDER FIRE. *By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D., S. T. D., Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1897. 12mo, pp. 246.

The contents of this book were given first to general audiences of intelligent, thoughtful people, but not with a view to leading them into the intricacies of technical details. It is, therefore, a popular discussion of the practical issues of the present day discussion. The first chapter gives a general survey of the position of literary criticism, showing how it is predominately conjectural, how the problems to which it addresses itself so confidently are insoluble, how it is itself dominated by historical criticism, how unwarrantable are the assumptions upon which all its processes and results are based, and how its acceptance involves the honesty of the biblical writers. He then discusses practically and logically Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament, Christ and the Old Testament, Criticism and the Old Testament, Criticism and Common Sense, The Historic Faith, and The Integrity of the New Testament. A note, written after the book had gone to press, gives a remarkable extract from the latest work of Harnack, of Berlin, showing how this great scholar is forced to repudiate the Higher Criticism in its assaults upon the integrity and credibility of the New Testament. The book is a brilliant and successful defence of the word of God. It is as timely as it is powerful.

THE GOSPEL AS TAUGHT BY CALVIN. *By Rev. R. C. Reed, D. D.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1897. Paper, 16mo, pp. 157. 15 cents.

This is a good addition to the doctrinal publications of our church. The Woodland-street pastor is developing power as a thinker and writer. As we read this clear and vigorous production our pleasure grew to the end. We commend it as a most satisfactory statement of Calvinism in comparison with the Pelagian and Remonstrant systems, and wish for it a wide circulation. It is a choice book for a pastor to drop in the homes of his people on his rounds. One chapter is a preliminary historical survey, holding up to the eye the lives and services of Calvin and Arminius. Then follow five chapters on the five points of the "grim Synod of Dort." Another chapter, perhaps the most masterly and suggestive in the cluster, treats of Calvinism tested by love. The final chapter is on the fruits of our doctrinal system, especially as to purity of morals, heroism of character, zeal for liberty, intellectual activity, and spiritual aggressiveness. The author states fairly the difficulties that are met with in each of the contrasted systems, and exposes the defects of those theological

schemes by which the Calvinism of the Bible is evaded or explained away. It is as full of quotable sentences as the Yukon Valley is of gold nuggets. Don't lay down your pen, Brother Reed.

HOW TO OBTAIN FULNESS OF POWER, in Christian Life and Service. *By R. A. Torrey, author of "How to Bring Men to Christ," "How to Study the Bible for Greatest Profit," "The Baptism with the Holy Spirit," etc.* 12 mo, pp: 106. 50 cents. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897.

The author's answer to the problem named in the title is, "by making personal trial of The Power of the Word of God, The Power of the Blood of Christ, The Power of the Holy Spirit, The Power of Prayer, The Power of a Surrendered Life, The Power of Personal Work." These chapters on these topics are full of earnestness and spiritual fervor, and almost all that the author says is well worth reading and following. He indulges, however, in the recently popular theory of the special enduement of the Spirit, with its attendant mystical interpretations of the word of God and inclination towards some phase of the doctrine which, in its grosser forms, is called the "second blessing," "perfection," or "place of rest," etc. He disparages the study of the Bible in its original languages, though it was in those languages that it was inspired and that prophets and apostles and Christ himself proclaimed the truth. He applies numerous passages of Scripture to all Christians which were spoken only to apostles. The earnestness and spirituality of all this school of thought which the author represents make it difficult to criticize their views, and yet, for this very reason, the error which is in it is the more insidious. Added to this difficulty is the further fact that any one who resists these views is apt to be set down popularly as well as by those with whom one disagrees as resisting that which honors and magnifies the Spirit, and thus of almost sinning against him. All the same, care must be taken lest in the attempt to honor and magnify him we are only honoring and magnifying some fiction of our own imagination and committing the grossest of all possible sins against him, that of laying upon him or holding him responsible for, or reading into his word our own ideas and thoughts.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY AND ITS CONFESSION FOR GOD. *By Rev. Joseph A. Vance.* Pp. 24. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson, Printers. 1897.

A sermon preached to the congregation of the Maryland Avenue Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Maryland, on the Sunday before the last General Assembly opened, and published by the session of the church. It is a clear and eloquent statement of the fact that Presbyterianism long antedated the Westminster Assembly, of the historical importance of the two great symbols of faith, the canons of the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Confession, of the calling and work of the Westminster Assembly, of the marked influence of its work upon civil government and the church at large, of the result of its work upon character, church unity, literature, the Christian Sabbath, and of

its general and happy influence in its conservative power. The thoughts are happily expressed, and the sermon or address throughout able and helpful.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY; Its History and Standards, being the Baird Lecture for 1882. *By Alexander F. Mitchell, D. D., LL. D., Emeritus Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews; Joint Editor of "Minutes of Westminster Assembly," "Minutes of the Commission of the General Assembly," etc.* Second edition. Revised by the author. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1897. 12mo., pp. xxvi., 539.

The present year, with its marked revival of interest in the formation of the church's Confession of Faith and other standards, is a most appropriate time for the issuing of this second edition of Dr. Mitchell's history of the Westminster Assembly. The lectures which compose this volume were first delivered in 1882, and were issued in book form in this country a year or two later. A valuable feature of the work is the attention which it devotes to the origin and history of English Puritanism up to the time of the Westminster Assembly. The book is in many respects more readable than Hetherington. It should have a wide circulation.

CRUCIFIXION. *By John H. Osborne.* 16mo. Walcott & West. Syracuse, N. Y. 1897.

This author claims to have new light on the mode of crucifixion. He thinks that the current understanding of this cruel method of punishment is in no little measure erroneous, and based on the overwrought representations of painters and sculptors. He puts a strange interpretation on many of the incidents, human and divine, that marked our Lord's death. The sufferings he endured on the cross were comparatively slight, and formed no part of a penal price paid for man's reconciliation. The author apparently knows nothing of the design of our Lord's passion. He seems erratic and indiscriminating in his judgment. Blending as it does fact with fancy, the book's sole interest lies in the novelty of its contents.

RUTH BERGEN'S LIMITATIONS: A Modern Auto-da-Fe. *By Marion Harland.* 12mo, pp. 129. New York, Chicago, and Toronto: Fleming & Revell Company. 1897.

The story of a lovely girl, whose implicit faith in the word of God as the inerrant rule to direct us how to glorify and enjoy him, engaged to a young theological student who has imbibed the new ideas taught by the advanced critics. She is first shocked by her lover's cold-blooded treatment of the Bible; then fortifies herself against his views, only to see him contemptuously, though lovingly, casting aside her arguments and telling her of her "limitations"; then earnestly studies the works which he places in her hands until, mind and body giving way, she falls ill. Upon her death-bed, to which the lover comes, she revives long enough, as he bends over her, to cry out in agony, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him!" It is a story full of pathos and power. It derives the greatest

force from the fact which the author tells us that it is a true story. The subject of the story is not a heroine invented as a type of a class. The book is biography, not fiction. As such it illustrates with a clearness which none can fail to recognize, except they be blind, the practical result of the present day teaching of a large school of critics. They are taking away the Christ of the humble, believing soul, and are giving nothing in his place. The author professes to be neither theologian nor logician. She shows, however, in these pages a marvellously clear apprehension of the position and theological bearings of the views which distress the subject of her story, and with a certainty which is like that of an intuition grasps the practical results of the prevalent error. We wish this book were scattered everywhere and universally read. It would do good. Its title, while expressive, and, after one has read the book, found to be appropriate, will not attract, in our judgment, as much as if some other had been adopted.

THE CHRIST BROTHERHOOD. *By Louis Albert Banks, D. D., author of "The Christ Dream," "The Heavenly Trade-Winds," etc.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. 12mo, pp. 323. \$1.20.

A series of twenty-six thoughtful, suggestive discourses, written in strikingly illustrative style, and admirably adapted to the times. Some of the incidents told to illustrate the themes discussed are pathetic in the extreme, and show a rare gift on the writer's part of both description and application.

THE BIRTH AND BOYHOOD OF JESUS. *By Geo. F. Pentecost, D. D.* New York: American Tract Society. 1897. 8vo, pp. 399. \$1.75.

In twenty discourses, published here without any attempt to change them from the original form or style in which preached, the eloquent pastor first portrays the events leading to the advent of Christ and the personages connected with these events, as Zacharias and Elizabeth, John the Baptist, and the angel, studying their significance and drawing valuable lessons from them. He then studies the relations of Mary to Christ, and rightly characterizes the adoration which is paid her as blasphemous. Mary's great confession and her "magnificat," are then expounded. Then the scenes connected with the birth of Christ, and following it, down through Simeon's recognition of the Messiah at the presentation in the temple, are described and useful lessons drawn from them. Following these, four sermons are devoted to the incidents connected with Christ's visit at twelve years of age to Jerusalem, and especially to his words concerning "his Father's business." The whole is a most admirable series, well worthy of the permanent shape now given it.

COLLEGE SERMONS. *By the late Benjamin Jowett, M. A., Master of Balliol College.* Edited by the very Rev. the Hon. W. H. Freemantle, M. A., Dean of Ripon. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1896.

MORNINGS IN THE COLLEGE CHAPEL. Short Addresses to Young Men on Personal Religion. *By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University.* 12mo, pp. x., 228. \$1.25. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897.

THE CULTURE OF CHRISTIAN MANHOOD. Sunday Mornings in Battell Chapel, Yale University. *Edited by William H. Sallmon.* With portraits of authors. 12mo, pp. 309. \$1.50. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1897.

These three volumes of short discourses addressed to university students are full of gems, beautifully set, polished and rich. The addresses of Dr. Peabody are very terse, but suggestive and striking. Having only a few minutes each morning in which to conduct a devotional service, he was forced to condense, with the result that he has packed his short paragraphs full of thought and forceful presentation of truth. The sermons to Yale students, delivered in Battell Chapel, are fewer in number and of greater length. Among the preachers are Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, Alexander McKenzie, A. H. Bradford, David James Burrell, Henry Van Dyke, Tennis S. Hamlin, Geo. T. Purves, Bishop Vincent and others. Among the evangelical topics discoursed upon are the Meaning of Manhood, Christ Seeking the Lost, The Gospel's View of our Life, The Sabbath, The Sinless One, etc. We commend this volume with special interest to our young men in college.

ST. PAUL. HIS LIFE AND TIMES. *By James Iverach, M. A., Professor of Apologetics and Exegesis of the Gospels, Free Church College, Aberdeen; author of "Is God Knowable?" etc.* New York, Chicago and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. 12mo, cloth. pp. 216. 75 cents.

This volume of the *Men of the Bible* series was noticed when it first appeared several years ago. The present publishers bought the plates and have issued the present edition, and it is now offered at a much reduced price. The book will be found to be an admirably condensed life of the great apostle, less encumbered than usual with notes or the apparatus of learning, and better adapted, therefore, to general use.

MARTIN LUTHER. *By Gustav Freytag.* Translated by Henry E. O. Heine-
mann. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1897. 8vo, pp. vi.,
130. \$1.00.

This very brief, beautifully printed and beautifully illustrated life of the great reformer was written in an irenic spirit. The author seeks to present his subject in such a way as to show that the Romanist world no less than the Protestant may realize its indebtedness to him whom it has denounced as an arch-heretic. His claim is that it was through the struggle which the great reformer aroused that the Catholic Church outgrew its ancient scholasticism and in the Council of Trent erected an apparently new and more solid structure, and that he gave a more powerful expression than had hitherto been known to the common foundation of all Christian creeds, to human bravery, piety, sincerity and other graces, which have developed a higher type of manhood. We could wish that the author's idea was less Utopian. The book being chiefly biographical and a study of the character of its subject, not much attention is paid to the theological aspects of Luther's career. It is intensely interesting and well repays the reading.

A HISTORY OF AURICULAR CONFESSION AND INDULGENCES IN THE LATIN CHURCH.
By Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. Vol. I. & II. Confession and Absolution.
 Pp. xii., 523; viii., 514. Philadelphia: Lea Brothers & Co. 1896.

Dr. Lea has proved himself to be a master in the department which he has chosen for special study. His *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages* and similar works will be monumental. In the present work the same profound learning is manifest, and the same marvellous fulness and exhaustiveness characterize the treatment. The development and growth of the doctrine are traced with special care, especially in showing the manner in which the change from public confession to private, and from enforced to voluntary confession took place. The treatment of the principles or ideas underlying, as satisfaction, the classification of sins, probalism, casuistry, etc., is marked by clear discrimination and analysis.

STRATEGIC POINTS IN THE WORLD'S CONQUEST. The Universities and Colleges as Related to the Progress of Christianity. *By John R. Mott.* With map of his journey. New York, Chicago, Toronto. Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. 218. \$1.00.

This book is the record of the travels of its author around the world in the interest of the World's Student Christian Federation, the Student's Volunteer Movement, and the Intercollegiate Young Men's Christian Association. It tells of the Christian work among the universities and colleges in all the regions visited by Mr. Mott, and of the measures being adopted for arousing a new and deeper interest in this work. The first two chapters give some account of the inauguration and purposes of the organizations which the author represents. The rest of the book is taken up in details of his observations in the student centres of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australasia. The tour was one of twenty months. The author is well known as one of the leaders in the departments of Christian work represented in these pages.

THE ILLUSTRATED BIBLE TREASURY; and a New Concordance to the *Authorized and Revised Versions*, Combined with a Subject-Index and Pronouncing Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names. *Edited by William Wright, D. D.* With upwards of 350 Illustrations, and a New Indexed Bible Atlas. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1896.

This volume constitutes the "Helps" of the publishers' latest editions of their Teachers' Bible. It is to be had separately bound, and can therefore be used with any Bible. In the eight sections of the first part of it, or the "Treasury," it covers every department of Bible study, in the way of general and special introduction, history and chronology, geography, antiquities, etc. The illustrations are not only numerous, but complete and beautiful, many of them being full-page, and taken from photographs. The authors of the various parts are such men as Drs. John Hall, B. B. Warfield, M. B. Riddle, T. W. Chambers, J. F. McCurdy, Willis J. Beecher, of our own country; Sir Charles Wilson, Professor Sayce, Lieutenant-Colonel Conder, Dr. Naville, Professor George Adam Smith, Professor J. Rendel Harris, and others from beyond

the Atlantic. The book is on the conservative side of the questions which involve authorship, date, and other critical views.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES; A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-school Lessons. With Original and Selected Comments, Methods of Teaching, Illustrative Stories, Practical Applications, Notes on Eastern Life, Library References, Maps, Tables, Pictures, and Diagrams. 1898. *By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. Pp. 399. \$1.25.

Our readers, if they notice the sub-title above, will be apt to expect very much from this book. They will not be disappointed. We wonder how the authors have managed to crowd so much in its four hundred pages. Both the Authorized and Revised texts are given in full, with all the marginal readings and references, followed by full comments, analyses, references, illustrations, hints, and helps almost without number. With such a volume in hand, or attainable, that teacher is without excuse who goes unprepared to meet the class, and the scholars are without excuse who are not ready to give an intelligent and faithful account of the facts and teaching of each lesson of 1898.

BIBLE QUESTIONS AND TOPICS. *By C. M. Lowe, Ph. D., Professor of the English Bible in Heidelberg University.* Parts I. and II. Creation to Solomon. The Kings and Prophets of Judah and Israel. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. 1897. Twenty-five cents per part.

These small volumes are mere outlines, by question and topic, of a full Bible course, so arranged as to carry the student, with one hour per week, through the Bible in four years. They are specially designed for college students and normal classes. Mooted questions in church government, theology, and criticism, are excluded. Blank pages are left for the addition of notes by the student. The arrangement is good, the topics clearly stated, and in admirable order and development, and in the hands of a painstaking student, or enlarged and developed by a faithful teacher, the outlines will be a valuable guide to the study of the facts and principles of the Bible. For general circulation, however, the same objection lies against these well-prepared volumes as against all mere outlines or notes. Apart from the teacher whose voice, and presence, and enthusiasm have vitalized the outlines, mere notes or syllabi are rarely popular or useful. Every active teacher will prepare his own notes, and being the product of his own studies and interest and method, they will be invested with a life and freshness in his work impossible to the notes prepared by another.

A NEW ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE OF FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY'S PUBLICATIONS. With New Classified Topical Index. New York, Chicago and Toronto. 1897.

The completion by the firm of Fleming H. Revell Company of twenty-five years of work is worthily signalized by the issue of this catalogue of its publications. The catalogue is not only admirably prepared and well illus-

trated, full and descriptive, but it is also so indexed that one can readily find any desired title. In addition, there is a classified index, by which the inquirer is enabled to find readily the titles of works on given subjects. This index is very full and complete, and will be of great usefulness. A study of this catalogue, with some familiarity with the majority of the publications of this company, shows how well they have carried out their purpose of publishing and circulating that kind of literature which emphasizes evangelical principles. Among the very many issues over their name, it is the rarest thing that one can find aught to criticize or reject. They have guarded their good name and the religious reading public with the most scrupulous care. In the missionary department the number and character of their publications are remarkable. The catalogue of this class of works alone is well worth careful study, and it is indispensable to those who are gathering or adding to their libraries works bearing upon this department of the work of Christ's church. We congratulate the firm upon the successful completion of its first twenty-five years' work. In both character and amount it has been worthy of all praise.

THE CARDIFF ESTATE. A Story. *By Julia McNair Wright, author of "Adam's Daughters," etc.* New York: American Tract Society. 1897. 12mo, pp. 367. \$1.50.

EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS. *By Agnes Giberne, author of "Sun, Moon and Stars," "The Andersons," etc.* The same publishers. 1897. 12mo, pp. 311. \$1.50.

SIR EVELYN'S CHARGE; OR A CHILD'S INFLUENCE. *By M. I. A.* Popular edition, with sixteen full-page illustrations, by Osman Thomas. The same publishers. 1897. 12mo, pp. 404. \$1.50.

These are three beautifully printed, attractive, helpful books for young people, and may be safely put in their hands. Mrs. Julia McNair Wright excels as a writer of this class of books, and always gives us something both wholesome and readable. Many of our readers know her as the wife of a beloved professor in our college in Fulton, Missouri. Agnes Giberne is too well known a writer to need commendation. Her series of books for young people along scientific lines is widely known and justly appreciated and esteemed.

OVER AT LITTLE ACORNS. *By Elizabeth Olmis.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1897. 12mo, pp. 384. \$1.25.

HOWARD McPHLINN. A story for boys. *By Miss S. O'H. Dickson.* 12mo, pp. 206. 85 cents. The same publishers.

THEODORA AND OTHER STORIES. *By Elizabeth Olmis.* 12mo, pp. 220. 85 cts. The same publishers.

TRUE STORY OF A JEWISH MAIDEN. *By Annie E. Wilson.* 12mo, pp. 193. 85 cents. The same publishers.

CAMPING ON THE BLUE RIDGE. Near the Lick Log Tunnel. *By Mrs. E. H. Amis.* 12mo, pp. 106. 60 cents. The same publishers.

These recent additions to the publications of the Richmond Committee are worthy of a place in our Sunday-school and young people's libraries. They are pure and wholesome in every way, and at the same time sustain the young reader's interest, as we have proved by practical test.

The December number of the *American Monthly Review of Reviews* has several interesting features. Mr. Earnest Knaufft, editor of the *Art Student*, contributes an elaborate study of "John Gilbert and Illustration in the Victorian Era"; Lady Henry Somerset pays a tribute to the late Duchess of Teck; an English officer in the Indian service writes about the Ameer of Afghanistan; Mr. E. V. Smalley discusses Canadian reciprocity, and Mr. Alex. D. Anderson summarizes the progress of the American Republics. There is also a twenty-three page illustrated department devoted to the season's new books, with an introductory chapter, by Albert Shaw, on "Some American Novels and Novelists." "How the Bible Came Down to Us," is the title of an article by Dr. Clifton H. Levy. Dr. Levy traces the history of the various versions of the Scriptures, presenting photographic reproductions of portions of the most celebrated manuscripts and printed texts. In view of the recent revival of interest in biblical discovery and textual criticism, this attempt to give a popular exposition of the subject will doubtless be warmly welcomed.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 44.—APRIL, 1898.

I. THE NEW PNEUMATOLOGY.

The genetic principle of the New Theology, the dynamic force with which it reconstructs the Old and organizes the New, is the *Immanence of God*.

Immanence and Transcendence are philosophical antitheses. Immanence (*immaneo*) literally means to remain in, indwelling, inhabiting, while Transcendence (*transcendeo*) literally means to go beyond, surpass, stand above, be superior to. An immanent soul is an embodied soul, an incarnated spirit, such as are all living men; a transcendent soul is one which has gone beyond the material organism, a disembodied soul. An immanent God is a world-embodied God, an intramundane God; a transcendent God is one which stands above the world and is superior to it and in no sense a part of it, an extramundane God. The life of an immanent God is an outflow; the life of a transcendent God is an inflow. An immanent God evolves; a transcendent God creates. An immanent God is natural; a transcendent God is supernatural. An immanent God operates *ad intra*; a transcendent God acts *ad extra*. An immanent God is related to the world as the Three Persons in the Godhead are related to each other; a transcendent God is related to the world in an extramundane and supersensible manner. Paternity, filiation, spiration, within the circle of the Godhead, are immanent and intrasitive acts; creation, providence, miracles, redemption are transcendent

and transitive acts of God. The world is a divine flux, in the opinion of one of these schools; the world is a divine creation, in the opinion of the other school.

Now the organic principle of the New Theology, the archetypal idea with which it builds, the fundamental concept upon which it lays all its structures, the ruling genius which presides over all its developments, the base-line from which it runs out all its surveys, the point of view from which it makes all its observations, is the Immanence of God.

The new doctrine of the Spirit is a special construction of this Platonic conception of the nature and life of God. It is part and parcel of a system, an article set in its creed by the logic of its premise. The doctrine is developed cautiously, unctiously, and with a great show of Scripturalness. Quotation marks, embracing texts of the Bible, dot the pages of its literature. Its exegesis is humble in tone, but dogmatic in conclusion. Interpretations are made in the figures of rhetoric, and the exact language of science is carefully and contemptuously avoided. The reader is never quite certain that he has the writer's meaning. The ideas are elusively mystical, and the language is always simile. The "personal equation" of the reader has the widest play. If his eye is unjaundiced, the text is white; if his vision is discolored, what he reads has the same tint. It must be so. The poetry and sentiment given out in figures of speech, must be translated into cold prose by the heart of the reader. If you cannot accept the doctrine, you are a subject of pity, because your eye is beholden. You are complacently told that your altitude is too low, that your spirit is too earthly. You may possess Christ, but not the spirit. You may have reached Calvary in your pilgrimage, but not Pentecost. Your method of approach is all wrong. You must brood, not think; you must feel, not cognize. A little while ago the cry was, "Back to Christ;" now, however, the call is, "Forward to Pentecost."

The system seems about to "box the compass" of novelty, to complete the circuit of reconstruction. It has introduced

us to the New Revelation, the New God, the New Man, the New Sin, the New Christ, the New Atonement, the New Spirit, the New Life, the New Eschatology. What now remains but the Alexander act of sighing for other worlds! This newness will soon be old, and the old is flat and insipid. Then these spirits which prefer to bound with new error than to lie in the cemetery of old truth must hie away to other adventures in religion.

"The fathers" of the new doctrine are Plato, Descartes, Kant, Lessing, Spinoza, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher. The offspring is baptized "Christian Pantheism." To get even a superficial idea of its meaning we must take a "running view" of the whole system.

The New Bible is a gradual unfolding of the mind of God to man "through the reason, through experience, through the course of history, or through the events and discipline of life." These men tell us that if Christ and the Apostles had had the "environment" of to-day, the indwelling spirit of our times, they would think as they think and reconstruct as they reconstruct. Revelation is a subjective process, and not an objective finality. A late writer says: "Pentecost was the culminating act of an æonial process of redemptive activity. . . . Spirit-taught men possess a new Bible. . . . Holy men of to-day speak and write and work as they are moved by the Holy Spirit. They are acted upon along the lines of their daily calling. The men of to-day are inspired for the work of to-day. . . . The declaration that 'no prophecy ever came by the will of men, but holy men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit,' is not to be limited to the utterances of the Hebrew prophets, but is to be widened in its scope to include the utterances of all Spirit-taught teachers."¹

The New God is a mysterious, undefined, formless substance, so intimately connected with the world as to form a part of it, and to preclude the idea of separating in reality between the two, and the whole idea of the miracle as a supernatural

¹*After Pentecost, What?* By James M. Campbell.

interruption of the course of nature. The life of the world is the life of God. Some check themselves before going so far as this, but all such checkings are illogical. The New God is pictured as having no sense of justice, no emotion of wrath, no power of indignation, no concern for himself, but is merely an immanent love-force which makes for the happiness of men.

The New Man is not strictly human, but theanthropic, a sort of chemical compound of divinity and humanity, Christ being his substance and the Holy Spirit his soul. He and those like him make the "New Race," which is realistic in its constitution, and which has for its new name the word "Church." This New Race is the goal of the depotentiation of God downward, and the impotentiation of man upward. The New God is man-centered, and the New Man is God-centered.

The New Sin is "depravity without demerit,"¹ defect in being, miscarriage of development. It is not so immoral as it is unfortunate. There are deformities of body and deformities of soul. Sin is the technicality for these deformities of soul. They come in the same way, naturally. They are to be eliminated in the same naturalistic way. One is not more defective and heinous than the other. Culture, physical and spiritual, is the great desideratum.

The New Christ is not a hypostatical union of divinity and humanity, but a substantive union. Oxygen and hydrogen have an affinity for each other, and when they unite they form a third substance called water. Water is neither oxygen nor hydrogen, but a substantive union of both. Christ is neither human nor divine, but a compound of the two, a unity which is theanthropic. After his incarnation his substance is not dual, but monadic, not divinity, not humanity, not one nor both, but a *tertium quid*, which might properly be called *theanthropicity*. The incarnation was the result of a kind of chemical affinity between divinity and humanity. In Christ these two substances came within range of each other and they

¹*Systematic Theology*, Miley.

united, like the acid and the alkali in the chemist's laboratory to form the neutral salt.

The New Atonement is unifying and vivific. We are saved by what Christ *is*, rather than by what he *does*. The incarnation, not the cross, is the central idea of the gospel. The atonement was made primarily for himself, to perfect the union in him of divinity and humanity; and men become the beneficiaries of this atonement by being made realistically one with him. The atonement is literally at-one-ment, the essential union of man and God. Says an able interpreter of this school, speaking of the atonement of Christ: "He redeems mankind from the curse of sin by developing and perfecting in himself the true life-communion between man and God, passing through and perfecting every age, from infancy to manhood. . . . The true life-communion presupposes the *essential* connection between God and man. . . . He quickens the essential connection, renews and perfects it. . . . He offers himself on the cross not primarily on behalf of individuals, but on his own behalf as the Mediator."¹

There is between God and man an *essential* union. (The word essential is used in its strict philosophical sense.) Sin makes this connection abnormal, and dooms its development to miscarriage. Christ in the atonement perfected the union and so became archetypal of a new development which should be true to type and ideal. Now a new force is required to preside over and carry forward the new start. The incarnation needs application. The Holy Spirit is that force, inaugurating and perfecting the life of Christ in individuals. He is the dynamic in Christian evolution. He is the soul of the New Race, the formative power in the Church of God. We must think of the Church as the real "body" of Christ, and of the Spirit as the living soul animating that body and perfecting its development. Pentecost was the incoming of this Spirit into the Church. Now God is immanent in the Church.

To understand this new doctrine of the Spirit, we must lay

¹*Institutes of Christian Religion*, Gerhart.

hold of the idea of the "New Race." We must interpret Christian Realism by the side of Adamic Realism.

The Old Race is Adamic; the New is Christic. Their constitution and life are similar; their bases differ in kind. The substance of the Old is Humanity; the substance of the New is Christianity. The whole quantity of Humanity came into being when Adam appeared on the earth; the whole quantity of Christianity came into existence when Christ was incarnated. The unitary Humanity is being individuated and personalized by generation; the primordial Christianity by regeneration. Individual Christians come into existence as do individual men. Natural law reigns in the spiritual world. Christians are born of the Christic substance as individual men are born of the Adamic substance. The generative force in the Old Race, breaking up Humanity into individual men, is an immanent spirit; the generative force in the New Race, breaking up the Christianity into individual Christians, is likewise an immanent spirit. In the Old, the generative force is the Human Spirit; in the New, the generative power is the Holy Spirit. The relation of the Holy Spirit to Christianity and the Christian is the same as the relation of Human Spirit to Humanity and men. The product of the Human Spirit is Human Life; the product of the Holy Spirit is Christian Life. The Life of the Christian is the life of Christ in the same sense in which the life of man is the life of Adam; it is the sameness of identity. Adam's identical life is transmitted to his posterity; there is no break in the continuity; no interruption in the flow; its identity is numerical and specific. So the identical life of Christ is transmitted to his posterity; there is no break in the continuity; the flow is uninterrupted from the first to the last Christian. The Old Race is a species; so is the New. "The solidarity of the race" has its exact analogue in the "solidarity of the Church." "Church" is the name of the New Race.

To comprehend the New Pneumatology we must, then, contrast the Old Race out of the loins of Adam, and the New

Race out of the loins of Christ. We must hold in mind that the substance of the Old Race, the matter, the stuff of which it is made, is Humanity; of the New, Christianity. What Humanity is to the Adamic Race, Christianity is to the Church. What the First Adam is to the First Race, the Second Adam is to the Second Race. Humanity is individualized into men by generation; Christianity is individualized into Christians by regeneration. The processes are identical. The active principle in both cases is immanent. In the Old Race it is the Human Spirit; in the New Race it is the Holy Spirit. The life of the New Race, of the Church, of the Saint, is the life of Christ in the same sense in which the life of the Old Race, of the individual man, of Society, is the life of Adam. The spirit of man and the spirit of the Christian—the one is the Adamic Spirit, and the other is the Christic Spirit. "As in Adam, so in Christ;" this famous Pauline parallelism is interpreted in the new school by the hypothesis of Realism.

A few extracts will sustain this exposition in all its essential points.

Dr. Gerhart, who gives this doctrine the most formal and scientific statement, is the first witness. He says:

"Pentecost is an epoch which is of the nature of a birth from above, introducing a fellowship different in kind. . . . As a consequence it must also be maintained that no function of the Holy Spirit, no function peculiar to the Christian communion was operative anterior to Pentecost. . . . 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. . . . 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. A new organization the Church is, because the principle and law of her origin and growth is the incarnate Son, the divine-human Lord glorified at the right hand of God. . . . He perfected in heaven becomes by the gift of His Spirit the principle and substance of His body the Church. . . . Pentecost, since it quickens a human race fashioned after the new type in Christ, is a creative epoch. The day of Pentecost may therefore be styled the birthday of the Christian Church, not merely because the history of the Christian Church dates from that day, but because this beginning is of the nature of a birth. The beginning of the Church is analogous to the

beginning of the individual man, analogous to the beginning of the personal history on the earth of the incarnate Son. . . . The Son of Man glorified is the principle of regeneration. . . . 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 participation in the life of the last Adam. . . . As natural birth implies a translation, a severance from the embryonic mode of growth, and an introduction into the family, a totally different sphere, into the new conditions and relations of separate individuality, so is the birth 'of water and the Spirit' a transfer of the subject from the kingdom of Adamic nature, from the fallen human race which stands in the first Adam, into the kingdom of the Spirit, into the life of the regenerate race which springs from the last Adam. . . . The Christian Church, being the organized form of the race of the Second Man."¹

Bishop Martensen describes the Spirit as a "moulding principle," a "plastic" power in creation, providence and redemption, "who models and prepares the manifold natural idiosyncrasies of men and the distinctive peculiarities of nations into an organ for the one Christ. . . . The Spirit ever moulds human nature. . . . The principle of free development continually creating the new upon the earth. . . . He moulds Christian doctrine and worship into new forms. He devises and finds out new means and plans for the spread of the kingly empire of Christ. He, the holy, ever-present principle of providence."²

In this elaborate system, evolved from the Pantheistic premise of the immanence of God, regeneration is interpreted as a literal birth, and sanctification as a literal growth. In natural generation the substance of the parents is communicated to the child, and he is literally bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh. The life of the parent is imparted to the child. He grows from infancy to manhood by the power of an inherent life-force, which is modified by environment. In a similar manner the Christian is a derivation from Christ. The Spirit of Christ begets him in the likeness of Christ in the same sense in which Adam begat Cain in his own likeness. He then grows like the child. Natural law reigns in the spiritual world. Martensen describes regeneration as the establishment

¹*Institutes of Christian Religion*, Vol. ii., p. 444, *Sq.*

²*Dogmatics*, pp. 383-386.

of a "new personality," and further tells us that this new personality is a "copy of the divine-human personality of Christ;" and Henry Drummond taught his many admirers that Christians grow like the lily grows, without effort, without trying.

The regenerate man is a derivate; he and Christ are *homousian*; there is both a unity and community of life between them. All such figures for the mystical union as those of the vine and the branches, the head and the members, are literal illustrations. The sap of the vine is the sap of the branches, and the life of Christ is the life of his people; his life and theirs is as identical as is the life of the vine and the branches. The same blood courses through the body that flows through the head; so the spiritual life of Christ is the common blood both of himself and his saints. He is the literal Head, and they the literal Body; the two are united by a living neck. The sap of the vine, the blood of the body, the life of Christ is the Holy Spirit. A principle of realism rules the entire interpretation. We are said to be "partakers of the divine nature," "partakers of the Holy Ghost," "partakers of Christ." The word "nature" has both a primary and a secondary meaning. In its primary sense it signifies substance, but in its secondary sense it signifies inclination, disposition, character. The pantheistic interpretation here gives the word its primary meaning, and teaches that the Christian is a partaker of the divine essence, while the traditional and orthodox interpretation construes it as signifying character, and teaches that Christians are made partakers of God's holiness, that the regenerate are like Christ. The one school teaches that we are made partakers of the divine nature in a metaphysical sense, the other in a character-sense.

It is at this point that many modern writers, otherwise theistic, couple to the pantheistic system. They think of the Holy Ghost, not so much as the personal agent originating and preserving and training Christian life, but more as an immanent life-force indwelling in Christianity, and operating fluently rather than voluntarily; of regeneration as a literal

birth, wherein the metaphysical nature of Christ is communicated to the regenerate as the physical and metaphysical natures of the parents are transmitted to their offspring; of sanctification as a kind of naturalistic growth and development of the supernatural life of Christ in the heart, which growth and development are conditioned by a spiritual environment. Hence we find them prescribing for spiritual health and growth an elaborate sanitory and athletic system. Physical exercise has its exact counterpart in spiritual exercise. Christians grow like vines, and the desideratum is a wise and industrious spiritual horticulture. Christians reach maturity as a child attains manhood, and so the great need of sanctification is an intelligent hygiene and active spiritual culture. The power in an electric plant can be applied by a proper system of gearing so as to run cars and illuminate streets; so the power in Christian life can be applied by a system of spiritual bands and pulleys. The power is resident in the heart, and is the Holy Ghost. He is dealt with as if he were a force, and not a sovereign Person. He is harnessed and used by a system of machinery. If good results are not obtained, it is because the gearing is defective; but if instructions, or more properly, directions, be followed, the Holy Ghost will work just as inevitably and naturally as does electricity. The system, consciously or unconsciously, reduces the Spirit to the category of a second cause, an immanent force in Christianity in the general and in the Christian in particular. The electrical force is for all the world, but it is specialized by some particular company. So the Holy Ghost is a spiritual force for all Christendom, but it is specialized by each individual Christian. Electric light-plants vary in quality, and so do Christians, not because the spiritual force varies, but because it is used clumsily in one case and skillfully in another. This modern scheme permits us to represent the Church as a kind of spiritual plant, generating religion as the electrical works generate electricity, and to picture each Christian as an individual spiritual dynamo. The whole scheme discounts the

sovereignty of the Spirit, who bestows his gifts as "he will."

Three volumes lie before us which we find tinctured with this soteriological pantheism. Their authors have, perhaps, unconsciously, yet really, slipped from the transcendence of God into the theory of his immanence; they have slipped the collar of theism for that of pantheism, when interpreting Christian life.

Mr. Campbell, for example, says concerning regeneration:

"Something more has transpired than the quickening of powers already existing. A new life has been generated; a new principle of moral action has been imparted; a new process of spiritual evolution has been started. . . . In this new epoch, spiritual power is the abiding possession of the Church. Some measure of it all Christians possess in virtue of the essential saving baptism of the Spirit by which they are united to the spiritual body of Christ. With many the measure received and used is well-nigh infinitesimal. They have a little strength, enough to keep them from denying Christ's name, but not enough to make them mighty in witnessing for Him. Others have merely a residue of the Spirit, the dregs of a former abundance, the mouldy manna of yesterday's gathering. . . . To make their witness-bearing clear and bright, what is needed? A new effusion of the Spirit? No; but a new baptism of power."¹

According to this writer, what is infused in our regeneration? A new life like the life of Christ? A new disposition like his? No; that which is infused is the Holy Spirit, who remains in the heart as abiding power. The feeble Christian needs to turn on the current. Perhaps the trolley arm is off the wire. The potentialities of the Holy Ghost are within him; he needs to bring them out by the use of spiritual machinery. He needs to be "filled with the Spirit," not to be brought under his personal power and influence, but with the Holy Ghost himself, as a pail is filled with water.

Rev. A. J. Gordon defines regeneration as

"Not a change of nature, but the imparting of a new nature. . . . We mean simply that the regenerated man has two natures—the Adam nature which is not improved, but crucified and to be put off; and the Christ nature which is to be cultured and developed till it is completely dominant in the believer. Therefore in our view Christian growth does not consist in the improvement of the old man, but in its repression; and on the other hand in the development of the new man till we attain unto 'the measure

¹ *After Pentecost, What?* pp. 159, 217.

of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' In other words, we hold that sanctification consists, as an eminent writer says, in the twofold process of mortification and vivification—the mortification of the old and the vivification of the new. . . . We hold that the true definition of regeneration is, that it is 'the communication of the Divine Nature to man by the operation of the Holy Spirit, through the Word.' . . . As Christ was made partaker of human nature by his incarnation, that so he might enter into truest fellowship with us, we are made partakers of the Divine Nature by regeneration, that we may enter into the truest fellowship with God. . . . It is the divine life imparted to us—the very life of very God communicated to the human soul, and bringing forth there its own proper fruit."¹

Here, then, is this writer's interpretation of the "Twofold Life." The Spirit in regeneration does not change the old nature, but on the contrary creates a new nature, and that new nature is the divine nature of God. The regenerate become divine in just as realistic a sense as the Son became man. We are made partakers of the divine nature in the same manner in which Christ was made a partaker of human nature. If we may say in any real and substantive sense that Christ is man, we may say just as truly that the Christian is God. He has two substantial natures—the sinful and the regenerate. When he expresses himself through his sinful nature he sins, and when he expresses himself through the regenerate nature he does righteously. Christ is constituted of two natures—the divine and the human; and the regenerate man is constituted of two natures—the sinful and the holy. It is Dr. Gordon's own illustration. It is he, not we, who makes the constitution of the regenerate sinner like the constitution of the theanthropic Saviour. The Person of Christ is the model and type of the person of the Redeemer. In Christ the divine and human attributes communicate with and through each other, and so in the Christian the sinful and holy attributes have fellowship with each other. "The very life of the very God is communicated to the human soul."

Now comes the Rev. Andrew Murray with a startling novelty, delivered after a sharp censure upon systematic theologians for ignoring the doctrine of the Spirit almost altogether,

¹ *The Twofold Life*, pp. iv., 22.

and misinterpreting him in as many places as they do refer to him—a novelty which he pronounces with the dogmatism of one who stands next to the Spirit as his familiar and confidential friend. According to this writer the regenerate man has *two* spirits; the first his own proper personal spirit which has been quickened into new life, and the second is the true and proper personal Spirit of Christ. He says:

“In the words of Ezekiel we find, in the one promise, this twofold blessing God bestows through his Spirit very strikingly set forth. The first is, ‘I will put within you a new spirit,’ that is, man’s own spirit is to be renewed and quickened by the work of God’s own Spirit. When this has been done, then there is the second blessing, ‘I will put my Spirit within you,’ to dwell in that new spirit. . . . The Holy Spirit is the Inmost Self of the Father and the Son. My spirit is my inmost Self. The Holy Spirit renews that inmost Self, and dwells in it, and fills it. And so he becomes to me what he was to Jesus, the very life of my personality.”¹

This may be interpreted by the conservative to satisfy his reading of the Scriptures; but when he asks this writer what he means by this second Spirit in the regenerate, he is told that “it is not the Spirit of God as such, but the Spirit of Jesus.” He has written this book for the purpose of showing that “it is as an indwelling Life that the Holy Spirit must be known.” This Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Glorified Christ; in other words, it is the indwelling Life of Christ in heaven that animates the new spirit of man.

At this point and upon this subject a very interesting quotation from Dr. Stevens may be made:

“Many scholars have called in question the current view that the Holy Spirit in our sources is meant a self distinct from Christ, and have asserted that under this term we must understand Christ himself glorified into a Spirit, or the spiritual presence and manifestation of Christ to his disciples after his departure from earth.”²

Dr. Stevens then reviews with great ability the exegetical arguments for this view, and reaches the strong conclusion that the Holy Spirit which indwells believers is not the personal spirit of Christ glorified, but a separate and distinct Self, the Third Person in the Godhead.

¹ *The Spirit of Christ*, pp. 16, 23.

² *Johannine Theology*, p. 193.

"The Spirit," says Murray, "not only dwells in me as a locality, or within me, alongside and round that inmost Ego in which I am conscious of myself, but, within that I, becomes the new and Divine life-principle of the new personality. The same Spirit that was and is in Christ, his inmost Self, becomes my inmost self."¹

The inmost Self of Christ is the inmost Self of the Christian. Here is not likeness, but identity; not analogy, but sameness. The Selfhood of Christ and the Selfhood of the Christian, they are the same. What, then, is a Christian but another Christ! The Scriptures teach us that we shall be like Christ; but we do not understand them as teaching that we shall be Christs—that his Selfhood and ours are destined to unite.

From Professor J. T. Beck, "one of the most deeply scriptural and spiritual theologians," Mr. Murray quotes approvingly:

"It is the very same Spirit who is the personal life of the Father and the Son, who has now become his (the Christian's) own personal life, his inmost self. In Christianity . . . a new life-organization of the quickening Spirit. . . . If the divine is indeed dynamically and substantially as a personal life to be organized into the human individuality, the only adequate organ for such a mediation will be one in which the revelation, or the divine principle of organization, shall make itself personal in the human being. That is, it will not be sufficient that the Divine should reveal itself in some man only, with whatever strength, in the way of his consciousness through the channel of conscience. . . . In a revelation, which is really to translate the Divine into man's individual personal life—in truth, to form men of God—the Divine as such—that is, as a personal life—must first be embodied in a personal center in humanity. . . . With the entrance of Christ into the human individual, the Divine life becomes immanent in us—not in its universal world relation, but as a personal principle—so that man is not only *ποίημα Θεοῦ*, a being made of God, but *τέκνον Θεοῦ*, or a being begotten of God. And with the growing transformation of the individual into the life-type of Christ there is perfected the development of the perfected personal life out of God, in God, and to God—the development not only of a moral or of a theocratic communion, but a communion of nature. . . . The Divine only receives its true acknowledgment when it is accepted as what it really is, the absolute world-principle, and becomes the absolute Life-principle of our personal development. . . . And this is now that in which Revelation finds its perfection, in the organizing the Divine as a living formative Spirit, 'the life-giving Spirit,' so that as a productive Life-Principle, or as the power of a personal life, it

¹ *The Spirit of Christ*, p. 332.

could become immanent in man's moral life, and so that out of that it continues development, the Divine could be reproduced in the individual as his personal life, and so God, in harmony with his idea as the Absolute, should indeed be the all-determining life-principle in man."¹

But this exposition is threatening to exceed its allotted limits. It must be arrested here in its incomplete state, so that three or four blows may be aimed at its vitals.

1. It is a child of pantheistic maternity. However named, baptized, uniformed, ornamented, or poetized, it still looks like its mother and remains true to its breeding. It belongs to the same family with the Immanence of God, the Evolution of the world, the Realism of the race, the Privation Theory of sin, the Mystical Theory of the atonement, and the Higher Life Theory of religion. Those theists who invoke the system to interpret regeneration and sanctification do the disastrous act of changing the design after the building is three-fourths finished. They start on the theistic foot and land on the pantheistic. They swap the theistic horse for the pantheistic heifer, and go on ploughing just as if the exchange had never been made. They put the meaning of Ashdod in the Jews' language. This unannounced and perhaps unconscious change of premises persistently vexes from start to finish. Dr. George B. Stevens truly says: "Experience shows the thought of mankind concerning God tends strongly towards one of two extremes. It tends either towards a pantheistic identification of God with nature, or towards a deistic separation of God from the world and from human life. The Christian doctrine avoids both these extremes with their pernicious consequences. It conserves the truth which pantheism exaggerates, by affirming the presence of God in his world, while it also conserves the truth which deism exaggerates, by maintaining the independence and supremacy of God in his relation to the world."²

2. This new doctrine misses the nature of regeneration. It teaches that it is a literal birth, in which the nature of Christ

¹ *The Spirit of Christ*, p. 326.

² *Doctrine and Life*, p. 123.

is imparted to the Christian. The child develops into a man like his father ; so the Christian ought to develop into a Christ. In the theistic scheme regeneration is not an evolution, but a creation. That which is created is not a new substance, nor new faculties, but a new disposition. If human life were a river, regeneration would be, not the making of a new river, but the incipient clearing of the old tawny tide and the straightening of the old crooked channel. If human life were a tree, regeneration would not be the development of a new species, but such a change in the old sinful crab stock as would end in the production of an Albemarle pippin. If human life were a lion, regeneration would not be the birth of a new kind of animal, but the supernatural infusion of the lamb's gentleness into the lion's fierceness. In this sense we are made "new creatures in Christ Jesus." Regeneration is a supernatural and creative act, and the product of that act is a new heart, a new disposition. There is no transmutation of species. There is a species man, but there is no species sinner, nor species saint. Sinfulness and saintliness are not specific qualities, but traits of character. Wicked parents do not beget sinful children under the influence of the law of heredity, nor do Christian parents beget holy children. Sin and holiness are not generated ; neither can be propagated ; if one, so could the other ; they are transmitted by the action of God, not by a law of genesis. Ours is a sinful race, but not a race of sinners ; the Church is a body of believers, not a family of saints in the literal sense. To be "born again" is a figure of speech ; the "new man" is not a creation *de novo*, but a man with a new disposition, relationship, and destiny ; the "new creature" is not a new being, a new substance, but a man with a new determination. A reformed drunkard is a new man, a new creature, born again, not literally but figuratively—one whose intemperate habits have been broken, and who has been introduced into a new life of sobriety. Regeneration is an initial reformation ; the disruption of the sinful habit ; a change in character.

3. The new doctrine tormentingly deals with the Spirit in sanctification as if he were a Force and not a Free Agent. His first implantation is in regeneration, and from that time on he is a "plastic force," an "indwelling life-power," an immanent principle moulding and forming from within. Grace is Force. Force can be geared and made to do your bidding. So this school gives us all sorts of minute directions as to the manner of gearing and applying this Spiritual Force so as to get pre-desired results. Their treatises on the subject are largely handbooks of instructions—minute directions as to how to grow a Christian as a gardener would tell you how to grow tulips. Tyndall once challenged the Church to show the force of religion as he could show the force of wind or water. Given a certain machinery and you can make water grind corn with unvarying uniformity. If there is a religious force, let its experts show it by fore-naming the effect and then harnessing the power so as to get it. The new doctrine has fallen into this trap. It gives you precise directions, which, if followed, will produce certain effects in sanctification with unvarying uniformity. The promises are like those of the vendor of patent medicines. And why not? If there is a spiritual force in a man, he can show it; he can prove it according to challenge. He can show his physical power by lifting a weight upon demand, or his intellectual power by working a problem in geometry, or his emotional power by laughing at the humorous, or his volitional power by running a race. If there is a spiritual force in him, then he ought to be able to use it and to show it in the only way we know anything about power, namely, by its effects. But all such challenges are nonsensical if the power in sanctification is a free and sovereign Spirit who works when and how he pleases. That sort of power cannot be transmitted by bands and pulleys. We can ask, but we cannot command. God's Spirit is not indwelling Force.

There is unmistakably a great discouragement at the heart of the Church. Efficiency is thought not to be proportionate

to equipment. Progress is supposed not to be up to promise. Returns are regarded as meager for the investment. To many the outlook is gloomy. There is occasion for sighing and crying in Jerusalem.

Hall Caine translates the heart of many when he makes John Storm say, "The Church is a chaos, uncle, a wreck of fragments, without unity, principle, or life. No man can find foothold in it now without accommodating his duty and his loyalty to his chances of a livelihood. It is a career, not a crusade. . . . It loves the thrones of the world and bows down to the golden calf."

That is a distinct triumph which causes the Church to look within, to unbraid its own spirit, to try its own reins. Heart-searching is a benediction. And many anxious souls are searching, with all diligence and prayer, to ascertain the cause of the present unhappy depression, and, if possible, prescribe for the disorder. Mistakes of diagnosis and prescription have been made, and it is at once a kindness, and a help to the cause, to point out the error.

Certain ones are coming forward with a new doctrine of the Spirit as a panacea for the ills of the hour. Failure to recognize this new doctrine has in their opinion brought the present gloom. Its acceptance, it is said, means instant revival of spiritual life throughout the Church, an increase of power, and both a widening and deepening of the currents of religion. In a word, it would restore apostolic days and power.

When we consider the godliness of its source, we ought to touch it with a tender hand; when we consider the scholarliness of those who inculcate it, we ought to touch it with a cautious hand; when we consider the purpose for which it is brought out, we ought to touch it with a trembling hand; but when we consider the cause of truth, we ought to touch it with a firm hand, and bravely expose its fallacy.

Doubtless the Holy Spirit does not receive full honor in the modern Church. The tendency is to lean upon human inventions—cathedral buildings, operatic music, remunerative

church-life, catching sermons, the machinery of societies, the hurrah of religious conventions, and the high pressure of peripatetic evangelism, which is "for revenue only." Our very buildings are elaborately expensive Church-plants, which, besides taking a large revenue to keep them running, constantly expose us to the danger of hoping that their architectural magnificence and cathedral splendors will draw men into their inner fold. In many instances, they are handsome, luxurious, free concert halls, and there is the unconscious hope that the ravishing sounds will entice the world behind the gates of the sanctuary: here we are in danger of imposing a delusion upon the worshipper—of making him think that mere sensuous delight in artistic music is real spiritual rapture and joy in the Holy Ghost. The tendency is to shorten the distance between the Church and the world by relaxing discipline, pandering to worldly pleasures, and even furnishing cheap theatricals, and conferring social distinctions: here we are in great danger of making our congregations ecclesiastical clubs, and finding our members have come in with the idea that they were promised entertainment and liberal club privileges. Entertainment threatens to supplant the notion of instruction, and our preachers find that "sight drafts" are made upon them for sermons that please, that draw, that hold the young as by spell, and that deliver the hearer from all effort and responsibility of hearing: we are threatened with the substitution of the magnetism of the preacher for the magnetism of the Holy Spirit. We are about to smother the Church with societies, congregational, denominational, inter-denominational, extra-denominational, until half the thought and energy and revenue which ought to be expended upon the cause of Christ is taken up in the effort to keep this elaborate machinery in operation: here there is great danger of dishonoring the Spirit and his cause by relying upon human inventions. Then the religious conventions of the hour! how multitudinous! how expensive! how superficial! how dishonoring to the Spirit! the "whoop-'em-up" method, the attempt to stampede sinners,

to corral them as negroes do rabbits with noise and shouting : do men hope to "bulldoze" the Spirit, to storm him into their scheme, to lay on his back the whip of the political "boss"?

Well, the world refuses to suck the Church's honey : some say make it sweeter. The world is largely indifferent to ecclesiastical sweldom : some say make the Church more aristocratic. The world will not be ground in the ecclesiastical mill : some say multiply machinery and increase the enginery. The world will not stampede : some say more conventions and louder lungs. But we surely have gone far enough in this disastrous direction, this conscious or unconscious reliance upon something else than the sovereign Spirit of God. Reformation is the demand of the hour. Back to Apostolic simplicity. Every reformation returns to it. So did the Lutheran and the Wesleyan. Sinners need regeneration ; they cannot be regenerated by millinery, nor by enticement, nor by the social lash, nor by the hurrah of the coacher of the race-track ; the heart of the world is too deeply wrong for "methods."

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

II. THE ANCIENT HEBREW POLITY.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the oldest is sometimes the newest. The dew which rests upon the beginning of things, is never completely exhaled. The water is always pure and sweet at the fountain, however turbid the stream in its after course. As we follow the development of history, we discover sometimes with surprise that institutions and ordinances, which we had supposed the creations of modern necessity and invention, were implicitly contained in seeds planted from the beginning. Thus in the old, yea, in the oldest of the old, we find the newness of much that marks our most progressive and advanced civilization. An illustration of this is afforded in the subject of the present article—*the political significance of the ancient Hebrew Commonwealth, the part it was called to perform in the historic drama of those times.*

There can be no difference of opinion as to the mission of the Hebrew Church. When the original Patriarchal faith had been thoroughly perverted and corrupted—when idolatry had been compacted into a system, and spread over the earth—God called Abraham out of that very Chaldea where this idolatry originated, to be the founder of a distinct people who should become the depository and guardian of Divine truth. In the front of all the statutes and ordinances given for their guidance was this supreme proclamation, “Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord”. In the assertion of a pure Monotheism, and with a ritual of worship which under exquisite pictorial emblems represented how the transgressor might be restored to the favour and fellowship of Jehovah, the Hebrew Church stood forth in protest against every form of a universal idolatry. Her geographical position in the centre of the surrounding nations, has been remarked as one of the providential indications of her mission. A nation selected for a Priestly function is placed in the bosom of other nations,

that her stationary light may be diffused over the entire circle from centre to circumference. That her testimony may more completely penetrate every land, note the enforced Evangelism when, as a Protestant against all idolatry, she is borne a reluctant and captive witness into those very countries where idolatry held its court with the most imposing symbols under which its mysteries could be veiled. Nor should it be overlooked that, from the moment of the great Captivity to the final overthrow of the Hebrew State, the interval was a period of dispersion during which the entire nation was never gathered within its ancient borders. It will thus appear how effectively the Hebrew Church discharged the office to which she had been appointed as a witness for the one living and true God, against that idolatry which occurring after the Flood constituted the second great apostasy of the race.

Can we assign as distinct a function to the Hebrew State? Were important principles as clearly embodied in the *civil polity* as in the *symbols of worship*? My answer is, that the one was intended by Jehovah to be a protest against the universal perversion of government, as the other was against the universal corruption of religion. It is a large proposition, which we must endeavour to make good. In the fragment of history given of the ante-diluvian world, no trace of any form of government appears but that of the family: the expanding branches of which would naturally recognize a loose subjection to the Patriarch, whose extreme longevity enabled him to embrace a tribe under his authority. Under such conditions society could scarcely be considered organized. The obedience would be an obedience to custom, rather than to law; whilst no central authority bound these separate fraternities together in a single Commonwealth. To the absence of all governmental restraints, doubtless, we must ascribe that degree of violence on the earth which could only be purged by the waters of the Deluge. In the death-penalty enjoined upon Noah, a little later, is detected the first germ of civil

government. It is a comprehensive principle, capable of expansion into the widest legislation ; for it devolves upon society the duty of protecting human life, and organized it for that purpose. The Ordinance "whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is not the proclamation of private revenge, but the prohibition of it. It is the creation of the Magistrate armed with the sword of justice, which never smites but in the name of law. In this world principles are the seeds from which laws and institutions are produced ; but the development is often gradual and slow. From the days of Noah onward, the earth had first to be re-peopled : and the exercise of Patriarchal rule would naturally proceed under the same conditions as at the beginning. Society would move forward under ante-diluvian precedents, rather than under the organizing force of the new revelation. It was attended with like results : until, at the tower of Babel, we find the race embarked in a direct conspiracy to defeat the purpose of Jehovah. The issue was fairly joined upon the plain of Shinar : and if the Divine promise is to be kept, of which the Covenant rainbow was the sign, a bridle must be put upon the human will through the majesty of human law. By the simple expedient of breaking the unity of language, the race was divided into groups, who were forced to dwell apart, and to organize into governments for mutual protection and defence.

Alas ! the gravitation to evil in man, perverted this idea of government from the moment it was seized. In the Divine purpose, it was an agency to secure the individual in the possession of his personal rights. When it was ordained "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," the reason is assigned "for in the image of God made He man." A sacredness is thus imparted to his person and life, which throws a Divine shield over him and all that appertains to him : and this lies at the root of the true conception of law or government. But throughout Asiatic history, the governments erected upon that monotonous Continent were not gov-

ernments of the people and for the people, but imperial creations for the glory of the despots who ruled them. Colossal empires lifted their brazen splendour before the world, each struggling for supremacy, and belching forth its armies for conquest or defeat, as so many desolating floods of lava from the mouth of a volcano. The modern idea of co-existing States with defined boundaries, between which diplomatic intercourse may be maintained, and strictly preserving the balance of power between them all, did not enter as an element in Asiatic statesmanship. The State was an engine either of triumph for the conqueror, or of luxury for the voluptuary—and always of oppression to the subject. The gorgeous Palaces and Temples, such splendid ruins as those of Babylon and Thebes, the massive Pyramids, could never have been achieved except through concentration of wealth and power in a single hand. In their melancholy silence they all testify to the abject wretchedness of suffering millions, upon which alone the monuments of despotism could possibly be reared.

Just here let the significant fact be considered that upon the threshold of this Asiatic history, with its constituent nations existing only in the germ and not yet crystalized into States, the Hebrew Commonwealth was planted in the bosom of them all, with the singular advantage of a revealed political Constitution. In this Constitution the central idea is that the Supreme Being is the Governor of nations, even as He is Lord of the conscience. This is a creative principle. It organizes the moral system of the Universe after the analogy of the material. It announces the great law of attraction which binds human governments to the throne of God, like that which binds these created orbs to their central sun. Subjection to law is found to be the essential condition of moral activity and freedom. Human legislation, postulated upon the Divine supremacy, is brought under the direction of the Divine wisdom and authority. The personal relations of the individual are mapped out as the sphere of obligation, in the one jurisdiction as in the other; and are protected in the one

by the guarantees which are furnished in the other. But we must not rush with premature haste into the heart of our subject. Let it be added here that the Hebrew Commonwealth with this Constitution was placed, as it were, in the cross-roads of ancient history—exactly in the path travelled by these old-world empires in their march to victory; where, of necessity, it was drawn into the vortex of all the revolutions, and became entangled in the fortunes of every kingdom in its turn. Thus was the leaven of political truth brought in contact with the inert mass of Asiatic despotism; against which it could at least protest, if it could not regenerate. We do not wonder that the typical Hebrew is proud of his lineage and of its history. To no other race was such a destiny ever committed by immediate revelation from Heaven, to be through fifteen centuries the exponent and champion of both human and Divine rights. If splendid traditions and glorious memories can oblige to virtue and excellence, the Hebrew people ought to move upon the highest plane to which the ambition of man can aspire.

The thesis of this article requires us now to prove that THE HEBREW COMMONWEALTH ENSHRINED THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL AND CIVIL LIBERTY; WHICH MODERN NATIONS HAVE ONLY REPRODUCED, AND UNDER OTHER FORMS HAVE APPLIED. In this analysis, we acknowledge our indebtedness to the authorities who have written upon Biblical Archæology, and especially to Dr. Wines' "Commentaries upon the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews", who has carefully compiled all the facts herein adduced.

1. Let it be noted, first of all, that it was the only government in those ancient times with a written Constitution. Through an entire year after the deliverance from Egypt, Israel was encamped at the foot of Sinai for the reception of the Law. Never was a Constitution prepared and ratified under circumstances of equal solemnity. In the solitude of the wilderness, amid the awful symbols of Jehovah's presence

upon the Mount which was consecrated as His earthly throne, Moses, their leader, went up into the cloud and talked face to face with the thunder. The entire code under which the people were to live, was there announced. Their religious ritual, their offerings and sacrifices, their Priesthood and the altars they should serve, their ceremonies of purification, their social customs, their sanitary laws and dietetic rules, their departments of government with the whole civil administration, their jurisprudence and courts of adjudication, their foreign policy and their domestic industries—every minute detail was authoritatively communicated, and reduced to record. "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the Covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the Covenant, that it may be there for a witness against thee." (Deut. 31:24-26.) We do not here speak of the People's acceptance of this Constitution, which will be better exhibited in another connexion; but press the simple fact that Israel was from the beginning under a Constitutional government, in which the relations and duties of all parties under its protection were accurately defined. Such an instrument becomes not only a regulative code, but also a charter of rights. After centuries of conflict to obtain it, modern sagacity has discovered no greater safeguard of political and civil freedom.

2. The people themselves were the proprietors of the soil. It is one of the maxims of political science that property in the soil is the natural fountain of power. It would seem to be a necessary inference that they who own the products of the soil must be in possession of the wealth of a country, and must therefore control its destiny. Thus it has often happened in English history that the popular branch of the Legislature has imposed a solid check upon the arbitrary power of the throne, by simply withholding supplies from its schemes of reckless ambition. Our own country furnishes a stronger il-

lustration still of the power of the masses, the pledge of whose patriotism is found at last in the interest engendered by their possession of the soil, as an immovable landed estate.

Not only is the division of the land into small freeholds a guarantee for the permanence of a government ; but, wherever it obtains, it is the source of a recuperative energy, which is a constant astonishment to the reader of history. Let France, through the whole of her distinguished career, be taken for an example. Engaged through centuries in successive wars, often lying exhausted and panting under disaster and defeat, she has required only a brief breathing spell of peace to spring up in her original elasticity and strength. A conspicuous instance of this marvellous recuperation is furnished in her late conflict with Prussia. The heavy indemnity exacted by the conqueror, added to the cost of a war which laid her prostrate in the dust, was a burden that should have crushed her at once into a secondary European power. Our own grand country with its inexhaustible and diversified resources could not sooner than France have thrown off this incubus, nor risen more proudly to an erect posture. The banks from which she drew the loans to meet these obligations, were the stocking-feet in which her own freeholders had secreted the small profits of their industry. Myriads of rivulets poured their golden sands into the treasury of the State, which was quickly rehabilitated through the economy and patriotism of her people who could not afford to see their country perish, every rood of which was owned and cultivated by themselves.

This distribution of the soil obtained in none of the Asiatic Empires ; where, on the contrary, it was divided between the King, the Priests, and the warriors. The tiresome monotony of Asiatic history teaches this warning to modern times, that it is always a fearful power which cuts off the bread even with the teeth between which it is chewed. In Palestine, all Communistic and Agrarian tendencies were averted by the equal distribution of the land between the Tribes ; each family holding its portion in fee-simple, and rendered incapable of alien-

ation by the readjustment in the year of Jubilee. Political science, after the experience of thirty centuries, has suggested no improvement of this economy.

3. The suggestive principle of the Hebrew Polity, as opposed to the intense centralism of the Asiatic despotisms, was the local jurisdiction of the several Tribes and the consequent distribution of power. Even where chartered rights exist, there is a tendency in power to steal from the many to the few; until, at length, government becomes so compact that the individual is nothing but a spoke in the great wheel. The tribal distinction, therefore, with recognized self-government in the smaller bodies into which society is distributed, has been in all ages the asylum of popular freedom. It was the haughty independence of the Germanic tribes, which offered the most stubborn resistance to the Roman arms sweeping on to universal supremacy. And when that bloated empire sank into decrepitude through its own debaucheries, it was the Northern tribes with their robust barbarism that burst through the empty crust—the rude material of that Congress of European States which at length emerged from the chaos.

It would require too much space to exhibit in detail the autonomy of the Hebrew Tribes, and the complete control of local interests in each. It is sufficient to mention the weakness of the general administration arising from the excess of this independence. It wrought such disasters during the period of the Judges, as almost to necessitate the Monarchy as the remedy for their divisions. It would be pleasant just here, to show the parallelism between the Hebrew Commonwealth and our own: which is so striking that in reciting the history of the one, we seem to be drawing the picture of the other. The twelve Tribes of Israel almost re-appear in the States of this Republic; and the weakness in the government from tribal independence was reproduced with us, compelling as in their case a closer Federal union. All this must, however, be premitted to make room for the statement that, in the

changes of time, so much has the danger shifted from disintegration to centralism, as to lodge the only hope of preserving our American system in the autonomy of the States, and in the maintenance of their right to local self-government. Can a stronger encomium be pronounced upon that feature of the Hebrew Constitution, which so early established a bulwark against Imperialism?

4. Right over against this, with all the emphasis of contrast, is the unity of the nation: divided into Tribes, yet bound together in the Theocracy—many, but also one. We scarcely know how to bridle this topic within proportional limits. The pith of it may be put in half a dozen sentences. God, though unseen, was the acknowledged King. Whatever the outward form of the government—whether democratic, as till the close of Samuel's regency—or Monarchical, as under the kings—or Oligarchic, as after the Captivity—through all it was Theocratic. Did ever a nation possess such a bond of union before? Did ever Majesty like this sit upon an earthly throne? Can we conceive extremes brought together, between which all friction shall be so completely removed? How could such a King encroach upon the liberty of the subject? How could the subject find occasion to be jealous of the prerogatives of such a Monarch?

This is not all. The Hebrew religion was thus bound up in the Hebrew nationality. The two were so welded into one by the pressure of fifteen centuries and under the discipline of an extraordinary providence, that eighteen centuries of dispersion have not separated the embrace. So thoroughly was the Theocratic principle wrought into the texture of Hebrew thought that, without a country and without a government, their religion alone makes them a nation still. The Hebrew State is gone; but the nationality which should have perished with it, survives unbroken in the Hebrew Church. When was such a crystal as this ever produced in the historic outworking of any other political Constitution?

5. We combine next two closely allied features of this an-

cient Commonwealth, the civil equality of the people with the universal supremacy of law. Perhaps the essential vice of Oriental society, after the practice of polygamy, was the prevalence of Caste, interposing walls of separation between classes, the intermingling of which was so necessary to the progress of the whole. Like the bandage which swathes a limb and shrinks it into deformity, it was a fruitful cause of that immobility so characteristic of Asiatic and Egyptian civilization. The only distinct class amongst the ancient Hebrews was the Levitical order, which, though hereditary, was not a social but an official distinction. Being set apart to a public function for the common good, it was not divisive but uniting in its influence—one of the ligatures by which society was bound together like the leaves of a book. The political mischief which might ensue from this isolation was forestalled by their distribution among the Tribes, their dis-possession of landed estate, the dependence of their revenues upon the offerings of the people, their exclusion from special privileges, and their equal subjection under the laws which were common to all.

This last reference brings up the coördinate principle of the supremacy of the law. There was no absolute power in Israel. If at any period of their history such power was assumed, it was in open defiance of the Constitution which covered kings, priests and people alike with its authority. *Lex scripta*, this alone was supreme; distinctly acknowledged as the charter of the people's rights in that famous aphorism of the threefold crown—the crown of royalty, the crown of the priesthood and the crown of the law—in the use of which the Hebrews were accustomed to boast the perfection of their system. Could the ideal republic of Plato, or the Utopia of Sir Thomas More, represent a better condition than that of a people equal in all their political franchises, and yielding obedience to a law which, while it restrains, at the same time protects with an equal authority?

6. The Hebrew government rested upon the consent of the

people, formally and constitutionally expressed. This is recognized in modern times as the corner-stone of civil liberty, which claims for the subject not only the right to determine the character and form of the government, but also a voice in shaping the legislation. The American Revolution, for example, which dissolved the bands of British allegiance, turned upon the principle that taxation without the right of representation was only the exaction of tribute. We find the same principle further back as the pivot upon which English history turns—from the wresting of Magna Charta by the Barons from the feeble John, to the issue of the long struggle between privilege and prerogative in the expulsion of the treacherous Stuarts from the throne.

If then this vital principle shall be found incorporated in the Hebrew polity, it will justify the assertion that it was designed by the Supreme Lawgiver to confront the old despotisms, as the working model of a free government. There is room for but a few specifications, and these in the briefest synopsis :

(a) The Constitution itself given by Jehovah was submitted, in all its details, to the ratification of the people ; and He, by public acclamation, was accepted as their Sovereign. This was done in the first instance just before the death of Moses, as thus recorded in Deuteronomy : “These are the words of the Covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides the Covenant which He made with them in Horeb. . . . Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God, your Captains of your tribes, your Elders and your Officers, with all the men of Israel, . . . that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into His oath which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day.” (29:1, 10, 12.) Still later, just before the death of Joshua, this compact was publicly renewed, with even more explicit declaration of the popular will. The record will be found in the book of Joshua, 24th chapter : “And the people answered and said, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other Gods ; . . . there-

fore will we also serve the Lord, for He is our God." When Joshua represented the difficulties of this service, the response was, "Nay, but we will serve the Lord : and Joshua said unto the people, ye are witnesses unto yourselves that ye have chosen you the Lord to serve Him : and they said, we are witnesses."

(b) We find some of the Judges, as Jephtha, chosen by the people (Judges 11:5, 10, 11); although this extraordinary office especially reflected the Theocratic principle.

(c) The great change wrought in the administration of government by the institution of hereditary Monarchy, was effected by the demand of the people, and against the remonstrances of Samuel : "Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel ; and they said, Nay, but we will have a king over us." (1 Sam. 8:19.)

(d) Both Saul and David, after being designated by God and anointed by Samuel, did not assume the functions of royalty until they were confirmed by the popular choice. (1 Sam. 11:14, 15. 2 Sam. 2:4.)

(e) David was seven years king over Judah alone, before his authority was recognised by the other Tribes ; who were nevertheless absolved from the charge of rebellion.

These instances are sufficient, without overloading the testimony, to show the extent to which the consent of the people entered as an element of freedom, both in the polity and practice of the ancient Hebrews, enshrining the principle in their code as in an ark of testimony, for the admiration and use of this modern age.

7. Not to fatigue the reader's patience, let him consider but one additional fact in support of the present argument, viz : the checks and balances under which this carefully adjusted system was administered. This would lead us to view the government as an organism, and would involve a full exposition of the methods by which it works out its design. A skeleton outline will suffice to map the distribution of offices in the same.

There was the Chief-Magistrate, who was of course only a vice-regent under the unseen Sovereign. Moses, their first leader and mediator in the reception of the Law—and Joshua, their military Captain, under whom the conquest of Canaan was accomplished—both held an extraordinary commission which was transferred to no successor. After these, the Theocracy was administered by a direct Providence, through the natural Heads of Tribes, and the Privy-Council of the Seventy appointed by Moses, and when necessary by consultation of the Oracle by the High-Priest in the Tabernacle. In special emergencies God raised up the Judges, who ruled sometimes over a portion of the tribes, sometimes over all, as the case required. No exact parallel to this office can be found in other nations. The nearest is the Roman Dictatorship: with this difference, that the Hebrew Judge once appointed held office through life—but with no natural successor. This entire period was, however, transitional and disciplinary, to root in the Hebrew mind the Theocratic principle which lay at the base of the government. When a visible and permanent Monarchy was instituted, it was accomplished without bloodshed because Constitutionally provided and was effected through a Constitutional procedure. It is well said, that governments grow: that is, they take on their outward form through the development of the inward life: and it should be noted that the Hebrews found it necessary to unite the Tribes under a permanent Head, at the time the great Asiatic kingdoms of Syria, Assyria, Babylon, together with Egypt, were consolidating into the massive Empires they became. But throughout the succession of Hebrew kings, especially at the critical junctures of their history, new capitulations were made by which the Monarch was restrained—as was attempted, we remember, in the case of Rehoboam.

Another department in the State was the Judiciary, which was rendered complete by the appointment of Judges over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. Thus was formed a scale of appellate Courts, so constructed as to make the ad-

ministration of justice speedy and summary—which the impatient blood of Oriental nations always required. In accordance with Eastern custom and the primitive idea of the paternal character of kingly rule, there would seem to be the right of appeal to the throne, as in Solomon's decision between the two mothers: or in cases of still greater difficulty, there was a reference to the Divine Majesty itself, as when the appeal of Zelophehad's daughters settled the question of female succession to the father's estate. (Num. 27:2 and 5.)

Next follows what may not inaptly be termed the Legislative branch of the government. It is true the legislation was already provided in the code given by Jehovah. But questions must arise in the application of these laws, calling for the deliberation and decision of the Hebrews themselves—as in the election or confirmation of their rulers, the forming of treaties with foreign powers, declaration and suspension of war, in staying the execution of a judicial sentence, even that of a king, as in the case of Jonathan (1 Sam. 14:45). In these and other instances there would be, as has been well said, “a residue of authority which sufficiently guaranteed the national autonomy.” The grand device of modern times to secure safe legislation is by the concurrent majority of “two Chambers composed of different persons belonging to different classes” (as in the English Parliament); or “elected for different terms of service” (as in our American Legislatures). The necessary delay in securing this joint action imposes a salutary check upon hasty legislation; whilst the expression of the public mind is unquestionably more accurate and more permanent.

It would be remarkable if we should discover the germ of this proud invention, existing 3,000 years ago in the Hebrew Constitution. We do not undertake to say that the line can be drawn as broad and clear between the Hebrew Senate and the Hebrew Commons as it is drawn in modern free States: but that such a distinction obtains cannot, we think, be successfully denied. The old Patriarchal government naturally

vested in the chiefs of tribes and heads of clans, of which we have the traces during the abode in Egypt. The rapid marshalling of two and a half millions for a sudden march presupposed an existing and familiar organization. After this, we find the Seventy appointed by Moses, a species of Privy-Council for the Executive. In addition to these, the Princes of Tribes and Heads of Clans, together with the Judges and civil Magistrates, represented their countrymen in the national Convention, forming a sort of upper deliberative House. What is known as "the Congregation," on the other hand, was the body of the people—sembled perhaps in mass, during the encampment in the wilderness; or more probably there was, afterwards when settled in Canaan, a representative body chosen from all the families in the several Tribes. How numerous these were is seen from the two hundred and fifty Heads involved in the rebellion of Korah (Num. 16:2). The distinction between "the Congregation" and the smaller representative body is shown in Numbers 10:4 and 7: "If they blow but with one trumpet, then the Princes which are the heads of the thousands of Israel, shall gather themselves unto thee. But when the congregation is to be gathered together, ye shall blow, but ye shall not sound an alarm." If this distinction really exists and was wrought into the practice of the Hebrews, it was certainly the most wonderful anticipation of the methods of modern Political Science to be found in that venerable Economy.

We come next to the Priestly and Levitical Order, considered of course not in their religious, but in their political, relations. One entire tribe was substituted for the first-born male of every family; thus at the outset, making it a representative class, performing duties which were obligatory upon the whole people. It was protected from aspiring to Priestly domination by their dispersion among the Tribes, by the surrender of landed estate, by their dependence upon tithes and offerings for their support. They were the Literary Faculty, answering to the University Class of our times, as Mr. Cole-

ridge suggests—and supplying the Judges, Genealogists, Lawyers, Physicians, Teachers, &c., of their country. As leaders of thought, and resolving the questions of casuistry naturally arising from a complex ritual, their influence was vast, whilst it was equally conservative.

After these come the Prophets. They were occasional and extraordinary, raised up by Jehovah to explain the lessons of His Providence. They were by their office public Censors—commissioned to inveigh against all infractions of the Constitution and the law, and equally therefore the guardians of the people's rights. The Roman Tribunes and Censors fulfilled somewhat similar functions; except that they were wholly secular—often agitators who merely uttered the popular resentments, and were consequently one-sided and factious in their influence. The Hebrew Prophets, on the contrary, were commissioned by Jehovah, and uttered their denunciations from His point of view. They were of necessity broad-minded expounders of the law, were imbued with its spirit, and so were constituted the truest patriots of the nation.

The Oracle is the only feature of this ancient system remaining to be discussed. Of course, in a government of which the unseen Jehovah was the Supreme Head, some provision must be made for occasional appeal to Him and for the communication of His response. It was the office of the High-Priest to discharge this important function; and to inquire by Urim and Thummim of the Lord in His Holy Place, where the Divine glory rested upon the Ark between the Cherubim. It is not necessary to go into the intricacies of this topic, so baffling to antiquarians. It played an important part in the early and forming period of Hebrew history: and there is not a recorded instance in which it was ever abused to tyrannical purposes.

In this rapid survey we have gathered the leading attributes of the Hebrew State: (1) a written Constitution, and a formal compact with the Sovereign; (2) the distribution of power, in the self-government of the Tribes; (3) the binding of these

in the unity of a Theocratic kingdom ; (4) the prevailing equality of fortune, in the possession of the soil by the people ; (5) the supremacy of the law ; (6) the resting of the government upon the free consent of the subject ; (7) the limitations upon the power of the Executive ; (8) the rapid administration of justice, through a scale of Courts exceedingly minute ; (9) legislation through responsible representatives ; (10) provision for the instruction of the people, as to their religious and civil duties ; (11) a final appeal to the Divine Majesty, with the privilege of a response. We do not say that the Hebrew race has always been faithful to these principles. Where is the single individual who comes up to his own ideal of excellence ? How much more difficult to preserve a nation from those pernicious influences which are constantly sapping its virtue ? But here is the Hebrew Constitution to speak for itself, and to challenge any positive addition which the boastful Political Science of modern times has made to the principles which have just been enumerated. Shall we not adore the wisdom of Him who, at the period when human history was crystallizing into shape, drew before the nations this grand outline of what a free State ought to be : delivering His protest against despotism as the perversion of government, side by side with his protest against idolatry as the corruption of religion.

B. M. PALMER.

New Orleans, La.

III. THE DIATESSARON OF TATIAN, AND ITS EVIDENTIAL VALUE.

Professor Fritz Hommel, in the preface of his lately published book, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments*, says :

“I look to the time when every enlightened reader of the Bible will be something of an archæologist.”

The article of Professor Sayce in the *Sunday School Times* for January 22nd, 1898, announcing the discovery of the tomb and remains of Menes, the first of the Egyptian kings, and a letter published in the same paper, announcing the discovery of a large number of inscribed clay tablets in the ruins of a city identified as Calneh, mentioned in connection with Nimrod (Gen. 10:10), are among the multiplying signs that we will not have to look far into the future to see this expectation of Prof. Hommel realized to a very great extent. No longer is the interest in archæology limited to a small circle of the learned, but facts about the oldest times come as the newest news through every avenue of public intelligence, from the “*Transactions*” of archæological societies, to the daily newspaper.

One result has been the demonstration before the eyes of the people of the absurdity of much that has been said by the Higher Critics. As has been well said, “The new discoveries have made the old infidelity impossible.”

No one at all acquainted with the facts of the case can imagine that an apology is needed for drawing attention, in a second article, to the evidential value of the Diatessaron of Tatian. As if in order to refute the assertions of modern skepticism, God has caused a great array of witnesses to rise from the dust to give an answer which cannot be gainsaid, and not one among all these witnesses speaks in louder or clearer accents than the Diatessaron. Yet even this witness

has not been allowed to go unchallenged. The result, however, has been only to emphasize the testimony and show more clearly the reliableness of the witness.

There seems to be good reason to suppose that the antagonist who has attacked the Diatessaron very viciously in the *Nineteenth Century*¹ is no other than its old enemy, the unknown author of *Supernatural Religion*. He seems to bear it an old grudge.

From a mere glance at the references to the Diatessaron, especially in Syriac literature, through many centuries, we may see that the writing of this article by Mr. Walter R. Cassels, attacking its genuineness, was an act of eminent un-wisdom. Finding the battlements erected by the author of "Supernatural Religion" as a coign of vantage from which skeptics might attack Christianity, shattered by the discovery of the Diatessaron and falling about their ears, this chief among them rushes out to exclaim that nothing serious has happened to the cause of destructive criticism. In this article, published in the *Nineteenth Century*, he boldly repeats some of the assertions of "Supernatural Religion." To use Prof. Harris's words in his *Reply*, "whole sentences are taken, with hardly a change or a transposition, out of the chapter on Tatian, in *Supernatural Religion* or in the corresponding material in the reply of the author of *Supernatural Religion* to Dr. Lightfoot, so that we might begin by discovering whether we were confronting one writer or two."²

It would be impossible within the limits of a paper like this to give even a resumé of Prof. Harris's "Reply," but it will not be amiss to give his concluding sentences, in which the results are summed up.

After taking up the assertions of Mr. Cassels one by one, and, from his own vastly superior knowledge of the whole subject, showing their falsity, Dr. Harris goes on to say :

¹"The Diatessaron of Tatian." Walter R. Cassels. *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1895.

²The Diatessaron : A Reply. *Contemporary Review*, August, 1895.

“But all these errors are slight and unimportant in comparison with the wrong he has done to himself and his reputation by expressing himself so strongly on a subject with which he was ill acquainted, and by sedulously cultivating the art of making the worse appear the better reason.

“Nothing, therefore, that has been said by Mr. Cassels can in the least invalidate the now generally accepted statement that, shortly after the middle of the second century, a harmony of the four canonical Gospels was constructed by Tatian, the Assyrian; and that our investigation has shown that the influence of this Harmony is widely diffused in Syriac literature.”

It is very true that puns do not usually add to either the dignity or the conclusiveness of an argument, but there is an irresistible impulse to say, that one can think of the result of the discussion as nothing less than the utter demolition of Cassels.

A passing view of the notices of the Diatessaron in many centuries of the past will show the truth of Prof. Harris's conclusion; but, before taking this brief survey, let us inquire about its author.

III. TATIAN, THE FIRST HARMONIST.

He is the first harmonist of whom anything is known, and it is not at all probable that there *was* one before him. His great zeal for Christianity, as well as his originality and genius, point to him as the probable inventor of this mode of presenting the life of our blessed Lord on earth.

In the introductory note to the Borgian manuscript of the Diatessaron he is called “Titianus, the Greek.” This is evidently the mistake of a copyist, for he himself tells us in so many words that he was an Assyrian. It is true that he wrote in Greek as well as in Syriac, of which his *Address to the Greeks* (Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας) is witness. He was a student of philosophy in general, but inclined to that of Plato as his own philosophical creed. He was born and reared a heathen, and, in the prosecution of his studies, traveled over many countries that he might study the systems of various nations. When he became acquainted with the Old Testament Scriptures he was impressed with the fact that these “barbaric

books," as he at first considered them (as a Greek philosopher of that day very naturally would), were "too old to be compared with the learning of the Greeks, too divine to be put on a level with their erroneous doctrine." It should be remembered that Moses preceded Herodotus, "the father of history," by more than a millennium, and it is not strange that he should have been impressed with the venerable antiquity of the books which "Moses wrote." Fortunately for him the Higher Critics were not to be born for nearly two millenniums after his time.

The account of his conversion to Christianity is thus given by Neander, who makes a summary of what Tatian himself tells in his *Address to the Greeks* :

"He was brought up in heathenism, and frequent travels gave him the opportunity of learning the multifarious sorts of heathen worship which at that time were existing together in the Roman empire. None among them all could recommend itself to him as reasonable. Not only did he observe how religion was used in them to the service of sin, but even the highly wrought allegorical interpretations of the ancient myths as symbols of a speculative system of natural philosophy could not satisfy him ; and it appeared to him a dishonorable proceeding for a man to attach himself to the popular religion who did not partake in the common religious belief, and who saw nothing in its doctrine about the gods but symbols of the elements and powers of nature. The mysteries into which he suffered himself to be initiated appeared to him also, in the same manner, not to correspond to the expectations which they awakened ; and the contradictory systems of philosophy offered him no sure grounds of religious faith. He was rendered mistrustful of them by the contradiction which he often observed in those who gave themselves out as philosophers, between the seriousness which they exhibited, for the sake of appearances, in their dress, mien, and language, and the levity of their conduct. While he was in this condition he came to the Old Testament, to which his attention was drawn by what he had heard of the high antiquity of these writings in comparison with the Hellenic religions, as might easily be the case with a Syrian. He himself says of the impression which the reading of this book made upon him :

"These writings found acceptance with me because of the simplicity of their language, the unstudiedness of the writers, the intelligible history of the creation, because of the prediction of the future, because of the wholesomeness of their precepts, and because of the doctrine of the ONE GOD which prevails throughout them."

"The impression which the study of the Old Testament made on him

would appear, from this, to have been with him the preparation for a belief in the gospel.

"Coming, in this state of mind, to Rome, he was converted to Christianity by Justin, of whom he speaks with great reverence."—*Neander's Church History*, p. 418, *Rose's translation*.

Tatian, like his spiritual father, Justin Martyr, retained his philosopher's cloak after he became a Christian, maintaining the position that he did not cease to be a philosopher in embracing Christianity, but rather advanced to that which is the highest and only true philosophy.

So firmly, however, were some of the *principles* of Platonism rooted in his mind that he seems to have been much influenced by them in his views and teachings during the latter part of his life. While Justin lived, however, we have the best testimony that he was free from the fault of teaching that dualism which is laid to his charge in his latter days.

Some time, we know not how long, after the martyrdom of Justin, he became a leader among the Encratites, and, it seems, declaimed against marriage and the drinking of wine as sinful. He also taught that Adam was not saved, deducing this opinion from the assertion of the Scriptures that "In Adam, all die."

Irenæus and Hippolytus speak of Tatian as, at last, a Gnostic, and Valentinian teachings are attributed to him.

These accusations quite probably contain an element of exaggeration as the result of ecclesiastical zeal, as Tatian is said by Irenæus to have "separated from the Church."

Whatever amount of deflection from the truth of Christianity he may have been guilty of, we may be quite sure that it was due to that fruitful source of heresies in all ages—ours being by no means an exception—the adoption of a false philosophy and the endeavor to fit Christianity to the Procrustean bed thus prepared for it. The whole history of Gnosticism is an illustration of this process as followed in the early days of Christianity, and the destructive school of criticism, founded by Baur of Tübingen on the postulates of the Hegelian philosophy, is an object lesson for our times of the

folly of assuming the infallibility of some human theory and then trying to square God's Word to it. The reverse order of procedure must suggest itself to every one who believes in the infallibility of the Scriptures as a Revelation from God to man, as the only true and safe course.

Irenæus tells us (*Adv. Hæres*, Book I., Ch. xxviii,) that as long as Tatian enjoyed the companionship of Justin Martyr, "he expressed no such views, but after his (Justin's) martyrdom, he separated from the Church," and also that he "composed his own peculiar type of doctrine," and that, among other things, "he declared that marriage was nothing but corruption and fornication."

We may well grieve that one who was so earnest in his advocacy of Christianity, and who held himself always in readiness to lay down his life in testimony of his faith, should, in any degree, have turned from the straight line of orthodoxy, and should, at last, have separated himself from the Church; yet we can never be too grateful for the fact that he composed the *Diatessaron* from the very words of the inspired Gospels of our Lord, "adding not one of his own."

Much as we may regret the false views into which a false philosophy and a mistaken zeal led him, it is an additional reason for gratitude that this very departure from orthodoxy on Tatian's part makes the evidence of the *Diatessaron* for the genuineness of the Gospels more decisive; because this makes it well nigh certain that he composed the harmony in the earlier part of his Christian career. This will be more fully considered when we come to make an estimate of the value of the evidence furnished by this work.

We will now turn to look at some of the

IV. FOOT-PRINTS OF THE DIATESSARON DOWN THE AGES.

From them we may see the utter futility of the contention of Cassels.

There are few books that have come down to us through more than seventeen centuries that have left plainer traces

along their paths. There is ample evidence of the existence of the work from a very early date down to the time of the Nestorian bishop Ebed Jesu (or, as our translator writes it, Abd Isho), who died in 1308. For more than five centuries it had been lost, or at least had been unrecognized by the learned, when it was translated into Latin by Ciasca in 1888. We have it now in the two Arabic manuscripts which have been mentioned, as well as the commentary on it written by Ephraem Syrus, who died in 373 A. D. This commentary is in two manuscripts in the Armenian language, which have a common remote ancestor, doubtless, but differ enough to show that neither was copied from the other. These Armenian MSS. contain a commentary following exactly the same order of events as the complete Arabic MSS. of the Diatessaron which we now have. It has been remarked that while these Arabic MSS. show the influence on their text of the Peshito version (or Peshitta, as it is now called), the Armenian MSS. of Ephraem's commentary contain peculiar readings of the Curetonian MS. and of that which Rendel Harris considers the Curetonian's ancestor, the Lewis Sinaitic Palimpsest;¹ and references and quotations "go to show that the Armenian text stands much more closely related to the original than does the Arabic." (Introd. to IX. Vol. Ante-Nicene Fathers, § 15.)

Thus the Armenian MSS. are another independent witness, not only of the existence, from very early times, of the Diatessaron, but of the fact that Ephraem wrote a commentary on it, for they are MSS. of that commentary itself.

The Diatessaron was very extensively used in Syrian churches until the Peshito version (Peshitta) gradually took its place in the fifth century. Even after this it was studied and valued.

Dionysius Bar Salibi, Bishop of Armida (twelfth century), has this to say of it: "Tatian, disciple of Justin, the Philosopher and martyr, selected from the four Gospels and combined

¹Called by Harris, *The New Syriac Gospels*.

and composed a Gospel, and called it Diatessaron—*i. e.*, 'The Combined, . . . and upon this Gospel Mar Ephraem commented. Its commencement was 'In the beginning was the Word.'"

But this, with the exception of the assertion that the Diatessaron began with the first verse of the Gospel of John, was said, about 350 years earlier, by a Syriac commentator on the New Testament, Isho'dad of Merv (852 A. D.), who distinguishes it from another Diatessaron by Ammonius,¹ who lived nearly a century after Tatian.

As belonging to this (9th) century, the subscription of the Borgian MS. should be noted. As we have seen, that states that it was translated from Syriac into Arabic "from an exemplar written by 'Isa-ibn-'Alial-Motatabbib, pupil of Honain ibn-Ishak," who, we learn, was a famous Arabic physician and teacher of Bagdad (d. 773), whose school produced many translators.

Of Isho 'dad Merv, Prof. Rendel Harris tells us that he transferred to his pages "some of the most astonishing interpretations which are found in Ephraem's commentary, and gives his express statement of his dependence, in these peculiar interpretations, upon the Syrian father." He also tells us that what is true of Isho 'dad is equally true of Bar Salibi and Bar Hebraeus,² and taking one passage, Matt. 2:23, as an instance, says :

"Syriac authors steadily quote, and some of them ascribe to Ephraem, a curious scholium on Matt. 2:23" (it is an explanation given by Ephraem of the words, He shall be called a Nazarene), "and this scholium is actually found in the Armenian Commentary."

Victor of Capua, too, had Tatian's Diatessaron, in 545 A. D. A century earlier, we find Theodoret, the zealous bishop of Cyrrhus, very much exercised over the general use of the Dia-

¹This Harmony of Ammonius of Alexandria (not Ammonius Saccas) was unlike the Diatessaron of Tatian. It was not "combined," or interwoven, but had the four Gospels in four parallel columns—a tetrapla, as Eusebius tells us.

²Bar Hebraeus lived 80 or 90 years after Bar Salibi.

tessaron in the churches of his diocese, and, impressed with the fact that Tatian was a heretic, employing very energetic measures to keep his flock from using it. Writing on Heresies, 453, he says, "I myself found more than two hundred copies in reverential use in the churches of our district. All these I collected and removed, replacing them by the Gospels of the four Evangelists."

About a century before this, Ephraem, "the most renowned father of the Eastern Church," wrote his Commentary, a translation of which from Armenian into Latin was made by Moesinger, as we have seen, in 1876, and texts from which, published by Zahn in 1881, led to the examination and translation of the Arabic MS. of the Diatessaron in the Vatican library, and its publication by Ciasca in time for the Pope's jubilee in 1888.

For those who, like the writer, are not Syriac scholars, the region through which the history of this Syriac book leads is largely a *terra incognita*, but when we thus get back to a generally known writer like Theodoret, we feel ourselves to be not only on firmer ground, but in more familiar paths.

Another step brings us to Eusebius, and though he does not seem to have been very familiar with the Diatessaron, as was natural, he being a writer in Greek and that being in Syriac, yet he speaks of it distinctly and indicates clearly his knowledge of its plan and contents. He says :

"Tatian having put together a certain harmony (*συνάφειαν*) and combination (I know not how) of the Gospels, named this the *Dia Tessaron*" (*Διὰ Τεσσάρων*). (H. E. IV. 29.)

Then, when we go back through a century to Hippolytus, we find him speaking of Tatian as an Encratite and Gnostic.

When we go still further back to Irenæus, the teacher of Hippolytus, we find him speaking of Tatian in the same way, and Irenæus was his contemporary for about a half century, and Hippolytus was probably twenty years old when Tatian died.

Now, it is well known that Irenæus was the devoted pupil

of Polycarp, and that Polycarp was the disciple of John, "that disciple whom Jesus loved," being more than thirty years old when John died.¹ Irenæus quotes the Gospel of John extensively, and Tatian places almost the whole of it, about 96 per ct.—a much larger proportion than would have been possible in the case of any of the other Gospels—in the Diatessaron. This settles the much talked of "Johannean problem," which must now retire to the shades of that limbo into which so many of the bloodless phantoms of the Tübingen school have disappeared.

An element of importance in this discussion is the answer to the question :

V. WHEN TATIAN COMPOSED THE DIATESSARON.

As to the date of the Diatessaron, common sense obliges us to agree with Harnack when he says, "It *cannot* have been produced during his later years, for all traces of dualism are absent."

The testimony of Irenæus is clear as to the fact that Tatian, his contemporary for about fifty years, did not teach "his peculiar form of doctrine" *till after the martyrdom of Justin*.

We find in the Diatessaron all those narratives and teachings which are most thoroughly out of keeping with the Encratite form of asceticism, given in full. Tatian in his latter days condemned marriage and the use of wine; but in the Diatessaron the account of the marriage in Cana of Galilee and the turning of water into wine is faithfully recorded, as well as Luke 7:33, 34.

Prof. Gildersleeve, in his introduction to his edition of Justin Martyr's Apologies, gives preference to A. D. 163 as the date of Justin's martyrdom.

¹The date of Polycarp's martyrdom has been determined, with a high degree of probability, as February 23rd, A. D. 55, and not in the time of Marcus Aurelius, as has long been thought, and, indeed, as Eusebius tells us. The reasons for preferring the date mentioned cannot be given here, but they are now quite generally accepted as conclusive.

The most probable time, for the composition in so laborious, ¹ pains-taking and reverent a way, of this harmony of the four Gospels, must have been *before Tatian had undergone this change*—before the simplicity of his faith had at all received the taint of that Gnosticism which was so rife in his day. The *motive* for such a work was probably strongest *when he first came to know the Gospels, and when he felt the ardor of his "first love."* The most probable date, then, is soon after 150 A. D. We can conceive of no *motive* for such a work, after his change.

VI. THE DIATESSARON AS A WITNESS OF THE GOSPELS.

(a) *It shows that the Apocryphal Gospels, so called, are all spurious.*

The importance of this may not be appreciated by all; but those who have been plied with assertions that there are many other Gospels as old and almost as good as our four,² will be glad of the ability to give a ready answer; and the Diatessaron furnishes that answer in a most conclusive form. It contains the Gospels as known to Tatian, and he a man of the widest information, born about ten years after the Apostle John died, *knows of no gospels but those of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. He evidently lived before any apocryphal gospel was written, or certainly before any such writings gained any credence in the Christian Church.* The very name, Diatessaron (Διὰ Τεσσάρων)—through four—implies that the life of our Lord was given through four Gospels, and four only.

(b) *It absolutely overthrows the Tübingen theory as to the late origin of our four Gospels.*

As we have seen, Baur dates the first three Gospels from 130 to 150, and John during the decade ending A. D. 170. Since the discovery of the Diatessaron, honest followers of

¹Glancing down a page of the Diatessaron, we see all four of the Gospels quoted in five (5) lines, so carefully are they interwoven. In at least one place, all the four Gospels are drawn on to make up four lines.

²This is one of the commonest of all cavils, though, as we see, entirely baseless.

the Tübingen school have acknowledged that Baur's position was utterly untenable. Renan acknowledges that the four Gospels are not spurious. Adolph Harnack, too, admits "that we learn from the Diatessaron that about 160 A. D., our four Gospels had already taken a place of prominence in the Church, and *that no others had done so*, that in particular, the fourth Gospel had taken a place alongside the synoptics." And, also, "that as regards the text of the Gospels we can conclude from the Diatessaron that the text of our Gospels about the year 160 already ran essentially as we now read them." (Harnack as quoted in article on Tatian in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.) But the Diatessaron proves much more than this. If we find a harmony of the four Gospels prepared as early as 160, at the latest, we may conclude that these Gospels had been accepted as the authoritative records of our Saviour's life, long before this time. A harmony of the Gospels would not naturally come into existence immediately on the writing of the Gospels. In the words of Prof. Maher (*The Month*, London, November, 1892), "If Tatian, knowing the whole Church as he did, devoted himself to the construction of an elaborate harmonized Gospel narrative, in which the paragraphs, texts and fragments of texts are interwoven with the utmost pains and ingenuity, and the very greatest care directed to the preservation of even the smallest words of our four Gospels, it can only be because these four Gospels and the least part of their contents had before this time been received by the Church, as a sacred deposit of Divine truth." Now, when we think of the fact that there were then no steam printing presses, no railroads for rapid distribution, and no general councils to stamp them as authoritative, we must conclude that this result, of a general acceptance in the different districts of all the four Gospels as a divine record of Christ's life, must have required a period of many years' duration. In the words of the same writer, "The Diatessaron proves that, in the minds of the Christian world of that day, every sentence and syllable, every jot and tittle of these Gospels pos-

sessed a peculiar sacredness. Zahn's conclusion, then, cannot be very far from the truth, 'In view of the history of the text, opinions as to the origin of John's Gospel, such as Baur has expressed, must appear simply as madness. It follows, further, that the element which remains the same in all the originals, and of the versions amid all the variations that crept into the text between 150 and 160, must have been everywhere read at the beginning of the second century.' "

They were certainly thus read as soon as the Gospel of John could be reproduced by copyists and distributed.

(c) *Confirms the testimony of Irenæus and Polycarp.*

Irenæus quotes the four Gospels as fully as any modern orthodox theologian would, tells us plainly that there were four Gospels, and only four, and speaks of them as "Holy Scripture." Now, as we have seen, Tatian was the contemporary of Irenæus for about fifty years, and Irenæus speaks of him at some length. When we consider that Tatian was the contemporary of Polycarp, the teacher of Irenæus, for more than forty years, and that Polycarp was a pupil of the Apostle John, and *his* contemporary for more than thirty years, and, then, that this Tatian prepared a harmony of the four Gospels, with that of John most prominent of all, it would seem that we are warranted in saying, as we have done above, that the "Johannean problem" has vanished, and that the apostolic authority of all the Gospels is established.

(d) *Confirms the testimony of Justin Martyr.*

The Diatessaron makes it certain that the "Memoirs of the Apostles" (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, First Apology, 67), spoken of by Justin Martyr, as read in the worship of the Christians, were our four Gospels, and not any then recent record of verbal traditions. Tatian was the pupil of Justin, and made this harmony of our four Gospels, and, as we have seen, in all probability, composed his harmony in the lifetime of Justin. It is not at all improbable, indeed, that he did it under his supervision and with his help. Those memorials of the Saviour's life which Justin recognized as bearing the stamp of

apostolic authority, and as Holy Scripture, were *our four Gospels*.

The alternative would imply, to employ a quotation of Prof. Basil Gildersleeve, in commenting on these words of Justin Martyr, that "an entire change of Gospels was made throughout all the different and distant provinces of the Roman empire, at a time when concerted action through general councils was unknown, and that, too, in so silent a manner that no record of it remains in the history of the Church."

(e) *Confirms the testimony of the "New Syriac Gospels."*

I was at first led to believe (and, as some may know, expressed the belief) that, in these Gospels, there were marks of manipulation of the account of the nativity of our Saviour in Matt. 1:16, 21 and 25, which indicated that this Syriac text was used in the propagation of the Cerinthian heresy; and Cerinthus was a younger contemporary of the Apostle John. (See Prof. J. Rendell Harris's Art. in *Contemporary Review*, November, 1894.) This, if true, would seem to show that the four Gospels were not only written, but already gathered together, recognized, by heretics as well as the orthodox, as the authoritative records of Christianity, and then translated into Syriac; and that, in the lifetime of a contemporary of the Apostle John. The *DiatheSSaron* adds much to the probability that Prof. Harris's conclusion is true, as far as the age of these Syriac Gospels is concerned. It shows marks of the Curetonian Syriac text, and, according to Prof. H., this is a revised version of the "New Syriac Gospels" in the interest of orthodoxy. It would seem, then, that these *Lewis Gospels, or Sinaitic palimpsest*, were, so to speak, two generations earlier than the *DiatheSSaron*, and that they must have been translated near the beginning of the second century.

Mrs. Lewis, the discoverer of the *Sinaitic palimpsest*, wrote me last summer, however, expressing her dissent from Dr. Harris's opinion that the version was Cerinthian in character, and saying that "some of the most eminent scholars in England, France, and Germany, including Dr. Westcott, have

pronounced in favor of its orthodoxy." She afterwards very kindly sent me her own translation of the Gospels, with her Introduction and textual annotations, that the grounds for this opinion might be seen. There is no room to introduce them here,¹ and I am not so presumptuous as to imagine that my opinion in such a matter would have any great weight; but it seems to me that she is fully justified in considering the version orthodox. In such a case, we have to be guided chiefly by the opinions of specialists.

However this point may be decided, there is little if any doubt of the very early origin of this translation of the four Gospels. The Diatesseron is good evidence on this point. Whether the *Sinaitic* or the *Curetonian* is the earlier Syriac version, may be left to the critics to discuss, and if they can do so, decide; but that both are older than the Diatessaron there can be little doubt, as peculiar readings of both these versions are found in it.

The Diatessaron, then, shows that both these versions must have been made early in the second century; and *one* of them *may* have been made before it began.

The only alternative, evidently, is that a Syriac version, the ancestor, so to speak, of both of these, was that from which the Diatessaron was composed, and for the settling of the main question, the genuineness of the Gospels, this would amount to the same thing. It is well nigh certain that both these ver-

¹These grounds may indicate, in a general way, however, by saying that the word "begat," in Matt., 1:16, is taken in a conventional sense, as simply meaning that he was his *legal* father. The whole account certainly, as is said in the Introduction, "presupposes the miraculous conception of our Lord." And Mrs. Lewis adds:

"I may also remark that we do not brand with heresy all the Greek codices which report the words of our Lord's mother in Luke 2:48, 'Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.'"

The same may be said of Luke 2:41, "Now, his *parents* went to Jerusalem every year, &c."

The view taken at first by Prof. Harris is thus referred to:

"Mr. Rendel Harris has given expression to what was at first the prevalent opinion in an able article in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1894, but the spirited discussion which followed in the *Academy* during the following months did much to clear up our views on the subject, and the matured opinion of some foreign scholars, such as Wellhausen, Zahn, Durand, &c., has been without hesitation in favor of its orthodoxy."

sions precede the Diatessaron, and it has been generally thought that another Syriac version preceded *them*. But, on this point, Dr. Nestle, as high authority on such a subject, probably, as any in the world, is spoken of in Mrs. Lewis's Introduction as considering the Sinaitic version "the very earliest translation of the Gospels into Syriac, on which the Diatessaron and the Curetonian are both founded."

The Diatessaron and Sinaitic palimpsest both lack the account of the woman taken in adultery. This is a characteristic of the earliest texts. But the Sinaitic also lacks the last chapter of Mark after the 8th verse, while the Diatessaron has it. This is one of the many signs that the Sinaitic is earlier than the Diatessaron. It also shows that the Diatessaron drew on some source other than the Sinaitic, (the Curetonian?), for this part of its text.*

CONCLUSION.

VII. THE DIATESSARON, AN INDEPENDENT WITNESS.

When the Diatessaron is spoken of as confirming the testimony of so many other witnesses, it should not be inferred that its testimony is in any sense *dependent* on theirs. While it makes clearer and more conclusive the testimony which each of them gives, its own would stand unimpeachable, even on the impossible supposition that theirs could be refuted. Among all these witnesses it occupies a unique position. It is the only copy of the Gospels of that early time that is known to have come from the pen of a well known historical character. It is as certain that Tatian prepared this harmony from the four Gospels in a complete form as any fact of that date can be to us. This, of course, absolutely fixes its date within the narrow limits of a very few years of Tatian's life. Other versions were certainly earlier, at least the one from which this harmony was composed; but the age of each one has to be determined by internal marks. The age of *this* is settled *historically* and without reference to those internal signs by which specialists determine the date of texts.

Pharos, the world's wonder, reared its marble shaft far aloft,

and threw its great light over all the approaches to Alexandria, showing the positions of other landmarks doubtless; but without reference to them, *its* position was well known to all the world, and if *they* had been swept away, *it* would still have served its own great purpose.

Thus, we see the Diatessaron—the fourfold Gospel—standing about a half century after John as a monumental witness of the genuineness of the Gospels which furnish those facts that are the foundation of our faith—facts concerning God’s merciful intervention to save the lost through Jesus Christ, whom He hath anointed and named Jesus “because He shall save His people from their sins”—and revealing to us, so to speak, the locations of other beacons still nearer the shore and shining with the light of all the Gospels.

In plain words, while its own testimony is clear and indubitable, it also serves to emphasize and confirm that of the contemporaries of Tatian, Irenæus, Justin, and Polycarp, and shows us that, in the Syriac version or versions from which it was composed, the Syrian Christians had their need supplied by copies of the four Gospels, complete and distinct, made still earlier.

We may appeal to the common sense of all honest men, and ask, in view of all these facts,

Is it credible that if the Gospels had been forgeries, the great company of Syrian Christians would have received, as a part of the Holy Scriptures, these versions made, when there were still living thousands of Christians who were contemporaries of the Apostle John in their youth? The improbability is too great to be entertained for a moment.

The only rational conclusion is that the Gospels thus early received as authoritative, translated, and combined into a harmony, *were* so received and prepared for use because they are genuine; that they were written by the persons whose names they have borne from the first; and that they had the stamp of apostolic approval.

P. P. FLOURNOY.

Bethesda, Md.

IV. THE COMINGS OF OUR LORD.

It is the contention of pre-millennial writers, that those passages in New Testament prophecy which speak of the Coming of our Lord have sole reference to his second, visible appearance at the end of this dispensation, and never refer to an invisible coming through the Holy Spirit or in visitations of providence or at death. However great the difficulties necessitated by this exclusive reference, however apposite the sense in many places, if understood to allude to a spiritual coming, or however strong the exegetical argument to sustain this latter sense, we are told that the former application is in the New Testament invariable. And well may they make this contention. For to concede the contrary would be to surrender the entire argument on which the imminency of the second Advent is based and to jeopard the whole millennial outlook as it looms before their vision.

We should not minimize the doctrine of the second Advent, or overlook its prominence in Scripture. A correct understanding of the resurrection, the final judgment, the spread of the gospel among the nations, the nature of the Messianic kingdom and the method of its introduction, and other vital doctrines hinge on the right conception of the return of our Lord and our relation to that Coming. Yet we meet with misleading statements as to the prominence of this return itself in Scripture. We are told the number of verses that allude to this sublime event, the percentage of space in the New Testament and in the ancient prophets that is devoted to it. But many of the references cited do not bear upon the personal Coming. Others simply allude to "that day," or to the resurrection, the judgment, the coming glory, or other matters incidental to, and chronologically subsequent to, the final Coming. And brethren who in their teachings and their prayers give a prominence to these things without specifically

connecting them with his Coming, or using that as a blanket phrase to cover all attending and connected blessings, are sometimes accused of neglecting the important fact of their Saviour's blessed return and minimizing its importance in the practical life. But emphasis on these things is emphasis on the latter. We do not dissociate them. These are the concrete and tangible blessings that stimulate our hope. Not to name, with studied regularity, that great and loved event which is the spring of all our pious anticipations and the precursor of the coming kingdom, need not imply its neglect. Nor do Christians who hold that the Scriptures speak of spiritual and invisible Comings of Christ merit the charge freely cast against them of rationalizing and of having drifted from the early faith. In the warmth with which they declaim against the doctrine of a spiritual and figurative coming of our Lord to his church or into the hearts of his people, many pre-millenarian writers openly charge brethren who understand Scripture to so teach, in certain passages, as holding that only in such Comings is he expected ever to return, and as denying any ultimate personal return whatever. In fact, some pre-millenarians seem to think that belief in a personal Advent is confined to themselves, and that those who repudiate a premillennial advent are not expecting a personal return of their Lord at all. Mr. Burgh calls pre-millenarians "modern expectants of the Lord's coming," as if they monopolized that expectation. At every prophetic conference addresses are made to establish the fact of a personal coming, as though the reality, rather than the time and the objects of that Coming, was the issue in controversy. All this is on the tacit assumption that they who see returns of Christ at Pentecost, or into men's hearts, or in the progress of the gospel, or at death, regard that as exhausting the prophecies of the Parousia, or as denying that there is to be, after these, a further and crowning return of the Glorified One in visible and personal splendor.

I. Often the Coming of Christ is spoken of absolutely, with-

out any statement as to what it is or when it will be. If it can be shown that the Scriptures speak of other comings than the final one at the end of the age, it cannot be affirmed off-hand that this last Coming is necessarily meant, in cases where the context does not explicitly affirm that that is the coming alluded to.

Now the Coming of Christ is sometimes spoken of as near at hand, and sometimes as distant. It is, therefore, not a single fact, but something comprehensive and continuous. He is constantly with us. Yet there are special seasons of extraordinary manifestation in which his presence is more vividly realized. These form a Parousia of Christ and on these the development of his church and kingdom is dependent. Dr. Hodge, commenting on Rom. 13:11, says, "We are not to understand the expressions, 'day of the Lord,' 'the appearing of Christ,' 'the coming of the Son of Man,' in all cases in the same way. The day of the Lord is a very familiar expression in Scripture to designate any time of the special manifestation of the divine presence, either for judgment or mercy. See Ezek. 13:5; Joel 1:15; Is. 2:12; 13:6, 9. So also God or Christ is said to come to any person or place when he makes any remarkable exhibition of his power or grace. Hence the Son of Man was to come for the destruction of Jerusalem before the people of that generation all perished; and the summons of death is sometimes represented as the coming of Christ to judge the soul. What is the meaning of such expressions must be determined by the context in each particular case."

According to Meyer, Jesus has spoken of his advent in a three-fold sense. "1. That outpouring of the Holy Ghost which was shortly to take place and which was actually fulfilled; see John 14:1, ff.; 16:16, 20, ff., also on Eph., 2:17. 2. That historical manifestation of his majesty and power which would be seen immediately after his ascension to the Father, in the triumphs of his cause upon the earth, of which Mat. 26:64 furnishes an undoubted example. 3. His coming

in the strict eschatological sense, to raise the dead, to hold the last judgment, and to set up his kingdom, which is also distinctly indicated in such passages as John 6:40, 54; 5:28; in connection with which it is to be observed that in John the 'I will raise him up at the last day' does not imply any such nearness of the thing as is implied when the spiritual advent is in question; but on the contrary presupposes generally that believers will have to undergo death." . Again he says in substance that though our Lord predicted his second Coming as an event close at hand, without understanding it, however, in the literal sense of the word: though in so doing he availed himself to some extent of such prophetic phraseology as had come to be the stereotyped language for describing the future establishment of the literal kingdom of the Messiah, (Mat. 26:64), and in this way made use of notions connected with this literal kingdom for the purpose of embodying his conceptions of the ideal event. It is nevertheless conceivable that in the minds of the disciples the sign of Christ's speedy entrance into the world again came to be associated and ultimately identified with the expectation of a literal kingdom. This is all the more conceivable when we consider how difficult it was for them to realize anything so ideal as an invisible return, and how natural it was for them to apprehend literally the figurative language in which Jesus predicted this return; how apt they were, in consequence, to take everything he said about his second Coming in the three-fold sense above mentioned, as having reference to the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. The separating and sifting of the heterogeneous elements that were blended together in their imaginations, Jesus appears to have left to the influence of future development, instead of undertaking this task himself, by directly correcting the errors to which this confusion gave rise (Acts 1:7, 8.) "The coming of Christ," says Bishop Waldegrave, "viewed from the human side is a phrase not always to be held to one meaning. The Holy Scriptures beyond all doubt recognize potential and spiritual, as well as personal, comings

of the Lord. See for potential comings, Mat. 10:23 ; Rev. 2:5, 16, 25 ; 3:3, 10. For spiritual comings, see Ps. 101, 2 ; John 14:18, 21-23 ; Rev. 3:20. In like manner the Scripture recognizes a potential and spiritual as distinct from a personal presence of Christ with his people. See Mat. 18:20 ; 28:20 ; Mk. 16:20 ; 2 Tim. 4:17. Since such potential and spiritual comings and presence, when translated into the language of imagery, naturally assume the outward appearance of a personal and visible coming and presence, this fact will abundantly account for the use of language expressive of potential and spiritual comings, like Ps. 102:13-16 ; Is. 19:1, 16, 19-21 ; 40:10 ; 59:20 ; Zech. 2:10-12 ; or expressive of potential and spiritual presence, like that in Ps. 135:21 ; Is. 12:6 ; 24:23 ; 60:13 ; Ezek. 41:22 ; 43:1-9 ; 44:2 ; Joel 2:27 ; 3:17, 21 ; Mic. 4:7 ; Zeph. 3:15 ; Zech. 6:12, 13 ; 8:3, without expecting a personal reign of Christ upon earth as its only adequate counterpart."

Says F. W. Robertson : "There are many comings of Christ. Christ came in the flesh as a mediatorial presence, Christ came at the destruction of Jerusalem, Christ came, a spiritual presence when the Holy Ghost was given, Christ comes now in every signal manifestation of redeeming power. Any great reformation of morals and religion is a coming of Christ. A great revolution, like a thunder storm, violently sweeping away evil to make way for good, is a coming of Christ." It is thus that the sacred writers speak of the Judge as standing at the door, and of the Coming of Christ as drawing nigh, or as always at hand. So also our Lord says : "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you." "Thus viewed," says Dr. Boyd-Carpenter, "from one aspect the coming of Christ has various applications. But viewed from the divine side the coming of Christ is a single act, in which all subordinate applications are included. His various advents may be viewed as forming elements of one advent which is progressive, from one side, but complete from another." There is no necessity therefore of leaping to the conclusion, that when the sacred

writers warned their hearers that the coming of the Lord was near, they were mistaken, or that they sought to sustain the fainting hopes of the early church by expectations which have proved false. Dr. J. B. Ramsey says that such language as "Behold he cometh with clouds" is used in a way that "seems necessarily to include the manifest, glorious, visible progress of his kingdom of grace from that generation in which it was established on toward that final consummation, as it is advanced from age to age by the mighty movements of his providence. These, as they sweep over the nations, remove obstacles, and combining with the Word and Spirit, prepare the way, by successive victories of grace and peace. The revolutions that shake the nations, that fill the world with desolation and blood, are but the footsteps of his providence, levelling the mountains and filling the valleys to make a highway for the onward progress of his kingdom." "The New Testament," says Dr. J. M. McDonald, "informs us of a two-fold coming of Christ. One, his appearing in the flesh, was visible; the other relates to the preservation, propagation, and consummation of his kingdom. This second coming is partly invisible, as when he punishes the incorrigibly wicked, as in the instance of the destruction of Jerusalem, or as when he interposes for his sincere followers and grants them the light and comfort of his presence, and it is partly visible, that is, Christ at the end of the world will thus appear, to raise the dead, and pass the irreversible sentence of judgment on every man. It is this second, partly visible and partly invisible, coming of Christ which the Book of Revelation reveals." Again: "The second coming of Christ has always, ever since he first promised 'Behold I come quickly,' been at hand. For 2,000 years the church has been looking out for the coming of Christ. Nor has she looked in vain. While some who have thought they saw symptoms of his coming to judgment have been disappointed, others who have desired his spiritual presence and have interpreted the providential events of their own time by the light of divine truth, have felt that their prayers for his advent were not unanswered."

Dr. A. T. Pierson quotes Mat. 16:25-27 as showing how the apprehension of a visible, premillennial coming is urged as a motive to self-denial. Of these, verse 27 reads: "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." But verse 28 shows the reference is to a spiritual and not to a literal or outward Coming: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," where coming in his kingdom is explanatory of his coming in the glory of his Father. This passage is fatal to the theory of an invariable literal understanding of the Coming.

In reply to the question as to the signs of his coming again and of the end of the world, our Lord, in Mark, 13th chapter, first tells (verses 4-13) what will not be the sign, then (verses 14-20) what will be the sign of that Coming. And the sign given is one that has distinct and unmistakable reference to the destruction of the Holy City, clearly pointing to that signal judgment as a second but invisible Coming. The 21st verse: "And then, if any man shall say to you, 'Lo, here is Christ,' or 'Lo, he is there,' believe him not," seems to imply, says Dr. J. A. Alexander, that the "coming of Christ, the signs of which had just been given, was not to be a visible, personal appearance. For if it had been, the declaration, 'he is here,' or 'he is there,' would not have been necessarily or invariably false, and the disciples could not have been charged to disbelieve it, from whatever quarter it proceeded. This consideration, taken in connection with the wonderful coincidence between the previous description of the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, a heathen host triumphant upon sacred ground, and the occurrences attending the destruction of Jerusalem, seems to establish the important fact that in a part at least of this prophetic discourse, the coming of Christ is an invisible, impersonal one."

John 16:16 is unmistakably a spiritual Coming. "A little while and ye shall not see me; and again, a little while and

ye shall me, because I go to my Father." It is not strange that men who apply virtually all that is said in Scripture with respect to our Lord's coming in order to destroy Jerusalem, and his coming to vindicate his Church, to the ante-millennial Coming, and that in a literal sense, should apply this verse to the same final advent. The "ye," here, means the twelve. The whole context is on the Holy Spirit's coming. The reference is not to his appearing after his resurrection or at the end of the world, but to the spiritual vision of him in the ministry of the Paraclete, which they should experience. There is nothing here, or in what follows, about the final return. Or if it have the comprehensive sense, it cannot refer to the personal Advent exclusively, and in no sense could it so refer to those to whom he immediately uttered the words. Similarly, John 14:18, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you," refers not to the final Parousia, for the next verse says, in explanation, that then the world shall not see him, only his disciples; whereas the world will see him at the final Parousia, for "every eye shall then behold him." Then the "yet a little while," if it refers to the last great day, would scarcely be appropriate as comfort to the twelve. If this passage does not refer to a spiritual coming through the Paraclete, then were they and then are we orphans, till the second visible coming. "The return of the Paraclete," says Meyer, "is the principal thing on which the hopes of the disciples had to fix themselves, the second coming of Christ being only a step on the road to the eternal glory."

That there is a Coming, true and real, which is not outward and visible, is clear from Christ's promise to manifest himself to his disciples. "Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot: Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?" Jno. 14:22, 23. Jesus answered and said unto him: "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." If this is visible for the Son, it is visible for the Father, who must then also have a Parousia.

John 14:1-3 clearly alludes to a Coming of Christ to receive his disciples at their death. His comfort for their troubled hearts was not death, as a physical fact, but that when he had prepared mansions for them in the house above, he would then come again and receive them to himself, that where he was, there they should be also. It is destructive of this passage to refer this comfort to the end of the world. If it had any immediate application to those to whom it was spoken, it pointed to the hour of death. For nearly 2,000 years these disciples have experienced the delightful rest of those heavenly mansions and the comfort of our Lord's immediate presence. To assume that Christ passed over all this period of ineffable blessedness and pointed them to the remote millennial joys of earth, to be experienced when they should return with him in his glory, is incredible; especially as the great solace for their sorrow was the prospect of reunion with him. Why should he thus pass over the certainly near, and point to the certainly remote consolations, and in so doing violate the prime canon of pre-millenarianism, that the pungency of motives, as a stimulus and a comfort, is measured by their known or apprehended nearness? Can it be, because the joys of heaven are to be so overwhelmingly eclipsed and surpassed by the beatitudes of the millennium as to be unworthy of mention in comparison? But that exegesis which denies a return of our Lord in judgment on Jerusalem, refuses this interpretation of John 14:1-3. It does not recognize this as a lovely hope. It speaks as though we made death itself the hope instead of Christ coming at death. Says Dr. A. J. Gordon: "He who rides upon the pale horse cannot be the same as he who comes in the clouds of heaven." Dr. E. P. Goodwin repudiates all reference to death in this passage, and denies that the Lord's Coming is ever spoken of in connection with the death of his saints. "Death," he says, "is our great, relentless foe. Its coming ought never to be in a believer's mind made the same thing as the Coming of the Lord." Dr. W. G. Moorehead says we have forgotten "the hope" and substituted death for "the

Coming." If these brethren are correct, we should no longer speak of death as the gate of endless joys, but should start and fear to die, as though Jesus were not with us to sustain us in that trying hour. The death of a believer is to all practical purposes the Coming of Christ to that individual. It summons him into the glorious circle of those who see his face and who now enjoy in the closest intimacy his blessed fellowship. It is to him the end of probation, the close of time and the opening of an unchanging eternity, as truly as the second advent will be to mankind at large. There can be no objection to the application to the death of individuals, in a proper and subordinate way, of the warnings suggested by the latter. That the pious heart instinctively clings to the view of a Coming of Jesus into the life and experience of the Church and the individual, we have but to inspect our hymn-books. The devotional character and elevated, scriptural sentiment of, "Come Thou Almighty King," "Come My Redeemer, come," "Come, Gracious Lord, descend and dwell," will cause them to live in the worship of the people of God, because they voice aspirations of the soul which are authorized and implanted by the Holy Spirit. But such comings do not exhaust the promise of his Coming. He will yet come in visible splendor amid the clouds of heaven, in the fulness of time. No minor or premonitory coming is fitted to take that place in our lively anticipations which this final, triumphant coming is designed to occupy.

II. But what effect on the promise of the final Coming has the question whether it is post- or pre-millennial?

The great majority of those who embrace the latter view, do so on the supposition that no other view of the second Advent accords with the Scripture understood in its plain and ordinary sense, or gives to its language on this subject its full and proper force; while the counter view derogates from the prominence of that Coming as a practical doctrine. Says Dr. J. H. Brookes: "The purpose of the constant representations in the New Testament of the nearness of the advent is to keep the church in

the attitude of eager expectation and unceasing watchfulness." Dr. A. J. Gordon says: "It is impossible that men should feel the power of an event which is certainly remote as they do one that is even possibly near. Push the event of Christ's return across a period of 1,000 years and by no possibility can it continue to be an event of such startling and solemn interest as when it is known that it may be very nigh." Says Dr. A. T. Pierson: "The mischief of the doctrine that interposes a millennial era between the first and second Coming of the Lord is, it makes impossible the posture of perpetually looking. The imminence of the Lord's Coming is destroyed, the moment you locate between the first and second Coming of our Lord any period of time whatever that is a definite period, whether ten or a hundred or a thousand years. I cannot look for a thing as an imminent event which I know is not going to take place for ten years to come. Therefore all the warnings of Christ and of the Holy Ghost touching the imminence of the Lord's Coming become not only absurd but farcical, if the Lord's Coming is not to introduce the Millennium but to end it." That is the point. We may long for it and wait for it on the post-millennial view, but how can we watch for it? The command to watch would seem to be precluded by the insertion here of a long, definite period. There is plausibility in this position. If we are shut up to this inference, and if with it we concede the postulate of two resurrections, then the whole pre-millennial programme with its pessimistic outlook for the church, its revived Judaism, and its incongruous blending of glorified saints with men in the flesh follows as virtually proved. It is claimed that what the New Testament writers emphasize is not so much the certainty of the second Advent as its possible nearness; that for aught that was revealed, it might occur in their day. The Prophetic Conference of 1879, held in Trinity church, New York, in its published creed affirmed that the second Advent is everywhere in Scripture represented as imminent and may occur at any moment. Dr. Pierson speaks of it as "an overhanging fact, liable always to

occur." The reason he assigns why it is always represented as near, is not so much that it is near, but that we may be perpetually looking for it. Dr. W. J. Erdman says that in the light of present events, the return of our Lord seems to be not far off. Dr. Tyng says that for some of us necessarily the interval of hope must be short. The circular call for the above New York Prophetic Conference, signed by Drs. Brookes, Gordon, Tyng, Bishop Nicholson and others, alludes to the revival of activity and aggressiveness among pre-millenarians then going on for the propagation of their dogma, and declares it to be nothing less than the wise virgins at last rising up and trimming their lamps in preparation for the Coming of the Bridegroom. This not only assumes that the Advent is at hand but it arrogates to premillenarians a superior readiness for that Coming, if not a deeper devotion to the cause of their Lord, and at the same time contains a sly insinuation that post-millenarians are the foolish virgins.

It constitutes no slight objection to pre-millenarianism that with so many of its ardent advocates not only is belief of this doctrine confounded with zeal for the Master, but also there is an habitual proneness, unperceived often by themselves no doubt, to impute to those not in agreement with them a lower scale of loyalty to Scripture and a laxer zeal for the honor and kingdom of their common Lord. I cannot see why it should be that those who do not understand the Word to teach an immediate visible return of Christ should love and long for his appearing less than those who infer from Scripture that the times are ripe for it. Yet too often it is assumed that this latter expectation is "the test of a vigorous faith and of a pious love for his appearing."

It is contended that the Apostles and Christians of their day expected the return of the Lord, with all its glorious consequences, in their lifetime. Almost all rationalistic commentators declare that the Apostles so held and taught, and they make the point against inspiration that this teaching was falsified in fact. Prof. Hackett affirms that the hope of

the speedy return to this earth of our Lord was with the first believers the great consummation, on which their strongest hopes were fixed, that they lived in expectation of it and hoped to be prepared for it. Rev. J. M. Gray says that our Lord in not contradicting these expectations, thereby authorized them. Dr. Tyng argues at length that the men of the first Christian generation, including the Apostles and the writers of the New Testament, lived in the almost daily expectation of the Lord and the end of the world. Dr. Gordon says of the early Christians that they lived in constant and joyful anticipation of receiving back their sainted dead. "The difference between their attitude and that which generally prevails nowadays is this: Now, men wait for death to bring them into the presence and companionship of the departed saints. Then, they waited for the resurrection to bring their blessed dead back to them. Now, they watch for the opening inward of the gate of the grave to let them into the company of the redeemed with Christ in Paradise. Then, they watched for the opening outward of the gate of the grave that their dead might rejoin them in their transformed bodies." That is, David's expectation of going to his departed child has for now 1,800 years been out of date. And we are urged back to this platform of hope, to this falsified expectation, as the highest and holiest plane on which we can pitch our piety. Viewed in the light of results, it may fairly be asked, which attitude of the two was divinely authorized?

We concede that the hope of the bright rewards attendant upon the return of our Lord constitutes now, as in the Apostolic teachings, the paramount incentive to faith and holy endeavor. Yet we fail to discover one instance where the hopes that center in his Coming are made contingent on the immediacy or the pre-millennial aspect of that Coming. They are just as real and operative on the other scheme as they can rightly be conceived to be on this. The early Christians, clinging to the fond idea of the earthly kingdom, at first hoped that the second Advent might occur in their day. The

Apostles themselves, no doubt, in advance of revelation, cherished that expectation. It was revealed to them, however, that other events should first occur. The world must be evangelized, the Jews converted to Christ, the apostacy come to a head and the man of sin be revealed. As the Apostles spoke by inspiration, it cannot be urged that when they say that the day of the Lord is at hand, and to exhort believers to watch and pray for his Advent, they believed it was to occur at once. What they said God said. If God, knowing that his Son should not return for centuries after his ascension, could say to the people: The day of the Lord is at hand; watch, for ye know neither the day nor the hour, then that language was appropriate, even though those using it knew that the Advent could not occur for many thousand years. Even in our Saviour's prophetic discourse, Mk., 13th chapter, a prominent aim was to tell what would not be the signs of his Coming, that believers might not be led to expect that event too soon. And while he speaks in this address of his speedy coming in judgment on the Jewish capital, he distinctly speaks of the universal dissemination of the gospel and other events that would intervene before his final return and postpone it far beyond the limit of that generation. When the Thessalonians came to apprehend that the Lord was to return, Paul wrote them a special letter to correct that impression. He beseeches them in earnest tones not to be troubled and to give no heed to the insinuation that the day of the Lord was at hand. He had already told them to watch for that Coming. Now he tells them that this Coming was not imminent. This teaching of Paul's is fatal at once to the theory that the early Church on divine authority lived in momentary expectation of the Coming and to the view that watching necessarily implies imminence. We have seen no reply to this. Bonar says Paul only meant that there were "no streaks of dawn as yet." Dr. S. H. Kellogg makes the attempt but breaks down. He can only say that Paul could not mean to contradict himself or weaken the force of his

previous exhortations, in which he had reminded the Thessalonians that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night; that no one can understand these words to contradict the many passages of the New Testament in which the Coming of the Lord is spoken of as imminent; that no matter how the passage be understood, a man cannot really be said to watch except he regard the event for which he watches as at least possible at any time. But in this he refuses Paul the right to explain his own words and erects his own inferences as to the imminency of the Coming against the clear and unmistakable teachings of the Apostle. Paul taught the Thessalonians that the idea of an immediate, visible Coming must not be allowed to gain possession of their minds. Such an entreaty would never have come from a pre-millenarian. He would have been afraid of destroying the possibility of watching. It is singular that the only errors as to the second Coming mentioned in the New Testament all consist in dating it too early. In the parables our Saviour hints at a distant Coming. The bridegroom tarried. It was after a long time that the nobleman returned. Peter, in his exhortation to his brethren in the flesh to repent that the times of refreshing might come, alludes to spiritual refreshing. As such, it had pertinency. But if he meant: repent that the Millennium may come, it would have been irrelevant as a ground of exhortation. As to the apprehension among some that John should live till Christ should come again, John himself tells us that was a misapprehension, unauthorized by the words of our Lord. Yet the statement which he cites as current, has this deep point of interest, that the facility with which, on the slightest grounds, our Lord was misunderstood, reveals among the, as yet, unenlightened disciples an expectation of a speedy return and erection of the Kingdom, and thereby reveals the source of this expectation as to John in the, as yet, unpurged Jewish conceptions of a carnal kingdom. So, of any similar expectation in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church. It had this same root, was equally unauthorized by

any revelation from God, and suffered the same refutation by the logic of events. It was the lingering remains of exploded Jewish expectation. Much that the disciples fondly dreamed failed to materialize. Our concern is not with what the early Church thought, but what the Apostles taught.

But there are other aspects of our Lord's Coming than the question of its nearness and the duty of watching for it, that are just as serious and as prominent. Even if this latter seems to imply that his Coming is now, and was in the Apostolic days, momentarily imminent, there are whole classes of passages which show that the reverse of this was the mind of the Spirit. The Church of to-day, as the Apostolic Church before it, not only has to watch, but has a work to do. To the end of time it must go, teach, make disciples. This is her great mission. We cannot conceive that the early Christians could expect to disciple all nations in their generation, or that they measured the destined progress and mission of the church by what they could accomplish in at best a few years. It is impossible that any inspired teaching should have been the warrant for such a falsified impression. At his Ascension, the disciples asked their Lord about his coming again. He replied by telling them of their work, which was to extend to the uttermost parts of the earth. Again, if the exhortations to watch were in that day compatible with all the work then to be done, they must still be compatible with the remainder of it yet undone. The expectation of the Coming must be repressed by the prior necessity of a world-wide evangelization. It is this latter, the work, that claims our love and consecration to-day. The more we realize its magnitude and obligation, the less serious will be our expectation of an immediate return. Dreams and fancies, now as then, give way before the dawning consciousness of a world-wide mission.

But what is meant by the Advent being near? 1. It must be understood in connection with many exhortations to patient waiting. 2. It must be understood in a sense that will admit of a lapse of 1,800 years, and may admit of as many more. 3. It

means that we are now entered upon the last dispensation, the termination of which will be the end of the world. Events which were to precede and prepare the way for the final consummation had, at least the first train of them, already begun in the Apostolic day, and are now hastening to fulfilment. It is based upon the great fact that with God all time is brief, that to him the end is as present as the beginning. But all this does not make the culmination of all things in the final Parousia imminent in the sense, as we are told, that it must be instantly and momentarily expected. It ever remains that the chronology of man and the time-measurements of God are gauged by different standards.

It may be here remarked, that many passages that seem to put the Advent near at hand, simply conceive the church as one in all ages, a continuous body, enduring till he Comes, and all in this line between the two Comings are made the objects of the exhortation. Dr. David Brown cites as passages that may be thus understood, 1 Cor. 1:7, 8; Lk. 19:13; Phil. 1:6, 9, 11; 1 Thess. 5:9, 9, 10, 23; 1 Cor. 11:26. Many pre-millenarians are inconsistent in that, while they hold that the final Advent may occur any day and is confidently expected, they hold views as to many of the prophecies that are incompatible with the theory of a possible, immediate return. They anticipate prior events that are not yet realized. The post-millenarian only affirms more prior events than these do. But these teach a number and variety of events, yet to be expected, that destroy the whole doctrine of immediacy, that is the very soul and central postulate of pre-millenarianism and absolutely necessary to any vestige of truth in the system. The Jews, they teach, must first be restored to their former land, and that sufficiently long for them to attain therein to much prosperity. The temple must be rebuilt as a Jewish temple, since Christ will not come till he sees the abomination of desolation standing in the holy temple. Then a confederacy must be formed against the Jews and they be assaulted by the armies of Gog, in the midst of which conflict Christ is to come.

Many, with Canon Ryle, hold that a more complete development of Antichrist is yet to be expected than we now have in the Romish Pope. How then can those who maintain such expectations be looking daily for the Coming of the Lord? Must they not rather be looking for those events which they believe shall precede it? Those daring souls who lift the veil, and find in the mystic 42 weeks or the 1,260 days the disclosure of a date yet future for the end of this dispensation, destroy the imminence of the Advent, and the possibility of watching in that temper and under those conditions which pre-adventists say are necessary to that exercise. Every calculator of prophecy, searching with his key for dates and disclosures of times that are fixed in the future, destroys the possibility of watching as truly as those do who say we must watch across the Millennium.

But granting that the Advent is thrust off by a sufficient interval for the ripening of these conditions, and that it is not in any proper sense now imminent, it is yet contended that it is at least pre-millennial. In support of this, they point confidently to 2 Thess. 2:8, the overthrow of Antichrist by the coming of the Lord, and to Rev. 20:1-10, the dual resurrection; which two great facts, it is claimed, necessitate an order that involves a pre-millennial Coming. It is aside from our purpose to discuss the topic introduced by this second passage. As to the former, it is argued that the existence of the apostacy is impossible during the Millennium, that it must come to a head and be overthrown in the person of Antichrist before the dawn of the millennial period. The contention is then made that the Coming which is to effect this overthrow is the visible, personal Coming of Christ, to erect his kingdom of glory on the earth. But this is assumption. It is not affirmed in Thessalonians that it will be by a visible Coming. The millennial position cannot possibly be stronger than this assumption, which is one of the necessary links in the chain of its proof. Yet it is purely an assumption, one that throws the whole problem of eschatology into confusion and has nothing

to substantiate it save confident assertion. This Coming is indeed a pre-millennial Coming, but it is at the same time a figurative Coming. On the other interpretation, it is the only passage of Scripture that seems to me to favor a pre-millennial Advent. But in this it is in plain conflict with other Scriptures that are clear. If we understand it, however, as a figurative Coming, according to the abundant analogy of the prophetic language in both Testaments and as our Saviour himself spake of his Coming to the overthrow of Jerusalem, harmony is restored and the last vestige of support is taken from the doctrine of a pre-millennial Coming. No argument can be drawn from Rev. xix., since the chronological connection of the 20th chapter with it is not established. This latter chapter does not mention any Coming at all.

III. But we are told that the prominence assigned to the future Coming of our Lord in Scripture, as an incentive to holy activity and watchfulness, not only argues that it must be pre-millennial, but necessitates that we should believe it to be daily and hourly impending, since only on the view of its imminency can it exert that peculiar uplifting and sanctifying power it is so fitted to impart; that any theory which interposes a millennium athwart this expectation is irreconcilable with the statements of Scripture that we know not the day when the Master will return. Says Trench: "It is a necessary element of the doctrine concerning the second Coming that it should be possible at any time, that no generation of believers should regard it as impossible in theirs." Says Dr. Brookes: "To hold post-millenarianism is to dismiss Christ's Coming from our attention, or to remand it so far back as to have no inference on character and conduct. The mind dwells instead on heaven, death and judgment, and from these derives its hopes and fears, and the Advent ceases to be the 'Pole-star' of our life." To show the disastrous effects of overlooking the imminency of Christ's return, he further declares that the ultimate cause of the Dark Ages, the Papal apostacy, the cessation of missionary effort after the first centuries, was

the lapse of the pre-millennial doctrine through the ease and sloth induced by the check of persecutions (though this can hardly be reconciled with the fact, which Dr. N. West concedes, that it was the revival of missionary activity and enthusiasm that relegated the doctrine into that general disbelief which has now for so long a time prevailed). But Dr. Brookes says further: "The spiritualizing away of the second Advent has to a fearful extent led to a denial of the literality of the resurrection." He virtually makes post-millenarianism responsible for that conception of justification which "banishes the sovereignty of God in the bestowal of his Grace from the emasculated theology of the day, so that men are thrown upon their own resources for salvation." To post-millennialism is due the impression that conversion is to be regarded "as a long and painfully laborious process, a result of culture under self-imposed restraints, or a conformity to ecclesiastical rules and regulations;" whereas "no one can look for Christ's Advent as possible every day, as not improbable any day, without being cast upon his finished work alone for justification, and upon his faithful word alone for assurance." As for sanctification, he says: "The second Coming, not death, is the appropriate and glorious termination of our growth in grace." This is a startling proposition from so noble a Christian! Does it assert that sanctification is not possible or perfect till our Lord's return? He surely cannot mean that the heavenly saints, with whom he now holds fellowship, are not perfect in holiness. We would rather believe that, in his enthusiasm for his favorite doctrine, he was so borne away with the conviction that the Coming was daily and hourly at hand, that he confidently expected this generation of believers to be sanctified by transformation at the Parousia, rather than by entrance into heaven through a death they were not to anticipate or ever to experience. This same beloved brother has given us one hundred classified verses from the New Testament to set forth the varied practical bearings of this expectation. Yet no one of them draws its force from the fact that the

Coming alluded to is pre-millennial, and a large proportion do not allude whatever to the final Coming. Violence is thus done to Scripture and an undue stress is laid upon the influence of that Coming by understanding it as the motive, where it is not properly alluded to.

But how are we going to vindicate the morality of God's plying his people with a motive that in itself is deception, of his authorizing an expectation that he knew would not be realized? If the Apostles and early Christians confidently expected their Lord in their day, and if that expectation was not a lingering, exploded Jewish conception, but rightly based on the teaching of the Lord, how can we hold that they were sanctified by a hope that proved to be false, and how justify the honesty of their Lord in warranting such a hope? If it was his wish that his second Advent should always be looked upon as a possible, nay, a probable thing; and if it was for that reason he gave us the injunctions to watch, etc., then he made use of false means for the purpose of attaining a moral end. If such terms as, "behold, I come quickly," "the end of all things is at hand," were properly applicable to an interval of 1,800 years, how can any one say that they express a momentary imminence to-day? It is no answer to say, with Prof. Lummis, that "We are little skilled in celestial arithmetic." We must accept the providence of God as a valid interpreter of his Word, and this interpreter has shown us that the imminence here taught is not of the character pre-millenarians understand as there taught. We are told that the hope of a later Coming is less powerful as a stimulus than the hope of a near one. Hence, that we may get the larger stimulus, God authorizes us to think it is near, and tells us it is, so, though when he so taught it was a score of centuries off. But is it not fallacious to hold that the strength and influence of a hope is measured by its apprehended nearness? Is a disciple, seventy years of age, more holy than one of twenty? Did the hope of the first Coming gather sanctifying strength as it moved down the centuries? Were those dwellers in Judea

who rightly regarded the prophetic time as come for the appearance of Israel's deliverer more sanctified by that imminent expectation than were Enoch and Noah, who walked with God, or Abraham, who desired a better country, that is a heavenly? Is the second Advent any more a "pole-star" in this dispensation than the first was under the former? Was the expectation of the disciples, at the Ascension, that the kingdom on which their hopes were centered, would then be erected, peculiarly sanctifying? How then could the same or a similar expectation, alike negatived as to the fact, be sanctifying, when entertained ten or five hundred years later? We have no stronger ground for expecting our Lord's return in our day than these disciples had in their day. How then can we attribute to this expectation, to-day, sanctifying power of peculiar order? To the early disciples, amid the crash of persecutions, the promise, "Behold, I come quickly," was peculiarly appropriate, if it meant a spiritual coming for their deliverance. But to refer it to the second Advent, an event indeed remote, but which in some way on God's authority they were to believe was to be realized in their day, is to suppose God meant to solace them with deceptions. But we are told that it was only the attitude of expectancy he wished to promote, and that such an attitude is refreshing and comforting. This, as a cure for heart trouble, is close kin to faith-cure for the body.

But we ask: What motive to holy endeavor is increased by the pre-millennial expectation? What more does it ultimately promise? What added responsibility does it entail? We have the commands of our Lord. Our obligation to his redeeming love is immeasurably great. We have an efficacious gospel and the outpoured Spirit, and a perishing world is appealing to us. After a brief course at longest, we shall lay down our work, enter into his glad presence and be crowned with the glories of an unspeakable triumph. How could motives be stronger or his known, certain return to-morrow add ought to them? An expectation, to be cheering and controlling, must

ground on more than a faint possibility. It demands the warrant of a promise as its assurance. Such expectation, as much as desired, is necessary to an active hope.

The error of the Thessalonians about the nearness of the day of Christ arose from the pretended revelations of evil minded men, and was bolstered by forged letters purporting to be from Paul. If the divinely authorized expectation for that age was a speedy Coming, it is strange that designing men should set themselves to systematically inculcate the same hope, with the result of excitement in the church and an idle cessation from work among the people. It is strange that, hostile to the truth, they should find their interest "to lie so much in possessing the church with the belief of Christ's nearness as to lay false prophecy, pretended Apostolic discourses and forged letters all under contribution to give currency and weight to this view of the Advent." If that was Paul's view, why their zeal in the matter? If "the hope" was so sanctifying, why should Paul hasten to puncture their hope and teach them that it was not imminent. If then, as now, it was desirable to believe that the Lord's return was an hourly possibility, the proper thing for these disturbers to have done would have been to teach the distance, not the nearness, of that Return. Certainly the disorder raised in Thessalonica by the doctrine of imminence is not favorable to the view, that it is one peculiarly promotive of rational piety. The systematic way, says Dr. Brown, in which Paul lays out with ample detail "the scheme of events that would throw the Advent into the distant future, shows that he saw some peculiar evils in the womb of that notion, and contemplated with concern and grief its possible progress in the church." Again: "Some of the prime delusions to which powerful but enthusiastic and feverish minds have given birth, have been associated with the very expectation to which the Apostle refers, and have derived from that expectation a pabulum which has rallied them when otherwise languishing, and without which they would neither have had the attractions which invested them

while they lived, nor been kept so long from sinking into the merited oblivion which at length they have found." It would be superfluous to trace the tendencies of this pre-millennial hope through the centuries and cite the extravagances it engendered in Cerinthus, the romancing Papias, the Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, Millerites, Irvingites and other ardent advocates of it, who made it the moulding thought of their religious creed. The effects claimed for it as to edification and experimental faith are wholly illusory.

Is the apprehension of a crisis needful as a spiritual tonic? Is it a moral motive? The wicked are frequently excited by the vision of impending death, but is it not more often alarm than spiritual conviction? But if the stimulus of a crisis be wholesome, why not draw our incentive from the nearness of death. Its nearness is certain, while that of the second Advent is at best but probable and precarious. These are equally blessings to the child of God. Each brings him into the presence of the Beloved. If imminence be the pungent quality in the needed motive, why should the expectation of going up speedily to the enthroned Christ, to be with him and like him, be less conducive to piety than that of the probably far more remote return of him to us on this earth? Few pre-millenarians really regard it as more probable that Christ will come this year than that they will die during this period. The blessedness of the saints now in the realms of light, is so inconceivably great, that even if a participation in an earthly reign with the returned Christ be a higher and more glorious state, that fact is inappreciable to our dull conceptions, save as we picture a sensuous element in the latter, attractive to our carnal natures by the materialistic conception it compels us to form. Why should not belief in an order that God actually instituted for all the saints who have preceded us, and which is doubtless appointed for us also, be less sanctifying than one he did not appoint for them, and doubtless has not for us? We cannot believe that holiness can be the product of a mistaken expectation any more than we can that super-

stition generally is sanctifying. Is it the ideal hope that we are to omit heaven and be retained on earth, though we are told that here we are but pilgrims, and that our citizenship is in heaven?

We charge the pre-millennial system with making too little of the blessedness that immediately follows death. Many of its ablest advocates fall into this mistake. Speaking of the second Advent and the early pagan converts, Dr. Brookes says: "There was nothing else, there could have been nothing else, set before them as the hope of the gospel; for if the grave intervened, it was only in the touching words of the inscription on Dean Alford's tomb, 'the inn of a traveller on his way to the New Jerusalem.'" Dr. W. P. Mackey, of England: "Men talk about dying and going to heaven. This 'going to heaven' is a mere sentimental phrase invented by man's mind. 'To be with Christ' is too personal, too Scriptural, and has too much of God in it, to be popular with world Christianity. So the 'going to heaven' phraseology has taken its place as being sufficient to look holy in talk, but not too far to commit one to a Person." Says Dr. C. K. Imbrie: "All the glorious pictures by the prophets of our earth's future and the race's future are relegated to the scenes of some distant place called Heaven." Says Dr. Gordon: "Let who can shout 'victory' as the grave opens and the darkness and corruption creep on, and the touch of the icy hand is laid upon the brow, but we are sure the Scriptures do not require us to commit such a solecism." Again he exclaims against those who "idealize this hidden enemy (death) into a good angel! as if it were his bony fingers that were commissioned to bring us our reward and unlock for us the gates of life." "Death has been thrust into the place that belongs to Christ himself, and the crown of welcome which we should ever be waiting to put on the head of him who at his Coming will swallow up death in victory, is put upon the ghastly brow of him who is daily swallowing up life in defeat." If the impatience which these manifest at the heavenly felicity that interposes between

them and the millennial kingdom on the earth be not cured at their death, then celestial joys will be commingled with a restless temper, and their serenity will not be secured by even the blissful sight of the Lord himself.

There is more of earth than heaven in this repressing of the hope of heaven. It is a clinging to the flesh. It is a minimizing the fact that God has other and satisfying joys than those of the Millennium. It is sensuous. It sees in the salvation of the elect the gathering out of a people to reign on the earth, not a people to "be with him, where he is." Not thus should Christians view their death. The vision, granted to the martyr Stephen, of Jesus standing with outstretched hand in the midst of the rended heavens, overshadows the cruel blows of the persecutors and makes his not a horrible but a triumphant departure. Since Jesus has lain in the grave its gloom is dispelled and its terrors banished. Go the full length of the pre-millennial tendency, and we must impoverish our hymnology by discarding those words of thrilling comfort and sweetest solace, which begin: "How blest the righteous when he dies;" and those other: "Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep." It still stands that to the believer to die is gain, and that there is no richer hope than to depart and be with Christ. "This language," says Dr. F. R. Beattie, "not only shows that Paul did not look for Christ's second Coming as the climax of his glory, but to his own departure to the presence of Christ as the highest possible felicity, and clearly indicates how Paul's piety was fostered by the thought of going to Christ rather than by Christ coming to the earth." The Epistle to the Hebrews emphasized the great fact that the promises to Israel were typical and spiritual, and had fulfilment in that heavenly rest upon which the believers entered. This was their sanctifying hope. We, too, have an inheritance undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved for us in heaven.

We should love and wait for the appearing of our Lord today, because then will his Kingdom receive its consummation and we our resurrection unto life; and because we enjoy to-

day the first fruits of the Spirit, which are a foretaste and pledge of the blessings we are to receive in their fulness at the Advent. That there are revealed reasons why the dawning of that blessed day may yet be remote, does not make us love it less. Our attitude toward the Coming should ever be that of eager desire and patient waiting, and of prayer for the accomplishment of those objects which we have reason from Scripture to believe must be fulfilled before the accomplishment of that crowning event.

Suffer an extract from a letter from that honored father, that champion of the truth and moulder of men, whose recent translation so profoundly impressed our Southern Zion, Dr. R. L. Dabney. It was written a few weeks before his death : "In my teaching on this subject, I have always urged, what seemed to me perfectly plain, that since our bodily death will place us in the personal presense of the Redeemer as definitely as would his pre-advent to this earth ; since this bodily death is certain for all of us, may be very near to many, and cannot be far off from any, this fact ought to furnish every possible stimulus to Christian watchfulness. I can see nothing at all in the other prospect of an early Advent more stimulating than this prosaic, familiar fact, except the romance of the picture. I have also referred to the clear language of Paul in 2 Thess. 2:1-11, which is dead against the pre-adventists. Their favorite position is that God intends every generation of Christians, including the earliest, to feel the pungent stimulus to holy living, arising out of the belief that this glorious and awful second Coming may take place within their own earthly lives, and that he commands us all, in every age, to cherish this probable expectation and watch accordingly. If words mean anything I hear the Apostle Paul contradict them, and say in substance : 'I do not teach any such expectation to believers of my own generation or any near subsequent ones.' He learned that the Thessalonians had thus misconstrued his first Epistle and become excited over the romantic notion. He now writes this second Epistle, in large part, to reject and re-

fute that notion. He gives his reasons why they should not have misunderstood him as teaching it, because he knew of truths which rendered the romance impossible. They were these : Christ's second Advent cannot take place until after the development and the whole wicked career of Popery. True, the germs of that heresy already existed and had begun to ferment. But there then existed a grand obstacle to the rise of Prelacy and Popery, an obstacle so powerful that the apostacy could not grow, until it was taken out of the way. This obstacle was the Pagan Roman Empire, then new and in its full vigor. Paul as much as says to them : 'Brethren, we shall certainly all be dead before the second Advent can occur, because all these things have got to happen first. So don't excite yourselves about the romance of the thing, but try to prepare for death with all your might?' To me it seems also plain that it would not be worthy of the truth and candor of Christ and his Apostles to make use of a scare, which they knew must prove false, in order to spur believers of those generations up to their duty. The inspired men must have known, what fact has proved, that the second Advent was in the far distance. I cannot think that they would deem a fable, which time must continually refute, either a wise or honest expedient for keeping men to their duty. Hence I must hold that many of the 'Comings' of the Lord mentioned in the New Testament, are not his actual second Advent, (in which I believe as fully as anybody,) but his personal presence with his people, by some other means."

W. A. ALEXANDER.

Clarksville, Tenn.

V. THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN EDUCATION— PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

Education, though it involves the implantation of certain facts and principles, pertains mainly to the development of the powers of the mind. In its broadest sense, education includes within its scope the body as well as the soul. But the development of the faculties of the soul being more difficult and important than the training of the physical powers, the term education has come to be used ordinarily with reference to the mental and moral nature of man.

If education be the development of the faculties of the soul, it is plain that unless the whole of these faculties is brought under its influence, the result will be a one-sided or maimed soul. The defect of ordinary educational schemes is the neglect of the moral as distinguished from the merely intellectual faculties. The study of the secular branches cultivates the intellectual but not, to any considerable degree, the moral faculties; the study of religion, and by that we mean Christianity, develops both.

If this be true, there can be no symmetrical education without the teaching of God's Word. To educate a people in secular branches only, is to leave a part of their nature undeveloped, and this is their better part, the part by which they know God, and apprehend moral truths. Man's moral nature is that which determines his character for good or evil. The leaving of the moral element out of education, is based upon a false conception of the state of the soul by birth. If the soul is born pure, it needs only exercise, on almost any line, to develop its powers: but in fact the soul is born corrupt. So it needs not development only; it must have implanted within it a new principle and be turned away from its natural bent towards righteousness and God.

M. Levasseur, member of the Institute of France, in a paper

on "Popular Education Among Civilized Nations," says: "There can be no question that the results have sometimes failed to justify the hopes that enthusiasm had engendered. The founding of the school has not dispensed with the prison, for criminality has numerous causes, both individual and social, that cannot be overcome by teaching children to read and write. The advancement of material well-being is not indissolubly joined, nor is it necessarily proportionate to the progress of education. It is even true that people may desire to feed upon debasing literature, as the success of more than one periodical and more than one French novel will testify."

Levasseur writes again: "To abstain from speaking to children, of God, of worship and of duty, under pretext of not wishing to interfere with their liberty of conscience, is not to be truly impartial, because such restraint will allow the tendency to indifference to implant itself in the soul."

The Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., lately deceased, said last year: "I wish that we could have a system of parochial schools as universal as Knox. If something effective is not done, both religion and civilization will be corrupted."

In the gigantic system of public education now being conducted in America with so much ability, and such vast expenditure of money, what is being done to educate man's moral nature? Almost nothing. Even the reading of a passage from the Bible is rapidly disappearing from the daily exercises of the public school. The great majority of the youth of the nation get no other education than that afforded by the public schools. The nation is trying an experiment fraught with momentous consequences, of educating its children in secular learning, to the neglect or exclusion of the moral. We are training the intellect, without the heart, and conscience.

May Christianity be taught in the public schools? The question has received its answer—No; and this is the logical result of the State undertaking the great work of education. Our government is pledged to entire separation from religion.

During many ages one of the greatest questions among men has been—"What is the best form of civil government?" And each country answers this question for itself. An equally important but much less studied question is—"What is the proper province of civil government?" In some countries and periods the province of government seems to have included the entire life and business of man. Under a paternal system, government is supposed to take care of everything and everybody. The tendency of modern progress has been to repudiate this idea, and the province of civil government has been much curtailed. In America, religion has been properly stricken out of it. Government still has too much to do with business, and in the State claims education as a part of its province. It will be strange if men do not learn by experience that, as it is a mistake for civil government to interfere in religion, so also it is a mistake for it to undertake education.

The best governed people are those who are little but wisely governed. Men should be left to work out their own welfare, and simply be protected in their rights. The State can only protect men in their religion as it does in their business. The State can have no direct agency in religion. Properly, civil government, as we understand it in this republic, is mainly for the protection of the rights of persons and the rights of things, and the doing for the people of such things as they cannot do for themselves. The intrusion of government into the private business of citizens, is always paralyzing and usually corrupting. Does the practical assumption of the duty of educating youth, as exemplified in our public schools, promise an un-mixed blessing to the nation? No; rather it tends to the development of an irreligious people.

This leads to the inference that whatever may be said of the State lending aid to education, it ought not to assume control of it. The logic of the situation is unavoidable. The State being the creature of people of all creeds, can adopt no particular creed, can authorize no positive religious teaching whatsoever. Therefore the State cannot give a complete or

symmetrical development of the soul; can give only a one-sided education. This raises the question—If the State can give only a one-sided education, ought it to give any?

Behind this question lies another—Is it expedient to educate the intellectual powers without the moral? Is it an advantage to the individual himself, or to the nation, to give a man secular learning, and intellectual skill, without awakening and instructing his conscience? The answer must be no—if we believe that man is born with a sinful nature. In other words, to give a man a godless education only makes him more powerful for evil. It is putting a rifle in the hands of a wild Indian and teaching him to use it, before he has become civilized and moral.

As to the supreme importance of religion as a part of education, there can be no debate among wise men. Daniel Webster said: "In what age, by what sect, where, when, by whom, has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere. Never! Everywhere, at all times, it has been regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction." These words were uttered in Mr. Webster's famous speech in the Girard will case of Philadelphia.

Prof. John B. Minor, LL. D., of the University of Virginia, says: "It must be acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable phenomena of our perverted humanity, that among a Christian people, and in a Protestant land, such a discussion" (whether the education of youth may not be secularized) "should not seem as absurd as to enquire whether school rooms should be located under water or in darksome caverns. The Jew, the Mohammedan, the follower of Confucius and of Budha, each and all are careful to instruct the youth of their people in the tenets of the religion they profess. Whence comes it that Christians are so indifferent to a duty so obvious, and so obviously recognized by Jew and Pagan?"

Governor Rice of Massachusetts, at a public anniversary, lifted up a warning voice against "the inadequacy and perils of our modern system of one-sided education, which supposes

it could develop manhood and good citizenship out of mere brain culture."

But it may be said that the family and the church are responsible for the religious training of the young: let them instruct the children in morality. Well, so be it. This is just where the responsibility should lie. But has not the State by her public school system rendered it almost impossible for the parents to discharge this responsibility to the young? Can a sufficiency of religious instruction be given children by the church in one hour of Sunday school teaching on Sunday morning? Can children get any systematic religious education in this way? No; the parents must do the greater part of the work of religious instruction. But what opportunity have the parents for this undertaking when their children must attend school all day, and study their lessons at night? Because parents have neither time nor, as a rule, ability to educate their children, they turn them over to those appointed for the purpose, and who thereby become the agents of the parents, the parents transferring to the teachers, for the time, a part of their authority, to be recalled if improperly exercised. Now when the parent commits his child to an agent to educate, shall he have an understanding with this agent that he is to educate only one class of faculties in the child? The parent by sending the child out of his house for education, has made it difficult for himself—the parent—to give systematic instruction in anything—including even religion. Therefore it amounts to this, the child shall have no systematic moral development. His head shall be educated, but not his heart; his mind, but not his conscience. He shall be trained imperfectly for this world, and not at all for the next. This is the practical result of the State school system of education.

The plan has now been in operation long enough for its fruits to appear. What can be said of the moral condition of the people of the United States? Is it improving? Is there a higher tone of public opinion? Is there more loyalty to

truth, more reverence for law, more honesty and virtue? Every thoughtful observer must answer—No; not more of these best elements of human character, but less, much less. We are distinctly on a down grade, driving forward, we know not whither. And this in spite of the fact that there has never been so much activity in Church work among all classes. What is the reason? It seems to be in considerable part, because for five or six days in the week, the rising generation are under the influence of purely secular training, and for one hour or two on Sunday only, they are subject to religious instruction. It is impossible, under these conditions, to secure a systematic moral training, and a symmetrical development of the powers of the soul. This is the fact with reference to those children who attend Sunday schools, but what shall be said of that vast body of youth who are not Sunday school scholars? They get practically no religious instruction whatsoever. We hear a great deal said about the parochial schools of the Roman Church. But is not that Church wiser than we? Indeed, it is better for a child to be trained up a devout Roman Catholic than an infidel or a sceptic.

What shall be done about it? Shall the State be made to teach religion? No; this is impossible and undesirable.

The parents must undertake the education of the young. The State is a voluntary human institution, recognized indeed of God, but the Church and family are his own direct creations. Parents hold the responsibility under God for the training of the young. We must have schools undertaken and carried on by churchmen—that is by Christian parents who are God's trustees for children; but it must be as Christian parents, and members of the Church of God, and the religious instruction of these schools must be under church direction. The church has a right to require her members to educate their children in secular and sacred branches of learning, and it has a right to superintend the religious instruction of the young in the school as it has in the family.

In this matter the Roman Catholic Church shows consum-

mate wisdom in keeping its children in her parochial schools, and it would be impossible for that church to live long without such a means of inculcating its doctrines in the minds of rising generations. The public schools would soon educate Catholic children away from the church if they were allowed to attend them.

The Lutherans also have been wise in recognizing the importance of Church schools. The Rev. C. J. Oelschlaeger, D. D., pastor of Bethlehem Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Richmond, who has a parochial school in connection with his church, tells me that "the Evangelical Lutheran Church has a system of church schools fully as well developed as that of the Catholic Church," and furnishes the statistics "one Synod of the Southern Church, the so-called Synod of Missouri, for 1896. Communicant members, 380,006. Parochial schools, 1,527; Parochial school teachers, 1,586; Parochial school scholars, 87,908." This surely is a very handsome exhibit. In these schools, in addition to the secular branches, the Bible, the Church catechism and Church history, are regularly taught. Why cannot we Presbyterians emulate the example of our Lutheran brethren, who are so much like ourselves in polity and doctrine?

In Canada we may learn something from the experiments there being tried on several lines. In the province of New Brunswick there is a public school system, and by law, religious instruction is excluded from the curriculum. In the Protestant province of Ontario the Protestant public schools are without religious instruction. This is said to have come about as an effect of denominational jealousies. The teachers are forbidden to read any except certain passages from the Bible, selected by the general school authorities, and are not allowed to make any comments. They are also required to read very indefinite and unsatisfactory forms of prayer at the opening and closing of each day's exercises. The Catholics have a portion of the school funds and control their schools absolutely, giving the children a thorough indoctrination in the tenets of the church.

In Ontario there is a system of Episcopal Church schools culminating in Trinity University of Toronto. The schools are modeled after English Church schools and give thorough religious instruction. In the elementary stage of education the schools have not been established in all communities, but their numbers are growing, and the Episcopal schools of Ontario are acknowledged by eminent Presbyterians to be giving the best results of all the schools in the province.

In the province of Quebec there is a division of the school funds. The Protestants here are in the minority, and they have their own schools with a complete religious curriculum, under the direction of a Protestant Board of Commissioners.

In Manitoba the Protestants are in the majority, and there are no separate public schools. But the priests are allowed at certain hours to come in and give religious instruction. An eminent Canadian Presbyterian declares that in the Catholic province of Quebec the backbone of the Roman Church is the Catholic schools, supported as they are by public funds. It so happens there that the Protestants, though a minority, pay the greater part of the taxes, and the funds being distributed by the per capita of the children, the Roman Catholics get the larger portion of the money. A Presbyterian minister of the province of Quebec speaking this said to me, that he did not object to this. It was far better for children to have a Roman Catholic training than to get no religious instruction of any kind. Better to be Romish than infidel.

It is plain that the logical result of the State undertaking to educate the young is that religion shall be eliminated altogether from the schools. It takes time to reach this result but it is certain to come at last. Therefore I argue the State has no business to undertake education, for the evident reason that it cannot give the young a complete education of their whole nature. The whole system is wrong, and it is time that the Church and parents awoke to their responsibility for the proper education of children.

The Christian people of the United States have long since

begun to supply their youth with religious education in connection with their secular training. There are Church colleges scattered over all the land, and they are doing a vast work, not only, but the best work that is being done, to make good men and women. The great number of these institutions, and the host of students on their rolls, show that there is a demand for colleges in which Christian influences are paramount.

Notwithstanding the great influence given by civil authorities, and the vast sums expended out of the public taxes, upon State institutions, two-thirds of the graduates of the nation are from Church and independent colleges. It is plain that a very large proportion of the best people of the land are not satisfied to have their youth educated without positive religious instruction, at least during the years immediately preceding graduation.

It may also be stated that the greatest institutions of America are not as a rule State Universities; witness—Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Vanderbilt, Leland Stanford, Chicago, Brown, and Amherst. The subsidizing of a University by the State prevents its receiving large bequests, and also brings the University into politics. So in point of fact few State Universities attain greatness.

Through the personal kindness of Hon. W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, I have secured the following interesting statistics of education in the United States. These are the figures for 1896–1897 for students in universities and colleges for men, and those to which both sexes are admitted, and for schools of technology. They do not include colleges exclusively for women:

Students in Public Institutions.....	27,196
Students in Independent Institutions.....	18,946
Students in Denominational Institutions.....	36,150
<hr/>	
Total number of students.....	82,292

The following are the statistics of colleges for women exclusively :

Students in Public Institutions.....	458
Students in Independent Institutions.....	2,921
Students in Church Institutions.....	4,959

These figures show that in male colleges the church is doing a third more than the State, and in female colleges ten times as much.

In the Church colleges religion is taught of course, and that is the case also in many independent colleges that have no connection with either Church or State. Washington and Lee University is a notable example of this class, so also is Hampden-Sidney College, which is classed as non-sectarian or independent, in the National Educational Reports.

All this shows that twice as much is being done for higher education by church and independent institutions as is being done by the State. But when we come to the lower branches of education, and look at the elementary schools, we find that though there are numerous independent private schools, the State is doing the great mass of this work, and the Church (except the Roman Catholic) comparatively little. The Church has failed to appreciate the importance of religious training in elementary schools. The unwisdom of this is manifest from the fact that it is while children are in their elementary studies they are most easily impressed with religious truth.

The whole number of pupils in the public elementary schools of the United States in 1897, was 13,998,585.

In private elementary schools there were 1,334,800 pupils. I have not been able to get the denominational elementary schools, but the following are the reports for high schools, academies, and seminaries not connected with the State :

Denomination.	Schools.	Teachers.	Pupils.
Non-Sectarian	1,182	4,605	57,385
Roman Catholic.....	271	1,237	11,728
Methodist (North and South)....	125	533	8,786
Episcopal.....	119	675	4,895
Baptist.....	115	474	7,294
Presbyterian.....	106	394	4,816
Friends.....	61	292	4,006
Congregational	58	231	2,813
Lutheran.....	33	134	1,989
All other Denominations.....	36	117	2,942
Total.....	2,106	8,752	106,654

The Roman Catholic and the Lutheran are the only churches that have undertaken to have a complete system of elementary church schools. In this they show their wisdom. The most important years in the life of a youth, regarded from a religious standpoint, are from 6 to 16—the period when religious impressions are usually received, if ever. The Roman Church does not greatly encourage higher education, for reasons of its own, but it does keep its hand on its children until they are thoroughly indoctrinated with the teachings of the Church.

The Church should enjoin upon parents the duty of establishing for their children, schools in which the Christian element is dominant, and should superintend the religious instruction given.

A conference of four South Atlantic Synods, four or five years ago, adopted a report, asking each Synod represented to appoint a permanent committee on "Church and Christian Education to excite interest in Christian education; and urging ministers to preach on the subject, also enjoining Presbyteries and Church Sessions to establish primary and preparatory schools in which the Bible should be a text book." This report was adopted by the Synods and the work was undertaken as proposed. In North Carolina collections are taken

up in the churches to aid in establishing schools in poorer and newly evangelized districts. The Synod of North Carolina has a permanent committee of "Church and Christian Education," and has adopted a "Constitution for Parochial Schools" prepared by the committee, and "proposed" it to the churches. It proposes that a school shall be conducted by three trustees appointed by the Session, and also that in addition to secular branches, the Bible and the standards of the church shall be regularly taught. The Synod "has undertaken to establish a day school wherever its missionaries are sent, and such has been the success of Church Extension by means of this adjunct to the preachers' work that it is becoming our fixed policy of universal approval." I quote from a letter from Rev. J. B. Shearer, D. D., chairman of the Synod's committee. Encouraging success has attended these efforts.

The following is the document referred to :

Constitution for Parochial Schools. Approved by the Synod of North Carolina, and Proposed to the Churches.

1. The Presbyterian Church of ——— does undertake to establish a school, to be under Church control as a Christian school.
2. The sole government and administration of the school shall be vested in a Board of Trustees of three members appointed by the session, whose terms of office shall be one, two, and three years, respectively, and the session shall fill vacancies as they recur, electing for three-year terms. Two members shall constitute a quorum.
3. The school shall be limited in its scope and design to primary and preparatory education, male or female, or both.
4. The Bible shall be used as a text book throughout the school in such measure and proportion as the Board may determine, so as to make the school distinctively a Christian school; and the standards of the Church, also, as far as it may be found practicable.
5. The Board shall have power to raise and disburse monies and to hold property in trust in furtherance of this object if necessary.
6. The Board shall, at their discretion, found and develop

the school as rapidly as the means in hand may justify without incurring debt.

7. The Board shall adopt their own by-laws subject to the limitations of this paper, which shall be of the nature of fundamental law to the Board in the execution of their trust.

8. In case it shall ever prove desirable to secure a charter of incorporation, the provisions of this paper shall be incorporated into the charter, or else adopted as a fixed part of the by-laws.

9. This paper, *mutatis mutandis*, is recommended to the Presbyteries for the founding of Presbyterian schools of any grade.

In Columbia, S. C., under the auspices of the Second Presbyterian Church, there is a school conducted successfully by the Session, in which "The Children's Bread," "The Child's Catechism," "The Shorter Catechism," and the Bible are regularly taught. It grew out of a mere class for study. It was formally organized under Mr. T. P. Junkin as principal, with four teachers. It began with forty scholars, and in two years it grew to a membership of 186. It is now flourishing and doing a great work for Christ and the Church. The Session has the right of giving free scholarships to not more than fifty children, the others paying from \$1 to \$4 per month tuition, according to grade.

This shows that the scheme is practicable, and that Presbyterian parents will be willing to pay for the education of their children in a Church school.

No doubt many parents not Presbyterians would send their children to such a school, especially if a high standard of scholarship be maintained. It is an interesting fact that "in the Presbyterian schools of Montreal there are 800 Jewish children, of which number almost none have been excused, by request of their parents, from studying the New Testament."

The success of Roman Catholic and Lutheran schools is proof enough that Presbyterians could establish and maintain parochial schools. The wonder is that we have not undertaken this work long ago.

If we are going to have Christian education in any thorough and effective way, it must be in a system based upon Christian elementary schools; and how this can be accomplished without the agency and indeed initiative of the Church, it is difficult to imagine.

What religious teachings would you have in an elementary parochial school? Answer—the Bible above all things. How can any one be called educated who is not familiar with the greatest of all books? I would have also the catechism of the Church, the history of Christianity, and Christian ethics. I would have attendance upon these studies compulsory, but any pupil might be excused on the written request of his parents. Comparatively few would make any such request, and when they did it would probably be only in the matter of the Church catechism, and possibly Church history.

In reply to those who oppose the teaching of the Shorter Catechism, on the plea that it is not wise nor liberal to have children study what contains so much dogma, I will quote from an address delivered in Edinburgh, January 18, 1898, by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, an elder in the Scottish Kirk. "Religion," said he, "in our Scottish schools has always been a fundamental part of education. What is wanted is Christian education by Christian teachers. We are constantly told that this or that catechism or manual is too advanced for children, and that what was wanted was a simple knowledge of the Bible without dogma. This is a contradiction in terms. You cannot teach the most elementary doctrines of Christianity without dogma. The catechism properly used is of incomparable value. The Lord's prayer even contains dogma."

It has been objected that the interference of the Church in education has not been productive of the best results—instance Russia, and the Roman Catholic countries. The obvious reply is that in these countries the Church has not had the Bible taught the young, but only a mass of mingled truth and error, in which Ritualism and Superstition were the predominant religious elements. In countries where the Church has had

the Bible and Christian truth taught, the results have been most beneficent.

It has also been objected that it is best to educate children in the midst of evil associates, that they may be able to learn how to resist evil. But surely it is wise to keep the young away from evil until their characters are formed, and their minds filled with the truths of God's Word.

The great object of religious teaching is to establish God in the soul, and to develop a new character having the divine stamp upon it. It is not enough to have the law of God occasionally presented to the mind. It must be constantly pressed upon it. What God has revealed of himself should be taught every day, especially during the formative period of youth. Our present method of confining religious teachings practically to one day, or a very small part of one day, per week, makes religion a thing apart from the life and education of a child. He puts it on and off with his Sunday suit, and the natural result is that religion has little or no influence upon conduct.

If we have Christian schools in which the religious elements of instruction are under ecclesiastical control, what should be the attitude of the church towards the State schools and colleges? Answer. It should certainly not be a hostile attitude. On the contrary all good people should endeavor, in all lawful ways to bring religious influences to bear upon them. At the same time, churches have a perfect right to establish schools of their own for the Christian education of youth, neither antagonizing public schools, nor asking any aid from the State.

If any argument were necessary to show the advantage of Church schools in which Christian truth is taught from the beginning, Scotland furnishes an unanswerable one. The most religious of all nations are the Scotch, and no people are more sturdy, and morally robust than they. There can be no doubt but that the great agency through which this has come about is the parish school. Knox in establishing and maintaining parish schools, had the enormous advantage of a State Church, and one including practically the whole population.

We cannot have that, but as a people, we have far greater wealth. Our parents would be willing to pay for having their children educated in schools where religion is dominant. It might be difficult at first, and progress slow, but as the merits of the system became understood and appreciated, endowments would crystalize about Church schools as they do about Church colleges, and they might be made free or nearly so. If one denomination established such schools, others would imitate their example. Well, all the better. Competition would tend to elevate and maintain the standard of education, and if the public schools were absorbed, so be it.

It is objected that the system would tend to intensify the sectarian spirit. This would depend of course largely upon what was taught in the schools. If only the distinctive tenets of a church were taught, of course the results would be sectarian. But if the Bible were the principal text book, and if the great doctrines of God and salvation were magnified, denominational peculiarities might safely be inculcated. But this is to be said, sectarianism comes largely from ignorance. A thorough education in Presbyterian church schools would produce intelligent Presbyterians; no harm in that surely; but they would be too well educated to be narrow and bigoted. The best Christians are not those who have no special regard for any particular church, but rather those who intelligently believe in the church to which they belong. The best citizens are, as a rule, the best churchmen, of whatever evangelical church they are members. The foundation of all permanent national greatness is moral character, and Christianity alone can give this. "Our help is in the Lord who made heaven and earth." "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." Deut. vi:5-7.

ROBERT P. KERR.

Richmond, Va.

VI. TWO FAMOUS CHRISTMAS DAYS—496 AND 800.

The Christmas festival celebrates an event of such transcendent importance that no human incident can add interest to it. The historian, whether he approaches the manger in the cattle shed in Bethlehem with the holy awe which animated the Judean shepherds, the lofty reverence which breathed from the wise men of the Orient, or the cold rationalism of the critical scholar, must reckon the birth of Jesus Christ among the greatest events of human history. His birth was epoch-making. None ever lived as He lived. Never man spake as He spake. Never, save by His death, has the symbol of the death of a malefactor been raised into the sublimest emblem of triumphant love.

The memory of that blessed birth has permeated every rank of society and sweetened every relationship in life. It has added beauty to the most beautiful of human things—motherhood. It has revealed the charm of childhood. It has dignified family life. It has elevated our conception of citizenship. And it has opened the eyes of men to the brotherhood of man in the fatherhood of God.

But while we recognize the surpassing splendor of the birthday of our Lord, we are interested in other Christmas days. Not because they add anything to the day, but for the very reason that they borrow from the event the day commemorates a noble dignity. There are two anniversaries of our Lord's birth of special note and united interest. They are famous not so much because the one was marked by the baptism of a barbarian king, and the other by the coronation of an emperor, but because they mark the beginning and the end of a great chain of events in connection with the triumphant struggle of the great Catholic church to maintain Trinitarian orthodoxy in opposition to barbarian Arianism. That is to maintain the Bible doctrine of three Persons of the Godhead,

that sublime and sacred mystery, against the attempt to reconstruct the truth of God according to the desires of sinful men. The first of these days, Christmas day 496, saw the fierce Frank, Clovis, or Hlodowig, as he doubtless called himself, bend his victorious head at the font in the Cathedral of Soissons. The second saw the greater hero of the Franks, Charlemagne, or more justly, Karl the Great, crowned Emperor of the West in the basilica of St. Peter in Rome by the hands of the Pope.

Jesus Christ was born in the fulness of the times. Greek thought and speech had done their work. Roman rule and law had consolidated the West. The astute and able Augustus was upon the throne of the great world empire and the world was for once at peace. But the Roman world was rotten at the core. Madness, or something worse, seized upon the masters of the world. Tiberius, Claudius, Nero, raved upon the throne. In vain the provinces gave greater emperors than Rome herself could furnish; in vain philosophers like Marcus Aurelius strove with self-complacent satisfaction to stay the progress of decay; in vain did the children of peasants, slaves and barbarians climb the dizzy steps to imperial eminence. Statesmen, soldiers, priests and philosophers; Romans, Spaniards, Pannonians, Dacians, Thracians, Illyrians and Arabians; heroes and patriots; monsters of cruelty and of vice;—the long procession passes by upon the sad and sickening path of ever-gathering doom. Rapacity and misrule, dissipation and profligacy, do their work within till the glory of Rome is but a hollow shell ready to be broken through by any blow which may be struck from without.

For a moment there was a hope of better things; a line of able soldiers culminated in the great Emperor Diocletian. He struggled to raise a new structure to uphold Rome's eternal name. The structure fell because he wedded it to heathenism. A worthier came after him in the person of Constantine, and in him Christianity ascended the Imperial throne. He followed the example of Diocletian in removing

the seat of empire from Rome to the East and with greater skill in selecting a position of strength and strategic importance fixed his capital upon the Bosphorus and gave it his own name. While Rome fell again and again before the wild invaders of the North, for nine centuries Constantinople withstood every shock of war and it was more than a millennium before barbarian feet brought their savage customs inside her virgin walls.

With the acceptance of Christianity and the removal of the capital of the empire to Constantinople, the Eternal City suffered a rude reversal of power. Rome might still give her name to the Empire, but it was Roman no more. Constantine was born at York, in England, his race was of alien stock, he had embraced the belief of a Jewish sect, and had fixed his throne outside of Imperial Rome, beyond the confines of Italy, outside even of glorious Greece. Rome herself, robbed of her might, kept up the empty form of rule in a barren Senate House, where the fair form of a discredited statue of victory spread abroad wings that were destined to soar no more. In her decay she was proud and pagan still. But as there had been even in Paul's and Nero's times "saints in Cæsar's household," there was a Christian church in Rome, and as the Emperors disused the old title, not less lofty than King or Emperor, of Pontifex Maximus, the bishops of Rome, able, faithful and politic, were preparing the way to assume it themselves. Even when there were two Emperors, one in the East and one in the West, the Western Emperor no longer fixed his court in worn-out Rome, but in far away Trier, on the banks of the Northern Moselle, or in lovely Milan, in the sheltered plain beneath the towering Alps, or, when Italy alone owned his sway, in Ravenna, hard by the eastern coast. Unabashed by the higher dignity of the imperial court, the bishop developed the germ which was to make Rome again mistress of the West.

It is not easy for us to realize how great a part North Africa played in those days. We find it difficult to think of Africa

save as inhabited by negroes, Moors and Arabs. We forget the glory of Carthage and the splendor of Greek civilization in Egypt, and only with an effort can think of the lovely Cleopatra as a fair-faced Macedonian with auburn hair and translucent skin.¹ It was out of the great cosmopolitan city with which the mighty Alexander crowned his conquests that Africa was to send a spirit to vex the victorious Constantine. It grew out of a mere church quarrel. Arius of Alexandria took exception to the doctrine set forth in a sermon by Alexander, the bishop of the city. In the discussion which followed it came out that Arius was the heretic and not Alexander, and the mighty Athanasius, then only a deacon, saw that in the views of Arius lay the germ of a grievous heresy—one form of unitarianism. It seemed at first but a nice distinction of words. It became at last the wedge to divide churches, kingdoms, races. Athanasius stood firm on the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead, that the Son is of the same substance with the Father. In the Council of Nice this view was sustained, but under Constantine's son, Constantius II., Arianism or semi-Arianism controlled the court and rapidly mastered the church through courtly appointments to the highest dignities in the East. Athanasius was banished. Only in the West did he find sympathy and support.

For the greater part of the time between 340 and 380, when the noble Spaniard, Theodosius the Great, began the work of rehabilitation, Arianism swayed the sceptre and the croziers of Eastern Christendom. During this time the great Teutonic peoples were pressing down on the Black Sea and the Danube. Goths and Visi-Goths, Burgundians and Lombards, Vandals and many other tribes, were coming in contact with Roman civilization, were enjoying Roman gifts, were finding employment in Roman legions, were winning by craft and conquest

¹Shakespeare in his *Anthony and Cleopatra* has doubtless imposed his idea of her as "tawny," and like a "gypsy" upon English readers. He may have thought of "gypsy" as meaning "Egyptian," but doubtless as the dusky race of his time.

the right to settle within Roman boundaries. And Ulfilas first, and after him many another missionary of the cross bore to Goth and Vandal and Burgundian the precious message of eternal life. Unhappily Ulfilas and his fellows taught their converts Arian Christianity, taught them that Christ was not begotten but created, that He was not the same in substance, but only of like substance with the Father, and so sought to rob the Redeemer and Lord of Life of some of His divine nature. Arianism was to be dreaded, too, not only for what it taught, but for what it implied. It opened wide the door to further robbery. For to deny His perfect divinity is to seek to dethrone the Son from His mediatorial throne, and so to lead the way to an ever-widening series of disastrous teachings. History has justified all of Athanasius' fears. To take but a single example: New England Unitarianism has run the whole gamut of dreadful denial of Christ's divinity in the past seventy-five years, until one section of it now shrinks from the very name of Jesus Christ and sets up a rival lord in an "historic Jesus."

When at the beginning of the fifth century the Goths under Alaric began at last the final act of occupation, they thus brought with them something far more terrible than the horrid menace of barbarian manners. They threatened to destroy the saving truth of the divine sacrifice for sin. Knowledge of law and letters, skill in art and handicraft, might rise again from the ruins of Rome as from the ruins of Memphis and Thebes, of Nineveh and Babylon, of Carthage and Athens, but, O Jerusalem, thou who killedst the prophets, thy last sacrifice could never more be made for man.

With frightful speed the Ostro-Goth mastered Italy, the Visi-Goth Western Gaul and Spain, the Vandal passed over and established himself in Africa, and the Burgundian took Southeastern Gaul. All were Arian; all looked askance at the ceremonies in St. Peter's and in the hundred bishoprics in Gaul and Spain and Africa where the holy Trinity was honored and worshipped. By this time, about 450 let us say,

while still barbarians, these great Germanic peoples were well acquainted with Rome's treasures and knew how to govern so as to preserve for themselves Roman wealth and commerce, Roman law and administration, Roman architecture and the useful arts. The Roman citizen in Rome or Milan, in Lyons or Geneva, was doubtless better off under Theodoric the Goth, or Alaric the Visi-Goth, than he had been under the last pale shadows of the Roman name such as Honorius or Romulus Augustulus.

The bishops of Rome now saw plainly that the Roman spirit was dead, that it was never again to breathe the breath of life into the dry bones of the old Empire. With subtle and far-seeing policy they set to work to build a spiritual power within the broken fabric of the Western world. After much study they developed a policy that was to justify richly their wisdom. They saw how Rome had lost her glory in her invaders' eyes. They recognized her unsuccessful rivalry with the Arian bishops of the new races. So they looked far away to the Northeast to the broken but reviving remnant of the Franks for an ally.

More than two hundred years before the Franks had appeared upon the banks of the Rhine. They were a powerful and enterprising people, mad with the fever of emigration, fierce in their lust for war, inexhaustible in their supplies of men. One little band flew off in an erratic flight, cut its way through Gaul and Spain, seized a fleet and crossed into Africa, hewed a path across North Africa, and faded out of memory in the deserts of Arabia; without purpose save that of plunder, without plan save that which guides the vulture to its food, without desire save that for action and the fray, they lived and died in a very spasm of ferocious life. A little later a band, more trained in human arts than these, who had been colonized on the southern frontier of what is now Russia to help keep back other fierce tribes, seeing a fleet in the Black Sea, decided to go on a school-boy frolic. They seized the ships and slew the sailors. Swept out of the Black Sea, rav-

aging the shores as they went; fell upon Greece and the Islands of the Ægean Sea, sacked cities of Asia Minor and of Africa, visited the coasts of Italy and of Spain, passed into the Atlantic, and thence into the German Ocean, and landed amongst their kindred at the mouth of the Rhine. This was in 270. Since then they had fought with and for the Empire with lordly impartiality, had given great officers to court and army, such as the terrible Arbogast, who slew the lovely child Emperor Valentinian II. in his bed, and set up a mere scribbler as mock Emperor while he, the fierce Frank, really ruled; and had set a nobler mark for future rivalry in the beautiful Eudoxia, the Frankish wife of the Eastern Emperor Arcadius.

But the inexhaustible Frank energy was too fiery for their prosperity, and when Chilperick, king of the Salian Franks, died in 481 he left the claim to rule over his tribe to a lad of fifteen. The Franks were then mere scattered handfuls here and there along the Rhine, the Meuse and the Schelde. But his son Hlodowig, whose harsh guttural name modern historians have softened into Clovis, was a born ruler. Steadily he gained the mastery over his own tribe and then over his race, till by the time he was twenty he was ready to go forth to wider warfare. A little remnant of the old Romanized Gauls had drawn together, in what is now Northeastern France and Belgium, around the beautiful city of Soissons. The other Teutonic tribes with eyes upon Rome and the golden south had passed them by. Now the young Frankish chief made of them an easy prey, and set up his throne in the beautiful Roman city. We cannot reproduce the splendor of those Roman cities, with their cathedrals and their basilicas, their palaces and their baths, their roads and their gardens. Least of all can we revive the spell with which they captivated the pagan forest-dwellers wont to worship beneath an oak tree and to dwell in rude booths. One thing only we know. These barbarians did not come with stolid indifference, but high joy, to this feast of rich things. They caught with surprising swiftness the ideas represented by the multiplex life they met

with. They had amazing assimilative powers of mind and soul. The time it took them to digest what they devoured is measured by centuries—a full thousand years—and we call it the dark ages. But it was scarcely two generations ere they lived the life and aped the manners and imitated the thoughts of the old civilization. It was only for the full tide of a new Germanic culture that Europe had to wait till the Renaissance.

The keen churchmen of the age saw the situation clearly. Men like the popes of the time and Bishop Remigius of Rheims had learned the Teutonic as well as other types of human nature. They knew how hard it is to unlearn a lesson once gotten well by heart, and how much easier it is to learn if there is a reward at the end of the task. They knew in Rome, too, the advantage of a distant master. So they formed the plan of winning the pagan Clovis to Catholic Christianity and of using him to break down the dominance of Arian Goth and Burgundian.

We cannot follow the threads of the diplomacy involved in this great plan. Remigius (St. Remi), Bishop of Rheims, was the worthy agent of the church. Theodoric the Goth, lord of Italy, played into their hands by asking the hand of Clovis' sister in marriage. The next step was to find for Clovis himself a royal bride of Catholic faith. This was no easy task, but it was accomplished in the person of Clotilda, daughter of a Burgundian king, then dead, and niece of the joint rulers of that people, Gondebald and Godegisil. She had been reared by her mother in Geneva in Catholic Christianity, and she was won for Clovis as his bride. She had the noble qualities which have adorned so many of the high-born women of her race. She was pure and gentle, yet loyal and brave; she was devout without being ascetic; devoted to her royal spouse without cringing before his wrath or refusing the opportunity to raise him to her own high privilege. Like her descendant Bertha, who bore the same glad truth to England when she was chosen for a like purpose as the wife of Ethelbert of Kent, she won her husband's love and not less

his high regard. Thus the outworks of the citadel of man's-soul were gained.

Then came the dark day of trial. Clovis in 496 was about thirty years old. For ten years he had lived in the midst of civilized life. For several years he had felt himself to be one of the four settled forces of contemporary rule. Suddenly his place and power were put in deadly peril. Another tribe of the great Germanic peoples, the Alemanni, demanded a share of Roman spoil and threatened all before them. Clovis, the last comer, held the gate of the West. Upon his kingdom the new-comers beat with fierce demands for spoil. A great battle was at last joined, probably not far from the present city of Strassburg. At first the fresh forest men seemed to beat the brethren who for ten years had felt the enervation of civilized life. Clovis saw the tide of battle set steadily against him. The thought which he had doubtless often revolved in his mind before now leaped to utterance. He vowed to Clotilda's God, the God of Battles, his allegiance if he would save his all from wreck upon this foughten field. Slowly but surely the tide of disaster was stemmed. The ebb tide set in. The Alemanni were broken, gave way and fled. Goth, Burgundian and Frank were given a respite, and Catholic Christianity was saved upon that field.

Clovis returned to Scissons in triumph—a triumph which was shared in every church of orthodox faith in Western Europe, and at once prepared to fulfill his vow. Some months were spent in needed instruction. At length at the high festival of Christmas Clovis and some thousands of his people presented themselves to receive the sacred seal of the Christian church. Remigius and his brother Principius, Bishop of Soissons, made use of every available means to impress their barbaric convert. Soissons still retained much of the civilization of Roman times. Its cathedral was no mean temple. The scene rich in the mellow radiance of the storied windows and the flaring lights of countless candles, varied by the costumes of priests and choristers, and the gorgeous vestments of the

bishops and higher clergy, was transformed by the celestial harmony of the chanted service of the ancient church. The fierce Frank was smitten with awe at the threshold. As he entered the great west door and breathed the air heavy with incense he exclaimed: "Is this the heaven that ye bring me to?" We can fancy the triumph in the bishop's tone as he replied: "Nay; but it is the way to heaven for thee."

Grandly the pious bishop bore himself as they passed down the splendid vista of the nave; more grandly yet as the rude and victorious king stood beside the font, he bade him bend his head before the majesty of God, and stoop his kingliness before the King of Kings. "Bend low thy head, Sigambrian," he is reported to have said; "adore that which formerly thou didst give to the flames. Let the flames now have that which once thou didst adore."

Such was Christmas Day 496.

It was a day of momentous consequences. From it dates the close alliance of the papacy with the Frank kings. It gave to Clovis the secret allegiance of thousands of the inhabitants of the cities of the Burgundian and Gothic kingdoms, and made the clergy of the orthodox church his spies and political agents. It aided him to wage successful war against the Burgundians and the Goths, and to make the Frankish rule a permanent force in Europe. On the other hand, the church labored faithfully to tame and Christianize her new ally. If the arm of strength was used to fight the churches' battles, fierce crimes were faithfully condemned. The house of Clovis, indeed, hearkened with but half an ear to spiritual counsels, and sank beneath the vices of too great power. Another house of the Franks arose, however, that of Charles Martel, and took its place. The Lombards pressed in by the Burgundian gateway and overran Italy with fresh barbarian rage, or fresh zeal for Arianism. The Saracen, too, with the new unitarianism of Mohammed, broke in over the ruins of the Visigothic kingdom of Spain and spread the green banner of Islam in the ravaged plains of Gaul. Once more the Frank proved faith-

ful to his vow. He crushed the Saracen at the gate of Tours in 732; then broke the waxing Lombard strength, and joined hands with the Pope in the Eternal City.

At length the greatest of all the Franks ascended the throne. Charles had many of the vices, but also all of the virtues, of his race. Forceful, broad-minded, a giant in mind and body, he upheaved the Western world upon his ample shoulders. In him the world rulers of the never-forgotten Empire of Rome seemed to live again. Here at length the German barbarians had bred a man worthy to carry on the tradition of a Cæsar and an Augustus, a Hadrian and a Marcus Aurelius, a Constantine and a Theodosius. The church saw in him the man she began to plan for three hundred years before. Church and Frank had kept their mutual vows. Charles had humbled the whole Western world. From the Danube to the Pyrenees, from the German Ocean to the Straits of Sicily, his edicts were obeyed. In all these lands the blessed Trinity was adored, and God praised with His coëqual Son. Charles himself went to Rome to keep in splendid state the Christmas feast, and the people received him as the church's most worthy son.

On Christmas Day 800, the Frank king bent his royal head before the high altar of St. Peter's Church. The high mass was chanted in the grandest of Gregorian music. All the pomp of majestic ritual and all the glory of human power united in the service. Just at the moment of deepest solemnity, the symbolic sacrifice complete, the Pope stepped forward and placed a crown upon that bended brow and hailed the Northern hero Emperor of Rome.

The moment was big with meaning. Two great ideas were linked in this hour. We behold the representatives of the world empire and the world church in closest union. Charlemagne was the fountain head of that Holy Roman Empire which was destined to dominate the Middle Ages and only to lose its last lease of life at the hands of an Emperor of the French who began to reign just a thousand years later. The

Roman Catholic Church leading a more precarious life was yet destined for higher things. Faithful and unfaithful, triumphing in weakness and tottering in pride, she gave life to a ruined world. In her arrogance, she denied her Lord, and passed her sceptre to no earthly hand, but in the Reformation restored it to that blessed Spirit who ruleth as He will in the hearts of men and among the kingdoms of the earth.

Mr. Bryce, the brilliant historian of the Holy Roman Empire, says :

“The coronation of Charles is not only the central event of the Middle Ages, it is also one of those very few events of which, taking them singly, it may be said that if they had not happened, the history of the world would have been different. In one sense, indeed, it has scarcely a parallel. . . . It was just because men felt that no one less than Charles could have won such a triumph over the evils of the time . . . that the excitement and hope and joy which the coronation evoked were so intense. . . . The Pope bestows the crown, not in virtue of any right of his own as head of the church ; he is merely the instrument of God’s providence, which has unmistakably pointed out Charles as the proper person to defend and lead the Christian Commonwealth.”

The French people see in the baptism of Clovis the real birth hour of the French government. They have long looked back to Charles as the great monarch of their race, a larger Louis and a nobler Napoleon. France is indeed the land of the Franks, but the French are scarcely their direct descendants. Yet in a wide sense the French do well to cling to these two great names and these two grand days as of deep import in their history. Their right does not exclude that of Germany, which most justly claims Charles as a German and the prophet of the idea of German Empire ; nor yet our right in these days so fateful in the history of our beloved faith, so momentous in keeping for us a sure hope of eternal life through the merits of our divine Lord and the sovereign grace of God applied to us by the saving work of His Holy Spirit.

ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD.

Easton, Pa.

VII. WAS HOMER A POETIC MYTH?

The poet Horace, speaking of Pindar, describes him as the swan of Dirce, compared with whom he himself, in his own estimation, was a mere insect. In another passage, however, he seems to have a more favorable opinion of himself, speaking of his own poems as an imperishable monument of genius—*monumentum perennius ære*. This may seem somewhat inconsistent with the modest comparison to which we have just referred; but he is abundantly justified by the impartial verdict of history. While all admit that Pindar is no ordinary poet, the bard of Venusium has almost supplanted him in our colleges and schools. With students, as well as teachers and professors, the latter is a universal favorite. To use his own language, he has, indeed, “erected a monument more enduring than brass;” one which the flight of nearly twenty centuries has not impaired; one which has long survived the dissolution of the Roman empire; and which is destined to survive the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds. And so Milton, when he had soared to the height of that great argument, the design of which was to vindicate eternal Providence, and justify the ways of God to man, did not hesitate to express the hope that he had left behind him something which posterity would “not willingly let die;” or as the Grecian historian, Thucydides, expresses it, *κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί*—“an everlasting possession.”

But there is another poet, of whom it may be affirmed with still greater emphasis than of Thucydides, the historian of the Peloponnesian War, that he has bequeathed to posterity an imperishable legacy; an intellectual treasure which has enriched every succeeding age; a mine of wealth which nearly three thousand years have failed to exhaust; one of that immortal trio to whom Dryden alludes in these familiar lines:

“Three poets, in three distant ages born,
Greece, Italy, and England did adorn;

The first in loftiness of thought surpassed ;
 The next in majesty ; in both the last.
 The force of nature could no further go—
 To make a third, she joined the former two."

It is unnecessary to add that the poets, to whom allusion is here made, are Homer, Virgil, and Milton ; separated one from another by an interval of centuries, but all standing on the same exalted plane of intellectual superiority. Of these names so illustrious in the annals of literature, ancient and modern, the first in point of time, perhaps in poetic genius, is Homer, *clarum et venerabile nomen* :

"One of the few, th' immortal names,
 That were not born to die."

Homer is generally believed to have been a contemporary of Solomon, King of Israel, who erected that magnificent temple, so famous in sacred history. But this temple, a miracle of architectural splendor and magnificence, to which there was nothing comparable in the ancient world—Egypt, Greece, or Rome—has long since vanished, like some unsubstantial pageant, or baseless fabric of a vision ; while that monument of letters, which was erected without the sound of axe or hammer, is to-day, after the lapse of nearly three thousand years, still the admiration of the civilized world !

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
 Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm ;
 Though round its base the rolling cloud is spread,
 Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

And yet, strange to say, there are some who believe, or pretend to believe, that Homer is a poetical myth, and that such a character exists only in the imagination of his readers or admirers. We are willing to admit that there is a good deal of uncertainty in reference to his origin and subsequent history ; but when it is borne in mind that he flourished nearly a thousand years before the Christian Era, we need not be surprised that there should be some difference of opinion concerning the time and place of his birth.

Herodotus, who is called the Father of History, asserts, in the most explicit terms, that Homer and Hesiod preceded him just four hundred years, and no more. In the Fourth Book of that time-honored narrative, he quotes a passage from the *Epigoni*, a poem which some attribute to Homer, but concerning the origin of which the historian himself is somewhat in doubt. In reference to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, however, he seems to be fully persuaded that they are the genuine productions, or legitimate offspring, of the great poet whose name they bear, and to whom they are generally ascribed. Again, there is a Legend of Homer, so-called, of which Herodotus is the reputed author, and in which the time, place, and circumstances of the poet's birth, as well as his subsequent history, are related with biographical precision and accuracy. The city, Smyrna, in the vicinity of which he was born; the origin of the name Melesigenes, by which he was first known; his education, which was thorough as well as liberal; his predilection for poetry, and his early compositions in this department of literature; the calamity which overtook him, resulting in the loss of sight; the composition of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which was the *magnum opus*, or crowning glory, of his literary achievements; the wealth and honors which he enjoyed as the reward of his transcendent genius—all these facts are recorded without the slightest intimation of doubt or uncertainty.

But some, who are willing to admit that there was such a poet as Homer, maintain (while making this concession) that he is not the exclusive author of the poems which bear his name. On the contrary, they insist that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are a poetical miscellany, or literary patchwork, to which a great variety of artists contributed, more or less. While we have the most profound respect for the learning and ability of such scholars as Wolf and others, with whom this hypothesis originated, we are, nevertheless, compelled to reject it as wild and extravagant, not to say absurd. It is utterly incredible that so many poets, none of whom, *ex hy-*

pothesi, is inferior to Homer himself, should have lived in the same age of the world. It is scarcely less remarkable that these poets should have entered into a partnership (if we may borrow a commercial phrase) to do business under the name and style of the Homeridæ, or Homer & Company, in deference, we presume, to the senior member of the firm! *Risum teneatis, amici?*

“To laugh were want of decency and grace,
But to be grave exceeds all power of face.”

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that a score of poets, equal or superior to Homer, lived in the same age of the world, and in so small a territory as that of Greece, does any man (except Wolf!) believe that a combination of this sort was practicable—nay, possible? To the sober second thought, the conclusion is irresistible that the Iliad and Odyssey are the production of a single master spirit, a poet of transcendent genius—in a word, of Homer, and not of the Homeridæ. The hypothesis of Wolf, which was once so full of vitality, is now defunct, making its appearance only as a sort of literary ghost, or apparition, to which the language of Macbeth may, with great propriety, be addressed:

“Avaunt, and quit my sight; let the earth hide thee!
Thy bones are marrowless, thy blood is cold!
Thou hast no speculation in those eyes
Which thou dost glare with.”

It is a remarkable fact that Wolf, the author of this wild hypothesis, has himself renounced it with expressions of the most sincere and profound regret. In his Preface to the Iliad, he makes use of the following language: “As often as I steep myself in that stream of epic story which glides like a clear river, my own arguments vanish from my mind; the pervading harmony and consistency of the poems assert themselves with irresistible force; and I am angry with the scepticism which has robbed me of my belief in one Homer.”

There are others again (and Wolf is one of them) who believe that the art of writing was not known to Homer and his

contemporaries. From this opinion, also, we are compelled to dissent. Whether the Iliad and Odyssey are the production of one poet or many, their preservation and transmission would have been utterly impossible without the written page, of whatever material composed. Milton, it is true, when he published his immortal poem, *Paradise Lost*, was totally blind; as he himself describes the situation with inimitable pathos:

"Thus with the year
Seasons return; but not to me returns
Day, or the sweet approach of even or morn,
Or sight of vernal bloom, or summer's rose,
Or flock, or herd, or human face divine;
But cloud instead, and ever-during dark,
Surrounds me, from the cheerful ways of men
Cut off, and, for the book of knowledge fair,
Presented with a universal blank
Of nature's works, to me expunged and razed,
And wisdom at one entrance quite shut out.
So much the rather thou, celestial light,
Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers
Irradiate; there plant eyes; all mists from thence
Purge and dispel, that I may see and tell
Of things invisible to mortal sight."

How, then, was this magnificent epic preserved to the world, in a visible, tangible form, while to the author himself it was destined to remain a sealed book? Behold him as he sits before you, enveloped in darkness which might be felt; but that celestial light, which could not be extinguished, was still shining within, irradiating his mind through all her powers, there planting eyes, dispelling the mists which enveloped his intellectual horizon, enabling him to behold that which was invisible to mortal sight. The mind's eye, or that spiritual sense, was still rolling in a fine frenzy, glancing from earth to heaven, from heaven to earth, as imagination bodied forth the forms of things unknown. But where was the poet's pen, which should give shape to these sublime conceptions, as well as a local habitation and a name? There is a tradition, which, so far as we know, has never been questioned, that this task was performed by an accomplished and affectionate

daughter, who sat at the feet of her venerated father, and copied from memory what was dictated to her "in thoughts that breathe and words that burn;" and thus to *woman*, but in a far different sense, the world is again indebted for Paradise Lost!

According to the Legend, of which Herodotus is the reputed author, Homer, as well as Milton, was blessed with two daughters—in other words, was *doubly* blessed—one of whom survived him; but the Iliad and Odyssey were composed before his marriage. Nevertheless, the conclusion is irresistible that these poems must have been copied by some amanuensis, either male or female. If, for the sake of argument, we admit that Homer was able to repeat from memory two poems of such length as the Iliad and Odyssey, consisting each of twenty-four Books, how would it have been possible to preserve them, after his death, without a written copy? *Litera scripta manet*—only what is written survives. It would scarcely be more absurd to believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were committed to memory in the original Hebrew and Greek, from mere dictation, and by the same method, or process, transmitted from one generation to another down to the present time, with all the accuracy and fidelity of the printed page! *Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego*. The prophecy of Obadiah, or the General Epistle of Jude, consisting of one chapter each, or the one hundred and seventeenth Psalm, containing only two verses, *might* have been preserved in this way—but even that is far from being certain.

Assuming, then, that there was such a poet as Homer, and that, with all his extraordinary gifts, or endowments, he was a man of like passions with ourselves, we shall next inquire what were those intellectual qualities, or mental characteristics, which, by common consent, have elevated him to the very highest position among poets of every age and race.

In the first place, then, we find in Homer that simplicity of thought, as well as of language, which all admire so much

in Bunyan's inimitable allegory, the Pilgrim's Progress ; or in the Spectator, or Vicar of Wakefield, which have made the names of Addison and Goldsmith so famous in the annals of English literature. In order to a full and thorough appreciation of this quality in Homer, we must have recourse to the original Greek, rather than to any translation, however laborious or accurate. There is, perhaps, no translation of any author, and, especially, of a poet, which fully preserves the spirit of the original ; or, that *vivida vis animi*, which, like some exquisite perfume, escapes, or evaporates, when we attempt to express it in a different language. Not even in the common version of the Bible, or Translation of King James (as it is familiarly called), which Macaulay, the very highest authority, does not hesitate to pronounce "incomparable"—not even in this "marvelous English" (to use the language of the same distinguished writer), is the reader so deeply penetrated, as in the original, with the feeling, or consciousness, of "rapt Isaiah's wild, seraphic fire." The *divinus afflatus* of the prophet, and other inspired writers of the Old and New Testament, who "wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," *vox non mortale sonans*, is still more profoundly impressive in the original Greek and Hebrew, than even in this incomparable version, this "pure well of English undefiled," the most illustrious and enduring monument of the language in which it is composed.

Homer has been translated into all the most cultivated languages of Europe, or of the civilized world ; and yet, in this great variety of translations, there is none (so far as our acquaintance extends) more beautiful and artistic than that of Alexander Pope. But no translation, not even that of Pope, which is one of the very best, if not *facile princeps*, can do justice to Homer ; and, especially, to that wonderful simplicity of language and sentiment, of thought and expression, to which your attention has just been called. Fully to appreciate his peculiar and inimitable style, or *genus dicendi*, it is necessary to hold converse with him in his native language, or mother

tongue ; or, as Cicero has so beautifully expressed it, *petere fontes, non sectari rivus*—that is, instead of following the stream, go at once to the fountain head :

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος,
 Οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἴαχαιοῖς ἄλγ᾽ ἔθηκε,
 Πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
 Ἑρώων. αὐτοὺς δ' ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν,
 Οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι. Διὸς δὲ τελείετο βουλή.
 Ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
 Ἀτρεΐδης τε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

But to *some*, at least, the English version may be a little more familiar than the original Greek ; and, therefore, we will follow the stream, so limpid and transparent in the beautiful paraphrase of Pope :

“Achilles’ wrath, to Greece the direful spring
 Of woes unnumbered, heavenly goddess, sing ;
 That wrath which hurled to Pluto’s gloomy reign
 The souls of mighty chiefs untimely slain ;
 Whose limbs, unburied on the naked shore,
 Devouring dogs and hungry vultures tore,
 Since great Achilles and Atrides strove :
 Such was the sovereign doom, and such the will of Jove.
 Declare, O muse, in what ill-fated hour
 Sprung the fierce strife, from what offended power?
 Latona’s son a dire contagion spread,
 And heaped the camp with mountains of the dead ;
 For Chryses sought with costly gifts to gain
 His captive daughter from the victor’s chain ;
 Suppliant the venerable father stands,
 Apollo’s awful ensigns grace his hands ;
 He sued to all, but chief implored for grace
 The brother kings of Atreus’ royal race :
 Ye kings and princes, may your vows be crowned,
 And Troy’s proud walls lie level with the ground ;
 But O relieve a wretched parent’s pain,
 And give Chryseis to these arms again.”

How beautiful and impressive the scene which is here presented to the mind of the reader or hearer ! On the one side, behold the venerable priest, overwhelmed with grief at the

loss of a beautiful and accomplished daughter; on the other, the sons of Atreus, Menelaus and Agamemnon, in "all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war;" seated on a magnificent throne; swaying an imperial sceptre; and wearing crowns resplendent with barbaric pearl and gold, as, with royal condescension, they listen to this eloquent and touching appeal. And yet with what wonderful brevity, simplicity, and fidelity are all the circumstances of the occasion described in the original by that consummate artist, who always holds the mirror up to nature! In expressing our preference for the original, we are far from intimating that Pope in his translation of this passage, or elsewhere, does *not* hold the mirror up to nature. Of all the translations of Homer, Dr. Johnson, who was, unquestionably, a most competent judge, has pronounced that of Pope incomparably the best. But if the lines which we have just quoted as a fair specimen of that translation, on the familiar principle *ex pede Herculem*, are compared with the original, the greater simplicity of the latter will be immediately apparent.

There is another characteristic of Homer still more important than simplicity of language; that is, a distinct and vivid conception of whatever he undertakes to describe, whether it pertains to the material or spiritual world. As a painter, in delineating some beautiful landscape, omits whatever is not essential; and, especially, that which would be inconsistent with the *tout ensemble*, or general effect; so the poet, while he holds the mirror up to nature, should be extremely careful not to imitate too closely what he aims to reproduce. Just as

"The smooth Peneus, in his glassy flood,
Reflects purpureal Tempe's pleasant scene,"

so the stream of poetic genius should represent, with equal fidelity, all that is sublime or beautiful in the natural world, whether material or spiritual. At the same time, a painting, or description, may be perfect, and yet omit many features that are not essential or characteristic; and, above all, that would be inconsistent with the beauty or sublimity of the

whole. In this respect, that is, in clearness of conception, as well as in power of description, the genius of Homer is unsurpassed (and, perhaps, not even approached) by any other poet, with the single exception of the bard of Avon, whom Milton so graphically describes as

"Sweetest Shakspeare, fancy's child,
Warbling his native wood notes wild."

Take the following chaste and beautiful description of a cloudless sky, from which the moon and stars are pouring a flood of glory, in the midst of a universal calm. What a magnificent picture is here presented to the "mind's eye" (in the language of Shakspeare); that inner sense of which we are now speaking, and which was so wonderfully developed in Homer, whom Milton describes as "blind Melesigenes." Admitting this tradition to be correct, he is evidently describing a scene which was once familiar to his eyes, and of which he retained a most distinct, as well as vivid impression :

"As when the moon, refulgent lamp of night,
O'er heaven's clear azure spreads her sacred light ;
When not a breath disturbs the deep serene,
And not a cloud o'ercasts the solemn scene :
Around her throne the vivid planets roll,
And stars unnumbered gild the glowing pole ;
O'er the tall trees a deeper verdure shed,
And tip with silver every mountain's head :
The conscious swains, rejoicing at the sight,
Eye the blue vault, and bless the useful light."

In these lines we have indisputable evidence of the fact that Homer's clearness of conception is not less wonderful than his power of description. When these two qualities are combined in the same poet (as in this case), their possessor towers above the intellectual horizon as one of the grandest and most majestic figures in the history of literature. Whether he is describing the resplendent canopy of heaven, or this lower world, with its mountains, and rivers, and lakes, and ocean, "swinging slow with sullen roar" (or, as he expresses it in a single word, *βαρύβρομος*), he follows nature with a fidelity which is truly

astonishing, almost miraculous; and here is the secret of his wonderful success as a poet, and of that reputation which he has enjoyed in every age of the world as a monarch in the realm of mind:

“First follow nature, and your judgment frame
By her just standard which is still the same;
Unerring nature, still divinely bright,
One clear, unclouded, universal light.”

There is a peculiar fascination, an indescribable charm, or, as the French express it, a *je ne sais quoi*, about his style, which it is impossible to resist, or even describe. It is like the spell of music, to the influence of which none can be insensible, however uncultivated his ear. Even without such cultivation, the soul is “moved by the concord of sweet sounds;” and, as Macaulay has somewhere expressed it with his accustomed felicity of language, “all the burial places of the memory give up their dead.” So, when we follow Homer in his beautiful descriptions of nature, there is a feeling, or consciousness, that we are led captive at his will; that some mysterious power, which we find it impossible to resist, is in full possession of our mental faculties; that there is something in his style and imagery which, in the language of Milton,

“Takes the prisoned soul
And laps it in Elysium.”

But there is another faculty much more important than either of the former two; and one which Homer possessed in the very highest degree. It is implied in the term *poet*, which is derived from the Greek *ποιητής*; one in whom the faculty of creation, or invention, is well developed, and largely predominates. Shakspeare has described it, in his peculiar and inimitable style, as a sort of temporary insanity:

“The poet’s eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from earth to heaven, from heaven to earth,
And, as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet’s pen
Turns them to shape, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name.”

This is a most impressive and original description of that creative faculty called imagination, and which was equally conspicuous in Homer and Shakspeare. In combination with a power of description and clearness of conception not less remarkable, it has exalted them to the very highest position in the firmament of letters as "two bright particular stars." According to Dryden, "loftiness of thought" and "majesty" (of style) are the qualities, or attributes, which distinguish Homer, Virgil, and Milton above all their competitors as the greatest of poets, the splendor of whose genius has shed imperishable renown on England, Italy, and Greece.

In the Odyssey, this faculty of invention has a still wider field for its exercise than in all the details of the Trojan War. This poem is a narrative of the most wonderful and startling adventures by sea and land; to which there is nothing comparable in the pages of fiction or romance, except the Arabian Nights' Entertainments. In the Iliad, the most conspicuous character is that of the indomitable Achilles; as Horace describes him,

Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.

In the Odyssey, Ulysses comes to the front as an eminently wise and prudent man. This character he maintains under the most trying circumstances, throughout that long and almost interminable voyage, the conclusion of which finds him once more in possession of that beautiful home in Ithaca, with his faithful and long-suffering wife Penelope, whose devotion is without a parallel. When we read the story of Polyphemus, Circe, and the beautiful Sirens, whose attractions Ulysses himself could resist only by the highly original expedient of binding himself to the mast—in reading these, and many other stories of the same kind, connected with that wonderful voyage, there is a profound conviction on the mind of the reader, that the genius of Homer has soared to the highest heaven of invention.

We observe, in passing, that the hypothesis which makes Homer the author of the Iliad, but attributes the Odyssey to

an altogether different poet, is refuted by internal evidence of the most overwhelming character. When we read the latter in connection with the former, it is impossible to resist the conclusion (unless we have made up our mind in advance) that both are productions of the same master spirit. The hypothesis of the *chorizontes*, or "separators," as they are called, would result in a most unnatural divorce; and, hence, we are compelled to reject it as highly improbable, if not impossible or absurd. If Homer did not write the *Odyssey*, as the advocates of this theory contend, where shall the author be found? It is related of Martin Luther, who was equally eminent for his learning and piety, modesty and discretion, that on a certain occasion, after hearing some documents read, the author of which was not known, he exclaimed: "*Aut Erasmus aut diabolus!*" And so, in reply to the question, Who wrote the *Odyssey*? the answer of the great Reformer, with the change of a single word, would be eminently appropriate: *Aut Homerus aut diabolus!*

We observe, again, that no other poet, except Shakspeare, has been so successful in the delineation of character. In Achilles, we have the very impersonation of valor, or physical courage; the *beau ideal* of the military hero, whose favorite place of resort is the "tented field;" whose ear is charmed, not with "the concord of sweet sounds," but with the shout of battle and the clash of arms; whose eye is fascinated, not with the charms of a beautiful landscape, or with the splendor of the setting sun,

"Arraying with reflected purple and gold
The clouds that on his western throne attend;"

but with the glittering helmet and flashing spear. On the Trojan side, there is presented to us, in the character of Hector, one who is not only a "hero in the strife," but an affectionate husband and father as well; who, just before going into battle, takes his little boy into his arms from the bosom of his wife, Andromache; and when the child shrinks back in terror, at the sight of his waving plume, lays his helmet on

the ground, then clasps the infant in his arms again, and, with a parting kiss of affection, rushes into the tide of war, μέγας, κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ—"tall Hector, with the waving plume!"

In Nestor, we have the consummate orator, whose eloquence was almost irresistible, but, at the same time, gentle and persuasive; or, as Homer has described it with characteristic simplicity, "sweeter than honey." In Ulysses, as already observed, we have the impersonation of common sense, and of that discretion which, according to the great English dramatist, "is the better part of valor;" while in Penelope, we find the highest exemplar of wife and mother. During the protracted absence of her husband, Ulysses, she was surrounded, night and day, by an army of importunate suitors, almost as numerous as that which invested the walls of Troy; but she refused to surrender, remaining steadfast and immovable, loyal to the end. After a siege of ten years, the city of Priam surrendered unconditionally; but when Ulysses returned home after a voyage of eight additional years, or an absence of eighteen, all told, he found the indomitable Penelope still holding the fort!

Hence, the Iliad and Odyssey may each be regarded as a drama on a gigantic scale. In both, we find an almost endless variety of character; from Agamemnon, king of men, to Thersites, the brawling demagogue, who was disposed to find fault with everything in the universe except—*Thersites*; from Penelope, the model of a virtuous woman, who is more precious than rubies, or all the diamonds of Golconda, to the unfortunate Helen, beautiful and accomplished, it is true, but thoughtless and indiscreet; whose sad history, or melancholy career, affords a striking illustration of the proverb: *corruptio optimi pessima est*, "when a good thing is spoiled, there is nothing half so bad."

In the poems of Homer, we observe again, there is a system of theology, as well as ethics, or moral philosophy. During the protracted struggle, which culminated in the capture and

destruction of Troy, Jupiter, Juno, Mars, Minerva, Neptune, and Apollo, with other divinities, male and female, are all prominent actors, or *dramatis personae*, in this historical tragedy, or national catastrophe. Everywhere, on almost every page, indeed, there is abundant evidence that the mind of the poet was profoundly impressed with a sense of human responsibility, and with a conviction that

“There’s a Divinity which shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we may”——

that human affairs are controlled, not by chance, or fortune, but by the King of heaven, or monarch of the skies, imperial Jupiter, *πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε*, “father of gods and men.”

—— “Who gives the nod,
The stamp of fate, and sanction of a god.”

Again, we find in Homer the elements, at least, or fundamental principles, of that law, which, as Paul says, is written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tables of the heart. In answer to the question, “Who shall dwell in thy holy hill?” the psalmist replies, in the most emphatic terms: “He that speaketh the truth in his heart.” In Homer, we find the opposite character, or that which is marked by insincerity, repudiated with indignation and scorn:

“Who dares think one thing, and another tell,
My soul detests him as the gates of hell!”

In these lines we have the great fundamental principle of all true religion, as it came from the lips of the divine Master himself: “God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.” Indeed, the poems of Homer have been called the Bible of the Greeks. From Plato’s Protagoras we learn that he was read in all the public schools, in order that the boy might be aroused, or impelled, to emulate the example of the poet’s heroes, and strive to “become such as they.” And in Xenophon’s Symposium, one of the guests remarks that his father, being anxious that

he should become a good man, made him learn all the poems of Homer; and that he could repeat "the whole Iliad and Odyssey by heart." These poems were regarded by his countrymen with almost as much veneration as that in which the Church Universal now holds that Scripture which "is given by inspiration of God." Achilles, Ajax, Nestor, and Ulysses were held up to the young, not only as objects of veneration, but as examples to be imitated, as well as admired. It is related of Alcibiades that, when a young man, he asked a schoolmaster for a copy of Homer; and when the latter informed him that there was no such book in the school, he showed his disappointment in a manner which was calculated to make a deep and lasting impression on the careless pedagogue—in other words, he *struck* his teacher, as a punishment for neglect of duty, with a cane which he held in his hand. This anecdote, whether true or false, is, unquestionably, a very *striking* illustration of the esteem in which the poems of Homer were held by all classes, the young as well as the old. It was the universal sentiment that no school was prepared to do its work in a satisfactory manner, in which a copy of Homer could not be found. Indeed, this book was a *sine qua non*; and a course of study in which it had no place, was regarded as essentially deficient. The same sentiment has been expressed, in our own day, by some enthusiastic admirer of this venerable poet, in the following couplet, to which, with all our admiration for the genius of Homer as, perhaps, the greatest of *uninspired* poets, we are not willing to subscribe:

"Read Homer once, and you can read no more,
All other books appear so mean and poor."

There is one Book compared with which the poems of Homer himself are "mean and poor;" and that Book is the Bible, or that Scripture which "is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" a Book which

ought to be found in every school and college in the land; that "celestial light," which guided the hosts of Israel through the waste howling wilderness, a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night. Compared with David, or Isaiah, or Paul, the genius even of Homer (among the first, if not the very foremost, of uninspired poets) is completely eclipsed:

———"As when the sun, new risen,
Looks through the horizontal, misty air,
Shorn of his beams."——

But in *natural* gifts, or endowments, he will compare favorably with "the sweet singer of Israel," who was a king among poets; or that prophet, who soared

"Beyond the flaming bounds of space and time."

The Philistines were very much perplexed concerning Samson, the son of Manoah, in their effort to discover the secret of his wonderful strength. He was not a man of gigantic stature. There was nothing in his appearance different from that of ordinary men; but, on more than one occasion, his enemies had an ocular demonstration of the fact that, in muscular power, he was incomparably superior to all other men. And so, in reading Homer, we often wonder "wherein his great strength lieth." We have endeavored to indicate, in very general terms, some points of superiority; some peculiarities in the form of expression; some intellectual traits, or characteristics, which, in their combined effect, make him "proudly eminent" above all, or most, of his competitors, in his appropriate sphere. In further attempting to discover "wherein his great strength lieth," we would invite your attention to another point of superiority, even at the risk of going somewhat into detail. The secret of Samson's great strength was in his hair; and we should not be surprised if Homer's reputation as a poet, which none has ever ventured to challenge or dispute, were due, in some measure at least, to his wonderful skill in versification. In Virgil, the hexameter is much more elaborate and artistic than in Homer. In the Pastorals of the former

occurs the familiar line which Johnson so much admired, and which every schoolboy knows by heart :

Formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.

But the Grecian poet has the advantage of composing in a language superior to all others in strength, and sweetness, and majesty. Follow that disconsolate father, who has just been deprived of one who was the ornament of his home, and the idol of his affections ; behold him, as he endeavors to escape from his own melancholy reflections, and to hold communion with nature in her visible forms ; and, above all, as he walks in solemn silence along the shore of the loud-resounding sea :

Βῆ δ' ἄκῶν παρὰ θίνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης.

Is there anything in Virgil, or Milton, or Dante, or Shakespeare, or any other poet, comparable to this magnificent hexameter, which makes the sound an echo to the sense ; in which the ear can almost detect the voice of many waters in the majestic combination, πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης ? This is only one example out of many that might be given, if time allowed. Here, then, is another element of strength in that wonderful combination which we have endeavored to analyze—the versification of Homer, which, in ease and freedom of movement, is almost, if not altogether, without a parallel.

In addition to this internal evidence of Homer's superiority as a poet, on which we have dwelt at considerable length, there is something much more definite and tangible ; namely, the fact that, in every age of the world, he has maintained his position as the prince of poets—*primus inter pares*, or, "first among his equals;" without a superior, scarcely an equal. Why do we believe that Alexander the Great, or Julius Cæsar, or Napoleon Bonaparte, was unsurpassed in military genius ; or Demosthenes without a peer in eloquence ? The answer is obvious, namely, that such is the unanimous verdict of history. We are willing to admit that Homer did not possess that metaphysical acumen, which was so remarkable in Aris-

tote, the prince of philosophers. At the same time, in Homer, as well as in Shakspeare, there is often discovered a depth of reflection, an acute discrimination, and a breadth of intellect, or *amplitudo animi*, as Cicero calls it, which we should rather expect to find in Aristotle or Kant. But we are dealing with Homer as a poet, not as a philosopher; and of his superiority, or preëminence, in this respect, we are assured by the concurrent voice of an overwhelming majority in every age of the world.

But, in our enthusiastic admiration of Homer, it may be well to remember that there is danger of going a little too far. There is a great deal of wisdom, as well as a salutary caution, in the familiar proverb: *in medio tutissimus ibis*, "It is sometimes wise, as well as safe, to take a middle course." We should not forget that there are other poets who will not suffer by a comparison with Homer himself. If Greece had her Homer, Italy could boast of one who was little, if at all, inferior—in some respects, at least—to his illustrious predecessor. Yes, there is another poet, who has immortalized in song the hero of Troy, and his wonderful adventures by sea and land—*multum terris jactatus at alto*:

"From whence the race of Alban fathers come,
And the long glories of majestic Rome."

This eminent poet, Publius Virgilius Maro, was not ashamed to imitate, sometimes almost copy, his predecessor of world-wide celebrity; but, at the same time, he was exalted immeasurably above the *servile pecus imitatorum*—mere imitators, without a particle of originality. It has been well said by an American poet, as well as philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson:

"The genius is the most indebted man."

If Virgil had been only a successful imitator of that illustrious model on which his eye was constantly fixed, any comparison between them would have been altogether absurd. But he has accomplished vastly more than could justly be claimed for a mere imitation, however successful it might be.

According to Dryden, who has given us the best translation of Virgil, the Roman poet was not only equal, but superior to Homer "in majesty," or elevation of style. This is the verdict of one who, in learning and genius, was not much below Milton himself. In versification, Virgil was unsurpassed. When we read his description of a storm at sea, we can almost hear the whistling of the winds, or the roar of the billows, in these sonorous hexameters:

*Una Euræque Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis
Africus, et vastos volvunt ad littora fluctus.*

There is nothing in Homer, perhaps, more vivid or picturesque than the verses which we have just repeated, and which startle the ear by the frequent repetition of the sibilant. In the language of Emerson, Virgil was largely "indebted" to Homer (what poet of any distinction is not?), but he was, nevertheless, a man of rare and transcendent "genius." The celebrated Dr. Samuel Johnson, whom Boswell, the prince of biographers (according to Macaulay), has made still more famous as a literary autocrat, from whose decision there was no appeal, on a certain occasion repeated one of Virgil's hexameters, to which he said there was nothing equal in the whole compass of literature, ancient or modern, Homer not excepted.

There is another poet, whose name should not be omitted, in estimating the relative position of Homer among the great poets of the world. That name is *Dante Alighieri*, the great Italian poet, author of *La Divina Comedia*, or "The Divine Comedy," as it is familiarly called; which, by general consent, has taken its position among the master-pieces of poetic genius. He has been called the Homer of Italy; than which no higher compliment could be paid to any poet, living or dead. He is an eminently original poet; and yet he does not hesitate to acknowledge his obligations to Virgil as his master and guide; as the source of all his inspiration; as his model, or *beau ideal* in composition, whom he imitated in preference even to Homer himself:

“*Tu se' il mio maestro, e' l mio autore ;
Tu se' solo colui da cui io tolsi
Lo bello stilo che m' ha fatto onore.*”

But there is still another name which deserves a conspicuous place in the same illustrious bead-roll ; one whom Dryden describes as a combination of Homer and Virgil :

“The force of Nature could no further go—
To make a third she joined the former two.”

Milton, the author of *Paradise Lost*, was one of that immortal trio, to whom Dryden refers in these memorable lines ; who, although “in three distant ages born,” made “Greece, Italy, and England” famous for all time to come. Homer, according to this estimate, “in loftiness of thought surpassed ;” Virgil “in majesty ;” and, as if the resources of nature had been already exhausted, Milton combined in himself the qualities which gave preëminence to that illustrious pair. If the names of Dante and Shakspeare are not found here, it was, certainly, not through any want of appreciation on the part of Dryden. His estimate of Shakspeare is expressed elsewhere in the most unequivocal terms, where he speaks of him as one who “towered in pride of place” above all his competitors ; as a poetical wizard or magician, whose *modus operandi* defied imitation :

“For Shakspeare’s magic could not copied be—
Within that circle none durst walk but he ;”

and Thomas Carlyle, a man of no ordinary learning and ability, does not hesitate to express his conviction that Shakspeare was not only the first of poets, but the greatest of human intellects.

Homer, Virgil, Milton, Shakspeare, Dante—of these names so illustrious in the annals of literature, it is difficult, nay, absolutely impossible, to decide which is entitled to the preëminence. All of them are stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of letters. After the lapse of centuries, they continue to shine with undiminished, or, rather, increasing splen-

dor. Of these intellectual luminaries, one of transcendent brightness, from which all the rest have borrowed additional lustre, has been the centre of attraction, the observed of all observers, during a period of nearly three thousand years; a fixed star, nay, a grand, central luminary, as the sun shining in all his strength, instead of a comet, which dazzles the eye for a moment, and is then lost in the surrounding gloom.

Columbia, S. C.

E. L. PATTON.

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DAWSON'S RELICS OF PRIMEVAL LIFE.

RELICS OF PRIMEVAL LIFE. *By Sir J. William Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., &c.* Published by Fleming H. Revell & Co., Toronto, Chicago, New York. Pp. xviii., 336. \$1.50.

This work is by an author whose various books, for more than twenty years, I have to a considerable extent made it a point to purchase and read and study as soon as issued from the press. Turning around to my shelves, I find a nest of fully a dozen of them, with their margins and fly leaves marked and annotated.

1. Here is a little book of 200 pages, published ten years ago by the Religious Tract Society of London, as one of that admirable series, *By-paths of Bible Knowledge*. Its subject is *Egypt and Syria, Their Physical Features in Relation to Bible History*. The author visited these countries before publishing, and his long and varied experience as a geological observer enabled him to throw light on some difficult questions of Biblical Geography and to furnish some useful illustrations of the Sacred Scriptures. This little book sounds the keynote of a main drift of his labors, and it is believed that it may be safely said, that no scientist in the history of the Christian Church has been so helpful to Bible students as Sir J. William Dawson.

2. Here is another of his books, entitled *Nature and the Bible*, published 1875, which contains an admirable course of lectures on the Morse foundation, before Union Theological Seminary of New York city. I listened to these Lectures when delivered.

3. *The Origin of the World According to Revelation and Science* was published in 1877, 440 pp., whose scope was substantially the same as that of "Archaia," 1860.

4. Intervening between these is a kindred book, 1873, of 400 pages, *The Story of the Earth and Man*, in which there is an articulate notice of that epoch or rather era making find, *The Eozoon*, the Dawn—animal, for whose defence as the oldest type of animal life known to geologists, Dr. Dawson has made a heroic and successful stand for more than thirty years. This find has changed the title of the earliest age from Azoic (lifeless) to Eozoic, life dawn age. In 1865, he had the honor of naming and first describing it, and it is known in the literature of zoology and geology as *Eozoon Canadense, Dawson*. It is a reef or rock making animal, and its fossil matrix was first found in the Laurentian outcroppings lying between the St. Lawrence river and the Arctic. These rocks are estimated as 30,000 feet in thickness on our Continent, but their development elsewhere as in Sweden Norway, the Hebrides, and Bavaria is inferior.

This is accepted as the oldest geological formation of the globe ; and being

the nucleus of our continent, it lifts this continent to the venerable position of the oldest of the continents, by its conspicuous outcroppings. Conceding to the first verse in the Bible its legitimate significance of announcing the origination, by God's creative act, of all the sixty-six or more ultimate and only known elements of the material universe, then the stages of vaporous and liquid combinations thereof, and of acid and watery showers pouring down from the atmosphere and forming a rolling, unobstructed ocean around the globe, up through which, as the mass cooled and shrank, the solid crust would rupture and emerge as the nuclei of continents, which have been formed or organized as they now stand in the great system of nature, and we see the back ground of the calculations of Sir William Thomson, now Lord Kelvin, "that the time which has elapsed from the first formation of a solid crust on the earth to the modern period may have been from seventy to one hundred millions of years, and the whole time from the vaporous condition of the solar system to the present, must have been still greater than even this enormous series of ages." The dawn of life did not suddenly flash upon the world, but emerged from the bosom of infinite patience, and the interval between Eozoon and the subsequent primordial trilobites may have been as great as that subsequently between them and Adam. Whilst "Eozoon preaches of progress [from the inanimate] and development, it has a tale of its own to tell of unity and sameness. Just as Eozoon lived in the Laurentian sea, and was preserved for us by the infiltration of its canals with silicious mineral matters, so its successors and representatives have gone on through all the succeeding ages accumulating limestone in the sea bottom. To-day they are as active as they were then, and are being fossilised in the same way. The English chalk and the chalky modern mud of the Atlantic seabed, are precisely similar in origin to the Laurentian Eozoic limestones. . . . It has been attempted to press the Eozoic Foraminifers into the service of those theories of Evolution which would deduce the animals of one geological period, by descent with modification, from those of another; but it must be confessed that Eozoon proves somewhat intractable in this connection." P. 33.

5. The next work of this distinguished and helpful author which comes to my hand is entitled—*The Chain of Life in Geological Time: A sketch of the Origin and Succession of Animals and Plants*, nearly 300 pages. The date of publication is not given, but my copy was purchased 1881. The questions touching the origin and history of life must find their scientific solution in the facts of Biology and Palæontology. The discursive and rhetorical speculators in modern science parade, on the one hand, carefully selected series of fossil species as demonstrating the reality of continuous derivation; and on the other hand, when this process fails to meet the requirements of the facts, they affirm that the imperfection of the record, or of our knowledge of it, invalidates any testimony of Palæontology on the subject. The plan adopted in this work has been, to note the first known appearance of each leading type of life, and to follow its progress down to the present time, or until it becomes extinct. In this wide survey all irrelevant and unproved matters are rejected, and the author selects a title well fitted to express the

connection and succession of forms of life, without implying their derivations from one another, while it reminds us that nature is not a fortuitously tangled skein, and that the links which connect man himself with the lowest and oldest creatures bind him also to the Throne of the Eternal. This work deprecates those coteries of specialists who are engaged in the effort to torture nature into a confession of belief in the doctrines of a materialistic or agnostic philosophy. This work was published by the Religious Tract Society of London.

6. In 1880, there issued from the press, *Fossil Men; and Their Modern Representatives*. An attempt to illustrate the characters and condition of Prehistoric men in Europe, by those of the American races. This is a work of 350 pages, and it canvasses a subject which bristles with interest. The treatment of it is calm, comprehensive, conservative, fearless and masterly. In a region where the philologist, the historian, the archaeologist and the anthropologist severally assume to speak as experts, our author judiciously surveys the facts and calmly passes upon them as a geologist and naturalist in accordance with the principle of referring to modern causes for the explanation of ancient effects, Considering the influence of the complicated causes upon human nature, the unity of the result implies, to the naturalist, unity of origin and genetic affiliation, just as surely as if the perfect geneological tree of the human race from its origin were in our hands [208]. Any true science of man must, therefore, go back to his origin, and trace out his primitive conditions and their results, and our best means for doing this are the remains of primitive man and the modern state of fact among those modified races that still exist.

Dr. Wilson is referred to as having shown in his *Pre-Historic Man*, that existing humanity, as it appears in the native American tribes, is little else than a survival of primeval man in Europe. And the inference is confidently drawn that primitive man was never in a lower state than these tribes.

And let it be observed that the Engis, Cromagnon, and Neanderthal skulls, so familiarly known to even amateurs, are probably the oldest known in the history of the world; and if the reader desires to realize the aspect of these skulls as probably indicating identity of race, he is referred to Modern American heads,—so permanent is this great Turanian race, out of which all other races now extant seem to have been developed in the milder regions of the Old World, while in Northern Asia and in America it has retained to this day its primitive characters, that it would be difficult to affirm that they might not have been near relatives. These fossil men tell us that primitive man had the same high cerebral organization which he possesses now. Even the Neanderthal skull may have been that of a philosopher, says Huxley. I will relate an incident. At the Chicago Exposition, 1893, when Prof. Helmholtz came forth on the rostrum to read a paper before a section of scientists, I was sitting quite near the rostrum, and on seeing him, I instinctively turned to an accomplished scientist on my right and remarked, Prof. Thomas, "See! There is the Neanderthal skull." So exact was the resemblance as to be startling. It was my first sight of this very eminent man. This abrupt appearance of man, as shown by these oldest fossils, in

his full cerebral and physical perfection, his association with animals, the greater part of which still survive, and his introduction at the close of that great and as yet very mysterious revolution of the earth which we call the glacial period, accords with the analogy of geological science, in the information it gives as to the appearance of other types of organic being in the several stages of development of our earth. Moreover, it is not conceivable that this high development of brain and mind could have spontaneously engrafted itself on a mere brute and savage life. These remains indicate also that, as the superior mound-builders preceded the red men, so man's earlier state was the best, and that he had been a noble creature before he became a savage.

"What evidence the future may bring forth," our author says, "I do not know but that available at present points to the appearance of man, with all his powers and properties, in the Post-glacial age of geology, and not more than from 6,000 to 8,000 years ago. I conclude, then, that there is no adequate geological reason for attributing the so-called 'Neolithic' man to any time older than that of the early Eastern empires, 2,000 or 3,000 years before Christ, and that the time required for the Palæolithic man need not be more than twenty or thirty centuries additional." It would be supercilious for any student of man to treat this conclusion otherwise than with deference and respect.

This conservative conclusion is boldly and fearlessly drawn and proclaimed by the most distinguished Palæontologist of our age. Mr. Darwin requires for the ascent or evolution of man from some primitive aquatic form, as the ascidian or sea-squirt, three hundred millions of years.

7. The next book of my Dawson collection that comes to hand is perhaps the most interesting and instructive one of the entire lot. It is entitled—*Modern Ideas of Evolution as Related to Revelation and Science*. The 5th edition was published 1890. The object of this work is to examine in a popular manner, and to test by scientific facts and principles, the validity of that multiform and brilliant philosophy of the universe which has taken so deep hold of the science and literature of our time. But why attempt such a task? The answer is 1st. The world of general readers is captivated, dazzled and perplexed by the new philosophy, and greatly needs some clear and intelligible exposition of its nature and tendency, some classification of its variations and some attempt to explain its agreement or discordance with science and religion. And a further and personal reason grew out of the circumstance that in various books, as we have seen, he had incidentally referred to the subject, which occasioned a multitude of inquiries, so that in self defence there was needed a more formal and complete statement as an answer to all the demands of the case. This little book of 240 pages is Sir J. W. Dawson's formal and avowed refutation of "Darwinian Evolution." There is nothing equal to it. Its ten chapters cover the following points: Present Aspects of the Question; What is Evolution; the Origin of Life; the Apparition of Species in Geological Time; Monistic Evolution; Agnostic Evolution; Theistic Evolution; God in Nature; Man in Nature; General Conclusions.

The appendix treats Weisman on Heredity and McCosh on Evolution.

It may be of interest to give part of what he says of Dr. McCosh: "The venerable ex-president of Princeton has just issued (1890) a second edition of his little work, *The Development Hypothesis under a new name: The Religious Aspect of Evolution.*" "The work," says Dawson, "makes no serious attempt to prove the validity of any of those various and often conflicting theories of evolution, the insufficiency of which, regarded in the light of scientific causation, I have endeavored to show in the preceding pages. It assumes them all as established scientific results, and then proceeds to show that they can be received up to a certain point without destroying our belief in God" (?)

It is obvious to remark that this looks like a compromise with falsehood, instead of standing squarely on the axiom that what is false in science and philosophy is false in theology and religion. It is not strange that a widespread dissatisfaction has been felt with Dr. McCosh's position. As he was a representative man, and did not avowedly, as his successor has done, snub the Church whose devotion to religious education founded and whose patronage was the backbone of the institution over which he presided, it was rightfully expected of him that he would not temporise by way of expediency with scientific and philosophic errors, but do his part in refutation of them. The principle involved is identically the same as that in the slanderous charge of accommodation against Christ and his Apostles. "For a time such conformity carries all before it, but it incurs the danger that when the false or partial hypotheses have been discarded, the higher truths imprudently connected with them may be discarded also." Is it difficult to find illustrations in the present case?

I see notices of a sixth edition of this work revised in the light of the criticisms of the preceding editions. All Dr. Dawson's works stand up to the highest scientific standard, and are at the same time conscientiously and unequivocally and unanswerably evangelical.

8. In 1894, he published a little book of 220 pages, entitled, *The Meeting-Place of Geology and History.* Its object is to give a clear and accurate statement of facts bearing on the character of the debatable ground intervening between the later part of the geological record and the beginning of sacred and secular history. At the close we find this statement: "Enough has, however, been said to indicate the remarkable manner in which the history in Genesis has anticipated modern discovery, and to show that this ancient book is in every way trustworthy."

In one of the works previously noticed, the following statement had been made: "Somewhere in the past, the long ages of the pre-human geologic record join and merge into the human period, the day when the first man stood erect upon the earth and gazed upon a world which had been shaped for him by the preceding periods of the creative work, was the definite beginning of the Modern Period in Geology. If that day could be fixed in the world's calendar, on reaching it, the geologist might lay down his hammer and yield the field to the antiquarian and the historian. On that day a world, for long ages the abode of brute creatures, became for the first time the habi-

tation of a rational soul. On it the old and unvarying machinery of nature first became amenable to the action of an independent, earthly agent—the marvelous power of a free moral agent. This mysterious meeting-place is the prolific soil of scientific questions in geology touching the close of the glacial period, and of archæological questions touching the beginning of literature." Every bone preserved in caves and gravels, is a text for the archæologist. Some intimation has already been given of the view of our author as to the lapse of time not being more than six or eight thousand years since man's abrupt appearance on this earth, to which he persistently adheres through all his writings.

Among the most interesting and novel features of this work is its geologic treatment of the deluge of Noah, and the ethnic relations of antediluvian man. One conclusion reached is that there is but one species of man, though many races and varieties. These races or varieties seem to have developed themselves at a very early time, and have shown a remarkable fixity in their later history. But this has its analogy. There is reason to believe, from various physiological facts, that this is a very general law of varietal forms. They are observed to appear suddenly and rapidly, and then in favorable circumstances to be propagated continuously. It would seem also to apply to the introduction of forms regarded as species. It is not unusual to find a genus at or near its origin represented by its maximum number of specific forms.

"We have found no link of derivation connecting man with the lower animals which preceded him. He appears before us as a new departure in creation, without any direct relation to the instinctive life of the lower animals."

9. Two years later, 1896, appeared, *Eden Lost and Won: Studies of the Early History and Final Destiny of Man as Taught in Nature and Revelation.* (Pp. 226.) It is claimed in this work that the time has come when the Science of Earth and of Man should take bolder ground than heretofore on the question of the validity of the literary and historical criticism which deals so freely with the earlier books of the Hebrew Scriptures. The student of nature alone can fully appreciate in special aspects the internal evidence which they afford of antiquity and of accordance with physical facts and the earlier remains and monuments of our species relative to past, present, and future humanity. The opinion is expressed that, if this field of investigation be occupied by an enlightened natural science and a reverent study of the Bible, it may not only be held against the aggressive forces of agnostic philosophy and destructive criticism, but may be made to yield much new evidence of the beautiful congruity of the Old and New Testaments, and of *both with nature and with human history.*

10, 11. But the particular work at the head of this series of notices has been held in abeyance and it now claims our attention without farther delay. It is not an isolated work but stands in articulate relation to preceding works, and especially to *The Dawn of Life* (1875), which has long been out of print. My copy is signed 1881. The author was associated with the original discovery and earliest description of this earliest trace of animal life on our

earth. He has followed up later discoveries which have tended to fill up the gap between it and its known successors. This subject was made the topic of a somewhat recent course of Lectures, in the Lowell Institute, Boston, of which the present work is a reproduction. It is hoped that the book may prove as fascinating to its readers as the lectures were to the Institute auditors. Doubtless the most scientific method of dealing with such questions as the origin and development of life is to carefully search for and study the earliest remains of living beings which have been preserved to us in the rocky storehouses of the earth. This is surely an inviting field of inquiry, and from it in the future will probably be gathered valuable contributions to our knowledge of life in the early history of our earth.

In the light of these remarks, the significance of the title of the work—*Relics of Primeval Life*—becomes more apparent.

Without enlargement a few points may be suggested :

1. These studies fortify the doctrine of biogenesis and confirm the refutations of abiogenesis, as in the noted laboratory experiments of Tyndall, but preëminently of Pasteur.

“The labors of Pasteur have given the finishing stroke to spontaneous generation. This dream of ignorance is older than Horace, Virgil and Lucretius, who dress its gross form in poetic language, as does Aristotle, in the prose of philosophy. This heathen conceit wended its way down the ages, till in the seventeenth century a celebrated alchemist gave as a recipe for producing scorpions : ‘Scoop out a hole in a brick ; put into it some sweet basil, crushed. Lay a second brick upon the first, so that the hole may be perfectly covered. Expose the two bricks to the sun, and at the end of a few days the smell of the sweet basil, acting as a ferment, will change the herb into real scorpions.’ And the same philosopher gave as a prescription for the production of mice, to stuff a dirty shirt into a vessel containing a little corn, when the ferment proceeding from the dirty shirt, and the odor of the corn, will, in about three weeks, transmute the grain into mice, full grown, and of both sexes. In the same century, Francesco Redi, 1668, published the first attack on spontaneous generation, maintaining the doctrine, *omne vivum ex vivo*—no life without antecedent life. This doctrine of biogenesis, as distinguished from spontaneous generation of life or of abiogenesis, is in all quarters triumphant. Prof. Huxley, sixteen years ago (1870) in an address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, sums up the case in these words : ‘So much for the history of the progress of Redi’s great doctrine of Biogenesis, which appears to me, with the limitations I have expressed, to be victorious along the whole line at the present day.’ Says Pasteur, in a lecture at the Sorbonne, 1864 : ‘There is not one circumstance known at the present day which justifies the assertion that microscopic organisms come into the world without germs, or without parents, like themselves. Those who maintain the contrary have been the dupes of illusions and of ill-conducted experiments, tainted with errors which they know not how either to perceive or avoid. Spontaneous generation is a chimera.’ ”—*Life and Labors of Louis Pasteur*, by S. S. Laws, pp. 24, 25 (1886).

2. It is enough to say that the labors of Sir J. W. Dawson have been preëminent in staying and disarming Darwinism and Spencerian Evolution in the minds of his careful readers. His different works have been effective in the refutation of the claims of this popular fad in scientific and philosophical circles, like the explosion of so many torpedoes, and taken altogether, they constitute a defensive and offensive battery. His answer to Prof. Huxley's Lectures in New York, 1876, and especially his criticism and exposure of the marsh horse series, as being as artificial and conventional as Barnum's happy family, which was recently repeated in the *Independent*, is an *experimentum crucis*. After all the wordy pretensions for forty years since the *Origin of Species* was published, not a single case in fact has been adduced from the surface or out of the crust of the earth.

3. It must be borne in mind that Evolutionism is absolutely dependent on spontaneous generation. It is both useless and suicidal to deny this. Herbert Spencer has at last in desperation conceded this and attempted its specific defence. (Factors of Organic Evolution, p. 70f.)

4. Moreover, it becomes the Bible student in these days to avail himself of all accessible scientific helps in defending the faith. The destructive criticism and the so-called new theology are the out-croppings, the hatchings of evolution. All religions including Christianity are natural developments or evolutions. We are under obligations to the devout evolutionist, Prof. Drummond, in the *Ascent of Man*, for unmistakably pointing this matter. He says: "Negatively the older view is not only the less worthy, but it is discredited by science. . . . We land here, not from choice, but from necessity. Christianity—it is not said any particular form of Christianity—but Christianity, is the further evolution," and "There is nothing in Christianity which is not in germ in nature . . . Christianity did not begin at the Christian Era, it is as old as nature."

Here we have the natural and logical outcome, and Prof. Drummond proclaims it, that evolutionism and Christianity are identical. "No man," he says, "can run up the natural lines of evolution without coming to Christianity at the top." All doubt as to "Natural Law" in the economy of nature being in his mind not merely analogous to, but identical with, the economy of redemption, is now dispelled. "Nature is herself that economy."

4. It is almost too obvious to remark it, that the most blighting present influence on Christianity emanates from prurient scientists who have crudely gulped down an avowed or virtually godless scheme of nature, history and religion. And yet some in even ecclesiastical circles, disparage apologetic labors in Theological Seminaries in the circle of the sciences. Where else can the antidote be so effectively administered?

I would recommend a study of Sir J. W. Dawson's writings, not to mention others, as a corrective of such views.

5. In conclusion, there is one point which should not be omitted from this notice. Notwithstanding the remoteness to which Eozoon, if finally and fully vindicated, pushes back the beginning of animal life, the evidence furnished in graphite and certain ores, puts vegetable life still anterior. It is an elementary and axiomatic principle in zoology that animal life depends

on vegetable life. Huxley finds the fundamental difference between the two in their feeding. The animal must have for food protoplasm, which the vegetable alone is capable of producing out of the elements. Animals cannot, like plants, live on the elements.

I am constrained to regard it as one of the most remarkable features of the Mosaic cosmogony, that it so explicitly and articulately places vegetable before animal life. All nature and these latest discoveries are confirmatory of this. I here recall and must be allowed to quote in conclusion the following extract from *The History of Creation*, by Prof. Ernest Haeckel. It must be borne in mind that Prof. Haeckel is an avowed materialist and atheist, and an evolutionist of the most pronounced type. He says: "Let us now first of all, glance at the most important of all the supernatural histories of creation. I mean that of Moses, as it has been handed down to us in the Bible, the ancient document of the history and laws of the Jewish people. The Mosaic history of creation, since in the first chapter of Genesis it forms the introduction to the Old Testament, has enjoyed, down to the present day, general recognition in the whole Jewish and Christian world of civilization. Its extraordinary success is explained not only by its close connection with Jewish and Christian doctrines, but also by the simple and natural chain of ideas which runs through it, and which contrasts favorably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the other ancient nations. First, the Lord God [*sic*] creates the earth as an inorganic body; then he separates light from darkness, then water from the dry land. Now the earth has become inhabitable for organisms, and *plants are first created, animals later* (ital. mine)—and among the latter the inhabitants of the water and the air first, afterwards the inhabitants of the dry land. Finally, God creates man, the last of all organisms, in his own image, and as the ruler of the earth.

"Two great and fundamental ideas, common, also, to the non-miraculous theory of development, meet us in this Mosaic hypothesis of creation, with surprising clearness and simplicity—the idea of separation or differentiation, and the idea of progressive development or *perfecting*. Although Moses looks upon the results of the great laws of organic development (which we shall later point out as the necessary conclusions of the Doctrine of Descent) as the direct actions of a constructing Creator, yet in his theory there lies hidden the ruling idea of a progressive development and a differentiation of the originally simple matter. We can, therefore, bestow our just and sincere admiration on the Jewish law-giver's grand insight into nature, and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation, without discovering in it a so-called 'divine revelation.'" Vol. I, p. 37f.

If this is not a "divine revelation," will the Professor tell us where and how *he* thinks Moses got this knowledge, now abreast with the close of the nineteenth century?

It is needless to say that where statements in the books noticed served the purpose, they have been freely used.

Columbia, S. C.

S. S. LAWS.

BRUCE'S APOLOGETICS.

APOLOGETICS; OR, CHRISTIANITY DEFENSIVELY STATED' *By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow.* Third Edition, New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

This book, as it comes to us, is invested with great significance. The name of its author and his position will insure for it an extensive reading. It is from the pen of Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of Apologetics and of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Apart from its prominence of authorship, the work sustains a unique relation to Theological study in our day. It is one of about twenty books which are to constitute an International Theological Library, Inter-Denominational and Inter-Confessional. This Library is to cover the whole field of Christian Theology; it is intended to form a series of text-books for Theological Students; and the Editors are Drs. Charles A. Briggs and Stewart D. F. Salmond. This origin and environment must give to Bruce's Apologetics unusual significance. Radical criticism having made it necessary to re-cast the defensive statement of Christianity, what is left worth defending and how is the defence to be made? Dr. Bruce in this book may be viewed as giving us for his school an authoritative reply.

The author writes clearly and forcibly. It would be foolish and perilous to call in question the extensiveness of his reading or to deny his readiness in commanding the resources of his information. His mind is logically ingenious, his book is a unit, and the plan of it is designedly Evolutionistic. And in that studied and over-wrought design lie its weakness and its snare, alike for the author and for his readers. The ably written book may be likened to Totten's elaboration of the identity of the Anglo-Saxons and the Israelites: in both we have ingenuity run mad.

Dr. Bruce's view as to the place and function of Apologetic is given in his Introduction. He puts it, with Schleiermacher, at the commencement of a Theological course, as a branch of Philosophical Theology. He starts it "where Philosophy terminates" and makes it "a mediator between Philosophy and Theology." The apologist is to "avoid partisanship with dogmatic belief." He is to "distinguish between religion and Theology;" he is to "regard himself as a defender of the Catholic faith, not as a hired advocate or special pleader for a particular Theological system." On the other hand, "the apologist instinctively shuns conflict with dogmatic unbelief as futile." Now right here begins fatal vagueness. How *much* unbelief will the writer hold to be "dogmatic" and fail to resist? How much Theology will he define as "dogmatic" and refuse to defend? He excludes "the debatable dogmas of the schools" from his concern and protection. What schools? A clear definition of his distinction between religion (and the things necessary to it) and the unnecessary things of Theology, would have helped us here. The failure to furnish it gives the author wide liberty, which he uses throughout his whole book. Let us follow him as he addresses himself to an ingenuous doubter, predisposed to Christianity, yet distressed by difficulties which Philosophy or the alleged facts of Christianity may have created.

Manifestly, the first thing must be to state these Christian facts. "The first step," says Dr. Bruce, "obviously is to make sure that men know what Christianity really is." And the author proposes to do this without dogmas of his own, without dogmas of "the schools," without antagonizing "dogmatic unbelief." And it is certain that he uses the term dogma, not as Charles Hodge might, but in the broadest sense, as about equivalent to Theological belief or Theological doctrine. This apologist has a hard road to travel!

He announces that he will have no distinctions of "Internal" and "External" evidences. These are confusing. There must be a simpler, a more direct way of coming into possession of the "Christian Facts." And the author develops his method. He begins by explaining that by the expression "Christian Facts," he does not mean "all that a Christian man believes to be true concerning the person, life, and teaching of Jesus, but only the things related in the Synoptical Gospels on these topics which possess such a high degree of probability that they may be provisionally accepted as facts, even by those who scan the evangelic records with a critical eye." Here is more wildness, more vagueness. The author labors under his difficulty. He confesses it in the very next sentence:

"The task now on hand is beset with difficulty arising from the circumstance that these records cannot, without proof, be assumed to contain only pure objective history, but may at least plausibly be regarded as history colored more or less by the faith of the narrators."

Passing by the first stupendous fact that confronts him,—the Synoptical Gospels themselves, the external and internal evidence of whose genuineness and authenticity he scorns to examine,—this apologist just takes them in a slipshod way as a "more or less colored" narrative and proceeds to evolve the basal facts of all Christianity out of a plausibility—something that may "*plausibly be regarded as history.*" The author here undoubtedly feels his embarrassment keenly. He is hard pressed. He admits that "estimates formed of the amount of historical matter in the Gospels are, accordingly, very diverse;" that "some reduce the kernel of hard fact to a meagre minimum;" that some doubt the whole history of Jesus, are agnostics as to everything about Christ, even as to the *possibility* of knowing anything about him: he admits the "imposing authority of these great names," almost great enough to "scare one from attempting to determine the outlines of the Christianity of Christ." Turning his back before these Goliaths, pronouncing it "futile" to contend with them for a solid historic basis of Christianity, this apologist meets the ingenuous inquirer with a plausibility instead of a history, and asks him to accept "the outlines of the Christianity of Christ" at the hand of a "more or less colored" Synoptical Gospel. Will not the ingenuous seeker after truth promptly demand two things: first, to have the *true* history set apart from the "colored;" second, to have this true history established as such by evidence, the measure of assent. And what is this but to show historic fact by the external and internal evidence evincing the credibility of the books recording it?—the very process which the writer contemns.

Let the reader get the book and examine for himself : he will see that Dr. Bruce never overcomes the embarrassment of the first two pages of this chapter on "The Christian Facts." He sees his trouble, he admits it ; he leaves it just where he finds it. No man can remove it who denies the historicity of the Gospels. And Dr. Bruce admits it only in part, as we shall see.

It is now time to ask : What *are* the Christian Facts as found by the modern Apologist? They are (1) Christ's love and compassion for the bodies and souls of outcast, sinful men ; (2) Christ's doctrine of God as Father, and of man as a Son, with the duties and privileges consequent ; (3) Christ as the Son of Man, the Son of God, the Messiah bringing in the *summum bonum*, realizing all religious ideals, establishing loving fellowship between God and man, and between man and man ; (4) Christ's greater hatred of sin in the form of Pharisaism and Rabbinism than in the forms manifest amongst common outcast sinners. These basal Christian facts the author accepts from Matthew, Mark, and Luke. At this stage of investigation, nothing is taken from John.

This statement is "meagre" indeed as compared with what it might have been. The "ingenuous" mind predisposed to Christianity, would find far more than these with which to commence the investigation even in Matthew, Mark and Luke. Does the author intend to *develop* all the other mighty facts from these few ?

So he begins. But not so does he continue. From the Christian facts, the Apologist looks backward to certain "pre-suppositions" of Christianity. These he divides into two classes, (1) the Speculative and (2) the Historical. He puts amongst Christianity's speculative pre-suppositions, the Personality of God ; the importance of man in the universe (including his immortality of soul and body) ; Sin as a reality, as not a necessity, as not originating with God, as not incurable. The author conceives of sin as "the result of a wrong choice on the part of primitive man" as "quaintly embodied in the story of the temptation and fall of Adam in the book of Genesis." Incidentally this story and evolution's theory of human depravity are compared and made to agree. The author thinks science takes a part in the revelation as to sin. Man has in him "a lower animal and a higher human;" to refuse the former and yield to the latter is to make moral advancement, and *vice versa*.

Our author prefers not to say much as to the relation between moral evil and natural evil. But, with all his hesitation, he comes to Schleiermacher's view as to the connection between sin and death. Viewed objectively, natural evil is not caused by sin ; subjectively, as it affects us, it is the penalty of sin, because, without sin, we would not feel it to be an evil. "Death (natural), decay, violence . . . were in the world not only before man sinned, but long before man existed," and God predetermined the correspondence between these natural evils and the moral condition of mankind. The author comes perilously near to teaching that God from the beginning projected an arrangement by which man, for his moral discipline, might be misled into a false theory as to the connexion between natural and moral evil, and be distressed by it as true,—while God knew that it never was or would be true !

Dr. Bruce holds that the Christian Theory also demands that God sustain to the universe the relation of a Creator. He thinks it unnecessary, however, for the modern Apologist to contend that the universe must have had a beginning because God created it. It might, or might not have begun; all that is essential is, that if it were eternal, it was so by God's will. This is another one of the things about which we may forego dogmatism.

The same position, he claims, must be taken to-day with respect to the ultimate salvation of all men. Christianity is optimistic—for time, for eternity. "For the Christian theory of the universe, universal salvation is not an article of faith any more than it is a heresy."

This condensed statement shows three things: (1) Dr. Bruce's induction of Christian facts is far from comprehensive; (2) his "Christian theory of the universe" is very partially drawn from even the facts he does adduce; (3) for many of the things he embodies in this theory, he is indebted to what he so earnestly forbids. That thing is—*dogma!*

Having stated "The Christian Facts" and "The Christian Theory of the Universe," the Apologist next considers certain other theories and their relation to the one which he describes as Christian. Accordingly, five chapters are given to the discussion of Pantheism, Materialism, Deism, Modern Speculative Theism, and Agnosticism. It is safe to say that in these chapters will be found the most interesting and the most valuable part of Dr. Bruce's work. At this point he seemingly forgets that he has said that an Apologist must "Shun conflict with dogmatic unbelief as futile;" he deals to these opposing Theories some heavy and deserved blows.

Pantheism is sketched clearly and entertainingly. Spinoza's philosophic unity is treated as an intended advancement from Descartes' dualism; one indivisible infinite substance, of which thought and extension are attributes, and all particular beings are modes; and thus our substance, God. Spinoza and Hegel are contrasted; Spinoza's substance is materialistic, Hegel's more spiritual: both, Pantheistic. The attractiveness of Pantheism, whether of Spinoza or of Hegel, is traceable to three things: (1) it has for the intellect the "imposing conception of the universe as a unity;" (2) for the feelings, the fascinating theory of the Divine immanence; (3) for the heart, the opiate of necessity and of perishableness even unto annihilation. It is gratifying to see our Apologist here a decided polemic. He properly pronounces Pantheism as "in deadly antagonism to Christianity at all points." It negates the personality of God, the creation of the world, the responsibility of man, the reality of sin, providence, immortality, redemption.

The treatment of Materialism is also vigorous. The Apologist does not regard all natural science as necessarily materialistic. He claims, however, that the trend is in that direction because of the "stony indifference" of modern science to Theological interests. He regards full-blown materialism as in our day "the most thorough-going and the most formidable opponent of the Christian theory of the universe." He defines the materialistic theory as follows: "that to account for all the phenomena of nature, including those of life, animal and vegetable, and of thought, nothing more is needed than matter and its properties." As to its Ethical aspect, materialism can

have no moral standard. Religiously, there is no object of worship but the universe. These horrible things in materialism are stated clearly and forcibly. In meeting them, our author is entirely too concessive. The origin of life as of Divine *creation* is not stoutly maintained. "It is enough . . . to believe that with God is the fountain of life."

The chapters on Deism and Agnosticism are full of interest. Pretermittting them, however, let us glance at Dr. Bruce's treatment of Modern Speculative Theism. The typical exponents of this theory are Francis Newman, Frances Power Cobbe and Theodore Parker, God's relation to the world is the chief subject of interest. The so-called Divine Immanence comes into prominent advocacy. Deism makes God's relation to the universe one of transcendence; Pantheism, one of identity; Modern Theism, one of immanence. But our author, with unmerciful deadliness for one who disclaims polemic intent, slays all of Modern Theism that is not Deism on the one side, Pantheism on the other. The sole thing upon which these Theists agree religiously is the "Aufklärung," illuminism in human consciousness. And this belongs to Deism.

With this consideration of The Christian Facts, The Christian Theory of the Universe, and opposing Theories, the author closes Book I.

Book II. deals with the *historical* "presuppositions" of Christianity. The author drops the phrase "Historical Presuppositions" and substitutes "Historical Preparation." He limits himself to the history of the people from whom Christ came. The facts of this history he must get from the Hebrew Scriptures. He is now face to face with modern radical criticism. What, as an Apologist, will he do with it?

He answers very cautiously that the attitude of the Apologist here must be largely non-committal. And straightway he goeth and committeth himself! No man will read his book and doubt where his heart is.

The composite character of the Bible is assumed and maintained. Dr. Driver is followed and J, E, JE, P, and the Redactor, all are in evidence. The Decalogue is from Moses. The Hexateuch is Post-exilic. Deutero-Isaiah is Exilic. And so on, all the way.

The question as to the moral honesty of making this literary patch-work is summarily treated: the process does not require us to believe in the immorality of the writers of the Bible, but only in their "*crude morality.*" The former must be denied. The latter must be admitted. The superficiality of all this is well illustrated by the following quotation:

"Deborah was a heroic woman and a true inspired prophetess, but she could write the words: 'To every man a damsel or two,' without feeling that she was saying anything indelicate or immoral. It was not immorality, as it would be to us, but it was a very crude, barbarous morality," P. 309.

But this misrepresentation of Prophetess Deborah is cruder and more barbarous. The reader gets the impression that the words are Deborah's and that she indorses the sentiment of them; whereas, they are treated by her as *the words of Sisera's wicked mother*, and condemned by Deborah. Where is any crude morality here?

The inevitable matter as to the historicity of the Old Testament, is met

with nothing but vagueness. Fidelity to historic facts must be claimed in some things, not in all things. But *what* things shall we insist upon? Well, all that are essential to the general drift of the revelation. But *who* is to define for us the essential facts? Besides, how can an honest man write a book and deliberately attribute his work to some other man who lived a thousand years before? Easily enough: this is only "crude morality."

With a history of this kind as his guide, the Apologist does the best he can, and moves onward in a gradually developing preparation for Christianity through Mosaism, Prophetism, Judaism, and "The Night of Legalism." To each of these is given a chapter.

Mosaism is simply and almost solely Ethical Monotheism. All that Moses has or cares much about is the Decalogue. Prophetism, first more national and then gradually becoming universal, is "passion for righteousness," faith in an objective moral order, anti-ritualism, healthy moral intensity, and magnificent optimism. Judaism might have been called Leviticalism. *Ezra*, Unhappy *Ezra*! brings it in from the Exile. "The Levitical ordinances," says our writer, "whether they existed before the exile or no, were not yet God's word to Israel at that time." Our author finds difficulty in admitting them as God's word at all. He says that the attempt to make Leviticalism, thus happening after the exile, a step in the onward march of the religion of revelation, "does seem very discouraging." After much effort, he develops at last an office for it: "Leviticalism, Judaism, may be conceived of as a *husk to protect the kernel of Ethical Monotheism.*" God-inspired men *might* have part in it, the writer says. But he adds: "It might even be affirmed with a measure of truth that the sinister reign of legalism began the day that *Ezra* appeared on Jewish soil with the law in his hand."

The "antidote" to the skeptical mood which Post-Exilic Ritualism is apt to produce, is said to be the (also Post-Exilic) Psalter. The thing could not have been so bad a "delusion" (at least not at first) as we might suppose, if the Psalms can appear just at this time to show that there's life in the old land yet! But bad Leviticalism was; and bad was its ultimate fruit. The germ of the night of legalism was in it: Pharisaism will yet burst forth from it. New Testament teachers shall yet condemn it "on account of its intrinsic weakness and unprofitableness," and these "peremptory judgments" shall be pronounced "on the traditional understanding that the whole law of the Pentateuch was Mosaic." And now, hear ye!

"Had the apostles shared modern critical views they might have taken their stand on the late and human origin of the system, and said: 'Leviticalism is not of Moses or of God; it is the work of *Ezra* and other unknown priests in Babylon, therefore it has no great claims on our respect.' A much easier thing to say than: 'It is of Moses and of God, nevertheless it has been proved to be worthless except as a means of preparing men for something better; therefore it must pass away.'"

By a double experiment, that of Mosaism pronounced a failure by Jeremiah and that of *Ezra*-ism resulting in legalism, Pharisaism, Rabbinism, the way of Christ was prepared. And so the revelation of the need of the coming of Christ was *evolved*.

Within these limited notes, it will be impossible to follow our Apologist through Book III., "The Christian Origins." Briefly let us advert to one matter of vital moment—his treatment of the historicity of the Gospels.

He considers separately the Synoptical Gospels, on the one hand, and John's Gospel on the other.

For Matthew, Mark, and Luke, he seems to claim and to establish historic accuracy and faithfulness. But afterwards he so modifies and qualifies his teaching as to leave us here, as in so many other places in his book, doubtful as to what position he does intend to take. He says :

"For the writers of the Gospels the religious interest is supreme. They are truly inspired men, and as such their main concern is not to give scrupulously exact account of facts, but to make the moral and religious significance of the facts apparent. Hence a considerable amount of freedom in reporting may be noted even in Luke who by his preface seems to lay himself under obligation to aim at exactitude in narration. . . . We ought rather to regard it as part of his plan to relate the facts of Christ's ministry so that they shall be a true mirror to the Spirit of Christ, and give readers a just and beneficent conception of his character."

All this puts one upon the *qui vive*. But listen yet longer :

"Such phenomena of the adaptation of facts to the service of mirroring the spirit, suggests the question, How far might this process be carried? Can we, for example, conceive of an Evangelist stepping out of the actual into the possible, in order that he might have ampler scope for the embodiment of his conception of Jesus than the grudging data of reality supplied, especially in the case of a life of so short duration?" For instance, "a disciple might say to himself : I desire to show my beloved Master as He appeared to me, and, for this purpose I shall not only report what I saw Him do and heard Him say, but also indicate what He would have done and said in circumstances which might have occurred, but did not actually occur."

The writer's position is that, "viewing the matter in the abstract, we are not entitled to negative dogmatically as inadmissible such use of ideal situations for evagelic purposes." He may well add : "In no case would inspiration be more needful," etc. !

Now just here comes a marvelous thing. Dr. Bruce gravely entertains the proposition that Matthew's report of Christ's great commission is "an idealized utterance of the Lord Jesus !" He makes an argument against its literalness, favors its idealism, and then, to show that the idealized utterance is true to Christ's spirit, assumes the very things because of which the literalness had been rejected, to wit : the rite of baptism, the full-blown universalism, the trinitarian formula, the promise of a perpetual spiritual presence, "all more or less suggestive of a later time and apparently expressive of the developed Christian consciousness of the Catholic Church, rather than of what was likely to proceed from the mouth of Jesus before he finally left the world." The improbability that Christ used the baptismal formula, the Trinitarian formula, the promise of perpetual spiritual presence, necessitated that the utterance be idealized. But fidelity to the spirit is a postulate of this theory of idealism. Now how is fidelity proved? By going straight back to Christ's previous teaching and showing that, with the possible exception of

baptism (really no exception at all), for all these features "vouchers can easily be produced" from the Lord's own sayings!

Dr. Bruce's answer to a projection of this idealism into John's Gospel is even more remarkable. He tells us that an increasing number of reverent and conservative scholars believe that the words of our Lord have been "very freely reproduced in this Gospel;" that it is free reporting to make John the Baptist say at the very beginning, "Behold the Lamb of God," etc., and to represent the first disciples as recognizing in Jesus at the outset the Christ, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, the Son of God, the King of Israel; and that, in the view of these scholars, this free reporting demands a theory of explanation. The author next describes fully what these scholars offer as such theory: John's "age, intellectual and spiritual idiosyncrasy, and the religious environment." Rejecting these, others say we must have recourse to "a transmuting activity of the evangelist's mind acting upon the original data, the words of the Lord Jesus;" "As the tree is potentially in the seed, so a devoted disciple may feel that the whole system of thought which has grown up in his mind out of the germs of truth deposited there by his Master, may be, nay ought to be, accredited to that Master. He may, therefore, deem it quite unnecessary anxiously to distinguish between what the Master actually said and what grew out of it."

Having thus sketched the views of these scholars, some accepting the "age, intellectual and spiritual idiosyncrasy, and the religious environment" theory, some the "transmuting activity" theory, the Apologist demands of himself: What am I to say to all these things? And his answer is, I am "not called on to pronounce dogmatically on these questions." And he does not tell us that any one else is. He falls back upon these very words: "*If* (Italics mine) an Apostle wrote the Gospel, then we can feel tolerably sure that with whatever freedom the acts and words of Jesus have been reproduced, the total effect of the picture is truth; the mirror held up to him faithfully reflects his lineaments and spirit." Well, if Apostolic authority and inspiration can guarantee the *spirit* of Christ's saying, why not the very words? Was John under a "crude morality" that he must thus give us his own enlargement upon Christ's saying instead of the real saying, and all the while not only leave us in darkness as to his method, but positively misrepresent to us his real doing?

These Notes may be closed by sorrowfully declaring that this book, with all its excellencies and all the ability and learning of its author, does not sufficiently honor the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ for human guilt, nor sufficiently magnify the Spirit of God as the Renewer and Sanctifier of ruined, depraved, lost souls, and as the true Author of the Word of God. Human developments are everywhere ingeniously wrought out; but God the Holy Ghost, where is He?

E. DANIEL.

Raleigh, N. C.

MACKENSIE'S MANUAL OF ETHICS.

A MANUAL OF ETHICS. *By John A. Mackensie, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Examiner in Mental Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen.* Quarto, pp. 355. London: W. B. Clive, University Correspondence College Press. New York: Hinds and Noble.

It is doubtless true, that in no line of mere human investigation, have we, as yet, reached the ultimatum, no where in this wide realm has the last word been spoken. The advancement constantly made in the domain of physics, in the new discoveries almost daily in the natural sciences, so called, in better methods of illustrating and enforcing them; in the constant enlargement of the sphere of physiology and philosophy; and almost hourly improvements in the arts; all this is a forcible reminder of the truth, that humanity is still very far from the goal of absolute perfection.

Fundamentals have no doubt been secured, essentials have unquestionably been obtained, foundations have been laid which may never be disturbed, but new methods of treatment, a new and better nomenclature, a clearer and a more comprehensive statement of old and accepted principles, may be expected and welcomed as the years roll on. The stream of knowledge will thus never grow stagnant or putrid. The objects upon which men look, and the realm to which their thoughts are applied, are not unlike a kaleidoscope. The same facts, at every turn, will present new and perhaps more attractive aspects, and will thus throughout the ages continue to delight the soul.

These observations find a striking confirmation in connection with the important subtle science of Ethics. From the days of Plato and Aristotle to the present the best minds of earth have deemed this realm of thought worthy of the most profound investigation, and each succeeding thinker has flattered himself that he has added something to the attainments of his predecessors, until as we might rationally conclude, nothing is left that can be deemed essential to the science itself. What may now be expected from further thought and investigation is a clearer presentation of fundamental principles and a better adaptation of the subject matter of the science to the class-room and private study.

This twofold end, it would seem, Dr. Mackensie has secured in the work which he modestly styles *A Manual of Ethics*. To the treatment of his confessedly important subject he has brought a mind thoroughly and intelligently familiar with ethical literature. He treats with candor the views of the authors from whom he is compelled to dissent, and generously credits those whose views accord with his own. He is not ashamed to refer to Christianity and to quote divine revelation, nor does he undervalue the thought of other authors than Englishmen. He concedes that the United States has produced one writer at least in his favorite science whom he is willing to regard as a master (Dewey) and at whose feet a teacher in Cambridge, Eng., even is willing to sit and learn. These facts indicate the generous spirit of our author and secure for him an unprejudiced hearing. We listen with favor to the utterances of one whose candor is so conspicuous and whose scholarly charity is so apparent and so catholic.

The comprehensiveness of Dr. Mackenzie's treatise can be judged by the following: it is divided into two parts. Part 1st, contains nine chapters, covering the following topics, viz: "The Scope of Ethics," "The Relation of Ethics to Other Sciences," "The Moral Judgment," "Duty," "Will and Desire," "Happiness and Perfection," "The Freedom of the Will," and "The Individual and Society." Part 2nd, contains eight chapters, in which are discussed, "Moral Order," "The Commandments," "The Virtues," "The Inner Life," "Moral Pathology," "Moral Progress," "The Relation of Art to Ethics," and "The Relation of Ethics to Religion."

In a range of topics so wide, it is perhaps unreasonable to expect an elaborate discussion upon every point, and, consequently, the work, to the minds of some, might be open to the charge of incompleteness. The author himself has seen his exposedness to this charge, and has sought to meet it, or, at least, to remedy, in part, the defect by the addition of several explanatory foot notes. Thus, for instance, when speaking on the propriety of retaining the term "Ethics," he appends a foot note as follows:

"The term Ethics is retained in this Manual partly for the sake of brevity and partly because the necessary limitations of the volume prevent a thoroughly philosophical treatment."

The reader is naturally led to inquire why the author should require large space to show that "Ethics" is a sufficiently accurate designation of his science, though others might prefer another term.

Again, in defining Ethics as "The science of the ultimate end of life," (p. 1,) he adds that "Ethics discusses man's habits and customs, or, in other words, their characters, the principles on which they habitually act, and considers what it is that constitutes the rightness or wrongness of these principles;" and when he proceeds to define the term "right," as derived from the Latin *rectus*, meaning "straight or according to rule," we cannot but feel disappointed that we are not favored with a discussion upon that which has ever been regarded, by writers on Ethics, as most important, viz: the ultimate ground of right. And this is to be regretted the more because, in a subsequent portion of his work, under the head of "The Virtues," (pp. 213, 214, 215,) he speaks in such a manner of what he calls the "Ethos of a people," as to leave the impression on the mind of the reader that the moral habitudes of thought and action of different times and peoples constitute the ground of right at such times and with such peoples. Thus he says:

"The Ethos of a people is partly constituted by definite rules or precepts. The Ten Commandments formed a very important element in the Ethos of the Jews; and they have continued, with certain modifications and enlargements to form an important element in the Ethos of modern European peoples. The precepts contained in the Sermon on the Mount have, perhaps, never been sufficiently appropriated by the world in general to be made definitely into the Ethos of any people; but they have undoubtedly exercised a most profound influence upon the Ethos of nearly all civilized nations."

"The Ethos of a people, then," he adds, "is partly expressed in definite commands and precepts; but partly, also, it consists in recognized habits of action and habits of judgment which have never been precisely formulated."

"It is the morality of our world: and on the whole the man who conforms to the morality of that world is a good man, and the man who violates it is a bad man." It is true that our author rejects Mr. Bradley's contention "that the man who seeks to have a higher morality than that of this world is on the threshold of immorality," and calls it "an exaggeration," and it is also true that he declares that "the teachings of Christianity hold up to us an ideal of life which has not yet been fully embodied in the current morality of the world." Still we experience regret that neither at this point nor elsewhere, that we have discovered, does he explicitly or impliedly affirm that the ultimate ground of right is the will of God. He refers, it is true, to Christianity as presenting an ideal Ethos, but why be so reserved as to fail to point to that which gives to Christianity itself its binding authority? If it should be held, as it has been and is, that in a purely ethical treatise it is forbidden to enter upon the distinctively religious domain, we might justly demand a reason for the adoption of *Agnosticism* in a realm from which *Theism* is so guardedly excluded. These things in this work, however, are to be considered as errors of omission, of limitation, rather than the sins of commission, and much in this direction can be overlooked in view of the manner in which Dr. Mackenzie meets and combats the deceptive and pernicious utilitarianism of Bentham of Sidgwick and of John Stuart Mill. Adopting a technical term, "Hedonism" (p. 89) from the Greek *ἡδονή*, meaning pleasure, he shows that the hypothesis that happiness is the grand purpose of life, has been, and now is held in many different forms. He recognizes Psychological Hedonism, which, as its name indicates, is the seeking of pleasure as a psychological fact, and Ethical Hedonism, which holds that we ought to seek the pleasures of others, and Universalistic Hedonism, which teaches that we ought to seek the greatest possible amount of pleasure for all human beings, and for all sentiment creatures. As opposed to the last two forms of Hedonism our author names Egoistic Hedonism which he claims "has always presented a repulsive appearance to the moral consciousness," a form which is purely selfish and absolutely exclusive of all altruism. It is very easy to see how what our author has to say in another chapter on "*Duty*" confutes the Hedonism of Bentham, and Mill and Sidgwick. It is a fact of consciousness that there is that within every breast which has a voice which possesses authority. It utters what our author terms a "categorical imperative," an imperative not "hypothetical" or merely "assertorial." It is a something which calls to "*duty*" instant, unvarying, and continuous, without waiting first to ascertain what is pleasure or pleasurable to the individual or the mass. Call that which utters this "categorical imperative" what you will, conscience or the moral sense, or, according to Kant the "law of reason," or of "formal consistency," it still declares that we must not pursue virtue for the sake of happiness but for "the sake of duty." This Mackenzie asserts with emphasis. Equally satisfactory is Dr. Mackenzie's review of Herbert Spencer's contention that Ethics is "the constant effort of an organism to adapt itself to its environment." He shows, most conclusively (pp. 125-6-7) that Spencer's position "involves a species of *υδτερον προτερον*," or "putting the cart before the horse," for the organism,

in the case of all intelligent and sentient beings, is not engaged in an attempt to adapt itself to its environment, but is constantly seeking to adapt its environment to itself. Indeed the entire chapter in which he discusses the hypothesis of Mr. Spence, not only, but of Stephens, in his *Science of Ethics*, and Alexander in his *Moral Order and Progress*, and of other evolutionists in their attempt to account for the development of conduct, through, so called, "natural selection," is exceedingly interesting and conclusive.

His chapter on the "Freedom of the Will," in which he combats the views of the Necessarians or Determinists on the one hand, and the Libertarians or Indeterminists on the other, and takes the ground that "to be free means that one is determined by nothing but one's self," is in accord with the settled sentiment of safe and conservative writers of the present on both sides of the Atlantic. In this connection he discusses with ability the "liberty of indifference," as held by Semi-Pelagians, and many leading Armenians, who have taught that, "at any given moment in our lives it must be possible for us to choose anyone of a number of alternative lines of conduct, quite irrespectively of our characters. They have thought, in fact, that, for true freedom, it is necessary that we should be undetermined even by our characters." "But," Dr. Mackensie adds, "such liberty as this is not only absurd in itself, but is actually contrary to the demands of the moral life. It amounts to this, that we are to be free not only from external circumstances, but from ourselves. But if we are not to be determined by ourselves, by what are we to be determined?" A most suggestive inquiry indeed.

It would carry us altogether beyond reasonable limits to dwell upon the author's view touching "The Individual and Society," Moral "Order," "The Commandments," "The Inner Life," "Moral Pathology," and "Moral Progress," and we close with a few thoughts upon what Mackensie regards as the relation of Ethics to Religion. His contention here is that Ethics holds to religion much the same relation that art holds to Ethics, meaning by *art*, of course, whatever exhibits and enforces the true, the beautiful and the good. The design of art, from which, of course, it may be wrongfully diverted, is to present ideals of the beautiful and the good. Where, then, it is thus legitimately employed, it may be called a hand-maid to Ethics. It suggests to the mind the beautiful and the good, possibly the good through the beautiful, and thus constantly inspires towards a higher moral attainment. Ethics, now, in that it deals with the ideal in the moral sphere and points toward it, incites toward the attainment of all that is best in man, all that is highest and purest.

But this is not all. Both art in its best attainments, and Ethics in its ultimate reach, leaves upon the mind a sense of *incompleteness*. We feel, after all, that the ideal has not been attained. This suggests the existence of a realm, in which the ideal may be secured, a realm where the longing of the mind, and the unappeased appetite of the soul may be met and gratified. This is the realm of religion. Both art and Ethics thus point, by their inadequacy and failure, to the existence of that in which there shall be neither inadequacy nor failure, when the soul shall say, "the ideal is attained."

And this position of the author is fortified by his adoption of Carlyle's assumption that, "Man's happiness comes of his greatness. It is because there is an infinite in him, which, with all his cunning he cannot quite bury under the finite." To this position of Carlyle, Dr. Mackenzie adds that of Kant in his "Critique of Practical Reason," viz: "Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe. The oftener and the more steadily we reflect on them, *the starry heavens above, and the moral law within,*" the first suggests an *objective* infinite of which we are necessarily a part, and the other as truly suggesting a *subjective infinite* which is a part of our conscious existence. "The former view of a multitude of worlds," adds Kant, "annihilates, as it were, my importance as an *animal creature*, which, after it has been for a short time provided with vital power, one knows not how, must again give back the matter of which it was formed to the planet it inhabits. The second, on the contrary, infinitely elevates my worth as an *intelligence* by my personality, in which the moral law reveals to me a life independent on animality and even on the whole sensible world, at least so far as may be inferred from the destination assigned to my existence by this law, a destination not restricted to conditions and limits of this life, but reaching into the infinite."

Dropping now the technical terms employed by our author and expressing in our own language his thought in this interesting portion of his volume, we understand his contention to be, that art being suggestive of the beautiful and the good, possibly also of the true, inspires to noble attainments in a realm higher than its own, the realm, namely, of Ethics, and Ethics again, inspires to attainments in a realm yet higher than its own, the realm of religion, that all this is re-enforced by the facts that both art and Ethics while reaching out after the ideal, fail confessedly to secure it in either of their legitimate domains, yet hint at a realm in which man's ideal may be secured, and that this is crowned by the sense of the infinite within us, which cannot be accounted for, unless we assume a domain highest of all to which the infinite within us undoubtedly points. Thus Ethics becomes the hand-maid of religion.

On the whole, we conclude that this is a fresh and highly suggestive addition to Ethical literature, characterized in portions of it, with a too condensed treatment, perhaps, to be entirely satisfactory, and yet a work which will be valuable, as a manifestly candid and scholarly ally to the safe and conservative thinking in the department of investigation to which it belongs.

Omaha.

WM. W. HARSHA.

TEMPLE'S THE COVENANTER, THE CAVALIER, AND THE PURITAN.

THE COVENANTER, THE CAVALIER, AND THE PURITAN. *By Judge Oliver Perry Temple.* The Robert Clark Co., Cincinnati.

This book contains 254 pages, and every page is crammed full of interesting and instructive matter. Whoever begins to read it, if he has one drop of Covenanter-blood in his veins, will read on with intense and growing interest to the last line of the last page. Judge Temple, in publishing this

book, has done a good work, and has done it well; and the patriotism and piety of the whole land, and especially of the South, owe him a debt of deep and lasting gratitude, because he has brought to light and set in order, in a compact and clear form, much valuable information about a people concerning whom we can never know too much. The originality of the book is in its title, and its discriminating classifications of Covenanter, Cavalier, and Puritan. On this point he says:

"The term Scotch-Irish is restricted in its application, and not altogether clear in its signification. By the term Covenanters is meant all Scotch Presbyterians, and their descendants, without reference to the place of their birth, or the place of their sojourning, who settled in the Colonies, or in the States, previous to the time when intermarriages with other sects became common. By reason of these intermarriages, the term ceased, in course of time, to mean both a race and sect, and came to signify only a race. This definition will not only include Scotch-Irish and their descendants, but Scotch Presbyterians also and their descendants who were never in Ireland, but came directly from Scotland, or from other quarters, to the Colonies. The term thus understood and used will make it unnecessary to refer to the Scotch-Irish or to the Scotch Presbyterians separately. The failure to find a term comprehensive enough to cover at once these two branches of the Presbyterian family doubtless accounts in part for the failure to do them justice in comparing their work with that done by the Puritans and the Cavaliers. Scotch-Irish and Scotch Presbyterians have had each and alone to bear comparison with races and forces not thus divided in the public mind. Under the general and comprehensive term Covenanters, my object is to show what this wonderful Scotch people has done for the cause of freedom, religion, and civilization in the world, and especially what it has done in our own country.

"At the time the great events of the Revolution were being unfolded, the Covenanters were regarded by Tory and Episcopalian writers as the chief authors of these revolutionary movements. This charge was brought against them at that day by the friends of royalty, and contemporaneous history goes far towards sustaining the truth of it. The Hon. Richard Wright, at one time Speaker of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania, an Episcopalian and a thoroughly informed historian and statesman, declared that 'The American War of Independence was a Presbyterian and Scotch-Irish War.'"

And thus our author discriminates between the Covenanters and the Puritans:

"Douglas Campbell calls the Covenanters 'the Puritans of the South.' It is not well to thus confound these two great peoples. Though the English and the Scotch people were originally largely of the same blood, they early became separated into two distinct peoples, each with peculiar characteristics of its own. It will be conceded that in certain respects there are some striking resemblances between them, especially between the early Puritans and the Covenanters. But the points of dissimilarity are more numerous and more marked than those of resemblance. In the austerity of their religion, and in the soberness of their lives—in a word, in the outward aspect of religious life, they seemed to be very much alike. And yet the traits which distinguished the one from the other were clear, striking and manifest. This became more evident, perhaps, after each had left its native land, and had found a new home for itself where its natural tendency had room for development. The Puritan was an Englishman, with English tastes, ideas and habits. In common with his countrymen, he believed in caste, in social distinctions, and in the inequality of men. In religion, the Puritan believed

with all the earnestness of his strong nature that he was right, and, so believing, he used the whole power of the Church and the State in enforcing conformity to it. He permitted no dissent. In his view there must be universal conformity, banishment, the whipping post or the gibbet. The State was merely the ally of the Church, useful only to enforce its decrees and dogmas. The latter was supreme over the minds, the consciences, and the bodies of men. This was the Church polity of Puritanism in Massachusetts.

"On the other hand, the Covenanter demanded in the Colonies total freedom of religion from the control of State. He denied the authority of the magistrate, in any matter whatever, to interfere with conscience, religious beliefs or religious practices. The religion of men should be, he insisted, as free as air, or the water of the hillside brook. As to government, he was Democratic in all his ideas. In his long experience he had seen the arrogance and the insolence of caste, he had felt its power and its enmity, and had come to hate it with all the strength of his soul. By reason of centuries of ill-treatment and persecution, he hated England, and every thing English, as he hated no other country or people. Of all the people in the Colonies, he was perhaps the least effected by the English ideas. It thus appears that the differences in thought, habits, and religious practices between the Puritans and the Covenanters were wide, radical, and fundamental. So, to designate the Covenanters, by the name of Puritan, is to confound race history and race distinctions."

Our author goes on to say :

"Both writers and public speakers have long been in the habit of dividing the men who have shaped and molded the institutions of this country, and guided and molded its destiny, into two classes, the Puritans and the Cavaliers, the one the representative of the Northern thought and civilization, and the other of the Southern. This leaves entirely out of consideration the Covenanters, the most numerous and in many respects the greatest of the three races. At the time of the Revolution the men of the Covenanter-blood were scattered everywhere in the Colonies, and were especially numerous in all the region south of New York. It seems clear that, when the Quakers lost their influence in Pennsylvania, by reason of the opposition to the separation from Britain, the Covenanters became ascendant in the councils of that State, and thence-forward mainly controlled its destiny. In Virginia, it was not the thoughts and the opinions of the Cavalier which mainly guided that Colony in the great crisis of 1775-6 and that were incorporated in the framework of her government. Cavalier thought, forms and principles, both in State and Church, largely passed away with the opening of the great Revolution. It little matters by whom these thoughts and principles were put into organic form, whether by those of Covenanter blood, such as Patrick Henry and Edmond Randolph, whether by half Covenanter Thomas Jefferson, or by James Madison, the disciple of John Witherspoon in his political education. Each and all of them had caught the spirit and the ideas of the great Covenanter, John Knox."

After thus discriminating between the Covenanters, the Puritans and the Cavaliers, our author goes on to show that at the outbreak of the American Revolution, the Covenanters were decidedly the most numerous people in our country. He says :

"Between 1728 and 1750, twelve thousand arrived annually in Philadelphia alone. Suppose that they had only doubled the number in forty-seven years, then they would have numbered in 1775, half a million. But the Covenanters who landed in Philadelphia were not the only ones who came to the Colonies. They landed at other ports as well : at New York, New Castle, Baltimore, at Wilmington, Charleston and Savannah. This immigration commenced about

1700, and continued, with intermissions, until the Revolution, a period of seventy-five years. Sometimes the immigration was very active. 'In the two years which followed the Antrim evictions,' says Froude, 'thirty thousand Protestants left Ulster.' James Logan, President of the Proprietary Council of Pennsylvania, wrote, in 1729, that: 'Last week not less than six ships arrived, and that every day two or three arrive also.' Froude says: 'That ships could not be found to carry the crowds that were eager to go.' From the well ascertained facts as to this remarkable immigration, the conclusion may be safely reached that, prior to 1775, not less than 500,000 people of the Covenanter race from Scotland and Ireland, had settled in the Colonies. Putting the average length of time that they had been here at thirty years, it can be safely assumed that they had increased at least eighty per cent. during that time, making them number not less than 900,000 people in 1775. It is clear that the Puritans in 1775 could not have much exceeded 600,000, for in 1790, the whole population of New England was only a fraction over 1,000,000. The Cavaliers in Virginia could not have exceeded 400,000 at this time, if indeed they were nearly so numerous, including their large number of slaves and white servants, since the whole population of the Colony in 1790 was only 747,610. But suppose they numbered 450,000, it would only make them half as numerous as the Covenanters in the entire country. These estimates show that the Covenanters were, at the date of the Revolution, the most numerous of the three great divisions of the people of the country. It has been computed that the Covenanters at the time amounted to one-third of the entire population of the country. This I think a very low estimate. This would give them 916,666 souls—about the same result reached by the previous calculation. The large part of these were in the South, perhaps two-thirds, or more than 600,000. They, therefore, constituted nearly one-half of the entire population of the Southern Colonies and States. It will be evident, on a little reflection, that they were more numerous than any other single people. In New York, and especially in the western section, a large part of the population seemed to have been of this stock. Delaware and New Jersey also had a large Covenanter population. In Pennsylvania they were numerous, being estimated at one-third of the population. Their influence on passing events was greater than might have been expected even from their numbers. In 1775, in all the Southern States, they exercised considerable power. In North and South Carolina, their control was almost supreme, as it has been ever since. Ramsey, the historian of South Carolina, states that Ireland—that is, the Covenanter settlements—contributed most to the population of that State. Williamson says the same thing in reference to North Carolina. It is admitted that Kentucky was peopled by them. It is equally clear that Tennessee from the very first settlement, has always been in the main under the control of this people. Any one acquainted with the names of its early inhabitants, with the history of its old families, and their customs, and with that of the State, can have no doubt on this point. Indeed, the early settlers were almost entirely from the Covenanter population of Virginia and North and South Carolina; as the population of Kentucky was from the Covenanters of Virginia and Pennsylvania. Georgia, also, was mainly settled by the Covenanter Race. Oglethorpe's Colony failed in this State in 1752. The New England Colony at Sunbury also failed. Then came the Covenanters 'from the mountains and Piedmont regions of the Carolinas and Virginia, and filled middle Georgia.' They have gone on from the day of their arrival in Georgia with that energy, intelligence and persistence so peculiar to them, building up the State in its material resources, in intellectual achievements, in moral and religious works, and in molding and shaping its institutions, until to-day its preëminence among Southern States is acknowledged by all the world."

One part of the service which the Covenanters rendered to our land in the days of its early history, has been brought into prominent notice by Judge

Temple,—a service, which, so far as I know, has not received at the hands of any other historian the notice it deserves. He says :

“The part taken by the Covenanters of the frontiers in fighting the battles of the Revolution in North and South Carolina only constitutes a part of their patriotic work. Everywhere along the western frontier from Georgia to Canada, and notably so in Tennessee and Kentucky, a constant Indian warfare blazed along the borders from the day that the pioneers set foot on virgin soil till long after the close of the war.

“The far-reaching importance of this Indian fighting has not been, and is not now, half appreciated. But few men ever think that when Sevier and Robertson and Boone and Kenton were repelling Indian attacks or invading Indian country, they were doing anything more than protecting the white settlements ; whereas, they were in fact, unconscious to themselves, fighting the very battles of the Revolution. The same great power that put in motion the armies of Clinton and Cornwallis for the subjugation of the Colonies along the Atlantic, and encircled them with a line of fire, also set in motion the fierce savage nations from Canada to Florida, bent on the destruction of all the infant settlements west of the Alleghanies and the Blue Ridge. Official records show that it was as much the policy of the British ministry to destroy these settlements and exterminate the settlers or drive them east of the Alleghanies as it was to destroy the army of Washington. Both were parts of the same cruel war, and the same scheme of subjugation. British agents, shrewd and heartless, with a plentiful supply of gold and presents, arms and ammunition, were kept at work among all the tribes east of the Mississippi, stirring them up to their work of blood. Henry Hamilton, Lieutenant-Governor of Canada, with headquarters at Detroit, was at the head of this diabolical movement. There was a regular organized plan of operation. Nor did the infamy stop here. Besides alluring the savages with presents, their cupidity and ferocity was still further stimulated by purchasing from them the scalps they had taken. The instruction given by the home government was to destroy the settlers, or drive them east of the Alleghanies.

“In pursuance of this comprehensive plan, the Indians north of Ohio made unceasing war on the settlers around Pittsburg and those in Kentucky. Those south of Ohio harrassed and threatened the settlements on the Cumberland, and attempted over and over again to destroy the Holston, the Watauga, the Nolichucky people. So, also the frontiers of the southern Colonies were harrassed by the fierce allies of England. Again and again these demons, incited by British agents, silently and murderously crept through the dark forrest, to fall on the settlements with fire and tomahawk and scalping knife, sparing neither age nor sex. And as often the leaders of the settlements—Evan, Shelby, Christian, Robertson, Boone, Kenton, Logan, and Todd, and notably Sevier and Clark—lead expeditions into the homes of the savages and inflicted on them merited chastisement. So at the close of the Revolution, not a settlement west of the mountains had been destroyed, not an inch of territory had been lost. Under the leadership of Sevier the Watauga, the Holston, and the Nolichucky settlers had slowly crept down these streams, extending the settlements further and further west. Robertson had firmly planted his colony on the Cumberland and in the heart of middle Tennessee. Boone, Logan, and others had successfully defended Kentucky, though more than once narrowly escaping destruction. And General George Rogers Clark, by a series of exploits almost unparalleled for daring, had conquered and firmly held Illinois and Indiana.

“It thus appears that while the Continental armies barely held the Atlantic States against the British fleet and armies, a few hundred hunters and pioneers of Tennessee, Kentucky, Western Pennsylvania and Southwestern Virginia, mostly Covenanters, unaided by Congress, and acting at their own expense and on their own volition, won and held by their valor what has

proved to be the very heart of our great empire against the combined power of all the savage nations between Canada and Florida, backed by British agents, stimulated by British gold, and aided sometimes by British troops. Putting out of view entirely the services rendered to the cause of Independence by Sevier and his associates at King's Mountain, and in other battles in the South, it is manifest that the Indian battles on the frontier were as important to the lasting power and greatness of our country as were the battles of Washington and Greene. The frontier leaders occupied, won and held the territory now covered by the great States of Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and parts of Pennsylvania and Virginia. These men planted their feet in this great territory and firmly held it. In war, as in peace, the doctrine of *uti possidetis* goes far in fixing titles."

We have purposely made up this notice of Judge Temple's most excellent and timely work, of quotations from the book itself. We have done this for two reasons; first, because the author's style is so compact that we find it impossible to condense his matter into any smaller space than his own sentences, and secondly, by these quotations we give an idea of the contents, and, at the same time, samples of the work itself. It is only needed that this book should be brought to the attention of the people to find readers and admirers in all parts of our land. The blood and the splendid elements which formed the character of the old Covenanters are still as potent in our land as in the days of the Revolution; and so long as the nation shall last the blood of this wonderful stock will exist, and make itself felt among men.

Knoxville, Tenn.

J. M. P. OTTS.

HEDLESTON'S LAMP OIL.

LAMP OIL.—AN ESSAY TO HELP SOME TO UNDERSTAND THE PLAN OF SALVATION. *By Rev. W. D. Hedleston, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Oxford, Miss.* Pp. 147. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shep-person.

This is an exposition of the plan of salvation that really expounds it. That plan is exhibited in its various parts, and the nature, significance, characteristics and relations of those parts are clearly and logically set forth, so that "the way-faring man, though a fool, need not err therein." The author is a pastor, and, therefore, familiar with the difficulties which beset even intelligent people when asking: "What must I do to be saved?" he is a theologian, therefore familiar with the great truths of the Bible as analyzed and synthetized by the master minds of the Church from Augustine to Calvin down to Dabney and Shedd; he is, also, master of the teacher's gift of imparting information, therefore able to translate the theologian's technical knowledge, from his own mind, into the plain, simple language of his readers. He who carefully reads the book, will realize that the author is "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

"Knowledge is power," says Bacon. True—but knowledge concealed in technical language is powerless. A thought must be apprehended by the mind, and understood in its relations, before it can move a man to action.

So a greater than Bacon has said : The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," but even the gospel is powerless, when it is expressed in conventional terms, so that no clear and definite meaning reaches the mind of the hearer. The author has unlimited confidence in the gospel as the power of God, and his experience as a pastor in dealing with souls, has convinced him that the reason the gospel is so often powerless, when preached, is because its terms are meaningless to even intelligent hearers. The terms are true, but they are "long-used coins of truth whose image and superscription have been worn and effaced." Hence intelligent people, who attend upon the preaching of the gospel, "hold vague notions of sin, a Saviour, salvation, atonement, regeneration, faith, repentance, the sacraments, and service of God." To remove these vague notions, and put a meaning into these terms, was the task Mr. Hedleston set himself in this book.

He has never once throughout the book permitted himself to forget the needs of the earnest soul inquiring, "What must I do to be saved?" In fifteen short chapters, he expounds the way of life from the conviction of sin to the full stature of manhood in Christ Jesus.

In chapter I., the true doctrine concerning conscience is set forth. Conscience is a *Judge*, not a *lawgiver*. God alone is the lawgiver, and the sole function of conscience is to judge whether my actions are in accordance with that law or not. If my conscience turns its back upon God's law, and adopts public opinion as its law, it will be manifestly impossible to convict myself of sin at the bar of conscience, if I am at all a decent member of society. This explains why so many respectable people are not convicted of sin, they have substituted for the decalogue of God, the decalogue of the world, and the moral standard of the world is so low, that no convictions can be procured under it, except it be of the outwardly vicious and depraved. The decalogue of the world is then summarized, and its authority impugned thus :

"I know that the chief agencies in its promulgation are good men—preachers usually, evangelists especially. But it is a lie being only a fraction of the truth. It lacks competent authority. The Lord is to be the sole Lord of our consciences. God has given a moral law. If we do not break that, we are righteous ; if we do, we are sinners. I propose in a few chapters to bring an indictment before the bar of conscience under this law."

This, he proceeds to do, in the next four chapters, using only the first table of the decalogue. Each commandment is first explained as to its nature, prohibitions, and requirements, and then a rigid application of it made to the conscience. He who reads carefully these chapters, be he saint or sinner, will have the conviction forced upon him : "Verily I am guilty before God !" So well has our author set forth the claims of God upon us, in reference to the Object, the mediums, the vanity, and the times and seasons of worship.

The next four chapters deal with our responsibility for sin, and God's method of removing the guilt of sin from us without dishonoring his law, and the way in which the Holy Spirit implants the new life within us. We

fell in Adam. The author is a Traducianist ; as Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek, being yet in the loins of Abraham, so we sinned in Adam ; but Mr. Hedleston does not rest in this natural relation alone as sufficient to account for original sin, he introduces the federal headship of Adam and insists as strenuously on it, as does Dr. Hodge. But, however brought about, the fact remains that the tree is corrupt, and therefore the fruit is corrupt—the Ego, that within us which thinks, and feels, and wills, is corrupt by nature, and if a man is not responsible for *his nature, for himself*, what can he be responsible for? The law cannot be broken, it must be fulfilled ; this Christ has done for us ; Christ is the end of the law for righteousness. Our guilt is transferred to Christ ; this is possible on the principle of vicariousness. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.” Then the Spirit writes the law on our hearts, when he begets us as sons of God, and we are no longer under law but under grace.

Chapter X. answers the question : “What must I do to be saved?” The sinner is warned not to attempt to do God’s work ; he is not to try to justify himself, since it is Christ’s work to furnish him a justifying righteousness, neither is he to try to regenerate himself, as that is the Spirit’s work, but he is simply to repent of his sins and have faith in Christ—that confidence in Him which trusts Him to save the soul.

The next four chapters exhibit the means of grace : the word of God, the sacraments, and prayer. The place of each of these in the sanctification of a soul is made plain. We know of nothing in these days which tests a man theologically so well as his opinion of the Bible. Is it that the Bible alone is the only infallible rule of faith and practice? then he is a Protestant, conservative and orthodox ; is tradition added to the Bible? then he is a Romanist, superstitious and enslaved ; is reason made co-ordinate with, or superior to, the Bible? then he is a rationalist, vainglorious and full of folly. Of the Bible, the author writes :

“It is the only publication extant to which God has affixed his signature as author. . . . The Bible is infallibly true, and has the authority of God. Other books are to be examined whether their words be true ; the Bible is to be examined whether we have understood the meaning.”

The last chapter presents us with the ideal Christian character which each should build for himself, based on the passage in 2 Pet. : “Add to your faith, virtue,” &c.

Thus Mr. Hedleston has shown in fifteen brief chapters that man can be convicted of sin at the bar of his own conscience if tried by the law of God ; that he is responsible for not only his acts of sin but for the corrupt nature within which produced those sins ; that he received this corrupt nature from Adam because of his relationship to him both by natural generation and federal headship ; that the law of God can pass away only by being fulfilled, hence that the sinner must endure its penalty himself, or another must fulfill the law for him, enduring its penalty to exhaustion and obeying its precepts completely ; that Christ Jesus the Divine-human Son of God has done this for man once for all on the principle of substitution—of “vicariousness ;” that the Holy Spirit renews the soul and writes the law of God within the

heart ; that man's work in the salvation of his soul is to repent of sin and to have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ ; that the renewed man's work—the Christian's—is to build up a holy character after the model of Christ Jesus ; that in order to do this the Christian must make diligent use of the means of grace, the word, the sacraments, and prayer.

All these propositions are stated in clean-cut phrases, their terms defined, argued, illustrated, and applied till the conviction of their truth and agreement with the Bible is forced on the mind.

We think it would be difficult to produce a better book on the plan of salvation in so brief a compass. Theologians would perhaps prefer, in places, technical language as more accurately expressing the truth—but then, that would have spoiled the book, it was not written for *theologians* but for *laymen* ! The author has admirably succeeded in doing what he purposed to do, viz : putting a meaning into religious terms for the layreader.

However, we do not like the title : "Lamp Oil." It is too fanciful, it gives no idea of the contents of the volume. It is a pity that so excellent a book should be handicapped with such a name.

This book is unique among religious books written for laymen in its utter freedom from exclamations, rhapsodies, terms of affectionate endearment for God and man, and that "goody-goody" hortatory "piosity" which forms the nauseating stock in trade of most of them. There is not a trace of anything of this kind in the book. On the contrary, the thought is vigorous, expansive, uplifting, reverent, and presented in clear, simple, nervous English that invigorates one like a breeze from the mountains !

We heartily commend the book not only to the class for which it was written but to pastors, Sunday school teachers, parents, and Christians generally ; to such, Mr. Hedleston will give valuable aid in guiding souls from darkness into light.

W. MCF. ALEXANDER.

Memphis, Tenn.

WARFIELD'S SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS AS A CREED.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS AS A CREED. An Address Delivered Before the Presbytery of New York, Nov. 8, 1897, on the Occasion of the Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Completion of the Westminster Standards. *By Benjamin B. Warfield, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton.* New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898.

The scope of the address is indicated precisely in the title—"significance" in the full sense of import and importance.

"I cannot, indeed, hope to tell over to-day all that the Westminster Standards are to us—to unfold in detail all that has for two centuries and a half made them precious to a body of Christians who have been second to none in intelligence of conviction, evangelistic zeal and faithfulness of confession. But if I were to essay to express in one word what it is in them which has proved so perennial a source of strength to generation after generation of Christian men, and which causes us still to cling to them with a devotion no less intelligent than passionate, I think I should but voice your own con-

viction were I to say that it is because these precious documents appeal to us as but the embodiment in fitly chosen language of the pure gospel of the grace of God . . . in these forms of words we possess the most complete, the most fully elaborated and carefully guarded, the most perfect and the most vital expression that has ever been framed by the hand of man of all that enters into what we call evangelical religion, and of all that must be safeguarded if evangelical religion is to persist in the world."

That such is the significance of the Standards is assumed. The task the speaker set for himself, was simply to show "how they came to be this." The occasion did not call for an analysis of their contents, nor was it possible in the time allotted. The account of the origin of the Standards, however, is so managed as to prove that they must be just what is here claimed for them in every particular.

The historical conditions of the origin of the Standards are first considered. "There is no other such gulf in the history of human thought as that which is cleft between the apostolic and the immediately succeeding age." "Thus it came about that the deposit of divine truth in the Apostolic revelation did not supply the starting-point of the development of doctrine in the Church, but has rather from the beginning stood before it as the goal to which it was painfully to climb." The long struggle is then sketched and the result stated in the following paragraph :

"It is because the Westminster Standards are the product of such men, working under such circumstances, that they embody the gospel of the grace of God with a carefulness, a purity and an exactness never elsewhere achieved, and come to us as, historically, the final fixing in confessional language of the principles and teachings of evangelical religion. Sixteen centuries of struggle toward the pure apprehension of the gospel lay behind them, culminating in that ultimate proclamation of evangelical truth which we call the Reformation. More especially, a hundred and fifty years of the development of Reformed theology lay behind them, culminating in the vindication of the purity of the gospel by the Reformed world as over against the Remonstrant adulteratives. Most especially of all, there lay behind them the half century of Puritan conflict—a half century of working and polishing the jewel of the gospel beneath every hammer that the cruelty of men, and every chisel and file that the ingenuity of men could devise, until it was beaten and cut into the most compact and sharply outlined possible impression of the pure gospel of the grace of God."

In the second place, the scientific perfection of the Standards is found in the same historical conditions.

"Whenever the elements cast into the crucible of life include all those that enter into the case, and the ferment is violent enough and sufficiently long continued, we may expect the ultimate eliminations and combinations to be in the highest sense natural—that is, to run on the lines of essential lightness—and the final crystallization to be a scientific product of the first quality. It is to the fact that just this was the process by which the Westminster Standards came into being that they owe their high scientific character." "I think it may be said there are only three main forms in which this (Christian) religion may be plausibly presented to the acceptance of men. . . . We may, for our convenience, label these the Sacerdotal, the Humanitarian, and the Evangelical Gospels; and it is among them that the battle of the faith must be fought out."

The first element was furnished in perfection by Rome. Socinianism,

Lutheran Synergism, and Remonstrant Humanism furnished the second. With these elements the Reformed theology was thrown into the crucible in all Europe, but the ordeal was severest of all on English ground.

"It belongs to the very essence of the situation that an enunciation of the elements of the gospel, springing out of such conditions, should be supremely well guarded from the sides of both its most obdurate foes. . . . No wonder, then, that even the most cursory reader of the Westminster Standards is impressed with the exquisite precision and balance of their statements, with the clearness and purity with which they bring out just the essence of the gospel, and the drastic thoroughness with which they separate from it every remainder of sacerdotal and humanitarian leaven."

In the last place the Standards are considered from the point of view of vital religion. It resulted from the conditions governing their origin that they should be also notable monuments of religious life. "Creeds have been given to the Church, not by philosophers but by the shepherds of the flock, who loved the sheep; not in a speculative but in a practical interest; not to advance or safeguard what we speak of as merely intellectual, but distinctively spiritual needs." "Of no creed is this more true than of the Westminster Standards." "It results, therefore, from the very nature of the case, that it is above everything else a religious document which they have given us . . . a document transfused with the very spirit of the age of religious revival which gave it birth, and bearing to every age which will receive it the spirit of devotion enshrined in its bosom." This is the crowning glory of the Standards. It is what has made them so precious to the holiest of men. It seemed so natural that the author should quote in this connection the estimate of Dr. Thornwell. To his students, and indeed to all who knew him, he was the embodiment of that clearness of view and glowing piety which are blended in our Standards.

It is refreshing in this age, when so many are growing restive under the authority of creeds, and others are claiming a broad license under them, to read this address of Dr. Warfield. It is a good tonic. He loves the Westminster Standards because of what they are, what they have accomplished, and what they are destined to accomplish in the future. As long as he occupies the chair of theology Princeton will remain true to its noble traditions.

Let us close by joining in the author's fervent prayer which contains the last words of the address:

"Surely blessed are the churches which feed upon this meat! Surely the very possession of Standards like these differentiates the fortunate churches which have inherited them as those best furnished for the word and work of the Christian proclamation and Christian life. May God Almighty infuse their strength into our bones and their beauty into our flesh, and enable us to justify our inheritance by unfolding into life, in all its completeness and richness and divinity, the precious gospel which they have unfolded for us in their protecting envelope of sound words!"

W. T. HALL.

Columbia, S. C.

KENT'S HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE.

A HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE. From the Settlement in Canaan to the Division of the Kingdom. *By Charles Foster Kent, Associate Professor of Biblical Literature and History, Brown University.* With Maps and Plans. 12mo, pp. xxii., 220. \$1.25. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896.

A HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE. From the Division of the Kingdom to the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. With Maps and Charts. The same publishers. 1897.

These two handy volumes, beautifully printed, beautifully arranged, and attractively written, are among the most readable of all the publications recently issued covering the same general subject. The apparatus of learning is carefully hidden. Even foot-notes are discarded. The authorities followed and the bibliography of the subject are relegated to an appendix in each volume. The style is clear and the method of treatment popular and effective, and both style and method so well sustained that the book almost "reads itself."

The first volume covers the history of the Hebrew People from their settlement in Canaan to the rupture of the kingdom in Rehoboam's day. Introductory to this perhaps one-third of the volume is devoted to such matters as the scope and importance of Hebrew history, its sources, the land to be occupied and its original inhabitants, and the genesis of the Hebrew people. The second volume divides the history into the pre-Assyrian period of the Hebrews, the Assyrian period of Israel, the Assyrian period of Judah, and the Babylonian period of Judah, with such preliminary matter to each as the study of the historical sources and chronology of the period.

The governing principle of the author's work is the adjustment of the history to the so-called findings of modern criticism. He calls it "the new history" of the Hebrew people, and characterizes it as likely to impress the reader at first as "quite different from that to which we were introduced by our parents." It is in the chapters containing introductory and preliminary matters chiefly that one finds the lines along which the history will be "constructed," though the author nowhere goes into any elaborate discussion of the methods of the critics whose results he accepts. Having accepted these results or findings, so-called, he adjusts the history to them so naturally and pleasantly that one forgets that they are only of the nature of unverified hypotheses. Indeed, the very clearness, simplicity, and popularity of the style make the book the more dangerous. Its assumptions are taken and argued from with all the reality and seriousness of actual facts. As usual with this class of writers, hypotheses are adroitly converted into facts. The careless or untrained reader is borne along with the author in utter unconsciousness of the fact that he has accepted and passed on from utterly unwarranted positions, and has built upon mere hypotheses that have been given with all the assurance of postulates.

As specimens of the author's position, the following may be noted. Hav-

ing asserted that the prophet regarded events in themselves as of little importance, he adds that the prophet

"Was as ready to employ a late tradition as an early narrative. . . . If he had had the data at his command whereby he could determine which of the two was the older, and, therefore, the more authentic record, he probably would not have deemed it worthy of his attention. . . . His historic knowledge also was that of his age. . . . Historic accuracy they did not claim. One's respect, however, for the Old Testament and the work of the prophets deepens when it is perceived that they were subject to all the limitations of an era when scientific methods of investigation were unknown and the exact historic spirit still unborn. . . . It is obvious that if the modern student is to become acquainted with the real facts of Hebrew history, he must do that for which the prophets had neither the desire nor the equipment." (Vol. i., p. 12.)

Poor prophets! Even in their nearness to the events, and even with the solemn duty upon them of telling the people the truth and not enforcing their proclamations with lies, they knew less than modern day critics blessed with the "historic spirit." And the only palliation of their lying is that they did not know any better, or that they did not regard the truth as of any importance in connection with their declaration of God's will!

And the poor priests were as bad. They felt the necessity of codifying the law, and of reforming the people committed to their spiritual guidance; and to induce them to accept the law, or Deuteronomy, they surreptitiously brought out and paraded as the law of Moses laws which they themselves prepared and "planted" in the rubbish of the Temple!

"The circumstances of the reign of Manasseh and of his son Amon, who pursued the policy of his father, were unfavorable for the promulgation of this new code; and hence it was laid aside in the Temple until it was discovered—actually or perhaps ostensibly in accordance with a plan known to the few most interested in it—and made the programme of the great reformation of Josiah." "They developed their plans at first in secret, awaiting a favorable occasion to raise openly the standard of reform." "The Book of Deuteronomy was . . . the result of a noble effort to replace the popular religion with a new system in accord with the new prophetic revelation." (Vol. ii., pp. 164, 173, 179).

Passages such as these, to which might be added numerous others in which the author accounts for many of the facts and incidents in the career of the Hebrews on purely naturalistic grounds, and in which the Biblical records are treated and even spoken of as "the Old Testament traditions," show very clearly that in the author's judgment we have in the Bible something worse than no history, that we have an actual imposition and fraud. 'Twere better, if he be right, that we should utterly discard it. Its traditions, its pious frauds, its "noble" deceptions, its disregard of the modern "exact or historic spirit" and of the modern "scientific methods of investigation," make it utterly unworthy of the confidence of honest men or honest seekers after truth. The possessors of the "historic spirit," and the adepts in "scientific methods of investigation," make it utterly unworthy of the confidence of honest men or honest seekers after truth. The possessors of the "historic spirit," and the adepts in "scientific methods of investigation," can give us a very much better Bible than these Old Testament prophets or the New Testament writers, including Christ himself, who quoted them!

Clarksville, Tenn.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

PEERY'S GIST OF JAPAN : THE ISLANDS, THEIR PEOPLE, AND MISSIONS.

THE GIST OF JAPAN : THE ISLANDS, THEIR PEOPLE, AND MISSIONS. *By the Rev. R. B. Peery, A. M., Ph. D., of the Lutheran Mission, Saga, Japan.* With Illustrations. New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. 317. \$1.25.

Book-makers and book-writers have not failed to take advantage of the interest the American people particularly feel in the keen, intelligent and plucky little Islanders of the North Pacific. So that during the last few years quite a number of books about Japan have claimed our attention. *The Gist of Japan* can hardly be considered as a book prepared in order to profit by our interest ; it has a higher end. Its title is well chosen ; the expectation awakened is realized. It is a good compendium on Japan in its manifold aspect. The author, besides being evidently a scholarly and accurate observer for four years of residence in "The Land of the Rising Sun," has made use of the best works on the subject by others. We commend the book to those wishing information in compact and thoroughly readable form.

Our interest in Japan is destined to be not merely temporary. She already ranks among the important nations of earth ; she must be counted as an important factor in the movements among the nations, a vastly more important factor than her ponderous and unwieldy neighbor across the channel, or sea as you may choose to call it. She seems destined to take and occupy the same position on her side of the globe as Great Britain does on hers. Indeed, there are several points of resemblance between the two, besides their being both island empires. They have about the same area, about the same population ; their climate largely agrees ; both are naval powers by necessity ; each has a constitutional monarchy ; the same boastful patriotism ; the same native ability of the people, especially commercial ability ; both races are mixed. The one great difference is in religion and this appeals profoundly to the Christian. Dr. Peery has given us a timely contribution in a most important field.

The book shows familiarity, intelligent appreciation and close observation. It corrects a number of erroneous impressions prevalent over here : as that Japanese flowers have no odor, that Japanese birds do not sing ; geographical mistakes ; and the story about Com. Perry's peaceable conquest. The author employs, in some cases, spellings different from those to which we have been used, but this is natural, as the transliteration of Japanese sounds has not become fixed as yet. We don't know quite enough Japanese to decide which is right ! The book is a series of monographs or studies, each complete in itself but part of a larger unit, as the lenses in an insect's eye. Perhaps the best conception we can give of the volume is by giving the titles of the several chapters with a brief estimate of each : (1) "The Land of Japan ;" a concise account of the geography, physical characteristics and natural history of the country—about what one will carry with him. (2) "A Brief History of the Japanese People ;" instructive though necessarily sketchy. (3) "Japanese Characteristics ;" quite interesting, with well-balanced conclusions. (4) "Manners and Customs ;" very entertaining. (5) "Japanese Civiliza-

tion ;" shows intelligent appreciation of the subject. According to the best definition of "civilization." the Japanese are a civilized people is the conclusion. (6) "Japanese Morality;" useful view. (7) "Religions of Japan;" instructive despite its brevity. (8) "First Introduction of Christianity." (9) "Modern Roman and Greek Missions;" impartial and appreciative. (10) "A Brief History of Protestant Missions in Japan;" compact but comprehensive. (11) "Qualifications for Mission Work in Japan;" some very sensible ideas. (12) "Private Life of the Missionary;" on the whole, good; lays considerable, perhaps not too much, stress on the money question. (13) "Methods of Work;" views judicious and fairly well maintained. (14) "Hindrances;" an excellent chapter. (15) "Special Problems;" shows intelligent acquaintance with the subject. (16) "The Outlook;" fairly good.

The author has very decided views as to qualifications for mission work in Japan. He places physical qualifications first, a man must, first and foremost, have a vigorous physique. Then *spiritual* qualifications, then *mental*. All must be of a high order. He opposes educational efforts in that particular field as not worth the cost, and makes it look very much that way. He does well, in our judgment, in emphasizing the catechetical method of instruction. His idea about the organization of the native church is that they should be left to determine their own polity, *inasmuch as no special form of church polity has divine sanction, it is a mere matter of expediency*. Presbyterians, generally, will scarcely accept this statement as to its being a matter of indifference; and certainly three large and influential denominations take their names from their form of polity.

The work comes to us in a good, compact, substantially bound, attractive volume, on excellent paper, in clear type, with eight full-page photogravure illustrations; a book that the bibliophile loves to handle and con; and withal cheap.

The arrangement of the work scarcely dispenses with the need of an index.
Columbia, S. C.

D. J. BRIMM.

LEAVITT'S CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY: A History of its Suppression and Revival.
By John McDowell Leavitt, D. D., LL.D. 12 mo., pp. 391. \$1.50. New York, Cincinnati: Eaton & Mains, Curts & Jennings. 1896.

I have read this book of about 400 pages, straight along. It required no effort to do it. After laying it down I would return to it with an appetite. I write this notice to commend more especially its historical value. And I do it more willingly because there is so much failure in Historiography. Poets are rare, and it is an egregious blunder, if not something worse, for one who is not a born poet to attempt to invoke the Muses. Writers of history are also rare. In proof of which I point to the many intolerably dull histories which we are forced to read. Not so is Dr. Leavitt's book.

The Christian Republic, instead of *The Christian Democracy*, might be preferred by some as the title for the theme, and to which the material might have been adjusted. But the history is the great value of the book

whether the Church be a Democracy or a Representative form of Government. The author presents most graphically an outline of the great topics of Doctrine, Polity, and Worship in their pseudo-development along the line of Ecclesiastical History. And these are not presented as dry abstractions. Along the line of the buried past the dry bones shake, move, stand up, and are clothed with flesh. The Old Fathers live again. The martyrs start up from the ashes. The Emperors, Kings and Popes though dead yet speak. The pick and the spade are not needed to find the actors in the dead past.

Persecutions, Fathers, Heresies, Councils, Sacerdotalism, Saint Worship, Morals, Witnesses, Popes, Jesuitism, Anglicanism, Protestantism, these are the heads of a part of the xxiv. chapters of the book. They span the whole sweep of Church History. None of these can be spared, and the reader will be in no danger of omitting any one of them. It is the kind of book to interest one in the field of Church History. It lifts the reader above the smoke of battle and gives him hill top views all along the line from which to survey and judge the issues for himself. The supremacy of Christ as Lawgiver and Judge in His Church, the supremacy of Scriptures as the infallible standard of faith and practice, and the supremacy of a regulated conscience at the bar of human courts, are issues that have been influential in history. As bearing upon these issues the chapters on the Fathers, Creeds, Councils, and Popes are very suggestive. According to a code of morals that obtains among some of the heathen, it is no harm to tell a lie provided you are not caught. Much effort has been made to find infallibility in the Church. It has been sought in the Fathers, in the Councils, and in the Popes, but they have all been caught. Note these chapters. The book deserves to be read and it will amply reward the reader.

J. D. TADLOCK.

Columbia, S. C.

SIENKIEWICZ' QUO VADIS.

QUO VADIS. A Narrative of the Time of Nero. *By Henry Sienkiewicz, Author of "With Fire and Sword," "The Deluge," etc.* Translated from the Polish by Jeremiah Curtin. Cr. 8vo., pp. 541. Cloth, \$2. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1897.

Taken altogether, this historical romance may be justly regarded as the great work of its class in the present decade. By its thrilling interest and accurate delineation of the times and characters which it presents, it attracts and entertains the reader, and by its power it holds him from first to last with irresistible force.

The author is a Polish writer who has only recently come to the front in literature, but who has already won a permanent place among the great authors of the day. His translator has happily rendered his work into the most elegant and idiomatic English. The title of the book is derived from the legendary words uttered to Peter and repeated by him when, as the story goes, fleeing from Rome, he was arrested on the way by a vision of the Lord Jesus, and when in answer to his inquiry, *Quo vadis, Domine*, Jesus said to him, "If thou desert my people, I am going to Rome to be crucified a second time," causing the apostle to turn his face again towards the devoted city

and to respond to the servant who asked him in the same words as those used by him in addressing his Lord. This scene is barely mentioned and then dismissed in this book, but nevertheless gives the author the singular title which the work bears. The spot where the legend locates the incident is just outside the ancient Porta Capena, and is now marked by a little chapel bearing the inscription, *Quo Vadis, Domine*.

The *motif* of the book is not so certain. Dealing largely with the Christian faith, it might be suspected of having some bias or partisan aim. If so, however, that aim is deftly concealed, and the whole impression as to the purity, power, and grace of the Christian faith is singularly fine. True, the presence of Peter in Rome, his supremacy there, and especially Paul's recognition of that supremacy, are among the other fictions of the book, but hardly in an offensive way. Three or four references of a disagreeable nature to predestination are made, evidently not so much for controversial as illustrative purposes, and even these may perhaps be more a reflection of the translator's than of the author's spirit.

The scene is laid in Rome, in the days of Nero. The heroine is a semi-captive maiden who has been reared, in a hostage life, under the influence of a noble Roman matron from whom she has learned the Christian faith. The hero is a youth of great accomplishments and gifts, reared amidst the most attractive associations of pagan life, who is gradually won from his dissolute and pagan life and thought by the beauty and strength displayed in the life of the Christian maiden. The heroine falls under the displeasure, through jealousy of her beauty, of Poppæa, the mistress of the infamous Nero, and is subjected to all the humiliations and dangers of the victims of Nero's bloody persecution. The story culminates in the scene, towards which the entire book gradually looks forward and works its way, in the arena, where a Christian slave of the heroine, a man of almost superhuman strength, preserves her life and wins the acclamations of the multitude witnessing it, and their cries for his and her release, by a successful combat with a mighty wild beast to whose shoulders the girl was lashed. The fortunes of the Christians in Rome, the work of Paul, the fictitious relations of Peter to the Church in that city, the fearful persecutions of Nero, the Paganism of the leaders, the wild orgies of their feasts and the licentious nature of their domestic life, the contemptible conceit of the Emperor, the sycophantic adulation of his courtiers, and the burning of Rome, are among the most striking and prominent features in the materials of the work. Some parts were decidedly better left out, as the realistic descriptions of two great imperial feasts, and a few other scenes. True, the facts are doubtless accurately set forth and are historically credible, and the descriptions may not more than barely touch the actual debauchery and licentiousness of the court and patrician palaces. But these were better left undescribed in their shameful nakedness. On account of them the book is hardly to be recommended to any but the maturer class of readers. In depicting the great characters of the day, as Nero, Seneca, Petronius, Poppæa, and others, as well as in describing the scenes in which the romance lies, the author has reproduced the epoch with consummate skill. The portrayals are marvellously divested

of the present and its coloring. The characters are those of the time to which they are referred. They live in their own age and not in ours.

Clarksville, Tenn.

GEO. SUMMEY.

HILLYER'S MANUAL OF BIBLE MORALITY.

MANUAL OF BIBLE MORALITY. A Text-Book for Elementary and Academic Schools, and for the Help of Parents in Training Their Children at Home. *By Shaler G. Hillyer, D. D., for More Than Forty Years a Practical Teacher, and for Nearly Twelve of Those Years a Professor in Mercer University.* 12mo., 224 pp. Price 60 cents. B. F. Johnson Publishing Co., Richmond, Va. 1897.

The venerable author of this compend of practical ethics has happily construed the crying need of the vast majority of the youth attending our common schools as a demand upon his talent, sympathy, and rich experience. The practical exclusion of the Bible as a text-book from the public schools in many of the States of the Union leaves a large percentage of our young people without a point of contact with sound ethical instruction.

For this class of neglected children, dependent upon these schools from which the Bible is virtually excluded for the little education they may obtain, this excellent Manual of Bible Morality has been prepared.

Not unwarranted seems the assumption that "the people of the United States with wonderful unanimity accept the morality of the Bible as preëminently the most perfect standard of rectitude known among men:—and would consent that it should be taught in our schools."

In the execution of his praiseworthy task our author adheres closely to his text, "Bible Morality."

The decalogue determines the plan of the book and its two-fold division.

The first part, prepared for the younger classes in our elementary schools, unfolds the meaning and applies the teachings of the "Ten Words" with charming simplicity and captivating tenderness of spirit.

The second part is designed for the more advanced classes in common schools and also for the youth attending high schools and academies in course of preparation for college or university.

Apart from its immediate utility, the book is admirably adapted to serve as an introduction to the more systematic study of ethical science.

While Dr. Hillyer modestly disclaims all intention of writing a scientific treatise, his intimate and profound acquaintance with the philosophy of morals are evidenced by the ability and skill with which he popularizes the most difficult, in certain of its aspects, of all the sciences.

In the second part of the work the Commandments are taken up consecutively, but treated in more elevated style and with more extended comment.

The eight concluding chapters deal with the great relative and personal duties; namely, the law of piety and of reciprocity, the duty of rulers and of citizens, the selection of company, the law of wedlock, the relative duties of employers and employees, and the law of temperance.

These topics are handled in a timely, stimulating, masterly manner. The

style is simple, lucid, forceful ; the illustrations are apt, adequate, and heart-touching. Especially commendable are the skill and delicacy characterizing his exposition of the Seventh Commandment, and his clear and practical presentation of social and civil relations and duties.

Noteworthy, too, is the fact that the teachings of this little book, while wholly free from suggestion of sectarian bias, are thoroughly biblical and therefore evangelical, depicting the Author and Promulgator of the Moral Law not only as man's Maker and Moral Ruler, but with equal clearness as the Redeemer of the guilty.

To read the writing, sympathetically, is to know and love the writer. Every page is luminous with vital faith in the great principles of Evangelical ethics ; pregnant with yearning for the little ones whose moral training is so sadly neglected in the formative and critical period of life ; beautified by a steadfast hope touching the purification and uplifting of the social and civil life of our people through the sympathetic teaching and the practical illustration in our schools of a truly Biblical morality.

Clarksville, Tenn.

J. E. FOGARTIE.

BLISS' HISTORY OF MISSIONS.

A CONCISE HISTORY OF MISSIONS. *By Edwin Munsell Bliss, D. D.*

Pages 321. Price 75 cents. Fleming H. Revell Company. New York, Chicago, Toronto. 1897.

The recent and rapid growth of the literature of Missions indicates a quickening of the vital sympathies of the Church and represents the indispensable means of stimulating and enlarging interest in the heart of every loyal subject of the Master. Information, conditions, intelligence, interest. To coöperate with Christ our Lord in the evangelization of the world, we must know what He has done and is now doing through His chosen agencies in the as yet unreclaimed portions of the great world-field.

A careful perusal of Dr. Bliss' *Concise History of Missions* leave the impression that he has made a valuable contribution to the means of missionary intelligence. In a compact and handy volume of 321 pages a complete outline of the rise and progress of Missions is clearly and interestingly delineated and the materials are furnished for a comprehensive view of the movements among the nations of the world-conquering kingdom.

Our author does not restrict himself to a bare narration of facts and tabulation of statistics : he aims to give us a history of the inner as well as the outward aspects of missionary enterprise ; he elucidates the growth of the missionary thought, spirit, and achievement of the Church. The book consists of three general parts. Part first deals with the development of the missionary idea and spirit from apostolic times to the present day. The second part investigates the different fields, sketches the progress of their occupation and development, and indicates concisely both their favorable and unfavorable characteristics in relation to gospel work.

In the third part we have a suggestive and interesting historical sketch of the objects, motives, and organization of missions, of the agencies on the field and the methods employed.

Two appendices, giving a table of the principal Missionary Societies and a bibliography of missions, complete the volume.

Dr. Bliss' special qualifications, as Editor of the valuable "Encyclopedia of Missions," for undertaking a history of missions are illustrated and confirmed by the eminent success with which he has executed the task.

The book is not merely readable, but attractive : the style is concise yet lucid and illuminated by a candid yet sympathetic spirit.

We cordially commend this little volume to all who are, or who ought to be, interested in the world-progress of the Redeemer's Kingdom as an admirable propædentic to the detailed study of modern missions.

Clarksville, Tenn.

J. E. FOGARTIE.

IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE FAMILY ALTAR. Helps and Suggestions for Family Worship. *Prepared by Annie E. Wilson.* 16mo., pp. 29. Cloth, 20 cents; paper, 15 cents. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1896.

The first part of this little treatise is a plea for the family altar. Then follow suggestions as to the methods of its conduct, as to the reading, singing, and prayers, with suggestions of Scripture readings for daily use, and for use on special occasions. Then fourteen specimen or "model" prayers are given, two for each day of the week. The work is well done, but will hardly displace other and fuller discussions or forms covering the same subject.

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE PARSONAGE. *By Belle V. Chisholm, Author of "Who Wins?" "Consecrated Anew," etc.* Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 346. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1897.

A wholesome, charming story, descriptive of the practical life of a minister's family, with just enough of romance wrought into it to make it thoroughly entertaining, and yet not enough to mar its sweetness and beauty, or to deprive it of lifelikeness.

BIBLE STUDY BY DOCTRINES. Twenty-Four Studies of Great Doctrines. *By Rev. Henry T. Sell, A. M., Author of "Supplemental Bible Studies," and "Bible Study by Books."* Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. 152. 50 cents.

It is quite the custom to denominate as "Studies" something which is not to be dignified by the title treatise. The term reminds one of the preacher who calls his plainer efforts "talks," when he feels that they are scarcely worthy of the name sermon or discourse. So these are "studies" in the book before us. They are sound and good, but there is nothing of special value in them. Completer works in Biblical Theology cover the ground more fully.

WHEN WERE OUR GOSPELS WRITTEN? *An Argument by Constantine Tischendorf.* With a Narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 16mo., pp. 95. Cloth, 40 cents.

This is a reprint of a little work most familiar to many, but always fresh and interesting and deserving to be made familiar to all readers. The account of the finding of the Sinaitic Manuscript, the most valuable of all the sources from which we ascertain the true text of the Word of God, will never cease to interest those who are desirous of knowing or telling others of the means of transmission of that Word.

THE MEMOIRS OF JESUS. *By Robert F. Horton, M. A.* Philadelphia : Henry Altemus. 1896. 16mo., pp. 36.

In this monograph on the Synoptic Gospels, the author first announces and almost ridicules the principle of inspiration, and then seeks to show that the narratives are more helpful and sweeter without the support of infallibility. It is a case of first cutting out the heart from the body and then showing how much better the body is without it. It is an attempt to adapt the new critical principles to popular thought and acceptance. In the place of the authority of inspiration, he maintains that the Lord is not taken away from these gospel narratives, or Memoirs, but is truly presented in authentic contemporary records ; that the truth of the picture which they present is guaranteed not by the writers, but by the picture itself ; and that, chiefly, the whole gist of the testimony given by these records, is that the subject of them is alive and among his people now, and that, therefore, all are brought to this issue, If he is alive and active and recognized among us now, how can it be said that his reality rests on the authority of any ancient writers?

SUNDAY-SCHOOL SUCCESS. A Book of Practical Methods for Sunday-school Teachers and Officers. *By Amos R. Wells, Author of "Business," "When Thou Hast Shut Thy Door," "Social Evenings," etc.* New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. 300. Cloth, \$1.25.

Out of a wealth of personal experience and success, the author, one of the most widely known and singularly successful Sunday-school workers of the world, gives here practical suggestions as to the methods to be used in reaching success in the work. His reliance, however, is not upon mere method or machinery, and hence the book is not a set of rules and regulations to be rigidly carried out or of methods to be applied. His suggestions lie largely along lines which necessitate personal effort and enthusiasm on the part of the officer and teacher. He knows that the "live" officer or teacher will enliven all his work, and hence the effort here is to develop that feature first of all. The book should be read by all who wish to make the best of themselves in this important department of work. There is not a teacher in the land who will not profit by its careful perusal.

IN HIS FOOTSTEPS : A Record of Travel to and in the Land of Christ ; with an Attempt to Mark the Lord's Journeyings in Chronological Order from His Birth to His Ascension. *By William E. McLennan.* New York : Eaton & Mains ; Cincinnati : Curts & Jennings. 1896. 8vo., pp. 111. .50, net.

This volume is intended to assist leaders of junior societies and others in teaching the Life of Christ to young people. Its plan is to follow Jesus from place to place, taking the Fourfold Gospel in harmony, and it is intended to guide the teacher in the use of blackboard, mounted pictures, and all sources of information, as he takes the pupil over these journeys in imagination. Ample instructions are given by the author in his preface and he tells us that

he has followed the method very successfully. The text while necessarily condensed contains many valuable hints and remarks. There are four full-page colored maps and a number of sketch maps, and there are numerous illustrations. The plan and this guide are to be commended to those who really wish and are willing to make some little effort and incur a small expense to interest the young in the earthly life and doings of their Saviour. There is a peculiar misprint in the first line of page 13, which leaves us in doubt as to whether the author wrote "treasury" or intended to coin "thesaurry." A grammatical error is found in the twenty-first line of page 73.

A CASTAWAY AND OTHER ADDRESSES. *By F. B. Meyer.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 16 mo., pp. 127. 30 cents net.

A neat little volume containing ten brief addresses, delivered at Carnegie Hall and elsewhere in the United States by this well-known representative of the Keswick teaching. The author tells us that what is taught in the addresses "will give a glimpse into those deeper aspects of Christianity, which are best adapted to nourish and quicken the inner life." Profitable reading! The teaching is clear and simple, the illustrations are apt. The addresses furnish a connected whole. There is little to take exception to. Possibly the theologian might object to his teaching that we cannot tell which comes first, faith or regeneration. But he is saying this to the ordinary man, as a preacher, not as a polemic theologian. Mr. Meyer says the Holy Spirit will not assist us if we undertake to preach on social reform, or on political crises, which we agree with; but he is a little inconsistent, on the next page, in commending preaching on the Arbitration Treaty. The typographical execution gives the impression of haste, but the print is clear, paper good, binding durable. Errors occur on p. 75, line 6, and p. 87, line 1.

SEVEN YEARS IN SIERRA LEONE. *The Story of the Work of William A. B. Johnson, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society from 1816 to 1823, in Regent's Town, Sierra Leone, Africa.* *By the Rev. A. T. Pierson, D. D.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo., pp. 252. \$1.00.

Given a thrilling subject, an able writer and a sympathetic reader, and by the literary Rule of Three you are sure to have an entertaining book. Such is the case here. Having read all of Dr. Pierson's previous books on missionary themes, we were ready to enjoy this latest. Dr. Pierson is undoubtedly a great writer in this field, able to awaken interest if it is dormant, and frequently to implant it when wanting. While he is palpably incapable of writing anything without introducing Slavery, or Abraham Lincoln, or Mrs. Stowe, or some other Abolition worthy, and so is destitute of the finer feelings, still he has a large following among the public people of his section in this respect, and the offense is somewhat palliated by his great power in presenting well whatever he writes about. In this volume he has re clothed and republished the story of W. A. B. Johnson's wonderful work in Sierra Leone, where he was the means, in comparatively a brief while, of working

such a transformation as only the Gospel and the Spirit applying it can produce among some of the most degraded of earth's population.

All who are interested in Missions, or wish a good subject for a missionary paper or address, will find themselves repaid in the perusal of this volume.

MISCELLANIES OF REV. THOMAS E. PECK, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. Complete in three volumes. Vol. III., Containing the Notes on the Acts of the Apostles, and Briefs and Sermons, Selected and Arranged by Rev. T. C. Johnson, D. D. With Biographical Sketch of Dr. Peck, by Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D. 8vo., pp. 421. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1897. Cloth, \$2.00.

This volume completes the Miscellanies of Dr. Peck, edited by the faithful and sympathetic hand of his friend and pupil, Dr. Johnson. The biographical sketch of Dr. Peck which it contains appeared first in the *Union Seminary Magazine*, in March-April, 1894, and is therefore already familiar to most of our readers. Of the *Notes on the Acts*, it will be said by all those who were under his tuition that they contain matter which will be most helpful and suggestive to the thoughtful student of that part of God's Word, and that it is a blessing to those who were not under him that this permanent and available form is given to notes and comments which were gems of richness in thought and suggestion. Of these notes, Dr. Peck himself says that they were not intended to cover the ground covered by commentators, but are thoughts suggested by his own meditations or derived from books which are not commentaries. Most of them are merely short sentences, in the most strictly "note" form, but their meaning and spirit are easily determined. The *Briefs and Sermons* in the volume are first those upon passages in the Acts, and then upon other parts of the Scriptures. A Scripture index to this volume, and a general index to all the volumes close the work.

OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND THE RIGHTS OF THE UNLEARNED; Being a Plea for the Rights and Powers of Non-Experts in the Study of Holy Scripture. By the Rev. John Kennedy, M. A., D. D., Honorary Professor, New College, London, Author of "The Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ," etc. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 16mo., pp. 96. Cloth, 40 cents.

The sub-title of this little work declares its purpose fully. In the first part of the book the plea is stated, argued and illustrated. In the second part, confirmation of it is drawn from reasons which are independent of expert scholarship, as that the new theory would displace the hitherto unchallenged testimony of prophets and apostles and of our Lord, that the new theory places Christ's testimony in an ambiguous light, that it is condemned by the moral implications and bearings of its processes, that it does not give an intelligent and sufficient substitute for that which it seeks to displace, that the old theory is strengthened by modern archæological discoveries, that the new theory does not avow faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and that

the same sort of criticism, applied to any ancient or even modern book, might be made to yield similar results. The argument is well made and is strong. The only fault of the book is its failure to discriminate between a proper higher criticism and that which is advanced and destructive. Thoughtful students of God's Word should not allow the enemies of the Bible to have the exclusive use and control of a term which is rightly used to express a proper department of study of that Word.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST : Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church. *By Rev. Andrew Murray.* New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 394.

This is a devotional study of thirty-one texts of Scripture, with seventeen notes of a theological character added as appendices. The author fails to recognize, or if he recognizes it fails to accentuate, the distinction between the spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit, the third person in the Godhead. The believer has his individual life, the spiritual force that is the cause of all his religious phenomena, and the Church has an organic and communal life, which is the force which brings all its experiences into being. You have the analogue in the natural life of the individual and the communal life of the race. The author identifies the indwelling life of the Church and the Christian with the Holy Spirit. He does not mean that the Spirit is the personal cause of the existence and perpetuity and development of Christian Life, but that the Life *is* the Spirit. He makes the two identical. "It is as an Indwelling Life that the Holy Spirit must be known." According to a sound Theism, God created the world and all the Life that is in it, and somehow he preserves and perpetuates all that lives, but the Creating Spirit must not be thought of as identical with the created life of the world ; that would be pantheistic. So God, by the Holy Spirit and through and on account of Christ, creates the new spiritual life of the believer, and sustains and governs it by the ceaseless actings of his power, but the Spirit always remains a distinct personal entity from the life which he originates : to identify the two is to cross over to a pantheistic premise. Mr. Murray's spirit is charming, and he has been deeply and genuinely regenerated, but we should hesitate, and so would he, to identify his spirit and the Holy Spirit. His Christian spirit is the product of the Holy Spirit, and it is sustained and cultured and nourished and made the sweet spirit that it is by the Holy Spirit, but his spiritual life is not the same entity as the Holy Spirit. Mr. Murray does not mean this, but he says so, and has made all his devotional and exegetical comments yield to this idea. The life of the world is not identical with the life of God ; neither is the life of the Christian identical with the Holy Spirit, nor is the Holy Spirit identical with the personal spirit of the glorified Theanthropos.

THE SPIRIT-FILLED LIFE. *By the Rev. John MacNeil, B. A., Evangelist.* Introduction by Rev. Andrew Murray. New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 126.

This little book is familiar to the religious public. It is an unctuous ex-

position of Eph. 5:18—"Be filled with the Spirit." The sentiment of the author is very sweet, almost maudlin. But he squeezes this little text so hard! He expresses an elaborate system of Christian experience from it, as though Paul wrote it for dogmatic purposes and not for hortatory reasons. The Spirit is treated as if he were the Atlantic Ocean, and the Christian heart were a quart cup. The author's own figure is that of a horse-trough and a service-pipe. A heart-full of Spirit and a trough-full of water are parallel ideas. To get a heart-full of Spirit three things are necessary: (1) cleansing, (2) consecration, (3) claiming. Clean out the trough, set it under the service-pipe, and demand its filling, and there it is, full to the brim with pure Holy Ghost. But the heart is not a trough, and the Spirit is not water. Both the Spirit and the Christian are persons. It is one person filled by another person, in Paul's mind. It is only a strong figure of speech. There is an interpretation which gets out of the figures of Scripture ideas which the Spirit never put into them. The Christian ought to be completely under the power and influence of the Holy Spirit; that is all the dogma there is in the text; there is nothing here as to the *mode* of sanctification. This treatise is altogether and viciously mechanical in its interpretation of the mode of sanctification.

THE SECRET OF GUIDANCE. A Companion Volume to "Light On Life's Duties." By *F. B. Meyer*. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 125.

Mr. Meyer is superlatively confident that he is divinely guided, whoever else may be wandering in the mazes of error and blunder. "Speaking for myself, after months of waiting and prayer, I have become absolutely sure of the Guidance of my Heavenly Father; and with the emphasis of personal experience, I would encourage each troubled and perplexed soul that may read these lines to wait patiently on the Lord, until He clearly indicates His will." But how does Mr. Meyer know that further waiting will not discover to him that the present assurance is a mistake? He exhorts others to imitate his example and camp with the Almighty until the Lord satisfies them with an infallible and inerrant Guide. In case Mr. Meyer reaches one conclusion and his disciple, imitating him, reaches a different and hostile conclusion, who is to judge between them? The Christian's Guide is a book, plainly written and easy to follow. It is a great blunder, to say the very least, to discredit revealed Guidance for secret Guidance, to discount the objective Rule of Faith for a subjective rule of life. The latter course leaves the traveller free to follow the inclinations of his own heart, and to make his theology and his conduct according to his own pattern, but surely it is not safe. The egotism and self-sufficiency and self-dependence of the school are obvious, though cloaked with all the forms of outward humility and piety. Christ's interpretations of religion and Paul's theology, are safer than Mr. Meyer's mysticism.

THE TWOFOLD LIFE, OR CHRIST'S WORK IN US AND CHRIST'S WORK FOR US. *By A. J. Gordon.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 289.

Dr. Gordon's aim is to emphasize, from Scripture and experience, the distinction between the Spirit's regeneration and the Spirit's anointing with power. Christian life is two-fold in its very nature, there are two distinct chapters in the volume of religious experience, both written by the Spirit. He calls them "stages"—"the first and second stages of spiritual experience." He has eleven pairs of terms for these two "stages," as follows: Life and Life Abundant; Regeneration and Renewal; Conversion and Consecration; Salvation and Sealing; Sonship and Communion; Righteousness and Holiness; Peace with God and Peace of God; Power of Sonship and Power of Service; Access and Separation; Grace and Reward; Ideal and Attainment. We feel that the author has been enamored of the brilliant antithetical method of statement. It always fascinates, but to be maintained the contrasts have often to be forced in the most mechanical and artificial way. Dr. Gordon defines regeneration as "not a change of nature, but the imparting of a new nature." Before regeneration man has one nature, "Adam nature;" after regeneration he has two natures, "Adam nature" and Christic nature. In the first "stage" the Spirit implants the Christic nature, and in the second "stage" he eliminates the Adam nature. The old tree is not made good, but a new tree is planted in the orchard of human life first, and afterwards, the old tree is cut down, leaving only the new tree. The reader will see the disagreement between Dr. Gordon and Christ. The journey of the children of Israel from Egypt to Caanan is an illustration of Christian life. There are as many and more "stages" in the soul's passage from sin to glory.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN. *By A. H. Ames, M. D., D. D.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1897. 16mo., pp. 280. Price 90 cents.

This is a very readable little book, written in pleasing style, and with sufficient imagination flashing out in the interpretation, to make it plausible on the surface. It follows the Ideal School of which Arnold of Rugby is the reputed father, as applied to the Apocalypse. It has some resemblance, in the general trend of it, to Prof. Milligan's book of the Expositor's Bible series, but is less vigorous and brilliant.

In the Preface, the author gives us good promise as to what he is going to do, by telling us that the subject of the Apocalypse is the Kingdom of Christ, of which John gives us thoughts "derived by him from the Old Testament Scriptures and from the teaching of Christ, as is drawn from direct revelation made to himself." With such an announcement we naturally look for a trail of the development of prophecy as an organic structure, and an exposition of the theory of the book of Revelation that makes it the flower of Old Testament and New Testament predictions as to the organic history of Redemption. But we are disappointed in our expectation. For he tells us, with strange inconsistency, in the next paragraph: "With these theories of interpretation which would make of the book an epitome of history,

either as confined to particular facts or as a whole, and which pre-supposes its design to be *the prediction of events*, great or small, in the progress of the world or the Church, the writer of this essay is not in sympathy." With this bow, we see the author parting company with præterists, continuists, and futurists. He sets sail on the sea of interpretation without a chart, to go as the breezes of Idealism may take him. Now and then he seems to pay a little court to the *objective lines* marked out by Old Testament prophets and Christ, but the effect is only to reveal the glaring incongruity of the author's work with his announced conception of the meaning of the Book. Idealizing he is intent on, and idealizing he does. Sad it is, that such vicious methods of dealing with the true word of prophecy should be called *spiritualizing*. One cannot see any reason for so dignifying a method of interpreting God's word. It is not according to the views of the *Spirit*, as revealed in the beginnings of prophecy, at any rate. Although the same volatilizing, evacuating process is pursued by this School in the handling of all the prophets, even of the Prophet himself. When one learns to read the Old Testament prophets in their *normal* sense, and thus to give Israel his place, then only can he read aright what Christ said on Mt. Olivet and what John wrote from Patmos. "*Salvation is of the Jews*"—in the Future,

THE INVESTMENT OF INFLUENCE: A Study of Social Sympathy and Service. *By Newell Dwight Hillis*. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell. 1898. 16mo. Vellum, gilt top. Pp. 299. \$1.25.

The author of this work is a young preacher who has recently removed to Chicago to take charge of an independent undenominational church. He was at once recognized as one of the foremost speakers in that great city, and his writings bid fair to give him eminent and permanent place in the esteem of the country at large.

This volume is the fourth that he has published, being a sequel to one immediately preceding it entitled *A Man's Value to Society: Studies in Self Culture and Character*—the one forming a discussion of the making of character; the other, of the use of character.

The volume before us is divided into fourteen chapters: I. Influence, and the Atmosphere Man Carries. II. Life's Great Hearts, and the Helpfulness of the Higher Manhood. III. The Investment of Talent and Its Return. IV. Vicarious Lives as Instruments of Social Progress. V. Genius, and the Debt of Strength. VI. The Time Element in Individual Character and Social Growth. VII. The Supremacy of Heart Over Brain. VIII. Renown Through Self-Renunciation. IX. The Gentleness of True Gianthood. X. The Thunder of Silent Fidelity: A Study of the Influence of Little Things. XI. Influence, and the Strategic Element in Opportunity. XII. Influence, and the Principle of Reaction in Life and Character. XIII. The Love that Perfects Life. XIV. Hope's Harvest, and the Far-Off Interest of Tears.

A survey of these titles will satisfy the reader that there is no originality of thought in the book; indeed, who could expect anything new on such a theme as Influence? At the same time, all will be impressed with a most savory freshness of expression in the wonderfully happy choice of titles.

This promise of the title page is faithfully kept by the book ; thoughts trite as the tritest are clothed in a beauty that gives them all the grace of novelty and holds the reader a willing captive to the last page.

The one fly in this precious ointment is the fact that the author's somewhat extravagant admiration for the anti-slavery heroes is too frequently in evidence for most readers of this QUARTERLY.

PRIMEVAL REVELATIONS. Studies in Genesis i.-viii. *By J. Cynddylan Jones, D. D.* New York : American Tract Society. 1897. Cr. 8vo., pp. xvi., 366. \$1.75.

This book embodies a series of lectures, on the Davies foundation, in the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church, covering the matter contained in the first eight chapters of Genesis. It is to be followed by two other parts, on *Patriarchal Revelation* and the *Sinaitic Revelation*. The first chapter is devoted to a study of the Pentateuch and Criticism, followed by chapters on the Creator and the Creation, Creation and Geology, Creation and Astronomy, Creation and Evolution, the Creation of Man, Man in Eden, Unity and Antiquity of Man, Man's Innocence and Probation, the Temptation and Fall, the Consequences of the Fall, the Protevangel : Dawn of Hope, Cain and Abel : Evil and Good, Antediluvians ; Development of Evil, the Deluge : Apparent Triumph of Evil. As will be seen from these topics, the lecturer deals with some of the scientific, critical and theological problems connected with the study of the first chapters of Genesis. He occupies the standpoint of intense conservatism as to all these problems, and maintains his position with earnestness and ability. He recognizes and acknowledges the need for scholarship and proper criticism in the study of the Word, but regards "a good, honest, believing heart" as far better, to enable one to appreciate its teachings. He repudiates all methods of ruling God out of his Word or reducing his work in creation to a minimum. He holds to the immediate creation of Adam from the dust of the earth, inorganic dust. In theology he is in full accord with the Calvinistic system as it regards sin, imputation and righteousness. As to the historico-evolutionary idea, he holds that there has been a retrogression or descent rather than "ascent" of man, from the primeval condition, knowledge, religion, ideas of God, service. Thus it will be seen that one has in this volume a thoroughly sound discussion. At the same time it is intelligent, scholarly, forcible. The book were well worth a wide circulation.

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS. *By George Holley Gilbert, Ph. D., D. D., Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in Chicago Theological Seminary.* Chicago : Press of Chicago Theological Seminary. 1896. 12mo., pp. 412. \$1.50.

The author states that the aim of this work is not to discuss the teachings of Jesus in detail, but only so far as seems necessary to a clear account of the character and life of Jesus ; and to adapt the volume to the wants of students in particular. He therefore does not either draw out the devotional and practical lessons which are so abundant, or weave together the facts into a

connected story, but studies the facts themselves, critically. The result is a work which is most valuable for the manner in which it brings up and deals with many of the problems of the Gospels. The author is decidedly on the side of the conservative criticism, though here and there appears some disposition to minify the supernatural aspects of some of the incidents. In the Introduction he discusses with some fulness the questions of the sources of the Gospels, their relations to each other, and their historicity. His conclusion is that the writers had to some extent written sources from which to draw their materials, that they are mutually independent, and that the historical value of the Gospels, especially of the Synoptists, is derived not only from the verification which they receive from day to day in the reliable spiritual phenomena which proceed from them, but from their actual records, especially in their unity. He accepts and strongly argues for the trustworthy character of the Fourth Gospel, after a somewhat full exposition of the divergent views. A specially valuable part of his Introduction is a section entitled "The Gospel Outside the Gospels." In this he gathers up all the specific references to Christ which are found in the Acts and Epistles, many of which are earlier in date than the earliest of the Synoptic Gospels, and which show that a tolerably complete life of Christ can be constructed from this source.

As to the author's position as to many of the mooted questions in the gospel story, we may judge in part from the following: he does not agree with Weiss and others, who hold that one of the genealogies is that of Mary rather than of Joseph. He regards the "star" which the Magi saw as probably some natural phenomenon. He regards Christ's words at twelve years of age as only a pious expression of a general nature falling from his lips, and not as indicative of a consciousness on his part of his messiahship and mission. He objects to the view that the dove and the voice from heaven, at Christ's baptism, were visible to eyes and audible to ears of flesh. He is uncertain whether the forty days of the temptation are to be understood literally or figuratively. As to the length of Christ's ministry, he holds with those who regard it as covering a little more than two years, basing his opinion, of course, upon that interpretation of the famous passage in John v. 1, which makes of the feast in Jerusalem which Christ attended on the occasion when he healed the man at the pool of Bethesda, not the Passover, but the Feast of Purim. His distribution makes the ministry of Christ in Judea longer than that in Galilee. He makes the return to Jerusalem about two weeks after the raising of Lazarus. The arrival at Bethany he places on the Jewish Sabbath, and the supper at the house of Simon the Leper the evening of the same day, and the public entry into Jerusalem on Sunday morning. Being uncertain whether Tuesday or Wednesday was the last day of activity in Jerusalem, he groups together all the events and teachings which are usually distributed between those two days. He discusses the chronological problem concerning the Last Supper, and concludes that it occurred on Thursday night, immediately after the Paschal feast. These positions are sufficient to show wherein the author agrees with or departs from those held by others.

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY—MARCH.

American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

- CLARK, D. D., Geo. W. Harmony of the Acts of the Apostles. 12mo. Pp. 408. \$1.25.
CLARK, D. D., Geo. W. Commentary on Romans and Corinthians. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 425. \$1.25.
MARSH, Rev. W. H. H. The New Testament Church. 8vo. Pp. 544. \$2.00.
STRONG, D. D., LL. D., A. H. The Great Poets and Their Theology. \$2.50.
VEDDER, Henry C. A History of Baptists in the Middle States. Pp. 349. \$1.25.

American Tract Society, New York.

- DICKSON, Ph. D., Rev. J. A. R. The Truth That Saves, and How to Present It. 12 mo. 50 cents.
NICOLL, M. A., Rev. R. M. The Incarnate Saviour. 12mo. Pp. 360. \$1.00.

D. Appleton & Co., New York.

- DUNCAN, Sara Jeannette. A Voyage of Consolation. 12mo. Pp. 325.
EVANS, E. P. Evolutional Ethics and Animal Psychology. Cloth. \$1.25.
HARRIS, W. T. Psychologic Foundations of Education. Pp. 400. \$1.50.
KELLY, M. A., F. G. S. Evolution and Effort. Pp. 293. \$1.25.
SIDIS, Ph. D., Boris. The Psychology of Suggestion. Pp. 386. \$1.75.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

- SMITH, D. D., LL. D., Geo. Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. (The Expositors Bible.) Vol. II. 12mo. Pp. 543. \$1.50.
STUCKENBERG, J. H. W. Introduction to the Study of Sociology. 8vo. Pp. 336. \$2.00.

Karl Baedeker, Leipsic.

- BAEDEKER, Karl. Egypt. Pp. 395.

Baker & Taylor Company, New York.

- BURR, D. D., LL. D., Rev. E. Fitch. Fabius the Roman: or How the Church Became Militant. 12 mo. Pp. 388. \$1.50.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York.

- BATTERSHALL, Walton W. Interpretations of Life and Religions. 12mo. Pp. 283.

Benziger Bros., New York.

- CORRIGAN, D. D., The Most Rev. M. A. The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. A Translation. Pp. 495. \$1.00.
MURRAY, Rev. Daniel. A Practical Guide to Indulgencies. Pp. 239. 75 cents.
SMETANA, Rev. Rudolph. Spiritual Exercises for a Ten Days' Retreat. Pp. 280. \$1.00.

Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.

- CHAPMAN, Rev. J. Wilbur. The Lost Crown. 10 cents.
 FINLAYSON, SPURGEON, MOODY, AITKEN, and MACLAREN.
 Faith. 16mo. Pp. 123. 10 cents.
 MACKAY, A. B. Naaman the Syrian. Pp. 128. 10 cents.

Bonnell, Silver & Co., New York.

- ROSSITER, D. D., Rev. S. B. Curlers' Sermons. 12mo. 50 cents.

Burrows Brothers Co., Cleveland.

- BANKS, D. D., Rev. L. Albert. Immortal Hymns and Their Story. Pp. 313.

Christian Literature Co., New York.

- JACOBS, Henry E. The Lutheran Commentary. Pp. 365.
 WELLS, Ph. D., Charles L. The Age of Charlemagne. 12mo.
 Pp. 472. \$2.00.

T. Y. Crowell & Co., New York.

- ABBOTT, D. D., Rev. Lyman. The Soul's Quest After God.
 12mo. Pp. 29. 35 cents.
 CUNNINGHAM, D. D., Rev. W. True Womanhood. 12mo. Pp.
 44. 35 cents.
 HERBERT, Rev. Charles. Wherefore, O God, or a Modern Es-
 dras. 12mo. Pp. 32. 35 cents.

Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, Nashville.

- YONAN, Rev. Isaac Malek. Persian Women. 12mo. Pp. 224.
 \$1.00.

Curts & Jennings, Cincinnati.

- WARNER, D. D., Sylvanus W. The Topical Psalter. 18mo.
 Pp. 187. 25 cents.

Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

- CHEYNE, T. K. Polychrome Bible. Part 10, Isaiah. Pp. xii.,
 215. \$2.50.
 MOORE, D. D., Rev. G. F. Polychrome Bible: Judges. Pp.
 xii., 97. \$1.25.
 WELLHAUSEN, J. Polychrome Bible. Part 14, Psalms. Pp. xii.,
 237. \$2.50.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

- BARING-GOULD, Rev. S. Perpetua. A Tale of Times in A. D.
 213. 12mo. Pp. 270. \$1.25.
 BELOW, Ida Comstock. Eugene Field in His Home. \$1.00.

Jas. H. Earle, Boston.

- HAMMOND, E. P. The Conversion of Children. 5 cents.

Eaton & Mains, New York.

- BREWER, A. T. How To Make the Sunday-school Go. Pp. 192.
 CLARKE, Felicia Buttz. Schwester Anna. A Tale of German
 Home Life. 12mo. Pp. 242. 90 cents.
 COWL, Rev. F. B. Digging Ditches and Other Sermons to Boys
 and Girls. 16 mo. Pp. 158.
 CROOKS, D. D., LL. D., Geo. R. The Story of the Christian
 Church. 8vo. Pp. 604. \$3.50.
 FOSTER, R. G. God: Nature and Attributes. \$3.00.
 KIRLEW, Marianne. The Story of John Wesley. Told to Boys
 and Girls. Pp. 168. 75 cents.
 SITTERLY, B. D., Ph. D., Rev. C. F. Praxis in Manuscripts of
 the Greek Testament. Pp. 61. \$1.00.
 THOMPSON, D. D. John Wesley as a Social Reformer. Pp. 111.
 50 cents.

WARNER, D. D., Salvanus B. The Topical Psalter. 16mo. Pp. 187. 25 cents.

Peter Eckler, New York.

RENAN, Ernest. Life of Jesus. 75 cents.

R. F. Fenno & Co., New York.

AUTHOR OF "QUO VADIS." Let Us Follow Him. 12m. \$1.00.
STEAD, W. T. Satan's Invisible World Displayed. Pp. 210. \$1.25.

Fords, Howard & Hulbert, New York.

ABBOTT, BRADFORD, BERRY, GORDON, GLADDEN, TUCKER.
The New Puritanism. Pp. 275. \$1.25.

Henry Froude, Oxford University Press, New York.

GIBBS, Mary and Ellen. The Bible References of John Ruskin.
\$1.25.

Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York.

BLISS, W. D. P. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform.

WEEKS, Robt. W. The New Dispensation. The New Testament Translated from the Greek. 8vo. Pp. 525. \$2.25.

H. L. Hastings, Boston.

INGLIS, James. Home, Marriage, and Family Relations in the Light of Scripture. 15 cents.

E. R. Herrick & Co., New York.

GRAY, Jas. C. The Biblical Museum. Vol. II. 8vo. Pp. 770.

PELOUBET, D. D., Rev. F. N. Suggestive Illustrations on the Books of the Bible. Matthew. 8vo. Pp. 450. \$1.25.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

EVERETT, Prof. C. C., TOY, Prof. C. H., CONE, Rev. Orello, GILMAN, Prof. N. P. The New World. Vol. VI. Pp. 800.

GLADDEN, D. D., Rev. Washington. Seven Puzzling Bible Books. 12mo. \$1.25.

GRIFFIS, W. E. The Pilgrims in Their Three Homes, England, Holland, America. \$1.25.

HIGGINSON, T. W. Cheerful Yesterdays. \$2.00.

SMITH, Nora Archibald. The Children of the Future. 16mo. Pp. 165. \$1.00.

George Hughes & Co., New York.

ROCHE, D. D., John A. The Life of Mrs. Sarah A. Lankford Palmer, Who for Sixty Years was the Able Teacher of Entire Holiness. \$1.50.

J. B. Lippincot & Co., Philadelphia.

PATRICK, L. L., David, GROOME, F. H. Chambers' Biographical Dictionary. Pp. 1002.

Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

EDERSHEIM, Ph. D., D. D., Alfred. Jesus the Messiah. \$1.00.

MOBERLT, D. D., R. C. Ministerial Priesthood. Pp. 360. \$4.00.

MORTIMER, Alfred G. Jesus and the Resurrection. Pp. 294. \$1.25.

WARD, Wilfrid. The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman. Vol. I., pp. 579; Vol. II., pp. 656. \$6.00.

————— Aids to the Devout Life. Reprinted from "The Outlook."

————— The Message of the World's Religions. Reprinted from "The Outlook."

- A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.*
 BARROWS, John Henry. A World Pilgrimage. Pp. 479.
 LLOYD, Ph. D., Alfred H. Dynamic Idealism. Pp. 247. \$1.00.
- The Macmillan Co., New York.*
 BENNETT, A. M., W. H., ADENEY, A. M., W. H. The Bible Story Retold for Young People. \$1.00.
 BRYANT, Sophie. The Teaching of Morality. Pp. 136.
 CHEETHAM, D. D., S. The Mysteries Pagan and Christian. Pp. 150. \$1.50.
 COOK, Albert S. Biblical Quotations in the Old English Prose Writers. Pp. 330.
 KRUGER, Dr. Gustav. History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries. Pp. 409. \$2.00.
 MACLAREN, D. D., Alexander. The Victor's Crown. Pp. 315. \$1.50. London: Christian Commonwealth Publishing Co.
 MOULTON, M. A., R. G. The Modern Reader's Bible. St. Matthew and St. Mark and the General Epistles. Pp. 298. 50 cents.
 SABATER, A. The Vitality of Christian Dogmas. Pp. 90. 80 cents.
 TURGOT, Anne Robert. Reflections on the Formation and the Distribution of Riches. Pp. 112. 75 cents.
- The Medical Missionary Record, New York.*
 DOWKONITT, M. D., Geo. W. "Tell Them;" or the Life Story of a Medical Missionary. 12mo. Pp. 256. 60 cents.
- The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.*
 CARUS, Dr. Paul. Chinese Philosophy. 25 cents.
Peri Hellados Publication Office, New York.
 ROSE, Dr. Achilles. Christian Greece and Living Greek. Pp. 330. \$1.50.
- James Potts & Company, New York.*
 SABATIER, Auguste. Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion Based on Psychology and History. \$2.00.
The Pilgrim Press, Boston.
 BOYNTON, D. D., Rev. Nehemiah. Real Preaching. 12mo. 75 cents.
Presbyterian Board of Publication, St. Louis.
 WILLIAMS, David Riddle. James H. Brookes. A Memoir.
Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond.
 BARNES, Anna Maria. The Outstretched Hand. 12mo. 50 cents.
 KERR, D. D., Rev. Robert P. The Dance, The Card Table, The Theatre, and The Wine Cup. 5 cents.
 LOUGHRIDGE, D. D., Rev. R. M. Sprinkling. The Mode of Baptism Taught and Practised by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. 10 cents.
 SPENCER, Rev. J. M. The Bible and Wage Earners. 5 cents.
 VANCE, D. D., Rev. J. I. Predestination. 10 cents.
 ————— Pioneer Presbyterianism in Tennessee. Pp. 83. 60 cents.
G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
 "A Clergyman." The Old Religion in Modern Words.
 GLADDEN, D. D., Rev. Washington. Social Facts and Forces. 12mo. Pp. 227. \$1.25.
 HUBBARD, Elbert. Alexander Hamilton. 12mo. Pp. 42.
 KAYNE, John Brayshaw. Vashti: A Poem in Seven Books. 16mo. Pp. 166.

- PETERS, Ph. D., SC. D., D. D., John Punnett. *Nippur: or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates.* 8vo. Pp. x., 420. \$2.50.
- PORTER, D. D., A. T. *Led On! Step by Step.* 8vo. Pp. 461.
A. D. F. Randolph Co., New York.
- MASON, Edward B. *The Ten Laws.* Pp. 196. 75 cents.
Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago.
- BEATON, David. *Selfhood and Service. The Relation of Christian Personality to Wealth and Social Redemption.* 12mo. Pp. 220.
- BISHOP, Isabella Bird. *Korea and Her Neighbors.* \$2.00.
- BLACK, Israel P. *Practical Primary Plans for Primary Teachers of the Sunday-school.* 16mo. Pp. 198. \$1.00.
- BLISS, D. D., Edwin Munsell. *A Concise History of Missions.* 75 cents.
- EXELL, M. A., Joseph S. *The Biblical Illustrator.* Pp. 219. \$2.00.
- FARRAR, Rev. Dean. *Sin and Its Conquerors.* 50 cents.
- GORDON, D. D., Rev. A. J. *Yet Speaking.* 12mo. Pp. 155. 50 cents.
- GULICK, M. A., Rev. Sidney L. *The Growth of the Kingdom of God.* 12mo. Pp. 320. \$1.50.
- HILLIS, Newell Dwight. *Foretokens of Immortality.* Pp. 100.
- MACKENSIE, W. Douglass. *Christianity and the Progress of Man.* Pp. 249. \$1.25.
- MARTIN, A. M., Rev. C. *Apostolic and Modern Missions.*
- MEYER, Rev. F. B. *Paul: A Servant of Jesus Christ.* Pp. 203. \$1.00.
- MILLER, Armand. *The Way of the Cross.* Pp. 227. \$1.00.
- MOSHER, Martha B. *Child Culture in the Home.* \$1.00.
- MORGAN, Rev. G. C. *Discipleship.* 50 cents.
- MURRAY, Rev. Andrew. *Money: Thoughts for God's Stewards.* Long 16mo. 25 cents.
- MURRAY, Rev. Andrew. *The Lord's Table.* Pp. 143. 50 cents.
- MURRAY, Rev. Andrew. *The Ministry of Intercession.* Pp. 225. 75 cents.
- McCLYMONT, Rev. J. A. *The New Testament and Its Writers.* 18mo. Pp. 155. 40 cents.
- OGILVIE, Rev. J. N., Zenos, D. D., Rev. A. C. *The Presbyterian Churches: Their Place and Power in Modern Christendom.* 40 cents.
- PARSONS, Ellen C. *A Life for Africa.* 12mo. Pp. 316. \$1.25.
- PLASS, Rev. Norman. *Buds that Bloom on Bonnier Banks.* 30 cents.
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- ADAMSON, B. D., Rev. Thomas. *Studies of the Mind in Christ.* Pp. 296. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- ARMAND, Imbert de Saint. *Napoleon III. and His Court.* 12mo. Pp. 407. \$1.50.
- FOREST, M. A., Rev. David W. *The Christ of History and of Experience.* Pp. 472. \$4.00.
- FRAZER, LL. B., R. W. *A Literary History of India.* Pp. 467. \$4.00.
- GORE, D. D., Charles. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.* Pp. 275. \$1.50.
- HUNTINGTON, W. R. *A National Church.* Pp. 109. \$1.00.
- JORDON, Elizabeth G. *Tales of the City Room.* 16mo. Pp. 232. \$1.00.

- LADD, G. T. Outlines of Descriptive Psychology. Pp. 423. \$1.50.
- MULLER, Prof. F. Max. Auld Lang Syne. 8vo. Pp. 325. \$2.00.
- MCGIFFERT, Ph. D., D. D., A. S. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. 8vo. Pp. xii., 681. \$2.50.
Scriptural Tract Repository, Boston.
- HASTINGS, H. L. The Corruptions of the New Testament. Pp. 94. 15 cents.
- REED, Elizabeth A. The Bible Triumphant. Twelve Dozen Scriptural Arguments Refuted. Pp. 160. 25 cents.
Frederick A. Stokes.
- HOBBS, John Oliver. Some Emotions and a Moral. Pp. 451.
- HOPE, Anthony. Simon Dale. 12mo. Pp. 367. \$1.50.
E. B. Treat & Co., New York.
- GREGG, D. D., Rev. David. Facts That Call for Faith. 12mo. Pp. 311. \$1.00.
- HANNA, D. D., William. The Wars of the Huguenots. 12mo. Pp. 344. \$1.50.
United Presbyterian Board of Publication, Pittsburgh.
- WATSON, D. D., Andrew. The African Mission in Egypt. Pp. 480. \$2.50.
Universalist Publishing House, Boston.
- EDDY, D. D., Richard. Universalist Register. 20 cents.
John D. Wattles & Co., Philadelphia.
- ARNOLD, A. M., C. E. Chart of Christ's Journeyings. 20 cents.
- HALL, W. H. Guide-Boards for Teachers in the Sunday-school. 8vo. Pp. 120. 75 cents.
Williams & Norgate, London.
- DREY, Sylvan. A Theory of Life Deduced from Evolution Philosophy. 1 shilling.
Thomas Whittaker, New York.
- CHAMPRE, A. St. John. Sermons on the Apostles' Creed. 75 cents.
- HUNTINGTON, W. R. A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer. 25 cents.
- MOULE, D. D., H. C. G. Prayers and Promises.
- ORR, D. D., James. The Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith. Pp. 275. 75 cents.
- WARRINER, Edward A. The Gate Called Beautiful. Pp. 355. \$1.50.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE SYNODS OF

South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Florida.

COLUMBIA, S. C.

SESSION OPENS WEDNESDAY AFTER THE THIRD MONDAY
IN SEPTEMBER.

SESSION CLOSES THE SECOND THURSDAY IN MAY.

FACULTY.

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.,

Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis.

DANIEL J. BRIMM, A. M.,

Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis.

WILLIAM T. HALL, D. D.,

Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology.

JAMES D. TADLOCK, D. D., LL. D.,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Church Polity and The Sacraments.

SAMUEL S. LAWS, M. D., D. D., LL. D.,

*Perkins Professor of Natural Science in connection with Revealed Religion,
and Christian Apologetics.*

Professor of Pastoral Theology, Homiletics and English Bible.

WILLIAM H. MILLS, A. M.; MELTON CLARK, A. B.,

Tutors.

Chairman of Faculty, WM. M. MCPHEETERS.

Clerk of Faculty, S. S. LAWS.

Librarian, D. J. BRIMM.

For Catalogue and all information apply to the Chairman.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 45.—JULY, 1898.

I. COMPLAINT* AGAINST THE ACTION OF THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN ADDRESSING AN OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION TO THE CIVIL COMMONWEALTH.

TO THE VENERABLE,

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
IN THE UNITED STATES :

We, the undersigned Ministers and Elders of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and members of the Synod of South Carolina, submitting to its authority, hereby present to your venerable body this our Complaint against the action of said Synod of South Carolina taken at its meeting at Darlington, S. C., on Monday, November 1st, 1897, in the matter of a petition to an official representative of the United States, touching certain civil affairs which concern the commonwealth.

*This Complaint as here given appears in an amended form. The nature of the subject, the time limit imposed by the Constitution, and the circumstances in which the writer found himself, combined to render it impossible for him to put the first draft of the Complaint in such form as was desirable.

The writer ought to add that he found it impossible to confer with the individuals who authorized him to sign their names to this paper as co-complainants, or even to submit to them for their formal approval the Complaint as drafted by himself. (Rev. W. T. Hall, D. D., is the single exception. To him the writer is indebted for valuable and valued advice and suggestions.) He has reason to believe, however, that on all material points he has faithfully represented the mind of his co-complainants.

W. M. MCP.

THE HISTORY OF THE ACTION.

The following statement will put your venerable body in possession of the facts material to a proper understanding of the occasion of the complaint now to be made.

During the session referred to, under the head of Communications, a paper from P. F. Stevens, Bishop Reformed Episcopal Church, was presented to the Synod, in which he submitted to Synod the following Petition, viz :

"To the Hon. James A. Gary, Postmaster General.

"HONORED SIR: The Sunday railway train, by its ready and wide extended inducement to travel, both for pleasure and business, is undoubtedly the most influential agency now undermining public reverence for the divinely appointed Sabbath.

"The transportation of the mail, except in the vicinity of large cities, is the chief cause and *support* of the Sunday train.

"The great facilities for daily intercommunication by rail, telegraph, and telephone, leave no excuse for the Sunday mail as a necessity, a fact sustained by the diminished mail service and almost universal closing of post-offices in England and Canada.

"State legislation cannot stop United States mail trains, therefore the responsibility for Sunday mail service, and largely for all Sunday travel, rests solely upon the Post-Office Department.

"If the United States Government, through *you* and your department, by the approval and direction of the President, would set the example of reverence for the Lord's day by stopping the transmission of mails and closing all post-offices on Sunday, it would evoke a Divine blessing upon itself and the whole country; would teach a sublime lesson to the world; would confer a great boon upon thousands of its own and other officials and employees, and would put such a stamp of condemnation upon all acts of public desecration of the Sabbath as would deter good citizens from their commission, and render all proper Sunday laws, State and municipal, easy of enforcement.

"We, the _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, therefore do earnestly but respectfully petition you, and through you His Excellency the President, to forbid

the transmission of any mails on Sunday, and order the closing of all post-offices throughout the United States on that day, or if not empowered so to do, to ask authority from Congress to order the same."

This Petition, Bishop Stevens requested Synod to adopt and forward through its proper officers to the Department at Washington.

Thereupon, a motion was made that this communication be referred to a select committee to frame a suitable response. For this motion to commit, the following substitute was offered, viz: "In response to a communication from P. F. Stevens, Bishop Reformed Episcopal Church, requesting this Synod, as a Synod, to petition the Postmaster General, Hon. Jas. A. Gary, to forbid the transportation of the mails and to order the closing of the post-offices upon the Sabbath, the Synod would reply: 1st. That it has heard said communication with much interest, and is in hearty sympathy with the ends sought to be attained by Bishop Stevens and his co-laborers. 2d. That it finds itself unable to comply with the request of the communication, not because it fails to recognize the fact that the transportation of the mails and the opening of the post-offices on the Sabbath is a flagrant violation of God's law, as disclosed in His Word, and as impressed upon the constitution of nature: nor because it is in any doubt as to the injurious tendencies and effects of such violation of God's law upon our material, moral, and political interests as a people—but simply because it is our settled conviction that 'Synods and Councils,' as such, 'should handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical;' and should 'not intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth.'" This substitute was subsequently so modified as to be merely a motion to table the motion to commit. The motion to table was put, and lost. The communication of Bishop Stevens was then referred to a special committee, consisting of Revs. W. T. Matthews and Jas. McDowell and Elder F. F. Whilden. This committee subsequently presented a majority and a minority

report. The former was signed by Revs. W. T. Matthews and Jas. McDowell. We had expected to submit it, but find ourselves unable to procure a copy of it. The minority report, signed by Elder F. F. Whilden, was as follows, viz: "We recommend that the petition be adopted by this Synod and forwarded to the proper parties." On motion, the minority report was adopted, and the Synod, as a Synod, committed itself to signing the petition above recited, and through its proper officers did sign it in the following form, viz: "We, the Synod of South Carolina, representing some 20,000 communicants of the Presbyterian Church, therefore do respectfully petition you," &c.

Against this action of the Synod of South Carolina we, the undersigned gave notice of complaint, and do now reluctantly complain, to your venerable body.

ATTITUDE OF COMPLAINANTS.

Your complainants trust that they need not assure the General Assembly that, in bringing this complaint, they are not in any way impugning the character or motives of their brethren, the majority of the Synod of South Carolina. On the contrary, your complainants are confident that, however ill-advised and unconstitutional the action of which they complain may be, it was taken by the Synod under the full persuasion that it was in the interest of God's law and truth, and under the farther conviction that it was sanctioned by the Constitution. From this their judgment we dissent. We cannot but regard the action taken as unwise, unconstitutional and unscriptural; and we believe that *in its effects* it will prove to be against the purity and peace of the Church. The question brought before the Assembly by this complaint, therefore, is one of judgment, and not of motive. And, if the Assembly sustains this complaint, the effect of its decision will not be to reflect in any way upon the Synod, but simply to reverse an error of judgment, to which class of errors all, even the purest and wisest, are liable.

And that the position and motives of your complainants may not be misapprehended either by any member of this venerable court, or by any others, it is proper for us to assure the General Assembly:

1st. That we as truly as those who voted for the action taken by Synod recognize that the transportation of the mails and the opening of the post-offices upon the Sabbath day are acts which are not only themselves flagrant violations of God's holy law, but acts which furnish an occasion and a pretext for numerous other equally flagrant and more odious violations of this and other laws of God and of the commonwealth.

2d. That we are not less concerned for the sanctity of God's holy Sabbath than are those who voted for this action of Synod. It was in order to establish this and the preceding statement that we have been so careful above fully to give the history of the case and to embody in this complaint the papers prepared and offered by ourselves. These papers speak for themselves. They express our honest sense of the peril, and our honest abhorrence of the enormity of all such violations of God's Sabbath law as are referred to in Bishop Stevens' communication.

3d. That we are prepared to join heartily with our brethren, the majority of the Synod, and others in the use of what we believe to be wiser, more scriptural, and more efficient means for securing a more general and better observance of the Sabbath.

ANALYSIS OF SYNOD'S ACTION.

And now, that your venerable body may have clearly before it the precise nature of the issue between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of the Synod, we ask your careful attention to the following features of the paper that is the occasion of this complaint, viz :

1st. *It is an OFFICIAL communication presented by the official representatives of Christ's spiritual Kingdom to an official representative of the United States Government.*

It is addressed to the "Postmaster General." It is addressed

to him in his official character. It solicits his official action. It says: "We, the Synod of South Carolina, representing some 20,000 communicants of the Presbyterian Church, therefore, do earnestly but respectfully petition you, and through you His Excellency the President, to forbid the transmission of any mails on Sunday, and order the closing of all post-offices throughout the United States on that day, or if not empowered so to do, to ask authority from Congress to order the same."

This communication was formally adopted by Synod sitting as a court of Christ's Kingdom. It reads on its face: "We, *the Synod of South Carolina, &c.*" It was signed for Synod by the Stated Clerk and Moderator and was forwarded by the Stated Clerk to the Department at Washington.

It could not, therefore, have been more truly an official communication, had it been prepared by the Vatican, and presented by its accredited agent to our government.

2d. *It deals with what is distinctly and exclusively a CIVIL INSTITUTION, viz: "the Sabbath of the State."* It is true that it uses once the expression, "the Lord's day," but with evident impropriety, inasmuch as the State knows, and can know, no "Lord's day," but only God's Sabbath. For the proof that "the Sabbath of the State" is a civil institution, we must refer to an article by the venerable and lamented Dr. R. L. Dabney, which appeared in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, January, 1880.

3d. This communication not only proceeds from the official representatives of Christ's spiritual Kingdom, it is not only addressed to the official representatives of a kingdom of this world, *but it is in the form of a PETITION—a petition to cease from an open and flagrant violation of God's law*, and this notwithstanding the fact that Christ sustains no mediatorial but only *rectoral* relations to human governments. The language of the paper is: "We, the Synod of South Carolina, * * * therefore, do earnestly but *respectfully petition, &c.*"

4th. In order to secure the end aimed at in this communication, which is a better observance of the Sabbath, *Synod seeks*

to call into play the machinery of the civil law, with its inevitable accompaniments of CIVIL PAINS and PENALTIES. The language of the paper is: "We, the Synod of South Carolina, representing some 20,000 communicants of the Presbyterian Church, therefore do earnestly but respectfully petition you, and through you His Excellency the President, to forbid the transmission of any mails on Sunday, and order the closing of all post-offices throughout the United States on that day, or, if not empowered so to do, to ask authority from Congress to order the same."

5th. *The paper further invokes the aid of the GOVERNMENT'S EXAMPLE in order to the restoration of "public reverence for the divinely appointed Sabbath."* It says: "If the United States Government, through you and your department, by the approval and direction of the President, would set the example of reverence for the Lord's day," &c., such and such happy results would follow.

6th. *The paper attaches a weight and an influence to the example of the government, could it be induced to desist from Sabbath desecration, that, to say the least, are quite extraordinary.* It says: "If the United States Government * * * would set the example of reverence for the Lord's day by stopping the transmission of mails and closing all post-offices on Sunday, it * * * would put such a stamp of condemnation upon all acts of public desecration of the Sabbath as would deter good citizens from their commission, and render all proper Sunday laws, State and municipal, easy of enforcement." In other words, this paper avers that the United States by stopping the mails and closing the post offices on the Sabbath can secure such an observance of the Sabbath as has not been secured by the promulgation of God's law, and the example of Christ's Church.

7th. *Lastly, this communication confirms and enforces the position taken in it, not by an appeal to the law and authority of God, but by a reference to the numerical strength of the Synod's human constituency.* It reads: "We, the Synod of

South Carolina, *representing some 20,000 communicants* of the Presbyterian Church, therefore do earnestly but respectfully petition," &c.

We trust that this statement as to the precise nature and specific contents of the paper which is the occasion of this complaint will of itself be sufficient to convince your venerable body that the action of which we complain is of sufficient gravity to justify your complainants in calling it to your attention, and respectfully requesting your patient and serious consideration of the grounds upon which we find ourselves constrained to dissent from it and disapprove of it as at once unscriptural, unconstitutional, and unwise. That the issues which the adoption of this paper has raised between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of the Synod of South Carolina—issues upon which this court is desired to pass, and upon which, it seems to us, it must pass in disposing of this complaint—that these issues may be distinctly before you, permit us to state the same as briefly and as precisely as possible.

I. PRIMARY ISSUES INVOLVED.

The primary issues raised by Synod's action are these :

1. *Has Christ authorized those whom he has appointed to be his representatives in his spiritual Kingdom to have any OFFICIAL intercourse, negotiations or relations whatsoever with the representatives of any human government in their official character?* That he has, seems to be assumed by our brethren, the majority of the Synod, in the action they have taken. We, on the contrary, hold, with no less an authority than Dr. Stuart Robinson, "that the State cannot rightfully know the officers of the Church as such, nor can the Church, as a government, recognize the officers of the State, as such." Synod in taking this action did, as we have shown, institute official intercourse between themselves, as representatives of Christ's spiritual Kingdom, and the representatives of the United States government. And of this we complain, because in so doing Synod

not only acted without warrant of Scripture, but, as we believe, went in the face both of the teachings and precedents of God's Word, and more specifically of Luke xii., 13, 14; Jno. xvii., 33-38; I. Co. v., 12, 13; Ac. xii., 1-5.

2. Again, the action of Synod raises this question: *Has Christ authorized his representatives to "RESPECTFULLY PETITION" transgressors to desist from transgressing his law?* This the Synod, as we have shown, has done. We are aware that God does, in the plenitude of his grace, condescend to beseech sinners, toward whom Christ sustains mediatorial relations,—not to desist from flagrant sin—but, which is another and a very different thing, to be reconciled to himself. But, so far as your complainants know, God has nowhere in his Word authorized his Church to "respectfully petition" human governments, towards whom his relations are *rectoral* and *not mediatorial*, to be reconciled to him, and still less has he authorized her to "respectfully petition" them merely to desist from flagrant sin. We are aware that the Church is "a government of moral power only," and that the symbol of her power is not the sword, but the keys. But for this very reason we are grieved and aggrieved that she should be placed in the position of respectfully petitioning a flagrant transgressor of God's law to desist from his sin; albeit, should he treat with indifference her respectful petition—as he may do, as he has done, and as we believe he will do—she would find herself impotent to uphold the majesty of the outraged law, because the transgressor is one against whom the power of the keys does not avail, seeing that the Church can neither open to him nor close against him the doors of the kingdom of heaven. We complain of this action, therefore, because, in taking it, Synod places herself and her Lord, though, as we believe, unwittingly, in a false and compromising position.

3. Further, the action of Synod raises the question: *Has Christ authorized his Church, under the guise of a respectful petition, in reality to call human governments to her aid in securing reverence for and obedience to his law?* That he

has, the Synod by this action seems to affirm. For this, as we have shown above, is what Synod does in this petition. She—indirectly, it may be, but none the less really—invokes the aid of the United States Government in the effort to restore “public reverence for the divinely appointed Sabbath.” She asks for this aid both in the form of example, and also of civil enactments, which, of course, carry with them, in case they are violated, civil pains and penalties. We, on the contrary, hold, here also with Dr. Stuart Robinson, that “* * * as * * * the Church may not employ any other forms of agency than those divinely appointed for her spiritual ends, so, conversely, Divine forms of agency may not be used for any other than these spiritual purposes.” We complain of this action of Synod, therefore, because, in taking it, Synod sought to employ, for the attainment of her end, other forms of agency than those divinely appointed, viz: governmental example and legislative enactments—and this not only without warrant of Scripture, but in the face of its teachings and precedents.

4. Another issue which is raised by the action of Synod is this: *Has Christ authorized his representatives to enforce their appeals for obedience to his law by referring to the numerical strength of their human constituency?* This is what the Synod did. It said: “We, the Synod of South Carolina, *representing some 20,000 communicants of the Presbyterian Church*, therefore, do earnestly but respectfully petition you,” &c. And of this we complain, both because the Synod *was not sitting* as a convention assembled to declare the mind of her constituency upon the proper observance of the Sabbath as a civil institution, and because Synod *was sitting* as a court of Christ’s Kingdom, in order that he, to use the sublime language of our Book, through her ministry, might “mediate exercise his own authority and enforce his own laws.” We complain of this action, therefore, as taken, though, as we believe, unwittingly, against the rights of Synod’s constituency, who had not authorized her to speak for them upon this

question, and also against the dignity and authority of Christ, in whose name Synod was bound to speak—that is, if she spoke at all—as a court of his Kingdom.

These, then, are the fundamental questions at issue between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of the Synod. Because of the position in reference to them involved in Synod's action, we complain of said action as without warrant of Scripture, and contrary to its teachings, and also as tending, howsoever little by Synod intended, to compromise the dignity of Synod as a court of Christ's Kingdom, the rights of Synod's constituency, and the honor and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. For these questions we bespeak the careful and prayerful consideration of this venerable court, because, in issuing this complaint, it must and will pass upon them directly or indirectly.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES.

Here we might rest our complaint. We have reason to believe, however, that Synod's action will be defended upon the grounds that it is warranted and authorized by the provision of her Constitution which says: "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, *unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate.*" (Confession of Faith, ch. xxxi. sec. iv.) This contention was made on the floor of Synod, and it raises the following issues between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of the Synod of South Carolina, viz:

1. *Does the matter of Sabbath violation by the State fall under the "cases extraordinary" herein signalized?*

That it does, the Synod, as it seems to us, has, by its action, affirmed. But Synod did not accompany its action with any statement to show that the case with which it was dealing was such a one as is contemplated in this provision, or was in

any true sense an extraordinary case. Your complainants respectfully submit that it devolves upon Synod to show to the satisfaction of this venerable court that the case to which its petition related was a case extraordinary within the meaning of this provision of the Constitution, and that, failing to do so, she must be adjudged to have exceeded her constitutional prerogatives in the action which she took. And we beg to remind your venerable body that when this provision was introduced into our Confession of Faith, such was the unhappy condition of affairs, such the erroneous ideas prevailing both in the Church and in the State as to their mutual relations, such the confusion that obtained as to the rightful jurisdiction of the State over the Church, that the officers of Christ's Kingdom were liable at any time to find themselves hampered by the civil government in the exercise of what we would esteem, and properly, their most inalienable rights, and in the discharge of their most essential functions. The fact is, that the ordinary status of the Church at the time the Confession was formulated was, from our standpoint, more extraordinary than the most extraordinary situation than can well be conceived as likely to arise under our free institutions, especially in view of the now generally recognized doctrine of the independence of the Church from the State.

Interpreting the words of the Confession, therefore, in the light of their historical genesis, we complain of the action of Synod as in disregard of the Constitution of the Church—in that the case covered by it was, so far as we can see, in no sense extraordinary, and was certainly not a case extraordinary within the meaning of this provision of the Constitution.

2. But, further, the appeal to this provision raises the question: *Is the teaching of so much of sec. iv., ch. xxxi., of the Confession of Faith, as limits the general doctrine of that section, in harmony, or capable of being brought into harmony, with the teachings of Scripture, or with those of other parts of the Confession itself and of our Form of Government?*

In order to make it the basis of action, Synod, as it seems

to us, must maintain that these last two clauses of Confession of Faith, c. xxxi., sec. iv., for they stand or fall together, are in harmony both with Scripture and the general tenor of the Constitution of our Church, or, at the very least, Synod must hold that there is no manifest, irreconcilable conflict between the teachings of these two clauses, and those of the Scriptures and of our Constitution—no such conflict, that the teachings of the former are either nullified by, or must nullify the plain teachings of the latter. We, on the contrary, maintain, and are prepared to show, that the teaching of the last two clauses of the section in question is not only not in accord with the teaching either of Scripture, or of our Constitution, but that it is in such radical opposition both to the one and to the other, as either to nullify them, or to be nullified by them. The correctness of this our position will appear from the following facts and considerations :

(1) The framers of the Confession were at no loss for Scripture proofs that "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical ; and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth." It is noticeable, however, that they found no single text of Scripture that would lend support or countenance to the teaching of these two clauses. It is farther noticeable that the passages cited in support of the doctrine of the first two clauses of this section do, when properly understood, amount to a practical denial of the teaching of the last two clauses.

(2) When the language of these last two clauses is studied in the light of their historical genesis, it is too plain for denial that they were, in the first instance,

(a) Designed to meet the exigencies of a time when the Church was, as a matter of fact, in bondage to an Erastian State.

(b) That they were introduced into the Confession by those who held that it belongs to civil rulers, *as part of their administration of those "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth,"* "to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blas-

phemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship or discipline be prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof," they go on to declare, the civil magistrate "hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God." [Conf. Faith, c. xxiii., as formulated by the Westminster Assembly and adopted by the Scotch Kirk, in 1647.]

(c) That they were based upon, grew out of, and were designed to meet a view of the relations of the State to the Church which we have discarded as unscriptural, and inimical to the highest interests of each.

(3) And farther, we do not hesitate to aver that the language of these two clauses cannot be harmonized with such statements of our Constitution as the following, viz :

(a) "Unto this catholic visible Church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God *for the gathering and perfecting of the saints.*" [Conf. Faith, c. xxv., sec. iii.]

(b) "The *sole* functions of the Church, as a kingdom and government distinct from the civil commonwealth, *are to proclaim, to administer, and to enforce the law of Christ revealed in the Scriptures.*" [Form Gov., c. ii., sec. iii.]

(c) "The Church, with its ordinances, officers, and courts, is the agency which Christ has ordained *for the edification and government of his people, for the propagation of the faith, and for the evangelization of the world.*" [Form Gov., c. iii., sec. iv.]

This language, fairly interpreted, precludes, as it seems to us, the idea that the Church has any mission to civil governments, as such. The language here used to define her mission is not only irrelevant, but positively meaningless, if applied to civil governments, which, as such, are incapable of being gathered and perfected among the saints, incapable of having a place among Christ's people, incapable of obedience to the faith, incapable of being evangelized, and are not amenable to the

law of Christ revealed in Scripture, but to the law of God revealed in the light of nature. So that, according to these plain declarations of our Constitution, Christ has nowhere enjoined it upon his Church, either as an end in itself, or as a means for the accomplishment of those ends for which she exists, that she should seek either to instruct, or reform civil governments.

We complain of Synod's action, therefore, because it is contrary both to the letter and the spirit of our Constitution, deriving its only seeming support from two clauses of a single section of the Confession of Faith—which clauses are a manifest anachronism, and an excrescence upon our scriptural doctrine of the Church, and remain—by inadvertence, as we would fain believe—only as a painful reminder of views and conditions which formerly obtained, but which, happily, have long since passed away.

3. But, assuming that Synod found its supposed justification for its action in these clauses of the Confession [c. xxxi., sec. iv., clauses b, c], there emerges a yet more radical issue between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of the Synod, viz :

Can any constitution framed by men for a particular branch of Christ's Church confer upon that branch of the Church a power which Christ has not conferred in his Word?

It is a well established principle of Christian ethics that no civil government can, by constitutional provision or by statutory enactment, grant the right to its citizens to do that which God has made it unlawful for men to do. We fail to see, therefore, how any constitutional provision, even supposing one to exist, can be pleaded by Synod in justification of the assumption and exercise of a power not granted by Christ to his Church. And here

(1) Let it be noted that the framers of our Confession have produced clear and unequivocal passages of Scripture to prove that "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical; and are not to intermeddle

with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth;" and that to the Scriptures cited by the framers of the Confession, yet others no less significant might be added.

(2) Let it be noted, as mentioned above, that whatever cases they may have had in mind in the clause, "unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary," the framers of the Confession have not produced a single passage of Scripture either to illustrate its meaning or to justify its claim.

(3) Let it be noted that there is, as we believe, no single instance in the New Testament to indicate that either Christ or the Apostles either had themselves, or empowered the Church to have any official relations or intercourse whatever with the State, as a State, by way of humble petition or otherwise.

(4) Let it be noted that the absence of passages suited to sustain the doctrine of these clauses is the more striking and significant in view of the complications which beset the relations of Church and State in the Apostles' days, and in view of the further fact that the special sin aimed at in Synod's petition, not to speak of numberless others, was equally rampant, possibly more rampant, then than it is even to-day.

We say, let these facts be noted and borne in mind, and the absence from the New Testament of any precedent of any kind that will justify or even suggest an appeal to the State upon the part of the Church, as a Church, by way of petition or otherwise, amounts to a practical demonstration that, in the judgment of the Apostles, no case could be sufficiently extraordinary to demand or justify such an appeal. But we are not left to argue only from the silence of Scripture. Paul says: "For what have I to do to judge them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? Whereas God judgeth them that are without." His language certainly suggests that there are offenders against God's law with whom it does not fall within the province of the Church to deal.

Whatever be the meaning of this clause, therefore, and whether Synod's action was based upon this clause of the

Constitution or upon some other, we complain of said action because, in taking it, Synod did, as we believe unwittingly, assume powers which no clause or clauses of the Constitution do, or could render it legitimate for her to exercise, for the simple reason that they are powers which Christ in his Word has not granted to his Church.

Because of the position upon each and all of these several questions involved in Synod's action, we complain of said action as taken, unwittingly, in disregard of its legitimate constitutional power, and we respectfully ask for them the grave consideration of this venerable court, because, in issuing this complaint, it must, as it seems to us, pass upon them either directly or indirectly.

III. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.

Should it be held that Synod's action did not relate to "civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," but to a question of public morals, which had direct and immediate spiritual and religious bearings, then the following issues emerge between your complainants and their brethren, the majority of Synod :

1. *Does it fall within the legitimate province of the Church to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, whenever these civil affairs have bearings more or less direct upon matters of morals and religion ?*

2. *Is the Sabbath of the State, notwithstanding its relations to and bearings upon the Sabbath of the Church, nevertheless a distinctly and exclusively civil institution ? Or is it an institution of a mixed nature, partly civil and partly religious ?*

Your complainants are aware that upon the first of these questions so eminent and distinguished a theologian as Dr. Chas. Hodge has asserted that it is the duty of the Church "not only to announce the truth, but to apply it to particular cases and persons. * * * If the State pass any laws contrary to the law of God, then it is the duty of the Church, to whom God has committed the great work of asserting and maintain-

ing his truth and will, to protest and remonstrate." But they are also aware of the fearful havoc which this doctrine, when faithfully applied, has always made in the most precious interests of the Church. Witness the war deliverances of our sister Church and their disastrous, God-dishonoring effects within and beyond her jurisdiction—which deliverances, be it said with regret, Dr. Hodge felt himself, *on principle*, obliged to defend.

Your complainants are aware that many precedents may be cited, *outside of Scripture*, to sustain the view advanced by Dr. Hodge, but they also aware that precedents only avail to establish the prevalence of a practice, not its intrinsic propriety, or lawfulness.

In reference to the second of the issues stated above, your complainants hold with Dr. R. L. Dabney, in his discussion already referred to, that the Sabbath of the State is strictly and exclusively a civil institution. They hold, with Dr. Stuart Robinson, that "*Religious* is a term not predicable of acts of the State;" and just as little is it predicable of civil institutions, as such. They ask attention to the fact that the Sabbath of the State differs from that of the Church both in its significance and in its aims: the former was provided for man the creature, the latter for man the redeemed sinner; the former commemorates God's ceasing from the work of creation, the latter the resurrection of Christ from the dead; the former was instituted to meet the needs of man's physical, intellectual and moral, the latter to meet those of his spiritual nature.

If, therefore, the action of Synod was based upon either of these assumptions, and whether based upon either of them or not, we complain of said action as in its nature tending, howsoever little by Synod intended, to produce effects prejudicial alike to the purity and peace of the Church and to the advancement of the interests specifically committed to her care.

(1.) Because its natural tendency and probable effect will be to make void the testimony of our Church in reference to the great doctrine of the spirituality of the Church: to becloud

the minds of our people upon this doctrine, and to render nugatory what we have said of it, and suffered for it in the past.

(2.) Because it initiates a policy which has only to be pursued to its logical issue to divert the thought and energies of the Church from her true mission and to disqualify her to bring to human governments and societies many blessings that would flow incidentally, but inevitably, from a vigorous prosecution upon her part of her proper work. If she enters the field of moral reform, or undertakes to become the mentor of the State in matters affecting the truth and law of God, she may, indeed, become an important sociological and political factor in the nation's life, but she will find herself hopelessly handicapped for her real work.

(3.) Because its natural effect will be to weaken the hands of God's people and to encourage their enemies. If the test of the Church's fidelity, if the test of the power of the Gospel be her success, and its ability to overthrow sin in high places, to bring governments as well as individuals into the obedience of Christ, then clearly both the Church and the Gospel have been dismal failures. For there is no government on earth to-day that can be called Christian, except by courtesy. And the Church cannot more surely discourage her own children and gladden her enemies than by making herself responsible for what God has not made her responsible, viz: the morals of the civil commonwealth, and its attitude towards the truth and law of God.

(4.) Because it is, especially at this time, fraught with peculiar perils. The tendency of the Church to-day is to forget her mission and to transcend her commission: to substitute sociology for theology: to ignore *sin* in her seemingly energetic attack upon particular *sins*: to neglect evils within her pale, and busy herself with evils that are without it. The effect of Synod's action will be to encourage these baleful tendencies. And, further, if Synod may petition the civil government, so may other religious bodies. Each body, moreover, must be its own judge as to the proper subjects upon which

to petition. What is to prevent the presence in the halls of our State Legislatures, and in those of Congress, of rival ecclesiastical lobbyists? Suppose we admit the principle, will our protest against what we may be pleased to esteem an abuse of it go for much? *Obsta principiis.*

(5.) Finally, because the action of Synod tends to put the whole matter of Sabbath observance and Sabbath desecration in an essentially false light before the minds and consciences of our own people, and of men generally. This is its tendency, and this we believe will be its effect: because it diverts men's minds from their own personal, individual responsibility in patronizing Sabbath trains and post-offices; it encourages them to plead temptation as an excuse for yielding to sin, and to shift off upon the State their personal responsibility for their personal violations of God's Sabbath; and, further, because it finds the explanation for the widespread desecration of God's holy day in the laws of the State, rather than in the greed and ungodliness of the individual heart, which first expresses itself in improper civil legislation, and then avails itself of this improper legislation as plea, excuse or extenuation for renewed manifestations of this same greed and ungodliness. Your complainants believe that the Christian citizens of this country have the remedy for Sabbath mails and Sabbath post-offices in their own hands: and they believe, further, that whenever the Christian people of our land become convinced of the grievous guilt and sin of their own personal complicity in the desecration of God's day, they can and will apply, as citizens, this remedy so as effectually to abate the evil of Sabbath mails and post-offices. Finally, your complainants believe that the true, Scriptural, and effectual way for the Church to hasten this good time is, not by sending impotent petitions to be placed in the waste-baskets of indifferent officials, but so to reprove, rebuke, and exhort all those who wait upon her ministrations as to set clearly before their minds, and bring home to their individual consciences, their personal relations to and com-

plicity in the desecration of God's Sabbath, and to do this "with all long-suffering and teaching."

Upon all and each of the above-mentioned grounds, therefore, we, the undersigned, complain of this action of Synod as without warrant of Scripture and contrary to its plain teachings, as against both the letter and spirit of our Constitution, and as in its tendencies prejudicial to the purity and peace of the Church and to the precious interests entrusted to her care; and we pray this venerable court to take such measures as God may give it wisdom to devise to correct the evils likely to arise from this unfortunate action of the Synod of South Carolina, and to prevent it from becoming a precedent.

[Signatures.]

Ministers :

W. M. MCPHEETERS,
 W. T. MATTHEWS,
 JAS. MCDOWELL,
 A. H. MCARN,
 S. H. HAY,
 J. R. MILLARD,
 J. G. RICHARDS,
 C. M. RICHARDS,
 W. T. HALL.

Elder :

G. G. PALMER.

II. THE NEW SCIENTIFIC RELIGION.

A "higher and more practical Christianity stands at the door of this age and knocks for admission."¹ "Above Arc-turus and his sons, broader than the universe and higher than the heavens of your astronomy, stands the Science of mental healing."² In words like these, Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy challenges the attention of the Christian world to the "sacred discovery" which she claims to have made. Nor is her challenge unheeded. Already the sect of which she has become the head and oracle has a considerable following. The "Mother Church" of which she was the founder and first pastor, otherwise called the "First Church of Christ, Scientist," in Boston, is pronounced by Dr. Edward Everett Hale to be one of the most flourishing churches in the city. It now numbers 6,000 members, and its spacious edifice is crowded at every service. In the *Independent* of January 7, 1896, the membership of the sect in the United States was reported to be 25,000, and a recent writer estimates the total number of adherents in the world at 300,000! It was claimed by the official report of 1896 that near 20,000 converts had been made in the United States alone within five years. The active ministry of the body, classed as "official church readers, missionaries, and healers," was set down as numbering more than 6,000, and this relatively enormous number of propagandists is, we are told, "being rapidly increased by the acquisition of many trained nurses, surgeons, and physicians from both schools of medicine, as well as many consecrated men and women from the ranks of mercantile, social, religious, and literary life." For the year 1896, there was claimed for this new sect an increase of forty-two "chartered churches" and four "Christian Science Institutes," and there is hardly a city of importance in our land where this sect has not a band of

¹ *Science and Health*.

² *Christian Science Series*, No. 5, p. 10.

zealous workers. It is a well-organized body, with national, state, and local societies, all compacted by the cementing power of a spurious sense of Christian brotherhood, and propelled by the energy of a novel and intense enthusiasm. It has already an influential periodical press, edited by men and women of some scholarship, of ability by no means contemptible, and of unflagging industry and zeal. It is prolific of books, booklets, and tracts, a few of them written in pleasing literary style, and all urging the claims of this new creed with some show of learning, much apparent sincerity, and vast plausibility of statement.

“Christian Science,” so-called, professes exceeding reverence for the name of Jesus, and proclaims as its mission the restoration of primitive Christianity through the healing of the sick and the reformation of the depraved. Its one method, by which all its marvels both of spiritual and of physical healing are wrought, is declared to be the same by which Jesus wrought all his “so-called miracles.”¹

Christian Scientism, as we prefer to call it,—since, as our examination will show, it has neither Science nor Christianity in it,—is one of the most curious phenomena of this very progressive and scientific age. It is well adapted to the wants of that very large class of independent and extraordinary people who have no higher aim than to keep “abreast of the age.” The world just now is worshipping Science. The leader of this new movement, wise in her generation, has adopted in her system a terminology than which nothing better could have been devised, either to split the ears of groundlings or to rivet the attention and compel the faith of the Athenian multitude which is ever desirous to “hear or to tell something new.” Birdlime for birds is hardly as good a device for trapping the unwary as is this new ism, when it is brought to the ears of those who know little either of science or of religion. It appeals most blandly to the “scientific” mind. Everything in the whole system is “scientific,” and to the unthinking and

¹ *Christian Science Series*, No. 6, p. 10.

the credulous it seems to savor of patient study, of unwearied research, and of exact methods. It proffers to those who have been vexed with the long-talked of contradictions between Genesis and Geology the latest and most "scientific" expositions of Bible history and doctrine. Its cures, conversions, spiritual victories over sin and temptation, and its manifold wonders, which challenge comparison with the miracles of Christ and his apostles, are "demonstrations." Its new Bible, for which plenary inspiration and Divine authority are claimed, is "our text book." Its basic ideas are presented as "rudiments and rules." Its theology is "Metaphysics," and the schools of its prophets are called "Metaphysical" or "Christian Science" academies, institutes, etc. Its theological graduates are all graduates in "Science," and receive academic degrees, "C. S. D.," or "B. S. D.," or the more modest "C. S.," answering to the degrees of Master and Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Philosophy in our colleges. Thus are all its authoritative expounders vested with badges which certify their proficiency in all the abstruse branches of a modern "scientific" education. Its new Divine revelation of ever-unfolding mysteries and its perennial fountain of living truth and of saving grace, is a book with a most prodigiously seductive title. We can conceive of nothing more taking in this practical age than *Science and Health*. Did I say this practical age? "Christian Science" professes to be "practical." It comes loaded with present blessings for all men and women who would enter into "freedom through the truth." Where is the "mortal mind" which would not like to learn the secret of unflinching health, and be informed of the latest revelations of science? This, too, is an age of doubt. This new creed proposes to give a satisfactory solution of all the questions started by the materialistic science of Darwin, Huxley, and Tyndal; and professes to vindicate grandly the spiritual origin and nature of Man.

In short, Christian Science, so-called, is the very latest phase of "advanced thought," the newest fad in rationalistic religion.

It comes, heralded as an authoritative settlement of all questions related to human life and destiny, and introduces itself as "Christian," and even more than that, as DIVINE Science. It is a brand-new, up-to-date system of religion, precisely meeting the requirements of all those who have grown weary of the absurdities of "traditional theology," and are just now longing for some pilot who will help them launch out into the deep, and steer them in their voyage of intellectual and spiritual discovery.

It is proposed in the present paper to exhibit the antecedents and character of this new cult.

Its antecedents, to say the least, are not above suspicion. Its origin was in humbuggery, patent and confessed. Mrs. Mary B. G. Eddy,—or Foster, as she would be called, had she not required her last husband to call himself by her name,—is a native of New Hampshire, and for more than thirty years was a member in good standing of the Congregational Church in the town of Tilton. She was a homœopathic physician. Her "medical researches and experiments",—the latter, no doubt, chiefly,—"had prepared her thought for the metaphysics of Christian Science" by "making her skeptical as to material curative methods."¹ Two of these experiments are related with charming *naïveté*. In one she "attenuated common table salt until there was not a single saline property left." Putting a drop of that attenuation in a goblet of water and administering a teaspoonful dose every three hours, she succeeded in curing a patient who was sinking in the last stages of typhoid fever! The other experiment was even more remarkable. The patient was in the last stages of dropsy; had been given up by the medical faculty; had been tapped; "looked like a barrel." Mrs. Eddy prescribed "the fourth attenuation of *Argentum nitricum*, with occasional doses of a high attenuation of *sulphuris*." The patient improved perceptibly. Fearing an unfavorable reaction from the prolonged use of the remedies, this cautious physician de-

¹ *Science and Health*, p. 46.

sired to change her treatment, and told the patient as much. The patient, however, objecting, Mrs. Eddy, unwilling to risk reaction, continued her treatment by slyly administering the *unmedicated pellets*, and thus effected a cure! In this way was our new prophetess led to see in the "Metaphysics" of "Christian Science" the "next stately step beyond homœopathy."¹

In her revolt against the use of drugs, she was further encouraged by the outspoken skepticism of Dr. Benjamin Rush and sundry other eminent medical men as to the value of their own science. Among others, she quotes the very startling opinion of "Dr. James Johnson, Surgeon Extraordinary to the King," to the effect that if there were not a single physician, surgeon, apothecary, man-midwife, chemist, druggist or drug in the world, there would be less sickness and less mortality. Herself a conscious quack, deeming all other practitioners equally dishonest, and fully convinced that all drugs were worthless, she began to muse on the faith-healing of the primitive church, in connection with the well-known fact of the power of the mind in the cause and cure of disease. At last, she avers, when desperately ill, and "standing within the shadow of the death-valley,"² she lighted upon her wonderful discovery, and received her call to become the prophetess of this new dispensation.

Justice, however, to the facts of the case demands the statement that some four years prior to the time of her alleged "discovery" of "Christian Science," Mrs. Eddy enjoyed the ministrations of one Mr. Quimby, "a distinguished mesmerist," who had some "advanced views about healing." This fact, which Mrs. Eddy cannot deny, has given rise, even in the ranks of so-called Christian Scientists, to much acrimonious discussion, many holding that she is indebted to Mr. Quimby for the chief points of her system, and that her claim to exclusive originality, revelation, etc., is not altogether well-founded. Several rival schools of mental healing have been

¹*Science and Health*, p. 50.

²*Ib.*, p. 2.

developed, and the feelings engendered by these rivalries combine the intensity of the *odium theologicum* with that of the *odium medicum*. Speaking of her rivals in general, Mrs. Eddy observes with characteristic modesty: "Some silly publications, whose only correct or salient points are borrowed, without credit, from *Science and Health*, would set the world right on Metaphysical Healing, like children thrumming a piano and pretending to teach music or criticise Mozart."¹

Mrs. Eddy's book, *Science and Health*, deserves to rank among the curiosities of recent literature. Giving the results of her ripest thought and experience, and containing, as she would have us believe, "God's gospel to this age," it is, both in matter and style, unquestionably unique.

Within the compass of a book of modest size, our author undertakes both to discuss and to decide all questions that concern human faith, life, and destiny. The sublime egoism of the whole performance is but faintly indicated by a quotation which one must needs observe on the fly-leaf as he opens the volume :

"I, I, I, I myself, I,
The inside and outside, the what and the why,
The when and the where, the low and the high,
All I, I, I, I myself, I."

Scarcely for a moment from the time when the author, "leaning on the Infinite," emerges to the dear reader's view in her preface, till the last page, in which, with wondrous humility for an "Immortal" so richly endowed and so marvelously favored, she concludes her "feeble revelation," are we permitted to lose sight of her very original and interesting personality. "*Ego dixi*" is her only "oath for affirmation." She is her own highest authority, and the revelation which she announces to the world was vouchsafed to none but herself. Her perpetual iterations are both bewildering and wearisome. With many an eccentric curve, and many a perilous leap, and many a swift and startling flight through thinnest

¹ Quoted by Dr. Buckley in *Faith Healing, Christian Science and Kindred Phenomena*.

ether, she rides her winged Pegasus through the universe; but from every new excursion she returns but to tell something she has already told. Never for one instant does her reason proceed on a straight line. In fact, the straight line itself is to her a symbol of the error she hates—"the finite, which has both beginning and end," "the belief in a self-existent and temporary material existence."¹ Having such a prejudice against straight lines, it is but natural that she should indulge in circular demonstrations. Her syllogism invariably expresses its conclusion in its premises. Her method is the absence of all methods. Her definitions do not define. Assuming as the basic principle of her thinking, a theory which denies the evidence of our five senses and the testimony of our reason, and yet compelled to clothe her vague conceptions in the language of ordinary human experience, she must of necessity use many words in an accommodated sense. But words refuse to be thus always accommodating, and the result is confusion than which imagination could conceive none worse confounded. "No pent-up Utica contracts her powers;" and, spurning all conventional restraints, both in thought and expression, setting at defiance alike the laws of logic and the laws of language, she essays to impose upon the world a new theology, a new philosophy, and a new system of medicine. With heroic sense of the danger she incurs and of the vastness of the results depending upon her unaided efforts, she addresses herself to the "task of the sturdy pioneer," and proceeds to "hew the tall oak and cut the rough granite;"² and it may be safely affirmed that from the beginning of the world until now such hewing, sawing, twisting, dividing asunder, and refashioning of things in the world of thought, has never been witnessed. She is impressed with the immense importance of her errand, now that "the time for thinkers has come," and feels called of God "to plant and water his vineyard."³ Impelled to open her treasures, she exhibits to our wondering view a new pearl of great

¹*Science and Health*, p. 178.²*Ibid.*, preface.³*Ibid.*, preface.

price, and, having risen high above all capability of displeasure at our unbelief, she commits her discovery, with Miltonic assurance of its high destiny, to "honest seekers after truth in this and every age."¹

Science and Health is a mixture of oracular dogmatism, feeble and inconsequential argument, crude theory, hackneyed platitudes, adroit misrepresentations of orthodox teaching, and withal of multitudinous and sublime absurdities. Its statements abound in contradictions and incongruities. Facts which the author denies in her theology she is compelled to admit in her ethics. For the Scriptures, which she holds to be the "chart of life," she seeks to substitute another chart, woven out of her own fancies, and marked with the eccentric lines of her own ill-regulated thought. Announcing her creed, by a significant and tremendously absurd reference, as the "leaven which A WOMAN took and hid in three measures of meal," she illustrates on every page the poet's remark about feminine thinking,

"A woman's reason is a woman's reason—
I think him so, because I think him so"—

a remark which is abundantly justified by the reasoning of some women, and most assuredly by the reasoning of such feminine thinkers as Mrs. Eddy.

Her book is "without a trace of literary art," and has not a single grace of style to redeem the tedium of "disjointed, inconsequential, dogmatic, and egotistical assertion and repetition."² One may open the volume almost at random and read in either direction, without finding any material difference in the "character of the argument or the sequence of the ideas."²

Nor are the claims of this book less remarkable than its style. It purports, as we have seen, to be a new gospel. Nay, more: it is a "final revelation,"³ the very last that shall

¹*Science and Health*, preface.

²*What is Christian Science?* By P. C. Wolcott, B. D. P. 13.

³*Science and Health*, p. 1.

ever illumine the darkness of human woe, and contains truth sufficient to deliver the entire race for all time from "all the ills that flesh is heir to." It proffers a "Key to the Scriptures," without which the manifold wealth of Revelation must forever remain hidden from our eyes. And, as a matter of course, it must needs possess plenary inspiration. "No human tongue or pen taught me the Science contained in *Science and Health*," says our author, "and neither tongue nor pen can ever overthrow it."¹ "Genuine Christian Scientists" are those who "adhere to *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*, to regulate their daily life."² This book is even presented as a substitute for our glorious Lord, whose name was called "Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us." Says one of its advocates, "*Science and Health* is 'God with us'—the Word of God."³ It is "the true Logos, and likewise the "Comforter, which leadeth into all truth."⁴ This new creed, and not the man Christ Jesus, is the "Good Shepherd,"⁵ who feeds and protects the flock of the redeemed; and its substance is the Bread of Life, which feeds the multitudes.⁶ "It surely is God's word," writes another,— "his best gift to fallen man; our rich inheritance, our salvation from sin, sickness, and death."⁷ Says still another, in the same publication,⁸ "What a wonderful help the Quarterly Bible lessons are! They seem to be the link connecting *Science and Health* and the Bible—uniting them as one—the Word of God."

Not only is this book every way equal in point of inspiration and authority to the Bible, but it is even superior to that revelation. The following, written by one of her followers, is found in a tract published, it is presumed by her authority, since it is protected by her copyright: "*Science and Health* does what Jesus did not,—because humanity was not ready for it,—what the apostles could not," etc.⁹

¹*Science and Health*, p. 4.

²*Christian Science Journal*, February, 1891.

⁴*Ib.*, pp. 167 and 28.

⁶*Christian Science Voices*, p. 57.

⁷*Christian Science Journal*, February, 1891.

⁹*Christian Science Series*, No. 6, p. 3.

³*Ib.*

⁵*Ib.*

⁸*Ibid.*

It is not surprising that, in view of this claim for a degree of inspiration and authority which she does not accord to Scripture, Mrs. Eddy should declare herself a new infallibility, and claim possession of the keys of the heavenly kingdom. This she does most plainly. "We must forsake the foundations of material systems, however time-honored, if we would gain the Christ as our only Savior."¹ "At the present stage of human experience, the only way to gain this consciousness (*i. e.*, of being the child of God,) can be found through competent instruction in *Christian Science*, by which (*sic*) can be learned how to conform our daily walks to the footprints of Jesus' pathway."² "Those who live the life of Science" are "children of Good,"³ and they only are true immortals, while all who reject the claims of this new revelation are still "dead in trespasses and sins."

But more marvelous than its claim to plenary inspiration is the claim asserted for this book as a remedy for human ills. It is, in common with all its author's works,⁴ a truly miraculous volume, a veritable physician and Savior in paper and ink, healing all manner of sickness and all degrees of depravity in those who read it, accomplishing the immediate redemption both of soul and body. It is an embodied pharmacopœia of both spiritual and physical medicine—"The Æsculapius of Mind."⁵ It boasts "sanative leafage,"⁶ and in those who read it with proper faith it changes the secretions, expells humors, dissolves tumors, relaxes rigid muscles, and restores carious bones to soundness.⁷ By the magic truth which it sets forth, its author reports that in her own "demonstrations" shortened limbs have been elongated, cicatrized joints have been made supple, lost substance of lungs has been restored, and—more wonderful still—"cancer that had eaten its way to the jugular vein" has been cured instantly, and the dying have been revived!⁸ "A high attenuation of truth,"—the only form in

¹*Science and Health*, p. 221.

²*Christian Science Series*, No. 12, p. 3.

³*Ib.*, p. 7; also, *Science and Health*, p. 212.

⁴*Science and Health*, p. 131.

⁵*Ib.*, pp. 45 and 431.

⁶*Ib.*, p. 431.

⁷*Ib.*, pp. 88-9.

⁸*Unity of Good*, pp. 8, 9.

which, as the intelligent and unprejudiced reader will be led to observe, Mrs. Eddy ever administers that potent elixir,—is a sovereign remedy for boils,¹ and will be equally efficacious for small-pox or diphtheria.² What is claimed for this new doctrine in healing disease is likewise claimed for it in the reformation of sinners, “truth” being as efficacious for sin as for dyspepsia.³

Not only is the book itself capable of healing all ills, but it imparts to those who absorb its teachings the same wonderful power!⁴ Mrs. Eddy declares that, when her mind is filled with these precious principles, the very “aroma” of her thought,⁵ like the hem of the Master’s garment, has power to heal; and she holds out to all the multitudes whom she prophesies will yet follow her, the hope of attaining, not only to the exalted heights which she has attained in the healing and redemptive art, but of surpassing her by the splendor of their achievements.⁶ The duration of sin and wretchedness in this world depends, not upon any divine permission or decree, but solely upon the faithful effort of those devoted Christian Scientists, who, like herself, are working for the world’s redemption!⁷

It is only natural that those who feed upon this “Little Book,”—it being alleged that *Science and Health* is the “little book” alluded to in the Apocalypse,⁸—should cherish low views of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Says a writer in the *Rostrum*: “The general disagreement as to what is sin, is owing to the fact that no infallible standard for judging such matters has been found. The Hebrew and Christian Bible is not the standard for the race.”⁹ Mrs. Eddy says, “the Scriptures are very sacred,”¹⁰ and how sacred we may learn from Rev. Frank E. Mason, one of her “students.” “The Bible,” he tells us, “contains more aggregate truth than any other one production;” but “to suppose that it is especially divinely

¹*Science and Health*, p. 47.

²*Ib.*, p. 69.

³*Ib.*, pp. 28, 29, 118.

⁴*Ib.*, p. 71.

⁵*Rudiments and Rules*, p. 17.

⁶*Ib.*, p. 400.

⁷*Ib.*, p. 426.

⁸*Rostrum*, p. 51.

⁹*Ib.*, p. 539.

¹⁰*Ib.*, p. 527.

inspired, is unreasonable. . . . The Bible is a consensus of spiritual ideas in the same sense that *Mother Goose* is the consensus of nursery rhymes, or as *Puck* and *Judge* are the centralization of humor."¹ This is a remarkable illustration of the progress of thought. The infallible exponents of the "Higher Criticism" have assured us that the inspiration of prophets and apostles is in no wise different in kind from that of Bacon and Shakespeare. Now, the "scientific" and inspired mind of Mr. Mason can see in Isaiah and Paul no inspiration other than that vouchsafed, for their purpose, to *Puck* and *Mother Goose*. Verily, to use a significant statement of Mrs. Eddy, "the rays of infinite Truth, when gathered into the focus of ideas, bring light instantaneously; whereas, a thousand years of unconcentrated beams,—human beliefs, hypotheses, and vague conjectures,—emit no effulgence!"² And here, if anything, is a beam still more concentrated: "Remove the gospels, the epistles, and the Psalms from the Bible, and what have you left?—Jewish traditions, which may or may not be true, but which obviously contain alike truth and error, fact and fiction. Many portions of the Old Testament are but vague reminiscences of periods so remote as to defy investigation, and which (*sic*) depict but the dim recollections of ancient legends of doubtful repute. To declare it sacrilegious to question their divine authenticity or to find more inspiration and help in the utterances of Emerson and Tennyson as preëminently God-inspired, is truly indicative of bigotry and narrowness."³ This is radiance, indeed; radiance more effulgent than that cast by the Drummond light of Dr. Briggs' beaming thought; in fact, the combined effulgence of Briggsism with the latest discovery utilized to help our vision—fluoroscopic light, with X-rays of candor, making the whole bony framework of the author's thought visible, despite what Mrs. Eddy would call the "capacity" of our reason.

And yet this book, made up of incredible legends and imperfect views of truth,—a book less valuable than *Emerson's*

¹*Seed*, p. 44.

²*Science and Health*, p. 486.

³*Seed*, p. 44.

Essays or Tennyson's Poems, Mrs. Eddy considers "very sacred," and terms it "the chart of life, to mark the healing currents and buoys of truth."¹ It was, she assures us, her "only text-book" in her study of the mysteries of "Divine Science."² How she studied it, will appear in the further progress of our discussion.

Holding such views of the inspiration of the Bible, it need hardly be expected that these new apostles of primitive Christianity would show much respect for orthodoxy. The evidences of their evil animus toward all Christian churches, are multitudinous. Mrs. Eddy's books teem with sly thrusts at the faith of the Christian world. "We soil our garments with conservatism," she sweetly informs us, "and afterwards must wash them clean."³ Her new revelation is a "truly Divine Science, which eschews man-made systems."⁴ Christian theology, as taught by the churches, "stands before the blackboard, and prays the *principle* of mathematics to work out the problem."⁵ "The first gleam" of the new light which came to her in the hour of her "sacred discovery," was sufficient to wean her away from her old faith.⁶ "The Jewish theology gave no hints of the unchanging love of God," it being reserved for *Christian Science* to acquaint the world with that blessed doctrine.⁷ Sin cannot be vanquished, until "in place of creeds and professions, the Principle of Being is understood and demonstrated;" and *Christian Science* only can show us how to achieve this blessed demonstration.⁸ "Christian demands have so little inspiration to spur mankind to Christian effort," because men are assured that these commands "were intended only for a particular moment and for a select number of followers."⁹ Which teaching, she proceeds to tell us gravely, "is more pernicious than the old doctrine of foreordination—the election of a few to be saved, while the rest are damned;" but the "lethargy" produced by such man-made doctrines will

¹*Seed*, p. 329.

⁴*Ib.*, p. 6.

⁷*Ib.*, p. 347.

²*Ib.*, p. 4.

⁵*Ib.*, p. 308.

⁸*Ib.*, p. 404.

³*Science and Health*, p. 437.

⁶*Ib.*, p. 455.

⁹*Ib.*, p. 343.

be broken by this new creed, offered so confidently to "advanced thinkers and devout Christians." This angelic woman, whose mission, it is claimed, is to introduce to the world "a higher and more practical Christianity," rivals, if she does not surpass, Ingersoll, in her persistent caricatures of Christian teaching, and her venomous sneers at the ministry of the gospel. Her soul is sad, because the phrase "divine service, has come so generally to mean public worship instead of daily deeds."¹ Orthodox prayer she denounces as "prayer to a corporeal God,"² and as being hurtful and demoralizing in its tendency. "Calling on God to forgive our work badly done or left undone, implies the vain supposition that we have nothing to do but to ask pardon, and that we shall feel free to repeat the offense."³ The doctrine of a vicarious atonement, too, is one which she despises heartily. "Final deliverance from error . . . is neither reached through paths of flowers, nor by pinning one's faith to another's vicarious effort. Whosoever believeth that wrath is righteous, or that Divinity is appeased by human suffering, cannot understand God."⁴ Of course not! "Advanced thinkers" are not willing to believe that Christ died for the ungodly! She handles the doctrine of the Trinity in terms no more respectful. To her "the theory of three persons in one God . . . suggests heathen Gods."⁵ In keeping with her assaults on the doctrines of Evangelical Christianity, is her attitude toward the Christian ministry. "The Gospel of Healing is again preached by the wayside," but "the pulpit scorns the message,"⁶ and hence the bitterest vials of her wrath are poured out upon the devoted heads of "the clergy." "Ruled out of the Synagogue," she must have her revenge, and she wreaks it upon the parsons, now in contemptuous remark, and anon in rhapsodic prophecy. Here, for instance, is a dignified and delicate insinuation: "Is it not professional reputation and emolument, rather than the dignity of God's laws, which many leaders seek?"⁷ Here, again,

¹*Science and Health*, p. 345.²*Ib.*, p. 317.³*Ib.*, p. 311.⁴*Ib.*, p. 327.⁵*Ib.*, p. 152.⁶*Ib.*, p. 360.⁷*Ib.*, p. 132.

is a very polite sneer: "One of the forms of worship in Thibet, is to carry a praying machine through the streets, and stop at the doors to earn a penny by grinding out a prayer; whereas, civilization pays for prayers by the clergy, in lofty edifices. Is the difference very great, after all?"¹ And here is scorn, blazing and brilliant: "If the soft palm, upturned to a lordly salary and architectural skill, making dome and spire tremulous with beauty, turn the poor and stranger from the gate, they also shut the door on progress. In vain do the manger and the cross tell their story to pride and fustian. Sensuality palsies the right hand, and causes the left to let go its divine grasp." And "Christian Science is the scourge of small creeds" with which "the clergy" are to be "whipped out of the Temple."²

Having observed the spirit and attitude of this new ism toward Èvangelical Christianity, we cannot be surprised at any marvels we may find in our further search of this very fruitful field of discovery. We proceed now to consider the system more particularly in its philosophical and theological bearings.

The basis of Mrs. Eddy's theological system is the idealism of Bishop Berkeley, although, so far as the writer has been able to discover, she makes no acknowledgment of her indebtedness to that eminent visionary. Some of her followers, however, have recognized the identity of their system with Berkeley's in its groundwork. A writer in the *Rostrum* of March, 1894, gravely declares that the feat of extracting sunshine from cucumbers, which the crank in *Gulliver* is trying to achieve, may yet prove possible! The same sapient reasoner declares that "the most notable exponent of this (*i. e.*, our) philosophy, was undoubtedly the keenly intuitive and spiritually developed Bishop Berkeley. . . . He boldly affirmed all true substance to be spirit, and all true causation to be comprised in the free activity of such spirit. . . . Nature, in its ultimate analysis, was but a conscious experience—the out-

¹*Science and Health*, p. 316.

²*Ib.*, p. 36.

ward symbol of a divine universal intelligence." It is wonderful how clearly, minutely, and repeatedly, Mrs. Eddy enunciates the fundamental postulate of Berkeley's philosophy, and with what labored steps, tracing his thought into its minutest ramifications, she seeks to make it the foundation of a two-fold system of theology and of therapeutics. "All real Being is in the Divine Mind and its idea;"¹ "a false sense evolves, in belief, a subjective state of mortal mind, which this same mind calls matter." "Mind is all, and matter is naught . . . the only realities are the Divine Mind and its idea,"² which idea, she holds, is Man. Her ingenuity in finding synonymous terms in which to clothe this thought, is marvelous. The Alpha and the Omega of all her thinking, it becomes a Proteus, appearing at every turn, and then vanishing only to reappear in some new shape at the next corner. And between this Alpha and Omega we find all the other letters of Mrs. Eddy's theological alphabet.

Her system of mind-healing is a deduction from one general principle, "the Allness of God and the nothingness of matter." If Mind is the only substance and the only reality in the universe, it follows that our perceptive faculties must be counted lying witnesses. Their report as to the reality of the external world being rejected, we must likewise reject their testimony as to our own sensations. The "universal intelligence," which is none other than the Infinite Mind, cannot be sick, nor can it, being infinite Good, create sin or sickness. Hence it follows that there is, in fact, no such thing as either sin or sickness. These evils are but phantoms of "mortal belief," which we can banish at any moment by simply refusing to admit their existence. This, then, is the omnipotent Truth, which may be prescribed, after approved homœopathic methods, in attenuations high or low, in the treatment of all diseases. We may rise superior to sin, to sickness, and even to death itself, simply by refusing to admit the claims of these "illusions of mortal sense." "Mind governs the body, not partially, but

¹*Science and Health*, p. 2.

²*Ib.*, p. 3.

wholly,"¹ and if you will correct your "erroneous belief" all will be well with you. The last enemy to be conquered by Christian Science, of course, is death; but while admitting that she and all her followers of the present and possibly of some several future generations, will pass through this phase of mortal belief, Mrs. Eddy holds out steadfastly the hope that the time is at hand when the advancing thought and the progressive sanctification of the race will usher in the glad day when there will be no longer any belief, and consequently, no further experience, of death on this planet.²

It may be observed that at this point lie both the strength and the weakness of this new medico-religious quackery. Its strength, because, unquestionably, mental states do, in many instances, produce disease, and in almost every case modify it. Modern medical science takes full account of the mental factors, alike in its diagnosis and its treatment of diseases. Faith-cures; the apocryphal miracles of modern Romanism; the oft-times undoubted efficacy of the sacred waters of Lourdes; the success of Joseph Smith, the first prophet of Mormonism, in certain of his attempts at healing; the practice of the Oneida Community in treating disease by criticism; the admitted efficiency of hypnotism in curing otherwise intractable diseases; Sir Humphrey Davy's famous experiment in which he healed a paralytic by allowing him to hold a clinical thermometer under his tongue: the facts of physiognomy; the well-known *vis medicatrix naturæ*, now so generally relied upon by prudent physicians in the treatment of all ordinary ailments:—these and many other facts that might be mentioned, which are discussed by all standard medical authorities, may be adduced to show that the influence of the mind is at least paramount both in the cause and cure of most of the ordinary ills that flesh is heir to. Beyond all question, the human soul is a chambered nautilus, building, to some extent, at least, its own shell.

And yet at this point also we find the fatal weakness of this

¹*Science and Health*, p. 5.

²*Ib.*, pp. 426, 480.

new system of mind-healing. With the proverbial blindness of the enthusiast, Mrs. Eddy proceeds to apply her pet theory to all manner of sickness and to all manner of sin, and even to questions of diet and cleanliness; and in so doing falls into numberless absurdities and self-contradictions. Thus, consistently adhering to her assertion that all disease is produced by erroneous belief, and opposed by the fact that young children experience ailments of which they have never heard, and of which they have no idea whatever, she is driven to prescribe for a common ailment of childhood in this way: "A child can have worms, if you say so, . . . timorously holden in the minds of those about him."¹ This, then, is her "scientific" vermifuge—Don't say so! And this same vermifuge, which is, of course, to be taken as in the prescription for boils, in a "high attenuation," is equally efficacious for membranous croup or diphtheria, which also are to be regarded "timorously holden in the minds" of the fond parents! Few indeed will be so foolhardy as to swallow such "scientific" nonsense, and, without calling in a physician, suffer *themselves* to be treated for the "belief," while a precious child lies gasping before them in the agonies of death.

Again, if children, too young to comprehend the philosophy of this new creed, are to be taught as was the little tot of whom we are told, to demonstrate by saying, "God is all, and bumps are nothing,"² ordinary consistency requires that a "Scientist" shall treat a broken bone in the same way. But notwithstanding her own marvelous cures of "cicatrized" and "dislocated" joints, and even of dislocated spinal vertebræ, etc., Mrs. Eddy is at this juncture driven to confess her faith in the necessity and efficacy of surgical treatment! Christian Science surgery, she avers, is best, of course; but this branch of its healing art will be the last to be developed; and, therefore, she advises that, "until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon," while the

¹*Science and Health*, p. 412.

²*Seed*, p. 104.

scientific healer devotes his energy to "mental reconstruction and the prevention of inflammations,"¹ etc. The intelligent reader coming to this passage in the new Word of God, cannot fail to read a confession of ignominious and of conscious failure between the lines.

Even more palpable is the absurdity of her theory when applied to diet. If drugs owe their healing properties to our faith in their efficacy, so likewise does food owe its strengthening properties to the same mental expectation. If there is nothing in the universe but Mind, and man's only real substance is that Mind, it follows necessarily that man does not need to eat in order to sustain life. Startling as this may seem, Mrs. Eddy, with all proper consistency, holds this view! She affirms it to be "self-evident that food does not affect the existence of man,"² since God is our only Life. But just at this point, across the track of her daring thought, a warning signal is displayed, lest any adventurous engineer, following in her wake, should let his train run away. It is displayed in a significant marginal note, "Hasten slowly," and it is swung with firm hand in the text, as follows: "It would be foolish to venture beyond our present understanding, foolish to stop eating, until we gain more goodness and a clearer comprehension of God." Then, and not before, can we hope to be free from the plague of grocers' bills, and "neither eat to live nor live to eat." We cannot doubt, after reading this, that Mrs. Eddy, though herself so near perfection as to heal by the mere "aroma" of her thought, still continues to indulge the "belief" of the necessity of food, and to regale herself with the good things of this world. And to this most illogical concession to the "materialistic spirit of our times," we are disposed to attribute her well-preserved physique at the ripe age of seventy-five or thereabouts, and also the further fact that her sect is gaining ground. But if we are wrong in the premises, and they could and would demonstrate the truth of their theory in this very important particular, it would undoubtedly insure

¹*Science and Health*, p. 400.

²*Ib.*, p. 387.

the success of the new reformation. The motives, economical and otherwise, urging the claims of the new creed, would be irresistible. But inasmuch as human beings *must* eat, Mrs. Eddy's sage advice is destined to pass into history as being either the dodge of a self-convicted charlatan, or else as a flash of temporary sanity out of an unbalanced brain.

It is worthy of note, in this connection, too, that Mrs. Eddy's practice ignores her logic in the treatment of sin, quite as much as her common sense ignores it in the matter of eating. According to her theory, sin, like sickness, is unreal. It may be counted an "awful unreality," indeed; but if it be an unreality at all, why not treat it as all other beliefs of mortal mind are treated in the Christian Science practice,—that is, as a mere illusion, the very existence of which is to be denied? "Suffer no belief of sin or sickness to grow upon your thought," says our author.¹ If, then, it be truly "scientific" to say to an invalid, Your sickness exists only in your belief, correct your thought by denying the evidence of your senses, and all will be well; why not say to the conscience-stricken sufferer from "chronic sin," Your sin is only a belief of mortal mind—a figment of your imagination; you have done no wrong, and your regrets are needless? If we may deny the testimony of our senses in the one case, and the plain sense of Scripture as well, why may we not, with equal propriety, deny the testimony of Scripture and of our own consciences in the other case? "Healing the sick and reforming the sinner are one and the same thing in Christian Science," she tells us; "and both cures require the same method."² And yet, after all this, she does not prescribe the same treatment. The sick must be cured by inducing them to believe that they are well, and cannot be sick, because Mind cannot be sick; and we would expect her to say that, inasmuch as Man's only real substance and life is in Mind, and Mind, being perfect, cannot sin, therefore the individual cannot sin. But this she does not once dare to say. True, the *Word of Science* declares,

¹*Science and Health*, p. 389.

²*Ib.*, p. 203.

“these beliefs of sin, sickness, and death are only beliefs ; they are not realities of Being ; God is Love, and he has not bound on you these burdens ; you are not the hateful beings you believe ; you were made in, and you are, the image and likeness of God,”¹ etc. True, we are told, again and again, that Man is perfect and sinless ; that “Soul cannot sin, for sin is not the eternal verity of Being,”³ etc., etc. But two difficulties lie in the way of a complete and consistent application of this principle, which could only be done by assuring the sinner that his conscience is a lying witness, and that he must say to himself stoutly, I have not sinned. One is, that both the general tenor and many particular passages of the Scriptures, which, equally with *Science and Health*, we are to regard as the word of God, plainly estop any such proceeding.⁴ Mrs. Eddy does not hesitate to misapply, explain away, or even deny, the authority of Scripture, when it suits her purpose ; but in this case the contradiction would be too bald. The other difficulty is, that in reforming sinners she can hardly expect to succeed by telling them that no reformation is necessary. It is quite pleasing to her fancy to view Man,—the vague, general, impersonal Man, conceived of as the abstract, Divine, Archetypal Idea,—as perfect, sinless, and incapable of sin. But, in her system, all this, practically, is pure Platonism. She cannot be blind to the facts, and does not pretend to deny them. She advises her students not to name diseases, lest the very naming of them should prove a creative power to produce such erroneous beliefs, but she deals with sin quite otherwise. “Lust, hatred, and dishonesty”⁵ cannot be waived aside like the false claims” of headache. Their reality must be recognized, especially by one who would uphold the Bible and teach Christian purity. Errors she calls them, it is true, but manifestly she uses the word in this connection in a sense different from that in which she uses it in

¹ *Christian Science Series*, No. 6, p. 4.

² *Science and Health*, p. 232.

³ *Ib.*, p. 452.

⁴ *Vide Rom.* 3:23 and *I. John* 1:8, 10.

⁵ *Science and Health*, p. 403.

her discussion of physical maladies. The latter are errors in the sense of being illusions, mere spectres, conjured up by "mortal mind;" but sinful passions and propensities she seems to consider as errors in the sense of being mistakes of judgment, and as promising falsely—a sense in which, so far as it goes, nobody denies that sin is a fearful mistake and a dreadful delusion. And, accordingly, her treatment of sin is almost orthodox. "The heat of hatred, inflaming brutal propensities, the indulgence of evil motives and aims, will make any man who is above the lowest type of manhood a hopeless sufferer."¹ Therefore, "Christian Science commands man to master those propensities,—to hold hatred in abeyance with kindness, to conquer revenge with charity, and to overcome deceit with honesty." "Choke these errors in their early stages,"¹ cries our oracle, with something like the fervor of a true gospel preacher, bent on saving souls, "if you would not cherish an army of conspirators against health, happiness, and success. . . . 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'" This, too, sounds orthodox: "You had better be exposed to every plague on earth than to endure the cumulative effects of a guilty conscience. The abiding consciousness of wrong-doing tends to destroy the ability to do right."² Thus, denying the reality of sin in general, she is compelled to admit the existence of sinful appetites and propensities and of sinful deeds in particular,³ and these, she maintains, are to be destroyed, not like disease, by the mere mastery of mind over "mortal sense," but, from first to last, must be "regretted,"²—she does not at this point use the word repented, possibly because it would be understood in some orthodox sense,—struggled against and conquered.³

Already the reader will have discovered in her doctrine of sin the trail of the serpent, which becomes the more conspicuous the longer we scrutinize her teachings; but when we proceed to examine particularly into her theology, we encounter a mass of dangerous speculative crudities, many of them

¹*Science and Health*, p. 403.

²*Ibid.*, p. 404.

³*Ib.*, p. 405.

not so much as bolstered up by a single Scripture reference, compared with which the wildest phantasies of Swedenborg are tame. Briefly stated, Christian Science may be described as a mixture of Pantheism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Rationalism, and Theosophy. All of these, in attenuations high or low, as it has suited her fancy to incorporate them, may be detected in the composition of Mrs. Eddy's "sanative leafage."

Beginning with the fundamental postulate of all Christian theology, the existence of a Personal God, against which she enters an ambiguous and equivocal denial, she would fain revolutionize our conceptions of every distinctive principle of the Christian religion. She defines God as "Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Mind, Spirit, Soul,"¹ and to these ideas she adds in a subsequent definition, "Mind, Intelligence, Substance," and declares him to be "the great I AM, the all-knowing, all-acting, all-wise, all-loving, and eternal."² Without pausing to discuss the various terms of this definition, it will suffice to observe here that she has stated as accurately as possible the ancient Pythagorean doctrine that God is the Soul of the Universe. She conceives of him as a universal Divine Essence of all things. Observe, also, that in defining God as Soul Spirit—not as *a* Spirit—she implies that there is no other but the one Spirit. This was the teaching of Pythagoras, and we are not, therefore, surprised to find a writer in the *Seed*³ recapitulating the teachings of Pythagoras as to the Supreme Being with manifest approval. In following in the wake of the old heathen philosopher, Mrs. Eddy has, in the estimation of her worshippers, only made her doctrine more "scientific."

Having made God a vague abstraction by her definition, Mrs. Eddy labors to impress upon her readers a more emphatic denial of the Divine personality. "God is identical with nature;"⁴ he is "natural Good."⁵ Any view differing from this she rejects as being "anthropomorphism, or a humanization

¹*Science and Health*, p. 9.

²*Ib.*, p. 566.

³*Seed*, May, 1893.

⁴*Science and Health*, p. 13.

⁵*Ib.*

of Deity ;" ¹ and declares that if God is personal, "there is but one person, because there is but one God." ² This must be so, if *God is all*. Orthodoxy makes God, she affirms, "a physical personality," a "corporeal Saviour;" but she would have us consider him a "Saving Principle." ³ So strongly opposed is she to the recognition of the personality of God, that she finds even the term individuality, when used of him, "open to objections." God must be "one alone and without an equal." ²

This denial of the personality of God tends manifestly to take the heart out of the Christian religion. It bids us reject as myths the story of Enoch, who walked with God; of Abraham, honored in being spoken of as the Friend of God; of Moses, who spoke to God as friend to friend, and endured "as seeing him who is invisible." Relegating all these to the realms of fancy, we can hardly find much comfort in the faith of David, as he cries, "I am poor and needy, yet the Lord thinketh upon me." And yet, in every possible way, does Mrs. Eddy urge this denial. One is astonished and shocked by the new and foreign designations, imported from ancient pagan philosophy and from modern Buddhism, which Mrs. Eddy prefers to bestow upon God. Terming him "the only Substance," ⁴ the "Principle of Being," or simply "Principle," "Mind," "Soul," "Spirit," "Intelligence," "Life," "Truth," etc., she takes pains not to admit into her nomenclature any term which seems to imply, even faintly, the doctrine of a personal God, as held by Catholic Christendom. True, she sometimes uses the personal pronoun, he, in speaking of God, but when she has once waived aside all ideas of personality in telling us who and what he is, he must remain to her followers nothing more than an Infinite Abstraction. Not even when she uses scriptural terms in speaking of him, is she content to use them in their scripture phraseology and in their natural sense. Thus, when she tells us that "God is Spirit," she adroitly suppresses the indefinite article, which the correct translation requires. ⁵

¹ *Science and Health*, p. 498.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 171.

² *Ib.*, p. 10.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 102.

³ *Ib.*, p. 181.

The way in which she professes to have arrived at some of her definitions is exceedingly amusing. This new "scientific" creed, which one of its advocates terms the "vesture of truth," is made, according to Mrs. Eddy, on the *reversible principle*! ¹ And it was in applying this same principle to the Bible—which is one of her favorite methods of exegesis—that she found some of her alleged Scripture proofs. But the reversible principle, which is of doubtful utility in the manufacture of clothing, is unquestionably inapplicable to many other articles of human use. We want umbrellas, for instance, and shoes, that are not reversible. And so of Scripture statements. The Scriptures tell us that God is light, but we may not reverse the statement and say that light is God. So also, when we are told that God is love, and that he is good: we are not warranted in affirming that all love is God and that all goodness is God. Yet this is precisely what Mrs. Eddy has done. Her favorite name for the Divine Being is the double term, "God, Good," which may seem innocent enough until we get at her real meaning. Then it is seen that she acknowledges no Divine Father, such as is the God whom we love and worship, and in place of him would have us acknowledge Light, Love, Goodness, Substance, Principle, etc., etc., as the "only living and true God." So, too, she and her school use the double term, "Christ, Truth." It is manifest that, unless Christian Scientists are content to stultify themselves by retaining in their conception of God and of his Christ ideas which their creed positively rejects, they can no more engage in the worship of God than they can bow down to the law of gravitation, or pray to the precession of the equinoxes. Hence, as we might show, did our space permit, Christian Science prayer and worship are, as far as possible, unlike our Christian devotions, as we have been taught to pray by our Lord and his apostles.

From what has been said, it is obvious that by no possibility can Mrs. Eddy escape the charge of teaching Pantheism.

¹*Science and Health*, p. 7.

True, she enters her protest against this charge in sundry passages; but, on the principle that we are not bound to accept apologies when the offense is often repeated and there is never any profession of repentance, we can pay no attention to her oft-repeated disclaimers. We have seen that the basis of her system is the proposition that God is all. This is Pantheism, whatever she may say to the contrary; nor can we honor her sincerity, save at the expense of her intelligence, when she charges all who believe that in man the soul is united to the body with entertaining pantheistic notions. For the sake of argument accepting as true her own definition of Pantheism, viz., that it is the belief in the intelligence of matter, few could be found who are able to see any material difference between Mrs. Eddy's theory and that of Spinoza. He taught that there was but one infinite substance, and that all finite existences are modes or limitations of that one infinite substance. Mrs. Eddy, likewise, makes the universe consist of one infinite substance, and views all finite intelligence as the expression or "idea" of that one infinite substance. The only difference between the two systems is that of nomenclature. In either system the question must needs be answered, Is all the Mind or Spirit in the universe one and indivisible? Are we to regard men and angels as distinct personalities, separate intelligent entities, as related to God? or does all finite intelligence and consciousness blend in the one universal consciousness? To which Mrs. Eddy would reply:

"God is all.¹ He is all the Life and Mind there is or can be.² Life is God, or Spirit, the Supersensible Eternal. The universe and man are the spiritual phenomena of this one infinite Mind.³ All consciousness is Mind and Mind is God.⁴ Science declares God to be the Soul of all Being, the only Mind and Intelligence in the universe.⁵ All that can exist is God and his idea.⁶ Spirit is the only substance, the invisible and indivisible God."⁷

Such views of God must require of necessity the rejection of all evangelical teaching as to the origin, nature, and moral

¹*Science and Health*, pp. 7, 412, 419; 365, and in all her publications.

²*Unity of God*, p. 4.

³*Ib.*, p. 13.

⁴*Ib.*, p. 30.

⁵*Ib.*, p. 36.

⁶*Ib.*, p. 59.

⁷*Science and Health*, p. 231, Par. XVIII.

status of man, the doctrine of atonement, the future life, prayer, the sacraments, and indeed every distinctive doctrine of historical Christianity.

To follow our new oracle in all her wanderings, would be a task impossible within the limits of this paper. It must suffice, for the present, to give some intimation of Mrs. Eddy's teaching as to the place of Jesus in Christian theology.

She holds that the man Jesus was merely a model man, and that he was not, in any sense, impossible to others, a Son of God. To believe in his suffering as having made atonement for human guilt and provided a way of access unto the Father, is in her opinion absurd. Affirming, as she does, repeatedly, that Man never fell,¹ that he is as perfect and incapable of sin² "as the mind which formed him;" that sin itself is an unreality; that God's only method of pardon is the destruction of sin;³ and, most precious truth of all in her system, that it is not the sinful soul—since there is no such thing as a sinful soul—but the *sense of sin* that is lost;⁴ Mrs. Eddy must needs give new meanings to many passages of Scripture, and put a new face on many familiar doctrines of the Book. And this she does with wonderful facility. Having claimed so much for Man, she cannot consistently concede to Our Lord anything more than she claims for the race. Rev. Frank E. Mason reports her as explicitly denying the Divinity of Christ and as denouncing our Christian worship as idolatry. (*Vide Reminiscences of the Class Room*, p. 1.) He says:

"Jesus was able to do the works that he did, because his idea of God was so grand and noble. This lofty conception of Divinity permeated his consciousness, and he reflected the greatest power of any man who ever lived, *simply because his aspirations were the highest.*"

This is broader than the broadest Unitarianism. Again:

"Jesus the Christ is an ideal man. The physical embodiment was but the material manifestation of the ideal man. This material manifestation, modern Christianity has deified, and, by so doing, has lost the ideal, worshipping a man made after the similitude of the flesh, rather than the Creator, which is wholly spiritual." [*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 13.]

¹*Science and Health*, p. 154; also, *Christian Science Series*, No. 2, p. 10.

²*Ib.*, p. 459 and 232.

³*Ib.*, pp. 334, 311.

⁴*Ib.*, p. 207.

Modern Christians, we are to understand, worship the body of Jesus! And they do not worship the Creator! Again, on pp. 56 and 57, of the *Rostrum*, we find these sentences:

"The blunder of the world is in assuming and supposing that the Man of Galilee possessed power in excess of the residue of mankind. . . . Such an ignoble conception of deity travesties justice and equality. . . . A God . . . can have no favorites. . . . Jesus possessed no power in excess of yourself. . . . The Christ-Mind belongs to the universe. It is the generic mind of man. All can assimilate it. It is not the specific mind of the Nazarene. . . . God has no specific son. Man is the son of God."

In these words it is plainly as possible asserted that Christ is the son of God only in the same sense that any other man may count himself the son of God. Again, in the *Rostrum*, p. 101, the same writer declares that

"Christ is the image of man, made in the likeness of God," and that "a like conception, that is, the same mind in us that was also in him, transforms us into the Christ of the God-mind, full of grace and truth."

That is, we became identical with the Christ.

We have all come across men who undertook to identify Melchizedek with Christ. Mrs. Eddy, having drank from the fountains of Theosophy and Buddhism, attempts a more startling identification. Adam, according to this inspired teacher, was the man Jesus in a previous incarnation! "It was the antedated state of the meek and mighty Nazarene, his life, truth, and love spiritual, that antidoted the ills of the flesh, and were the first man; it was Jesus, as he expressed himself, before Abraham was, I am."¹

Since Christ was only a Buddha,—or, to use the phrase of modern Theosophy, with which, most evidently, Mrs. Eddy is in full accord,—an adept, or Mahatma, which any one else may become by proper effort, it follows that he is not in any sense, the Saviour of men. He was a great teacher, a great martyr to truth, (having been crucified for giving his "scientific definition of personality,")² an ideal man,—that is, to a considerable extent, understand,—but nothing more. He had no gift of grace or power that did not belong to the race, and

¹*Christian Science Series*, No. 4, page 9.

²*Science and Health*, p. 259.

can not do anything for us : a special and startling reason for which will appear presently. Each man must be his own Saviour, the notion of a vicarious atonement being only "the creation of a sentiment,"¹ and he must save himself by imitating—not too closely, as we shall see,—the example and character of Christ.² Jesus, says the Rev. Frank E. Mason, who has been privileged to drink deep from the Pierian spring of Mrs. Eddy's teaching, "is the model man over whom we throw the various garments of thought, to study their effects, and the privilege is granted each child of God to select the garment that is most becoming. In this sense only is Jesus our Saviour and Redeemer ; not vicariously and by substitution, but by posing before us as a model to instruct us in the nature and character of thoughts and their effects upon man, to save us from suffering by donning (*sic*) only those garments that clothed him with joy, and by refusing to be arrayed in the habiliments which bring sorrow and pain."³ This makes small account, assuredly, of the sufferings of Christ. Our Lord told his disciples that "it behooved him to suffer and to rise from the dead, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And from the epistle to the Hebrews, we learn that "for the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross, despising the shame." But, according to Mr. Mason and his new prophetess, all this was a foolish performance, altogether unnecessary and unbecoming. Christ was merely a sort of clothier's dummy or milliner's model, from whose very unsatisfactory experience, as we behold him arrayed in the various "habiliments" of his sometimes erroneous thought, we may learn not only what to imitate in his example, but also what to avoid ! This, for example, is one of the lessons of the crucifixion : "Nothing is gained by suffering for the truth. It is simply a sentimental patriotism so to believe. Suffering is not an essential quota (*sic*) of the Divine plan of salvation."⁴

¹*Science and Health*, p. 56.

³*Seed*, April, 1892.

²*Rostrum*, January 1895, p. 57.

⁴*Ibid.*

Jesus, then, was only a sentimental patriot! It was a very foolish blunder when an apostle wrote: "It became him for whom all things were made, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." Nay, rather, the Man of Nazareth ought by all means to have avoided the "habiliments which bring sorrow and pain!"

But these startling contradictions of Holy Writ are not so marvelous when we remember that in Mrs. Eddy's scheme all suffering is illusory. If the sufferings of Jesus were real, we might justly consider our own sufferings as real; and if they were illusions, they might have been, and ought to have been, avoided. The Christian Scientist, then, has reached a height of heavenly contemplation from which he can look down in pity upon the folly of the suffering Nazarene! Or, if he suffered, (which must be considered doubtful,) his sufferings were caused by the thoughts of others. "If Jesus suffered," says Mrs. Eddy,—and that she should use an *if* in such a connection, with the Bible, her precious "chart of life," before her, seems passing strange,—"it must have been from the mentality of others."¹ The agony in the garden, the crown of thorns, the buffeting, the shame and torture of his crucifixion, all were created by the mentality of others; and, however real to him, were, after all, but hypnotic illusions! He was only an idea-Christ, and his passion and his cross were imaginary!

Not only do the sufferings, but also the death and resurrection of Christ play a very important part in Christian theology, as understood by the orthodox. But Mrs. Eddy and her followers have learned how to view them quite differently. Says Mrs. Eddy, "In Science, Christ never died. In sense, Jesus died and lives again. The fleshly Jesus seemed to die, though he did not. Mortal sense . . . is all that can be buried or resurrected."² It was not the real body of Christ that was buried and resurrected: *he had no body*, and all that men beheld, all that died or was buried and raised from the dead, was his "mortal sense." Now, Mrs. Eddy would gravely deny

¹ *Unity of Good*, p. 70.

² *Ib.*, p. 78.

that there is any "mortal sense" about her doctrine in this particular, and we must confess her denial just! Mr. Mason reiterates her teaching: "We affirm that he was alive during the three days, despite the fact that he was pronounced dead." Again, "the only tomb in which Jesus lay, was the world's physical apprehension of him:" a statement not to be wondered at when we bear in mind that these scientific people consider the sun and moon as mere "subjective states of the human thought."¹

But Mrs. Eddy goes still further in her efforts to idealize our Lord and his redeeming work. She uses language which, if it means anything, is intended to cast doubt upon the genuineness of his humanity. She speaks of Mary as "the *reputed* mother" of Jesus, and says he wore "in part a human form, that is, as it seemed to mortal view, being conceived by"—this term she prefers to use instead of being born of—"a human mother."² He was, we are to understand, conceived *in her mind*, and was simply her *idea*! Mary was thus in fact his creator, her mind having projected him upon the world, "though at first faintly developed in an infant form!"¹

At this point we come to another peculiarity of this very scientific creed. Mrs. Eddy would have us believe that this Jesus was not, as Scripture affirms, and as the Church of God has believed in all ages, the Christ, but only a phantom partner for another something to which she gives the unscriptural but charmingly scientific name of the "Christ-Principle." This Something, we are to understand, is impersonal, and, as we have seen, is the "property" or attribute of universal Man. "The Christ dwelt forever in the bosom of the man Jesus," and "this dual personality, of the seen and the unseen, of the Jesus and the Christ, continued until the ascension, and then the human or corporeal concept, or Jesus, disappeared, while the invisible, the spiritual idea, or the Christ, continued to

¹*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 5.

²*Science and Health*, p. 211.

³*Ib.*, p. 334.

exist.”¹ This antithesis is significant. The term *disappeared*, is opposed to the term *continued to exist*, and the meaning is, evidently, that the humanity of Jesus, “the human or corporeal concept,” was annihilated! It was nothing but an appearance, or an idea, and that appearance ceased—that idea was no longer entertained among men! But Mrs. Eddy would not leave us altogether comfortless; and there is a sense in which we may still realize the presence and the power of Jesus. From *The Seed* we learn, as its editor, Mr. Mason, has learned from Mrs. Eddy, that “the only right understanding of Jesus” is gained through the recognition of Christ as the “ever present consciousness of true manhood,” and that when he died he “diffused his thought through the universe, and this thought is the leaven which shall leaven the lump.” “The realization of Truth . . . is the Christ Principle working within, for he said, ‘I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’”² We are not to believe in the immortality of the Man of Nazareth. He is now only

“the sweet presence of a good diffused.”

Our only Master is “a master thought, which possesses the mind of each individual.”³ “‘The Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world’ is the sense of individual dominion . . . the inward consciousness of perfection, which lifts us slowly, above the claims of matter, to the realization that Mind is all.”⁴ Salvation is, as we have already seen, nothing but complete acquiescence in the claims of this new creed, and to attain this, the one thing needful is, it seems, to make a Christ of one’s own self-conceit, and follow its suggestions until one is able to rejoice in the complacent assurance that he is “one with God.” Here, heresy borders close on lunacy.

The worship of our Lord Jesus Christ is, of course, out of the question for those who believe that his humanity was a phantom, and that they themselves are possessed of his Divine

¹*Science and Health*, p. 229.

²*Seed*, April, 1890, p. 102.

³*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 8.

⁴*Seed*, April, 1890, p. 98.

nature. This logical result of Mrs. Eddy's hypothesis brings her creed into sharp contrast with the gospel as taught by our Lord and his apostles. It requires us to believe that Jesus did wrong to accept the worship of his disciples, and that all who have done so since the days of Jesus have been guilty of idolatry. Mrs. Eddy would have us banish even the very name of Jesus from our prayers. She is reported as saying that "worshipping the personal Jesus keeps the world on a physical basis, and in a physical belief, making such a religion largely emotional; while, on the contrary, the adoration of the Christ-Principle, which influenced Jesus and dictated his demeanor, teaches us that we can be like him, and becomes an incentive to labor for such a glorious possibility. The impersonal Christ should be the only object of worship."¹ Observe, God the Father is not even excepted here. Bearing in mind her teaching that man's destiny is, as we saw just now, to be at last absorbed by, or somehow merged and identified with, that invisible Christ or Christ-Principle,—which, even here, is but another term for the "ever-present consciousness of true manhood," and is, in fact, nothing more than perfect manhood;—remembering that she exhorts every sinner to refuse to believe himself a hateful creature, and to hold steadfastly to this thought, "I am perfect, sinless, incapable of sin," etc., and to believe that every man possesses the Christ-Mind, which belongs to the universe,² etc., it is easy to see that the only worship consonant with this unique system is SELF-adoration. This fact is abundantly advertised by Mrs. Eddy's oft-repeated definition of God as "the Ego."

And, finally, Mrs. Eddy identifies the Holy Spirit with Christ, and anon with her own precious doctrines! "Throughout all generations the Christ as the spiritual idea,—as the Holy Ghost, the Comforter,—has come."³ And, lest we should fancy him to be a Divine Spirit, infinitely transcend-

¹*Reminiscences of Class Room*, p. 5.

²*Rostrum*, January, 1895, p. 56. ³*Science and Health*, pp. 228-9.

ing the "diffused thought" of Jesus, she tells us that the Holy Ghost, which "reveals this Triune Principle" of Life, Truth, and Love, "is expressed in Divine Science, which is the Comforter, leading into all truth."¹ Her book, then, is "the spiritual idea," or Christ, and the Comforter promised by our Lord!

We fear our discussion has been too prolix. Enough has been said, we feel sure, to indicate that the remark which Mrs. Eddy puts into the mouth of "Material sense," might very properly have been used by the author herself when speaking of her own *very* "feeble revelation:"

*"Like an airy bubble, I but expand to my own destruction,
and shine with the fatal resplendency of error!"*²

Graham, N. C.

WM. P. MCCORKLE.

¹*Science and Health*, p. 227; also, *Christian Science Series*, No. 2, p. 4.

²*Science and Health*, p. 148.

III. THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE IN THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS.

Something ought to be said on this topic before the present interest in the work of the Westminster Assembly subsides. It has not been embraced in any of the elaborate programs used in the memorial services of Assemblies, Synods or Presbyteries: nor has it been mentioned in the religious journals, so far as we have observed. This omission is remarkable when it is remembered that the doctrine of the Covenants is peculiar to the Westminster Standards. We have searched in vain for any other instance in Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*. It is still more remarkable when the prominence given to the Covenants in the Standards is considered. One entire chapter in the Confession is devoted to the subject; and the Catechisms are equally express. This is not, however, the only, nor the principal, way in which the Covenants are made prominent. They are the mould in which the Westminster Creed is cast. The plan of salvation is treated as a Covenant. Sin and Grace are alike taught in the light of the Covenants. One might almost venture to say that the doctrine of the Covenants constitutes the distinctive feature of the Westminster Creed. It is certainly the distinguishing characteristic so far as the Reformed Creeds are concerned. And, as we shall see later on, the doctrine would not fit any but a Reformed Creed. The omission is due, no doubt, simply to an oversight. It is liable, however, to be misconstrued. The Rev. Dr. Francis R. Beattie, in his work, *The Presbyterian Standards*, says: "It is quite true that the Standards do not push the Covenant idea so far as some representatives of that type of theology, but it is evident that on broad scriptural outlines they are constructed under the control of the federal principle, both in regard to the natural and the legal relations in Adam, and in reference to the gracious and redemptive relations in Christ. There is

some need to emphasize this aspect of the structural principle of the Standards at the present day, as there is a tendency in certain quarters to overlook or lay it aside."

It is plain enough now that the Westminster Assembly followed the Bible closely in the prominence given to the Covenants. We find a definite word for Covenant in both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Not only the Word, but the elements of the Covenant, parties, condition and promises, are found there. How deeply embedded in the Scriptures the federal principle is may be learned from the parallel drawn in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans between Adam and Christ. But it happened in the case of the Covenants as it did in relation to other great doctrines that seem to us now so plainly taught in the Scriptures. It was only after the lapse of centuries, and in many cases after heated controversies, that the Scripture doctrine was distinctly formulated and defined. It has been said that to the Greek mind and to the Greek Church was assigned the task of elaborating the doctrines of the Bible concerning the Trinity and the Person of Christ; to the Latin Church, the doctrines concerning sin and grace; to the German Church, the doctrine of justification. It may be added that it was reserved to the Dutch Church to be chiefly instrumental in developing the doctrine of the Covenants. The Westminster Assembly met just in time to reap the benefit of their labors, and to incorporate the doctrine in a full and final statement of the Reformed theology.

There is a very natural connection between the work of the Reformers, Luther and Calvin, in ascertaining and formulating the true doctrine of justification, and the subsequent work of the Dutch on the Covenants. The doctrine of the Reformers, as stated in the Shorter Catechism, is: "Justification is an act of God's free grace; wherein he pardons all our sins, and accepts us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by faith alone." The act terminates on the legal relations of man; consists of a title to eternal life as well as pardon of sin; and is grounded on

the perfect obedience of Christ to the precept as well as the penalty of the law. The act of justification secures to man far more than was possible under pure moral government. All that unmixed moral government can secure is the favor of God as long as the law is obeyed. Under such a system man's destiny must forever remain precarious. A single sin at any point in his career would alter his relation from that of innocence to that of condemnation. But the introduction of the federal principle modified moral government in two important respects. First, one was made to stand for the many. Under pure moral government every member of the human race would have stood for himself, but in the modification under the first Covenant Adam represented all his natural posterity. The representative character of Adam made it necessary also that another limitation should be placed upon pure moral government. The question of his allegiance had to be settled before the birth of the first of his posterity. Now the first of these limitations necessarily introduces the principle of imputation; and the second, the principle of justification. From this brief statement it will be seen how the apprehension of the Scripture doctrine of justification would tend to the development of the doctrine of the Covenants. No other than the federal arrangement could secure such a result as that implied in justification.

Before passing from the position of the Covenants in our Standards, we cannot forbear to refer to the important service rendered by Dr. Thornwell in this connection. From the time when we studied under him as a candidate for the ministry, we have felt that he deserved the credit of some original work in removing the obscurities that attach to the Standards when dealing with the Covenants. We are glad to see our impression confirmed by so competent a judge as the late Rev. Dr. Thomas E. Peck. We quote a brief passage from his *Miscellanies*, Vol. II., p. 365: "As to the nature and purpose of the Covenant of Works, the great merit of our author, it appears to us, is the clearness with which he brings out the

precise points of difference between the dispensation which goes under this name and the dispensation under which man was by the mere fact of his creation; or, in other words, the difference between moral government absolutely considered and the same as modified by the Covenant. The Westminster Standards throw no light on this subject. They say nothing, in describing man's condition under the Covenant of Works, from which we can gather the import of the promise of life, or determine why such a promise could not have belonged to a dispensation of *mere* moral government."

To this want of clearness may be added apparent inconsistencies in the statement of the doctrine of the Covenants. Leading theologians, who differ on some important points, claim with equal confidence the support of the Standards. It does not fall within the scope of this paper to interpret our Constitution, or to decide whether the differences which have emerged are due to the Standards, or lie back of them. Whatever may be the source of the differences, they are most likely to disappear at an early date. Take, for instance, the question whether there are two Covenants, or only one, relating to the salvation of fallen man. The chapter on the Covenants in the Confession mentions but one relating to salvation, which is called the Covenant of Grace. But when the question is raised as to the parties to that Covenant, two different answers appear to be given in the Standards. Chapter VII., Section III., of the Confession implies that God and his elect people are the parties. The answer to question thirty-one (31) in the Larger Catechism says: "The Covenant of Grace was made with Christ as the second Adam, and in him with the elect as his seed." The chapter on the Covenants is followed immediately by one "Of Christ the Mediator." In this chapter it is said: "It pleased God, in his eternal purpose, to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, his only begotten Son, to be the mediator between God and man, . . . unto whom he did, from all eternity, give a people to be his seed, and to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified and glori-

fied." This is enough to show why it is that there is now, and always will be, two views drawn from the Confession and Catechism. One class of readers sees two distinct statements as to the parties; and the troublesome difficulty of making Christ at once one of the contracting parties and the mediator in the same Covenant. The other class sees in the Larger Catechism an explanation of the statement in the Confession as to parties, and seems to feel no embarrassment from the specified difficulty. One class sees in the Confession two Covenants, the other only one. And when they go back to the Scriptures, the divergence is not healed. One class sees on the face of Scripture two distinct Covenants, with distinct parties, conditions, and promises: the other sees only the parallel between Adam and Christ, and a testamentary dispensation founded on it. Another instance of apparent discrepancy, giving rise to like divergence of view, is found in connection with the question of imputation under the Covenant of Works. Chapter VI., Section III., of the Confession reads: "They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed." Chapter VII., Section II., says: "The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." In the Larger Catechism the statement is: "The Covenant being made with Adam, as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity; all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression." With the Larger Catechism the Shorter agrees. The Standards thus set forth the dual relation of Adam to his natural posterity. He was to them a natural and a federal head. But it is not so clear what is taught as to the reason why Adam's posterity became involved in the guilt of his sin. The Confession seems to teach that imputation proceeded on both relations. The Catechisms make it proceed exclusively on the federal relation.

Passing now from the position given to the doctrine of the

Covenants in the Standards, we come next to inquire why the dispensations under which man has been placed have assumed the federal form? The answer of our Confession to this question is in these words: "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" (Chapter VII., Section I.). This is a statement worthy of our serious consideration. It may be broken up for convenience into several connected propositions. The duty of obedience to the Creator, on the part of an intelligent creature, springs necessarily from the relation involved. On the other hand, the fruition of God by the creatures, as their blessedness and reward, is a matter of sovereign grace. Since this is so, God has been pleased to offer this fruition of himself to man by way of covenant. The first of these propositions is self-evident. The obvious relation implied in the term *creature*, is that of absolute dependence on the will of the Creator. This gives God an absolute right of property in them. The right to govern, on the one hand, and the duty to obey, on the other, begin with the being of the intelligent creature. The second proposition is equally true, but not always as readily admitted. There is at least some obscurity attaching to the utterances of many in this connection. Perhaps a disregard of a very simple distinction lies at the root of the perplexity. It will be granted on all hands that the subject of God's moral government is sure of immunity from suffering as long as he obeys. This is implied in the verdict of conscience. But mere immunity from punishment is not all that conscience promises. It is clear from the light of nature that divine justice is a guarantee of all the positive rights belonging to the creature. It guarantees to the loyal servant all the blessedness attaching naturally to his nature and state, *but no more*. To infer from what God has done that he may be expected to do more; to reason from the

precarious situation of a free moral subject to some further sovereign interposition for his safety ; all such reasoning is fallacious. The act of creation brings the creature under obligation to God, but it cannot bring the Creator into obligation to the creature. Creation itself is a signal act of grace ; and, being such, cannot endow the beneficiary with a right to more grace. Otherwise, grace is no more grace. Obligation attaches to the creature necessarily, and every increase of grace heightens the obligation : but God is under no sort of obligation to give being by creation, or to add other gifts where he has bestowed one. The third proposition is vindicated by a study of the teaching of the Scriptures as to the Covenants. It is true that no mention of a promise is found in the account of the Covenant of Works given in Genesis. That a promise was made to Adam in that Covenant, and that it was a promise of life in the sense of the fruition of God, is put beyond question by the fact that the Covenant made with the second Adam was intended to secure all that was lost by the disobedience of the first. The only trouble with this third proposition is that it simply affirms a gracious fact and goes no further. The Covenant was introduced to secure for man a fruition of God, which mere legal relations could not give ; but why the promise of life belongs to the Covenant and not to pure Moral Government, we are not told. How Moral Government was modified by the Covenant in order that God might bestow the fruition of himself upon man, is not explained. Let us not, however, overlook the great truth stated distinctly in the Confession, because of regrets that it was not accompanied with an explanation as to details. The Covenant was devised by infinite wisdom under the prompting of divine grace. Not content with having made man in his own image, and with having set him over the work of his hands, God would introduce him into closer fellowship with himself, and give him a participation in his own blessedness. How soon the Covenant was made, we are not informed. The impression made by the narrative in Genesis is that it was very soon after man's

creation. This is an additional mark of the divine goodness. What happened immediately on the transgression, we are plainly informed. It is impossible for the mind to dwell upon the history of the Covenants without feeling the infinite goodness of God. To put man in his original innocence beyond the reach of sin, and to give him unrestricted fellowship with the Creator, was the design of the first. To rescue the lost, and make them joint-heirs with Christ, was the purpose of the second.

By the side of the statement of the Confession of Faith we will place the following from Witsius *On the Covenants*: "God, by this Covenant, acquires no new right over man; which, if we duly consider the matter, neither is nor can be founded on any benefit of God, or misdemeanor of man, as Arminius argues; nor in anything without God; the principle and alone foundation of it being the sovereign majesty of the most high God. . . . But man, upon his accepting the Covenant and performing the condition, does acquire some right to demand of God the promise. For God has, by his promise, made himself a debtor to man. Or, to speak in a manner more becoming God, he was pleased to make his performing his promises, a debt due to himself, to his goodness, justice and veracity." There is a thought here additional to the ground taken in the Confession. The Covenant places man upon a different footing. The promise held forth calls into play his activities, and the Covenant conveys the right to plead the promise. It is, however, in this connection, as we have already intimated, that the Rev. Dr. Thornwell has rendered valuable service to the Church. His view is that the design of the Covenant is to turn the relation in which the rational creature naturally stands to God from that of a servant to that of a son. "Though God in justice might have left man to the operation of a pure moral government, conducted by the rule of distributive justice, and might have forever retained him in the attitude of a servant, yet the Divine goodness seems to have contemplated from the very beginning

a nearer and tenderer relationship, and a destiny of inconceivably greater dignity and glory than mere justice would or could have awarded. It was always God's purpose to turn the servant into a son." That it was the design of the Covenant of Grace to make believers sons of God is the explicit teaching of the Scriptures. "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." The relation of the Covenants, as we have seen, is such as to necessitate the inference that the first Covenant must have had the same purpose. The relation of a son, it may also be remarked, evidently secures that nearness upon which the fruition of God may be obtained which according to the Confession is not found in man's natural situation. The ground of a son's right to the blessings he enjoys is the love of the father, and the principle on which he possesses it is that of inheritance and not of debt. A son has ready access to his father; nor is he the subject of judicial discipline. The son is his father's companion and heir. Thus far the case is clear. But how does the Covenant turn a servant into a son? It does so by introducing the principle of justification. Moral Government could never justify in its pure form. Perpetual and perfect obedience would only secure perpetual innocence. A sin at any period would bring condemnation. Justification is a final state of exemption from the possibility of condemnation. In our Standards it includes a title to eternal life as well as pardon. There is no mistaking the import of the Scriptures as to the matter. There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died." The obedience of Christ under the Covenant secures justification for his people, not simply pardon. And if Adam had obeyed the Covenant of Works, he and his posterity would have been secured forever against the possibility of sin or condemnation. The

time of probation was limited for that very purpose. And, of course, in case of justification the relation of a servant ceases. The only relation consistent with a justified state is that of a son. In other words, adoption is founded on justification. So it is presented in the Epistle to the Romans.

The design of the Covenants shows that the federal principle is one of benevolence. If Adam had obeyed, none of his posterity would have criticised the principle. That he failed was not the fault of the principle. Its vindication by the second Adam was complete. And it was the only principle that would have availed to rescue any sinner. But the question has been raised, whether the federal relation is founded in justice? Our Standards assume that it is, without debate or even mention. Where the Scriptures are silent, they have nothing to say. It must be confessed that the efforts that have been made to justify the relation upon principles of reason have not been satisfactory. That our native depravity is sin is the verdict of conscience as well as the doctrine of Scripture. That it is the penal consequence of the first sin of the first man is equally clear from the Scriptures. That Adam represented in the covenant of works all his posterity descending from him by ordinary generation is also a plain fact of Scripture. We are glad that our Standards are content simply to state the case as it is taught in the Bible. Our understanding is that the construction commonly placed on the teaching of the Standards in this country is that imputation proceeds upon the federal relation, while the natural tie determines who were represented in the Covenant, and serves as the ground for the representation. This theory avoids the metaphysics of personal unity; and, at the same time, is regarded as sustained by the Scriptures. It also accounts for the fact that Adam's influence upon the race was limited to his first sin. That God adopted this method in dealing with Adam and his posterity is ample guarantee for its essential righteousness.

There is a third consideration connected with the subject of this article which remains to be mentioned. The federal

principle should be made prominent in our creed not only because it is scriptural and gracious, but it should be cherished because of its apologetical value. This is the citadel of our characteristic doctrines. Calvinism triumphed in the Synod of Dort, and excluded Arminianism. The Westminster Assembly endorsed the works of the Synod, and committed the Presbyterian Church to the defense of that system which gives all the glory to God. It is a noble trust, but not to be executed with human weapons. All that is intended here is a hint as to the vantage-ground we have in the doctrine of the Covenants. It lies upon the face of the fifth chapter of Romans that there was a Covenant of Works. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." "By the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." The reference is unmistakably to the record in the second chapter of Genesis. It is all spoken of as known and understood: and used simply in the way of illustration. The matter in hand was the method by which a believing sinner becomes righteous. Paul says that Adam was a type of Christ. The analogy is made to lie in the federal principle. Adam was the representative of his natural descendants in a Covenant, and the consequences of his disobedience were imputed to them. In this he was a type of the second Adam, who also represented a people in a covenant, and the consequences of whose obedience are imputed to them. The second Covenant is a reality, call it what you may. The parties to it are God and his eternal Son. It is not so much a covenant with a people, as about them. The work of Christ is not to make it possible for God to enter into Covenant with Adam's descendants, but to fulfil the terms of a stipulation by which some of them are to be saved. To this agrees the whole tenor of Scripture. Christ constantly speaks of the commission under which he acted, of the work given him to do, of his people as given to him by the Father and of the promises made to him. As sin entered into the world by the violation of one Covenant, so redemption was secured by

obedience to another. Milton was orthodox when he proposed to sing :

“Of man’s first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful seat.”

Suppose, now, that the question of the decrees of God be under consideration. Let the decree of election particularly be the subject. There is no lack of proof as to the nature of the decree, particularly that it is not founded on the foresight of faith and repentance. The facts of providence, of the Bible, and of experience are all on the side of unconditional election. It is, however, significant that the Scriptures couple the decree with the Covenant. As, for instance, in Ephesians 1:3-6: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; According as he hath *chosen us in him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.” The Augustinian doctrine of election could not be stated more clearly and comprehensively than it is in this passage. We have italicized the clause which connects it with the Covenant. The elect are chosen in Christ. The only reason they are treated differently from others is that he represents them. They were given to him before the foundation of the world. They were given to him not because it was foreknown that they would be holy, but in order that they might be holy. Representation is incompatible with any conditional scheme. Or take the doctrine of original sin. There can hardly be a question as to the fact that men are born with a depraved nature. The testimony of the Scriptures is so fully sustained by observation and experience as to leave no room for debate. But is the case so utterly desperate as the Reformed theology represents? Here, again, there could be no difficulty if the

doctrine of the Covenants was received and understood by all. The penalty of the Covenant of Works was "death." "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." What death is eludes our grasp. What life is we are unable to say. But we do know life as the condition of consciousness, activity, and blessedness. It is easy to detect its presence or its absence. Death, on the other hand, is the absence of life. A dead man neither sees, nor hears, nor feels, nor moves. Life and death are alike pervasive. When a man is dead he is dead all over. Adam died spiritually the moment he disobeyed. Not a vestige of his original holiness remained. Not only so, but at the same moment "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." And so we might illustrate as to the extent of the atonement, efficacious grace, justification, and the perseverance of the saints. But we have said enough to indicate the value of the federal principle from this point of view. And here we make an end.

W. T. HALL.

Columbia, S. C.

IV. THE PILGRIM FATHERS OF THE WEST.

On August 25th of last year, at Holland, Mich., a semi-centennial celebration was held of the colonization of various parts of the Union, by emigrants from the Netherlands; but especially of the forming of the large colony on the shores of Macatawa Bay.

Says the Commission: "No immigrants, from whatever shores, have made a better record, in this country, during the present century, than from 'Brave little Holland.'"

The movement began in 1847, and still the current flows, until it is estimated that over half a million of Hollanders are scattered, in smaller or larger colonies, from the Atlantic to the foot of the Rockies and even far beyond to the very shores of the Pacific.

Ever since Henry Hudson, the intrepid navigator, of English blood and Dutch affiliation and sympathies, in 1609, had discovered the Hudson River in his search of a N. W. passage to China, the thrifty Hollanders had looked to the American Continent, with a keen appreciation of its commercial possibilities, especially as regarded the fur-trade.

The "West India Company" was established, and New Amsterdam became the distributing point and centre of its enormously profitable American trade.

Hundreds of colonists, Dutch in the main, but also Walloon and of other nationalities, were carried across the seas, in the hope of bettering their condition and of securing a future for their descendants. These colonists established new centres of life and prosperity, and patterned closely after the Fatherland, in their civic and domestic establishments.

But in 1664 England laid its strong hand on the Dutch colonies, and the treaty of Breda, 1667, confirmed its possession, and thus the names New Netherlands and New Amsterdam became a memory and a tradition.

The Dutch tenacity of purpose, however, is shown by the fact that the earmarks of the Netherlands still abound, along

the Hudson and the Mohawk, where the language and the customs of the Fatherland, in an extremely untoward environment, were religiously perpetuated from generation to generation, till they died out only in the first half of this century. Meanwhile the great Indian pelagic possessions of the Dutch and South Africa had absorbed the rivulet of emigration.

Then came the mighty changes in the Netherlands, which prepared the way for the exodus of 1847 and subsequent years.

England slowly absorbed the royal trade of the Netherlands, the power of the Dutch Republic was waning, the old inspiration had vanished, and in 1795 the fabric of the commonwealth melted away. Ever since the great ecclesiastico-political struggle of the early days of the 17th century, the centrifugal and centripetal forces in the Union had been at war, with the inevitable result of slowly but steadily undermining the foundations of the proud burgher-Republic.

The revolution of 1795 cleft the mystic tie between the House of Orange and the Netherlands. Old landmarks were buried out of sight and old principles were scorned and trampled in the dust. A brief dream of absolute liberty, a withering intoxication with French maxims and ideas, and the strong heel of Napoleon had crushed out the life of the short lived "Batavian Republic" and embodied it in the voracious empire. For the kingdom of Louis Bonaparte had been but a fiction of independence. One of the ministers of the Emperor, Fouchè, had stated the matter correctly, when he said: "the Emperor considers the countries, which he has given to his brothers, as belonging to the French Empire. He was willing that they should bear the title of kings, but simply in order that they might govern according to *his*, not their own will." Indescribable misery was endured by Holland under the French regime, especially through its close relations with England. In the vortex of the revolution the country had lost its grasp on the former order of things; a counter-revolution must therefore establish something entirely new. This new thing was created, when William V. of Orange was re-

called from England in 1813, and as William I. was crowned as Holland's first king. But William had not been abroad in vain, and both kings and subjects had obtained new ideas in the revolution. One of the first things he undertook to do, was the reorganization of the Dutch Church, which in the 16th century had given birth to the Republic. The Dutch reformation had been at the same time a revolution; the free Church in the Netherlands existed before the free State. This Church had been intensely democratic, its government had been representative from the lowest to the highest bodies. The power, which the government exercised over it, had been coöperative rather than regulative, paternal rather than coercive. The Stadholders and Regents exercised only such supervisory functions in it, as were the legitimate outcome of the historic relation between the Church and the State. In her own sphere the Church had been claimed to be absolutely free and sovereign. At a stroke of the pen all this was changed. William's ideal was the reorganization of the Dutch Church after the pattern of the Anglican Church, with the sovereign as its practical head. All the representative bodies of the Church were set aside and replaced by appropriate Boards or "Bestwein," and the idea of popular representation, by regular ecclesiastical appointment, was utterly banished from the new organization, whilst the old test for entering the ministry was changed. Any one acquainted with the history of the Netherlands, in which Church and State are so inseparably interwoven, will readily perceive the ruinousness of this high-handed proceeding. In the end it occasioned the Free Church of Holland.

The life of the Dutch Church moved on a low plane, when the trumpet blasts of Cesar Malan of Geneva, himself set on fire by the Methodistical movements in England, resounded through the Netherlands in 1832. Holland was swept in line with the "great revival." Men of international fame, like Groen Van Prinsterer, Bilderdyh, Da Costa and others were deeply stirred by it, and in the University of Leyden it acted

like a hot blast on a small coterie of men of intense convictions and great force of character. And when the natural leaders recoiled from the logical consequences of the movement, these young men lifted high the banner of the old Church and the old doctrine, for which the fathers had bled, and the Free Church of Holland was born in 1834. Among these courageous spirits were A. C. Van Raalte and H. P. Schotte, who were destined to become the leaders of the new exodus to America. But between those years of 1834 and 1847 lie the horrors of a relentless persecution. The government tried to thwart and coerce the new movement. An old Napoleonic code against secret societies, forbidding more than nineteen people to meet in any given place, unrepealed because of its perfect uselessness, was unearthed and applied to the Seceders; and on this anachronism a bitter and shameful persecution was founded. The adherents of the new movement were fined and imprisoned, dragonnaded and mobbed, their meetings were rudely dispersed, sometimes with bloodshed, their preachers were hounded and incarcerated like the vilest criminals. Thus Holland, whose name once had been a synonym for religious liberty, in the 19th century, persecuted her sons and daughters, *for adhering to the very faith, for which the war of independence had been waged during eighty weary years.*

Meanwhile a dreadful commercial paralysis smote the country. Business of every description stagnated, work was scarce and ill paid, capital lay idle, confidence was destroyed, and a general condition of "malaise" prevailed; when the cup, already dangerously full, ran over by the blight of a double national calamity—the "rinderpest" and the "potato-rot," and thus the fever of expatriation set in.

For eleven years Van Raalte had borne the heat and burden of the day, and he had emptied the cup of persecution to the very dregs, when he was stricken with the deadly typhus. In his delirium he was ever occupied with the startling condition of affairs in Church and State, and in his lucid intervals he

vowed that, should he get well, he would lead those, who would follow him, across the sea. People were desperate, but whither? To South Africa? But the journey was long and the conditions there far from propitious. To Batavia? But the same religious intolerance would follow them to the "pearl of the Indian Ocean," from which they sought deliverance at home. And thus the pilgrims turned their faces westward, and the American emigration was a "*fait accompli*."

Look for a minute at its chief leader—a man short of stature but well proportioned and of commanding aspect; with an uncommon expanse of forehead; clear gray-blue eyes of wonderful expressiveness; a smile, which was a revelation; lips firm and full of decision, nose prominent, chin indicative of strength of character; a man once seen never to be forgotten, a man of rare powers of eloquence, of brilliant education, of great administrative ability and rare organizing talent; a man among a thousand, specially and providentially fitted for his great life-work. Such was Albertus C. Van Raalte. What Robinson was to the Leyden pilgrims, that and far more than that Van Raalte was to the pilgrims of 1846. In September of that year he set sail, with his immediate followers, in a small sailing vessel, variously named in the documents "the Sultane" and "the Southerner," and on the 17th of November they reached New York, where the pilgrims, whose history was well known in America, were warmly welcomed by members of the Reformed Dutch Church, among whom Drs. De Witt of New York and Wyckoff of Albany and elder Forrester were most prominent. And now the wide Western world lay before them. It is almost inconceivable what changes the last fifty years have wrought on this continent. The "WEST" in 1847 had still an ominous sound, in which the rustle and roar of the mighty forests, the breath of the prairies, the thunderous hoof-beat of the lordly buffalo, and the wild Indian war-whoop were strangely blended. Van Raalte had carefully studied the situation and had selected the woodlands of Eastern Wisconsin as a place of settlement. But even in New York this

decision wavered. The cost of travel was a serious consideration, the means of transportation in the West were limited and primitive, the distances were great and the people were poor. Why look far away, when near at hand a suitable situation offered itself? Michigan just then offered special inducements.

The preposterous speculative feature, which had ruined thousands, had brought its inevitable reaction and cleared the atmosphere; the main current of immigration had sought other channels; lands were comparatively cheap. It was just ten years ago that the territory of Michigan had been, somewhat irregularly, admitted to Statehood. It was three years ago that the Supreme Court had declared the law unconstitutional, under which the "*wild-cat*" banks played their nefarious game with public interests. In 1800 Michigan was an unknown and ill-famed wilderness. In 1830 it had 32,000 inhabitants, which number more than doubled itself in the next five years. Its ruinous financial policy caused the new State, in 1839, to totter on the very verge of total collapse. Wiser counsels prevailed, and in the next decade there was slow but marked progress; and in this period Van Raalte reached these parts. The advice of prominent New York people and the general poverty of his followers decided the choice, and thus the fall of 1846 found the pilgrims at Detroit, where Van Raalte left his family, and whence he began a systematic exploration of the country, for the selection of a proper site for his colony.

Since 1833 there had been a slow infiltration of white settlers into the basin of the Grand River valley, and to this location he was specially attracted. In December, therefore, he traveled from Detroit to Allegan, with such facilities as the state of society afforded, and at Allegan he found, in Judge Kellogg, a life-long and trusted friend and adviser. To the West of this place lay the maiden forests in an unbroken chain, sparsely inhabited by the Potawatamie and Ottawa Indians, among whom the Rev. S. Smith labored as missionary. And to the lowly blockhouse of this man Van Raalte was led by Judge Kellogg and a few other friends, travelling on horse-

back and in single file, along the Indian trails and deer-tracks, which formed the arteries of the untouched wilderness, along which its life seemed to pulse. Hospitably received, the pioneer at once began his work of exploration, and several times these excursions in mid-winter, in his weakened condition, came near killing him. Once, as he was crossing a swollen creek on a tree, cut down for the purpose, the unstable bridge lost its equilibrium, and only the unequalled agility of Van Raalte saved his life. On another occasion he became benumbed with cold, miles away from home, and begged the Indians, who accompanied him and who endeavored to arouse him, to leave him to his fate. With infinite trouble these faithful souls succeeded in getting him back to the block-house of the missionary.

At last the work was done and the location of the new colony selected, on the shores of Black Lake, a beautiful bay of Lake Michigan. Late in January he returned to Detroit, and preparations were at once made for removal to their chosen forest home. On the boundary-line of civilization the women and children, with most of the men, were left behind, whilst a few sturdy pioneers and one single woman, who soon paid with her life for her temerity, went ahead to prepare some sort of shelter for the colonists. And thus on Tuesday, the 9th of February, 1847, these pioneers, led by Van Raalte, reached the spot which had been selected, and after a fervent prayer, in which the colonists joined with rapt devotion, the first axe-blow was struck and the first tree was felled.

After a few weeks, when some rude preparation for shelter had been made, the rest of the colonists came with their families; whilst three months later the wife and children of Van Raalte arrived, who had meanwhile been the guests of the estimable family of Judge Kellogg at Allegan. And now the battle began in earnest. Lands were distributed in severalty and the gigantic task of *clearing* began. One who has never seen an untouched maiden forest can scarcely conceive

of its tangled density and wild, awful grandeur. Every tree, which is endemic to the temperate zone, grew here in wild profusion. Mighty forests of pine and hemlock, bordered on mightier forests of oak and beech and birch and maple and all manner of hardwood trees. Game abounded, and partly civilized Indians roamed through the wilderness, in a state of slow decadence. And to the stupendous task of creating a kosmos out of this chaos men addressed themselves, whose early training had wholly unfitted them for it. Few of them were familiar with forests, none with nature in a state of complete abandonment, and not one of them was skilled in wood craft. They had been bakers and carpenters and ship-builders and tailors and painters and merchants and teachers and clerks; but what did these occupations avail in the forest. And yet they succeeded, by sheer will power and indefatigable industry and faith in God, in converting the howling wilderness of 1847 into the blooming paradise of 1897, with its substantial buildings and rich farms and sleek cattle and evidences of prosperity on every hand.

But how they suffered and toiled! What heartaches and home-sickness, what disappointments and privations, what despair often and soul-hunger, lie buried beneath the ruins of these magnificent forests. Their poverty had led them to the wilderness rather than to the prairies, as the comparative wealth of a second band of colonists, who under Rev. H. G. Scholte settled the rich plains of Iowa, had led the latter to the prairies rather than to the forest. And the poverty, which brought them here, chained them to their apparently forlorn hope and to their gigantic struggle. The destruction of trees was indiscriminate and often apparently wanton. More timber was leveled than could be disposed of, and these prostrate trees, as after events proved, grew into a terrible menace to the little city, which formed the throbbing heart of the entire settlement. In all those years Van Raalte was the soul of the enterprise, and his removal at any time would have been a disaster to the colony.

In the first few years of their history death moved with swift strides among them. Four mighty allies served him. First came the unaccustomed work and its exhaustive nature. In the second place, insufficient shelter. The first homes of the colonists were mere tents and booths, and later on rudely constructed shacks and log houses. In the third place, they had to contend with a new and very trying climate, coupled with insufficient and unwholesome food and poisonous drinking water, and almost universally insufficient clothing. And last, but not least, came the pestilential exhalations of the newly broken soil. Every clearing became a plague-spot. The merciless sun of the hot summer months beat on the stagnant pools, which could not be drained on account of the encircling forests, which blocked the way to the creeks and rivers, the natural drains of the soil. And thus death reaped a rich harvest and held wild carnival in those early days of the colonial history.

Fever-and-ague, bilious, typhoid and scarlet fever, bloody flux, measles and smallpox and other diseases appeared in the settlement, till it was devastated and resembled a huge hospital. Every log house and booth and tent contained dead and dying settlers; dumb despair laid hold of all hearts; funerals were so numerous that they were conducted without ceremony or religious rites. Dickens' desperate picture of "*Eden*," here seemed to be realized. A settler, returning home late at night, found a tent with a deathlike stillness hovering over it. Turning back the sheet, which formed its door, he saw an appalling scene. On a rude bed lay two dead children, the mother, in her death struggles, had rolled off the bed and lay on her face on the frozen ground. As darkness came on apace and the way was long, all he could do was to place the mother beside her children and cover all with a sheet. When he returned in the morning, the tent was gone and the dead slept beneath the freshly turned soil. This was not an extreme case. Whole families were found dead together, all of them yielded their quota to the spoils of the dread de-

stroyer. During this critical period Van Raalte, while preaching in the forest, from a stump, was so overcome by mental agony, that he broke down in his discourse and wailed, in the anguish of his spirit: "*O God, must we then all perish.*" And yet those Sabbaths were the uplifts of those Puritans, schooled by adversity, who dragged themselves for weary miles along impassable footpaths through the wilderness, to attend the inspiring ministrations of the great preacher. His prayers carried them beyond their present sufferings and steeled them to new courage and new effort. His sermons were like Pisgah's mountain top, whence he bade them survey the future, the land of promise before them; and with new vigor and indomitable determination they were sent back to resume their gigantic task and to struggle onward into the slowly breaking day of better things.

Meanwhile other bands of pilgrims had come from various Dutch provinces and branch colonies were established for miles around, and in ever widening circles the stroke of the axe was heard and the crash of falling timbers. As the clearings grew in extent and the settlers in prosperity, comfort began to replace want and the promise of final success developed into faith and assurance. Among the pioneer leaders of the Michigan pilgrims, Revs. C. Van der Menten, the genial Leeland pastor, and S. Bolhs, the shrewd and sturdy minister of the Overisel settlers, occupy a prominent position. Especially the former became Van Raalte's trusted friend and coadjutor; but as before he remained *the* leader. With true Napoleonic instinct, he never allowed his people to think of the insurmountable obstacles before them; with inimitable optimism he caused them to scorn the thought of possible failure; new plans and projects ever boiled up from his resourceful brain and were realized or at least attempted, and thus the disappointments of the pioneers were largely forgotten in the feverish expectations of new issues, which were ever preparing.

And slowly the evidences of progress became marked, and gradually the city of Holland, nestling cosily by the side of

the beautiful bay, was evolved from the wilderness; order had been developed from chaos.

The parallel between these pilgrims of 1847 and those of 1620 is exceedingly close. Religious intolerance was the ultimate cause of both movements; both sought abroad what they could not find at home—the betterment of their physical condition, but above all religious liberty. Both hailed from the same country and from the same port, although they were of different nationalities. Both held an identical faith, a faith which in history has proved itself a nation builder; a faith which may disappoint aesthetically, but which never disappoints in the ethics of a people thoroughly swayed by it. Both were pioneer movements in an unbroken wilderness, and wrought out their salvation by infinite toil and pain. In both success was attained by the sacrifice of large numbers of pioneers; both had eminent leadership and achieved marked results. What the Puritan of 1620 was to New England, the Puritan of 1847 proves himself increasingly to be to Michigan.

No sooner were the first trees felled but a log church was erected,—the first building constructed,—and a portion of that primitive structure was set apart for *School purposes*. “Education alone can save you from complete materialization”—was Van Raalte’s ever recurring warning to his people. And in the elucidation of this maxim, ideas were evolved from his fertile brain, which for many years, to say the least, seemed visionary and optimistic. But Van Raalte was a seer, he felt the needs of the future and saw what was hidden from others, and he tried to meet those needs. A school of high grade must be established, to be developed into an academy, then into a college, then into a seminary. He felt the need of accomplished leadership in every sphere, and only education could furnish it. And thus primary schools were established in every branch colony, which were to be feeders to the higher something which Van Raalte had in mind. In February, 1847, the first tree fell in the colony, two years later the pilgrims had ecclesiastically associated themselves with the Re-

formed (Dutch) Church in America, and in 1850 Van Raalte arose on the floor of the Particular Synod of Albany at Schenectady to plead for higher education. After hearing him, they said to him: "Your fervor is commendable, but you anticipate on your development. First try to reach a decent degree of physical prosperity in your colony, and then you may begin to think of a college." Here is Van Raalte's reply: "How could we answer to God and to posterity, if we took care of material affairs and not, nay especially not, of the intellectual and spiritual interests of the future. Neglect here were a crime." Such a man *must* succeed, and succeed he did! For in October, 1851, Walter T. Taylor, of Geneva, N. Y., who there presided over a flourishing school, arrived in the colony to open an academy.

Think of it! An academy in the wilderness, among a people wholly unacquainted with the English language, and struggling with adversity and death itself, and having but a precarious hold on existence. *From such stuff empires are built.* The school was established and began to develop. The noble Taylor also was forced to yield to hard work and malarial fever, and the youthful John Van Vleck took his place. In 1857, ten years after their arrival, the colonists saw the first academic and dormitory hall arise, principally through the tireless work of Van Raalte. Two years later, Dr. Philip Phelps, jr., took charge of the nascent institution, whose large idealism and wonderful tact and scholarship, ably seconded the efforts of Van Raalte, till in 1863 the academy developed into a college, and in 1866 into a theological institution, with full collegiate and theological courses.

Thus the dream of Van Raalte was realized. From the beginning he had called this school his "Anchor of Hope"—and these words are immortalized in the present seal of "Hope College," which consists of an anchor, around which the legend is written, "*Spera in Deo.*"

The most serious trial of Van Raalte's life came on the 9th of October, 1871. Little more than three months before, he

had lost his beloved wife. In the fall, that phenomenal fall of 1871, the forests avenged themselves on their victors. Simultaneously with the great Chicago fire, the beautiful little city of Holland, with its 2,400 inhabitants and growing industries, was all but annihilated by fire. For days, before the blow came, it had been expected. The air was full of fire and thick with smoke. A long continued drought had enabled the forests to do their worst. At midnight, when nearly the entire population was fighting the fiery demon in the neighboring forest, he suddenly flung himself on the largest church in the city and on the bark piles of an extensive tannery plant. Within two brief hours Holland, the centre of the colony, was practically wiped out. Nearly a million dollars worth of property, the fruit of almost a quarter of a century of toil and thrift, was hopelessly lost. The insured and the uninsured fared alike, through the collapse of numerous insurance companies, by the Chicago fire. Fortunately no lives were lost, except that of an old woman, but many narrowly escaped by plunging in river and lake. Besides the city, numerous isolated farm houses, in the colony, were destroyed by this fire.

The morning dawned on a sad scene; the city was in ruins, the citizens in despair, and Holland's fate trembled in the balance. Then once more Van Raalte's old spirit flamed up, and, in a memorable address, he poured, as of old, courage and strength to endure and to hope, into the hearts of his people. He ended with these memorable words: "With our Dutch tenacity and our American experience, we will rebuild Holland."

And he lived to see the day of the partial fulfilment of his own prophecy. Death claimed him on the 7th of November, 1876. That death and that funeral showed how deeply he had embedded himself in the hearts of his people. A perfect shower of resolutions and encomiums fell upon his coffin. All business for miles around was suspended, city and county, church and college mourned, and well might they write on the memorial tablet in his own old church: "*A man mighty in word and deed.*" For such he had proved himself to be.

He had his meed of praise during his lifetime. Both the University of New York and Rutgers College, N. J., honored themselves by giving this man the honorary title of Doctor of Divinity. But the future will know Van Raalte better than the past and the present.

Nearly a quarter of a century has elapsed since he passed away, and the colonists and their children have celebrated the semi-centennial anniversary of his great colonization effort. What changes these fifty years have made! The little town, he planted, has developed into a prosperous city, throbbing with life and industry, and more than realizing the extremest ideals of the pioneers of 1847. The College and Seminary, though modest yet in their equipment, lift their heads without shame. With their fifteen professors and two hundred and seventy-five students, with their thorough courses and established reputation, they look hopefully ahead and trust in God. The great original hives have swarmed again and again and the Michigan colonies have been duplicated in almost every Western State. They are found in Wisconsin and in Illinois, in Minnesota and Nebraska, in Ohio and Kansas, in Iowa and the Dakotas, as well as in New York and New Jersey, in Montana and Washington. Truly those early "Pilgrim Fathers" of 1847 built better than they knew. The immigration of 1847 and subsequent years has given to America a class of citizens, who may gratefully and proudly repeat the challenge of the Semi-Centennial Commission.

The pioneers of 1847, and their children and grand-children, with a countless host of their American friends and admirers, assembled on August 25th and 26th, 1897, to intertwine the star-spangled banner and the three-color; to raise a votive altar to the memory of the heroes of half a century ago; and above all to place a garland and to drop a tear on the grave of the man who conceived the plan of this building, and who succeeded in rearing it, with consummate skill and courage and faith: "*Requiescat in pace.*"

Holland, Mich.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

V. A DEFENCE OF THE SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1. "*When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them, and humbly to petition that they may be repealed.*"—*Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ Throughout the Earth, 1861.*

2. The Church's vocation is "to be a witness-bearer, and the Bible regulates her testimony and her profession. *The State must not contradict her testimony, and that is all the State is bound to do.*"—*Thos. E. Peck.*

3. "Nothing, therefore, ought to be considered by any court as an offence, or admitted as a matter of accusation, which cannot be proved to be such from Scripture, *as interpreted in these Standards.*"—*Rules of Discipline.*

4. "We will not at present inquire whether the doctrine be or be not agreeable to reason and morality, whether it be right that a man should, with a wig on his head and a band round his neck, do for a guinea what, without these appendages, he would think it wicked and infamous to do for an empire."—*Macaulay.*

5. "By *father and mother . . . are meant . . . especially such as by God's ordinance are over us in place of authority, whether in the family, Church, or commonwealth.*" "The sins of superiors are, . . . commanding things unlawful, . . . careless exposing or leaving them (inferiors) to wrong, temptation, and danger."—*Larger Catechism.*

6. "We have not intended to deny that the State is a moral personality; that there is an 'organic life,' or a 'public conscience' belonging to political communities. All this is freely admitted. . . . This public conscience and organic life are to be regulated and controlled by the light of nature, *interpreted and corrected by the Word of God,* when the State is in possession of that Word."—*Thomas E. Peck.*

7. "Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary," &c.—*Confession of Faith*.

8. "Whereas, Synods and Councils *may handle* affairs which concern the commonwealth, 'by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary.'" &c.—*General Assembly, 1890*.

These extracts, taken from various sources, are put at the head of this discussion, because they formulate articulately the fundamental principles underlying it. But before applying them to the matter in hand, I must call attention to another question of some importance. The complainants seem to limit their appeal to Scripture to the New Testament.

"Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are contained all the books of the Old and New Testament. . . . All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life."—*Confession of Faith*.

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience."—*Larger Catechism*.

1. "In cases extraordinary." It is denied that the case is extraordinary. We affirm that it is such a case. (a) We could easily wish that our Church might come to some certain, settled conclusion as to the use of the word "extraordinary." In regard to licensure "in extraordinary cases," we find extreme laxity of construction of this word even by those who will have none of such laxity in the case before us. They swing from an intolerable extreme on the one hand to an intolerable extreme on the other hand. (b) Anything may be extraordinary, (1), in kind, as, *e. g.*, the first railway train: (2), in intensity, as, *e. g.*, Nebuchadnezzar's furnace: (3), in extent, as, *e. g.*, a man of great mental power, such as our sainted Dabney or Thornwell, reaching beyond the ken of ordinary mortals: or (4), in efficiency, such as the blowing up of a great battleship by a little torpedo boat. That the Post Office department is guilty in the sense of the rule, or law, in

the last three senses, needs no proof. With ever increasing intensity, extent, and efficiency, it has gone on, in all these respects, to such lengths that the anti-Sabbatarians claim the field and denounce Sabbatarians as impertinent intruders, and many timid Christians are afraid to assert God's law in the face of such powerful opposition. Enemies numerous and powerful are shaking the Sabbath to its deepest foundation. A network of railroads is spread out over our whole country, and the Sunday-newspapers, flaming with pictures, teeming with charming stories and exciting news from all the world, are delivered at our very doors by ten o'clock a. m., and inducing hundreds of thousands of people to stay away from church. We have arrived at an extraordinary stage in our downward career in this matter. (c) It is extraordinary in kind. The State has not, so far as I am aware, gone about to annul any one of the remaining nine commandments of the Decalogue. It has attacked Moses only in this one point—the fourth commandment; and, viewed from any Christian standpoint, this is a proceeding without a parallel—yea, even from the standpoint of natural morality, it is a long step towards moral and national decay and ruin. Much more might be said, but enough is said, on this point.

2. The Synod's action can be defended, in our judgment, without recourse to the rule "that Synods and Councils may handle affairs which concern the commonwealth in extraordinary cases." The fourth commandment does not concern the commonwealth in the sense of that law. It is, if viewed affirmatively as commanding, truly both moral and spiritual, belonging by right to the Church of Jesus Christ; and he, as King of kings and Lord of lords, has given to the State no right, authority or commission to abrogate or annul this law. When the State, therefore, presumes to set aside this holy commandment, the State attacks the Church, assails her right, and invades her sphere. The question, in principle, may be shifted to any other commandment. Suppose it should prohibit, by law, our celebrating the Lord's Supper, or adminis-

tering baptism, or our sending out missionaries. Has the Church no right of self-protection? Must she use no means for self-defence? We have an inherent, inalienable, eternal right to appear at the bar of the State and by moral, rational, and rightful means seek to induce the State to recede from its wrong and wicked position, and to grant to us our right to move on in our own sphere without interference of any kind from it. The doctrine that the Church of Jesus Christ is denied by the law of God the right to use any means whatever to protect herself when assailed from without by the State, makes her a unique institution—the only one on the earth absolutely excluded from the use of means for self-protection, and for the fulfilling of her mission. Without the Sabbath, it is confessed by all, religion can not survive. Ungodliness through State-machinery attacks it: shall godliness through a fatalistic ecclesiasticism deny it the right of defence? “I trow not.” The sentiment expressed in the above quotation (No. 1) from the great Magna Charta of the Southern Church is a truth that lies at the bottom of all rights and duties. Kings, queens, empires, and nations come and go, but the right to stand and appeal to reason and conscience for self-protection and self-preservation, and for the accomplishment of a divinely appointed mission, by all, from the humblest to the greatest, will abide on forever, and no amount of sophistry will avail to rob us of it.

“There are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.”—*Confession of Faith*.

An appeal to the sense of justice and conscience of men was the last and only resort of our holy Lord in the day of his sorrow: “If I have spoken evil, *bear witness of the evil*: BUT IF WELL, WHY SMITEST THOU ME?” When, then, we challenge the kings and potentates to remove their unholy hands from the throat of the Church, the blessed Master’s struggling,

suffering Bride, his own example points to duty and shows the way, and assures us that we are right.

3. There is a wide and obvious distinction between *enacting* a law and *repealing* a law: a distinction overlooked by the complainants, and that ruins their cause. When the State *enacts* a law, it prescribes penalties for its infraction, and modes of procedure in trial and conviction. Men are made responsible for its enforcement. But in *repealing* a law, pains, penalties, agencies for enforcing, *etc.*, have no place. No law is left to be violated, no penalty to be inflicted, no men to enforce it, and so on.

Now, as a matter of fact, it is a question whether the Postmaster General has or has not legal authority to order the suspension of the transmission of the mails and opening of the post-offices on the Sabbath. Hence, the petition takes the alternative form, requesting him to issue the order if he is not compelled by law to continue it; if he be compelled, to seek the *repeal* of the law that makes such continuance compulsory. Such are the facts in the case. The complainants charge that "Synod seeks to call into play the machinery of the civil law, with its inevitable accompaniments of *civil pains and penalties.*" If Synod had asked the government to *enact* a law of any kind, the charges here made would have had some appearance of reason in them; but when we consider that the Synod, *at most*, only sought the *repeal* of a compulsory law, if such exists, the injustice of these allegations are manifest to all.

In regard to the relation of Church and State the changes have been rung *in extensu* on the beautiful similitude found in our Magna Charta, "*Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ,*" &c. :

"They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter."

But when one, the State, has left its sphere and has invaded the orbit of the other, the Church, as is the case with respect to our government annulling the fourth commandment; the

collision has come, and the predicted disasters are in sight. The question is no longer one of what ought to be or to have been, but as to what must be done to avert the foreseen and impending ruin. It is an imbecility to sit idly and discuss theories of sanitation to prevent the introduction of yellow fever, when the disease is now here and raging. Not a theory but a condition must be met.

Since, then, as we have shown, the State has set aside the fourth commandment, whether by custom or legal enactment, the condition is one of a collision that *has occurred*, and the supreme duty of the hour is to avert the disasters and terminate the collision. Passive resistance means surrender. The collision is ended in that case by the Church abandoning the fourth commandment, *quoad hoc*.

The reader is now begged to note that Synod sought only and the whole of her petition was, that the State recede from its invasion of *her* orbit. The right of humbly petitioning an intruder into our affairs to get out, is inalienable and can not be ceded away even by conventional articles of a Constitution. To deny this is to reduce man's agency to zero, Pyrrhonical in theory and fanatical in practice. The Synod needs no sheltering by the rule for extraordinary cases. The right of self-protection and the duty of self-propagation, gleaned forth from every page of our Constitution and of the Word of God, will stand till the Master comes. By transmuting our petition requesting, if any act of legislation at all, only the *repeal* of the law making compulsory the transmission of mails and opening of post-offices on Sunday, into a petition to *enact* a Sunday law, or laws, the complainants simply created a man of straw. So much for this point.

4. Our view is the historic and traditional view of our American Presbyterian Churches, and the Presbyterian Churches of Canada. We say nothing about the Churches of England and the Continent, because we know nothing about them hereon, and have not the means of informing ourselves; and we say little about the attitude of the Northern Churches

since 1861, because they have all more or less gone into politics, a thing we abhor. The General Assembly, in 1812, petitioned Congress touching Sabbath mails, and we know of no protest or dissent. Another petition to the same body was prepared and sent up in 1814. The matter received endorsement in 1815 and in 1816 by the Assembly of each year. In 1862, while smarting under the wrongs done us by the politicals of our Northern brethren, and while vehemently protesting against the same, our own General Assembly, overtured by Tuscaloosa Presbytery, sent up to our Government at Richmond a petition about Sabbath observance, and in 1863, on motion of the noble and now sainted Col. J. T. L. Preston, "implored the legislators of our land" to take action respecting keeping the Sabbath holy. The same year our country's peerless chieftain and liberty's martyr, Gen. T. J. Jackson, sought the same result in the same way. In 1878, and from that day to this, our General Assembly went into co-operation with the American Sabbath Union, the main effort of which is by petition and otherwise to secure legislation in favor of Sunday rest. This union is, in part, our agent, and has our indorsement. In 1898, our General Assembly, in a judicial case, decided, by 145 to 25, that our understanding of the Constitution is the right one. The Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Virginia, and Texas, all have petitioned the State. Moreover, the General Assembly petitioned the State in a matter, to our mind, purely political—to substitute arbitration for war as the means of settling international disputes. This petition was sent to all the governments of Christendom, and was approved by several Assemblies. Such is some of our testimony that it is our historic policy to exercise the right of petition.

The Canadian Presbyterian Church, which is made up largely of those who represent the Free and U. P. Churches and the Irish Presbyterian Church, holds clearly to the principle of a free Church and a free State; and that neither shall interfere with the other in its own proper sphere. Still the

right of petition is held fast and vigorously exercised in regard to matters where great moral issues are involved. Not only so, but deputations from the Churches will wait on the civil authorities, and urge measures which are for the moral welfare of the community. As examples where this is done may be mentioned: The Bible in the Public Schools, Sabbath observance in every phase of it, as represented by railroads (they have no Sunday papers), and especially the Manitoba School case which agitated the country for several years. On this question the General Assembly often made representations to the State. While all this was done in a public way, careful instruction and constant preaching were carried on. The result is that in Canada far more than in this country the whole moral force of the churches, as representing religion, is brought to bear upon the life of the nation and the actions of public men. Any one acquainted at all with the conditions of public life and with the way in which it is affected by religion in the two countries, can not fail to note the marked difference. If there be danger, and there is great danger, in the blending of Church and State together, there may be some danger in the opposite extreme of an absolute ignoring each of the other.

5. At once, if possible, the most serious and the most objectionable feature of the Complaint against the Synod is that it tries to exclude all official communication between Church and State. It tries to fix an impassable gulf, like that between heaven and hell, betwixt the Church and the State, so that official communication shall be constitutionally impossible. This is the *magnum opus elaboratum cum omnibus viribus—summa contentio* of the complainants. They cared little about the matter of correspondence—indeed, they allowed that our efforts to save the Christian Sabbath for our Church and country were in themselves not vicious, but, in a certain sense, commendable. Our great crime, in their judgment, was, we addressed an *official* communication to the State. If we had taken recess for ten minutes *as a Synod*, and retained the same formal organization as a convention or mass meeting, and as

such had done the same thing we did as a Synod, no complaint would have been made. Yea, if we had made the arrangement in the church, then gone out and signed the petition in the vestibule of the church, still all would have been right. Our crime consisted, then, not in the matter of our petition, or the form of it, but in the single fact that it was an official communication to the State. Here, then, we are confronted face to face with a new theory of high-churchism. The Church must strut along the boulevards of earth, daintily handling her immaculate skirts, nose to the front, eyes to the sky, mouth pinched shut, as dumb as a mummy *quoad* all human governments, moral agencies or influences, and rational endeavors in the use of means to sustain herself or conserve the holy commandments of God! The State may annul every commandment of God without an official word from her majestic, imperial lips! Heaven and earth may pass away, but she shall speak never! Complaint is made against the Synod thus:

"It is an OFFICIAL communication presented by the official representatives of Christ's spiritual kingdom to an official representative of the United States Government." *"Has Christ authorized those whom he has appointed to be his representatives in his spiritual kingdom to have any OFFICIAL intercourse, negotiations or relations whatsoever with the representatives of any human government in their official character?"*

See how labored is the effort to make the point clear and certain that under no circumstances shall the Church either address a communication to the State or receive one from it. She is to know nobody but God and herself—to have no consciousness but God-consciousness and self-consciousness, *quoad* official intercourse. If the State should fall among thieves, like the man on the way to Jericho, she must act the part of the Pharisee, and no amount of possible good she might do will justify her condescension to the example of a certain Samaritan. Let us see how this works in detail.

The Church has and must have property-rights and legal standing under the State. This theory denies her all official intercourse with the State. Suppose the Church should want a charter for a Church college in Georgia: how shall she get

it? She must communicate with the State officials either by letter or by a delegate. In case her chartered institutions are about to dissolve by the time limit of their charters, how shall she secure their renewal? Only by a similar appeal to the State. If in a will money be left to our Church, and heirs contest the will, how shall she defend her rights? By going before the State's court in the person of her representative. If our property-rights are invaded in foreign lands, to whom can we look, to whom do we look, but to our own government, and through it to foreign governments, for the protection of our rights? If the lives of our missionaries are imperilled, to whom do we hasten with our appeals but to State officials here and consuls abroad? When we organize a Church, or seek to form a board of trustees or directors, to whom do we appeal or apply? Who alone can constitute such boards? The State. To whom did Dr. Stuart Robinson appeal when his honor as a servant of God was assailed? Did he wait on God for vindication? No! He did what he had a right to do, and was right in doing: he appealed unto Cæsar.

We know the reply attempted: "We do these things as citizens, not as Christians, much less as Church courts." Answer:

(a) This might but does not apply to Dr. Robinson's case, but does not, and can not, to the other cases.

(b) What is wrong for a Church as a Church is wrong for a Christian as a Christian, and especially for a minister of the gospel as a minister of the gospel. The rule we combat excludes all rights, all duties, all privileges, all reputation and character *as Christians*, and as ministers, elders, etc., and allows only these *as citizens*. The rule admits that *only civic* right, *civic* privileges, *civic* good name, etc., are allowable before human courts, and denies all other and additional rights to church-members and officers as such. To appeal to a civil court to protect a Christian right, is just what the Complaint condemns.

(c) Directors, trustees, and other men, who go before legislatures, governors, courts, etc., to secure or to manage prop-

erty rights, or any other kind of rights, go as representatives of the Church. By her commission, by her authority, in her name, they go; and, without such relation between her and them, they would be regarded and treated as frauds, and rightfully. Such a relation is the essential condition of their appearing before the State for the Church. But that *she* does what her agents do is a maxim of both law and morals. *Facit per alium facit per se*, is a sound principle, and applies strictly.

(d) Prior to the existence of trustees, directors, etc., some Church official must appear before some State official and seek their appointment. Intercommunication in some way is a necessity in order to the State's knowing what is wanted.

It does not follow that, because the Church must have some relation to the State, must have some intercommunication with the State, must have some respect for the State, and must be respected by the State, she must lose her wits and run into Hildebrandism, or submit the crown-rights of her Husband, Lord, and King to the domination of the State—run into Erastianism. The Church and State, like a twin brother and sister, may be free and equal, each supreme in his or her sphere, yet on speaking terms at least, without the thought, wish or right, of marriage. Neither the Synod of South Carolina nor the writer of this article can be accused of Erastian tendencies with the slightest degree of truth or justice. We deny the slightest intimation that we have sought “to call into play the machinery of civil law, with its inevitable accompaniments of civil pains and penalties;” or that we, “under the guise of respectful petition, in reality” called on “human governments” to “aid in securing reverence for and obedience to His law.”

6. The Complaint attacks the Constitution of our Church. Chapter XXXI., Section IV., from the words, “Unless by way of humble petition,” &c., to the end, was declared to be an anachronism and in conflict with the rest of the Confession of Faith, Form of Government. &c. Upon this but little needs to be said. But (a), it is a part of our Standards, right or

wrong ; (b) the presumption is that it is there by right, inasmuch as our fathers in sweeping away every vestige of Erastianism, retained it as a necessary part of the section ; (c) the exception is a practical necessity, as we have already shown ; (d) if it were there not by right, the Constitution itself provides for its own amendments in another and direct and only way ; (e) the determination of a judicial case under the rule, if wrongly made, leaves the law still on the statute book in full force ; (f) it is wrong in principle to attack men living under a law to get rid of that law. It makes obedience liable to prosecution, and renders one unsafe no matter whether he obeys or disobeys, and for this reason is anarchical in its tendencies. Complaint is made that Synod, by signing this petition to the Postmaster General, "*initiated a policy.*" We maintain that we did not initiate this business. Our Church has had this policy for nearly a hundred years ! First in the mother Church and then in our Southern Church ! See records recited already above.

8. An important part of the Complaint remains to be discussed. It is charged that by petitioning the State touching its violation of the Christian Sabbath the Synod weakened out testimony in behalf of the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, and did so at an especially inopportune time, inasmuch as the tendency on all sides is to the obscuration of that point. In reply to this charge we submit the following considerations : (a) If such a result should occur, justly or unjustly, none would regret it more than ourselves. Of all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the world the Southern Presbyterian Church alone has stood for, and still stands for, the non-secular non-political character and mission of his Kingdom, and we believe that to stand and testify for this principle is the peculiar and worthy mission of our Church, itself alone justifying the maintenance of our separate existence ; and, if the issue comes, we shall not be found wanting, or lagging in the battle. We shall then challenge the complainants to stand with us. On that point we will have victory or a split.

(b) We deny *simpliciter* that such a result will follow either justly or unjustly. We have only asked the State politely, respectfully, kindly, to repeal a law making Sabbath-desecration compulsory, if such a law exists; or, if such does not exist, to terminate the existence of an official mandate that makes such violation compulsory upon the employees of the Post-Office department. We neither offered to the State advice, aid or comfort, nor sought these from it. The State and the Church are in collision, and we asked the State, the invading party, to step down and out of our sphere—to terminate the collision. Instead, therefore, of inviting a future collision we are seeking to terminate the present one. Our whole influence, example and action combined to discredit mutual intermeddling.

(c) The Complaint and those who sustained it have unwittingly struck our testimony the only and the hardest blow it has received by pushing it out of its own sphere and pressing it into a new and indefensible one. What is that evil thing against which we have borne our testimony? Confessedly on all hands, it is dealing with POLITICAL questions. But what *are* political questions? Is the fourth commandment one of them?

Our contention and testifying came about in this wise: The Mother Church decided a political question (the question whether the citizen's allegiance was first to his State and then to the United States, or first to the United States and then to the State), and bound its decision on the consciences of men, making loyalty to the United States Government a test of good standing in the Church. The wrong done, as we see it, was not in making a wrong decision, though we hold that it was wrong and silly; but that it was decided at all, or even considered. It was a plain, clear case of importing politics and State-craft into the Church. We planted ourselves on the broad, clear, clean-cut, intelligent, Scriptural principle that *political questions are not to be determined or handled by ecclesiastical courts*. In doing so, we took a noble stand for

a most important truth. Our course was wise, our cause was just, and our testimony is none too emphatic. We are truly glad the Christian world is beginning to find out what it is we are contending for. But now come the complainants, not to charge us with introducing some political question into the Church, but with petitioning the State to cease its intrusion into the Church! The subject matter is not the Constitution of the United States, but the fourth commandment; the act we performed was not to legislate but to petition; what we sought was not State help but to get rid of State hindrance; and the end aimed at is that each party, Church and State, may move on in its own sphere without molestation from the other. To push the doctrine, the principle, we have contended for, of the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom, into the extreme of not admitting that the Church, when invaded by the State, can assert her right, by requesting or petitioning it to recede from its unholy and wicked invasion, is a perversion of the principle itself to a bad use, and reflexively will bring it into disrepute.

It will be a sad day for us when our Southern Church abandons her high clear vantage ground, and condescends to hair-splitting to define exactly how much of the fourth commandment is political, civil, secular, and just how it can be treated so as not to touch the State's political part. It is far better for us to take the common-sensed ground that a State may invade a Church as well as a Church invade a State, and that when the State has done so, the Church has a natural, inalienable right to ask the State to withdraw from the conflict and allow her to go on undisturbed in the faithful discharge of her own duty. We thereby retain our testimony in its integrity.

9. We shall conclude this paper with a restatement of our own views in the premises: (a) We hold that the Church and the State cannot come into collision unless the one or the other has blundered. But we hold that with human nature as it is, each of them is liable to blunder, and that as a matter of fact both of them have blundered, and have done so in many and

serious instances. (b) When one or other has blundered, a new condition arises, requiring a readjustment. The question for practical solution is, What is to be done in the given case? We do not care to answer this question for the State, seeing that its resources for self-protection are in sight, are ample, and visible, and speak with powerful eloquence, and command respect. But what shall the Church do when the State is the aggressor? Is she allowed to use rational and moral means to induce the State to terminate its aggression? Can she not appear at its bar and point out the fact and nature of its invasion, the great injury thus done to her, and the awful disasters sure to come to it and her in consequence of its blunder? Is she precluded by the law of her King from all respectful, honorable, rightful effort to secure the free right to do her own work without obstruction by the State? The Complaint says, Yes: we say No to this last question. The Complaint silences the Church absolutely in the presence of the State. In its view she cannot even humbly petition the State, without violating the fundamental nature of her commission and the law of her King. No matter how much evil she might thereby avoid, and how much good she might accomplish, she must remain a passive, silent spectator. Whatever else must go to ruin, her sublime silence must be maintained as the dominant principle of her conduct and the *quasi* chief end of her being!

(c) There is no question in our mind that the Church should let the State absolutely alone where the State is not trenching on her ground, and that the utmost she ought to do where the State obstructs, is to seek the removal of the obstruction, and a free field to do her work. She has no right to seek State aid to do her work in spiritual things. Not State laws and constitutions but the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation.

(d) The Church is dependent on the State in the matter of property rights, and also for lawful protection in numerous ways, and, therefore, may make representations to it in whatever way may seem best to herself, whether by letter, or by special agent or representative, or by an official.

(e) There

is a distinction, a wide distinction, between the visible Church and the invisible Church. The effort to spiritualize the visible into the invisible is unwise. She has material interests that are subject to the laws and modes of procedure found among men. She has moral relations to this world which she cannot afford to ignore. They are incidental to her great commission, to be sure, but they exist. "Ye are the light of the world;" and light must be seen. If the State ought to be moral, much more ought the Church. Her light should shine before men, that they may see her good works and glorify her Master.

Lancaster, S. C.

C. W. HUMPHREYS.

VI. THE FOURTH ECLOGUE OF VIRGIL.

Among the shorter classic poems the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil holds an eminent place. Particular attention has been attracted to this choice work, not only on account of the harmonious felicity of its language, not merely for the fascinating beauty of the imagery employed, but chiefly because of the singular coincidences between passages and expressions in the Fourth Eclogue and portions of the Messianic prophecies of the Scriptures, especially in the Psalms and Isaiah. These similarities of thought and structure to Holy Writ render this poem an ever new delight, and commend its study to each generation of students. Thus, again and again, lovers of Latin literature have reviewed this POLLIO with ever growing enthusiasm for its scope and expression, finding in it the best of all those supreme traits of the Prince of Latin Poets, which won from Cicero the encomium, "*Magnae spes altera Romae.*"

THE POET.

Pompey the Great and Licinius Crassus being Consuls, seventy years before the birth of our Lord, an Italian mother in the hamlet of Andes, three miles from Mantua, found the Ides of October a white day in her life, as it had brought to her a son. The child was named Publius Virgilius Maro. The family of Virgil, while humble, was honorable. Later, among the relatives of Maia, his mother, came Quintilius Varus, who rose so high in the favor of Augustus that he was made proconsul of Syria, holding that office when the Christ was born. This Varus favored Archelaus, son of Herod, and maintained him to "reign in the room of his father Herod." Later he was commander-in-chief of the army in Germany, and there, by neglect of the warning of Segestes, king of the Cotti, suffered that tremendous defeat wherein three entire Roman legions were cut to pieces by the Gauls under Arminius, at

the Teutobergiensis Saltus. Varus in his despair, died by his own hand. So were his ears sealed to those doleful cries of Augustus, when he would beat his head against the walls of his palace wailing—"Varus! give me back my legions!" While the stock of Varus was lowly, as was that of his cognata Maia, the mother of Virgil, there seems to have been genius among the hereditaments of the line. Maia's son was destined to eternal fame. His childhood repeats the experience of many poets. His first years were passed as part of that simple, rural life which he sings so masterfully in the Bucolics and Georgics.

The peasant proprietors among the Latins seem to have set high value on learning, and spared no sacrifice to secure education for sons who gave token of intellectual power. Horace, in the Sixth Satire, pathetically tells us how his own good father placed him in school with the sons of far richer men, and, not being able to secure a suitable slave to act as pædagogus, himself escorted his son to and fro through the streets.

Actuated by the same zeal for the advancement of his child, the father of Virgil kept him for ten years in the best schools of Cremona, until, at seventeen, the lad like other Latin youth, assumed the toga virilis. Intent on higher mental discipline, Virgil went to Naples, where he studied medicine, mathematics, philosophy, and Greek. The study of Greek was his darling occupation, and in it he became a master. At that date one of the most widely copied and disseminated books in the Greek language, was one which had emanated from the Hellenist schools and colonies at Alexandria, under the patronage of Ptolemy III., the *Septuaginta* or translation into Greek of the Hebrew Sacred Books. This version was concluded about 221 B. C. "In such manner," says A. Edersheim, "the LXX. version became really the people's Bible to that large Jewish world through which Christianity was afterwards to address itself to mankind." Copies of the Septuagint were enormously multiplied, and carried by Jews into "every nation under Heaven." A lover of the Greek language, and a collector of Greek books, could scarcely be without knowledge

of so popular a work. A poet would be as little likely to ignore a book so full of magnificent poetry as this, which embraced the stately Song of Moses; the sombre splendors of the book of Job; the harmonies of the Psalms; the Philosophy of Ecclesiastes and Proverbs; the Oriental magnificence of The Song; the glorious strains of Isaiah; the tender minor key of Jeremiah; the marvelous imagery of Daniel and Ezekiel; the sweet preludes and fuller lays of the minor prophets. This storehouse of poetry, history, philosophy, was opened to Virgil in the pages of the Septuagint, and it is impossible to conceive of him as ignorant of them. Here he must have largely fed his beauty and harmony-loving soul. It is far from a necessary consequence that the reading of the "Law and the Prophets" would have made Virgil a "proselyte of the gate." The reading of the Law and the Prophets now, with the whole New Testament to reinforce them, does not have the invariable effect of drawing men to God. The Jews were a despised race. Seneca later named them the "vilest of mankind." The student of the Epicurean Philosophy, the pupil of Syro, ambitious for the favor of kings and kingship among poets, was little likely to ally himself with a creed or nation so incompetent to forward him in life.

When twenty-four years of age, Virgil returned to his paternal home, which seems at that time to have fallen to his inheritance. It was a home most dear to him in its very simplicity. He cries out his true emotions when he says—

*"En unquam patrios longo post tempore fines
Pauperes et tuguri," &c.*

That pathetic *mea rega* goes straight to the heart—"his home, his kingdom."

Already the poetry of Virgil had happily attracted the attention of lovers of literature. Among them Pollio, distinguished alike in poetry and in arms, was commandant in Cis-Alpine Gaul, wherein lay Mantua. Augustus, having decreed to divide the lands about Mantua among his veterans, the farm of Virgil was embraced in this most cruel confiscation.

Pollio—apparently indifferent to injustice, unless it bore hard upon a poet, commended the case of Virgil to the wealthy Maecenas, the splendid friend of kings, and patron of literature, and by him the favor of Augustus in behalf of Virgil was secured. His "*Pauperis et tuguri congestum cespitem culmen*" was spared to him.

Further residence on the little estate seems to have been rendered unattractive by the prepotent and contumacious behavior of Areus, a veteran centurion, to whom Virgil's land had been given. The man of culture and the servant of the muse could not contend with the son of Mars, whose iron hand had not even the velvet glove to commend it. The softer manners of *Magna Roma* appealed to the singer, and there he took up his abode. Pollio and Maecenas were his friends, and frequent hosts; Augustus loved and honored him. Cicero eulogized him in stately periods; and the flippant Horace made him his friend. We have in the Fifth Satire (Book I.) of Horace, the chronicle of an excursion which he made in company with Virgil. This poet of the lighter mind evidently loved the man of loftier heart and more resplendent genius. To this his Ode (Books 1, 3,) on the departure of Virgil for Greece, bears witness, and that Ode (*Ib.*, 24,) in which he endeavors to console Virgil for the death of his friend, Quintilius, whom "*Nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi.*"

At ease in Rome, and favored by fortune, Virgil began to write his Eclogues. Theocritus, one of his favorite Greek authors, had written pastorals called *Idyllia*, and him Virgil freely imitated in his Eclogues, or "chosen poems," which, as collected, he named "Bucolica," or Shepherd Songs. The direct inspirer of these songs was Pollio, and to Pollio the Fourth Eclogue is addressed.

THE DATE.

This was the 717 A. U. C., 37 B. C. The second triumvirate was holding world sway. Octavian, moving toward the imperial purple, had appropriated Italy and the West. The

eastern world wherein Egypt and its Queen lured him to ruin, fell to the share of Antonius, while Lepidus withdrew to Africa, there to hide his chagrin and nurse the pining sickness of disappointed hope. Already in the dreams of Octavian lay the vision of a subdued world, a conquered peace. Yet a very few years of sporadic tumults, and Octavian, become Augustus Cæsar, should close with his imperial hand the doors of the Temple of Janus Quirinus, when "repose had been given to the whole earth."

Slowly, gently as dawn-light grows in the Eastern sky, the time drew on which Zechariah had seen in vision, "and they answered the Angel of the Lord which stood among the myrtle trees, and said, We have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest." Such a calm was drifting nearer, as a later poet named

"A universal peace, on sea and land."

THE OCCASION.

The Second Triumvirate had swept into power in true Sul-lan fashion. A deadly proscription had robbed Rome of many of her choicest citizens. Among the first to fall had been Cicero, glory of Roman orators and philosophers. United only in their deeds of tyrannous vengeance, the triumvers were at strife among themselves. Octavia, the well-beloved sister of Octavian, mediated a peace between them. Antony approached Brundisium with a fleet of fifty ships. Being refused reception by the city, he moved on to Tarentum. His words were of peace—his appearances were of war. Once again commissioners were sent from the capital to meet Antonius, and re-affirm the three years' old "Treaty of Brundisium." These officials were the same who had settled the former peace—Cocceius and Maecenas. Cocceius Nerva was a friend alike to Antonius and Octavian. The family of Nerva was noble and influential. A later Cocceius Nerva, a famous jurist, was Consul in A. D. 22. Always friends and favorites of the emperors, this line at length reached, in Cocceius Nerva, the

Emperor, the Imperial throne. This Nerva Emperor showed, during a reign of sixteen months, wisdom, justice, and clemency. He adopted Trajan to succeed him in the Empire. To Cocceius Nerva, Maecenas was a suitable colleague. No citizen of Rome was more distinguished. Learned and judicious, a lover of art and song, a patriot, a courtier, patron of poets, and light of his age, one of the enormously wealthy men of the luxurious world-center, Maecenas had active part in all the great events of the period. Maecenas invited Horace the poet to accompany him to Brundisium, and Cocceius took Fonteius. At Sinuessa they were met by Virgil, Plotius Tucca, and Varius Rufus. Virgil and Rufus accompanied the official party to Brundisium, and returned with them to Rome, peace having been established.

POLLIO.

Returned to Rome, Virgil presently heard of the happy event of the birth of a son to his friend and patron Pollio. Caius Asinius Pollio, consul, general, orator, poet, critic, historian, a man of gifts as multiplied as were those of Michael Angelo Buonarrotti at a later day, was a peer of Maecenas in influence and position. Out of humble life, Pollio rose by the magnificence of his gifts, to be one of the most eminent men of his time. Born A. U. C. 675, he lived until the age of thirty under the Republic, and its principles fortified in him the virtues of the patriotic citizen. Cicero ranks him with Cato, as an incorruptible patriot. (*Ep. ad Fam.*, 10, 31.) When the Republic was overborne, Pollio joined the party of Cæsar. Cæsar having fallen under the hands of assassins, Pollio was drawn to the side of his old fellow-soldier, Antonius. Nurseling of the Republic as he had been, Pollio preferred the Triumvirate to the new Commonwealth, and contributed more than any other man of the day to the establishment of "three-man-power."

When the cause of Antonius sank below helping, Pollio withdrew to his villa at Tusculum, and there gave himself to

letters and the protection of men of genius. Augustus, while he could not obtain from Pollio that warm friendship which had been given to Antonius, cultivated by many concessions and kindnesses the favor of the sage of Tusculum. The splendid Emperor cherished as a choice ornament of his Empire the elegant culture of the literary circle about Asinius Pollio. Until eighty years of age, Pollio maintained his court of orators, poets, singers and artists, holding himself a master critic among critics. He died A. D. 5, unconscious that the presages of Virgil's famous Fourth Eclogue, passing over Pollio's babe and the young Marcellus, had found their real fulfilment in a Babe born in Bethlehem.

THE POET'S MIND.

The friendship re-pledged by the Triumvirate at Brundisium was doubtless as welcome to Virgil as to any man of that day. Retired and studious in his habit, nothing could be more ungrateful to him than the horrors of proscriptions and the tumult of civil war. Through the gathered storm clouds of discontent, had shone the fair face of the popular and honored Octavia, smiling her angry kinsmen into peace. Now at last might a poet hope for blessed leisure to weave immortal verse. No doubt in that journey back from Brundisium to Rome, Virgil's mind had been full of visions of calm and plenty; war no more, agriculture revived, white sails of commerce flitting along the Mediterranean shores, the songs of the shepherds on the hills, of the women at the loom, laughter of young men and maidens in the vineyards. Very shortly after this well-omened home-coming, word reached him that Pollio's house was blessed with the long-desired son. Nothing could be more natural than a song to celebrate these doubly fortunate events—the pledged friendship of the Triumvirs, and the welcome child. Such a Song was a flower of courtesy native to the time. As now a Poet Laureate prepares his verse to celebrate births, marriages, conquests, or bemoan deaths and disasters of the sovereign family or state, so in those days the

poet stood as court singer to his powerful patron, and laid at his threshold the tribute of his song. There are numerous instances of these personal poems. Horace, in his first Ode, dedicates his works to Maecenas; he writes his twentieth Ode (Book I.) to invite his patron to supper, and another Ode (II., 20,) to thank him for a similar invitation. Maecenas marries the lovely Terentia, and Horace celebrates the event upon his lyre; when Maecenas recovers from fever, Horace has a new theme for his verse. Virgil himself embalms in his first Eclogue, Augustus Deus, "*Namque erit ille mihi semper deus.*"

Behind the joy of the new peace, and the welcome of a son of Pollio, another thought lay shining like a star, in the poet's mind. That well beloved sister of Octavian, the noble and gracious Octavia, queen of women of that day, celebrated alike for her beauty, her virtue and her intellect, had a young son, like-minded with herself, child of her first marriage, a lad noble in person and character, equally loved by his mother and his imperial uncle. This youth had attracted the attention and affection of Virgil. His personal charms and promise, his high position, the courage and sweetness of his disposition, and the evident devotion to him of the great Triumvir, who was soon to be Augustus Cæsar, Emperor Orbis, filled the poet with hopes and dreams of the youth's future greatness, and of a world lying in happy peace under his sway. In the fourth Eclogue he dared but dimly shadow forth this boy and his hope. Later, in the Æneid, near the close of the sixth Book, he gave clearer and more splendid Eulogy, which was also an elegy—a wreath upon a bier, a dirge sung about a funeral pyre:

*"Nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
In tantum spe tollet avos
Heu pietas! heu prisca fides! invictaque bello
Dextra!
Heu miserande puer! si qua fata aspera rumpas
Tu Marcellus eris—"*

Such was the epitaph for which the heart-broken Octavia paid a royal price.

But now, as Virgil returned from Brundisium, no shadow of these sorrows hung in the sky. All was joyous promise of prosperity.

Moved by this triple source of happy thought—the peace, Pollio's son, Octavia's world-heir, Virgil began his Fourth Eclogue; elaborately beautiful, full of gracious harmonies, bearing high thought above the lower clouds and nearer days, into purer skies and beyond the limits of time.

No man of his contemporaries had a finer mental equipment and more extensive literary opportunities than Virgil. From his seventh year he had been an industrious student. A man of leisure and sufficient means, he had frequented the best schools, studied with the most erudite masters, collected books. He was in close friendship with Maecenas and Pollio, wealthy men possessing large libraries, which would be at the poet's service. Other of his friends and admirers, Horace, Cicero, Varus, L. Varius Rufus, Plotius Tuca, were men of letters, book-lovers and buyers, and probably the libraries of each were at the service of the entire literary circle. Plotius Tuca was so elegant a writer and critic, and so closely associated with Virgil's work, that he was appointed to edit the *Æneid* after Virgil's death.

In these present days of multiplied printed books, days whose literary affluence causes us to recall with a smile Burton's complaint in the opening of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, that the book-market was so overdone that all themes were exhausted—we are tempted to fancy that books were a rare commodity in the days of Virgil. It is true that they were almost an unknown quantity to the mob, the masses, the *populi*, but for the *litterati* they were abundant. Hundreds, thousands indeed, of scribes, in Italy, Egypt, Syria, Greece, even in less cultured lands, were busy in multiplying with the pen, copies of all existing works; hundreds of slaves, taught to write with neatness and accuracy, were occupied in making copies of all that was valuable, for the libraries of their masters.

Not only, as has been noted, the Jewish sacred books were translated into Greek in Egypt, and almost endlessly multiplied in editions by competent scribes, working on their own account, or as slaves of men of letters, and wealth, but many of the Jewish Targums, the Three Midrashim, the works of the Rabbis, were objects of literary curiosity, and widely scattered. No works were more popular or more widely quoted than the Sibylline Leaves or writings. There were three chief sets or series of these Sibylline verses—the Roman, the Greek, and the Jewish. We are told that the Jewish Sibyl, written in Egypt about 170 B. C., often passed for, and was accepted as the utterance of the Erythrean and Cumæan Sibyls (A. Edershiem—*Life of Christ*, 1, 38). It is especially remarkable that Virgil, quoting in his Fourth Eclogue from the Sibyl, quotes from the Jewish, not from the Roman or Greek Sibylline.

This brief glance at the literature which must have been daily food to the mind of Virgil will sufficiently explain and make natural the thoughts and embellishments of

THE FOURTH ECGUE.

No poet sings for himself alone : he but leads the universal choir : he voices his day ; often, it is true, he strikes its highest thoughts and purest aspirations, but still these are thoughts and aspirations shared by others about him. He gives form and beauty to the general hope, the popular expectation. This Fourth Eclogue is an instance in kind, and peculiarly interesting, as pouring out a world's expectancy of a Coming One, a Prince of Peace, a God-descended One. The yearning of a weary race for better things breathes here ; it is a harking back to Eden lying so far behind ; an outreaching toward the restored Paradise which, ever fugitive and ever alluring, had flitted before all the toilsome steps of Humanity's pilgrimage.

There is a general consensus of historians and scholars that these were peculiarly days of expectation. Some great and good change would soon intervene to turn back the ages of

loss, pain and hate, and bring in righteousness, joy and peace. Such a renewal of the world must be inaugurated by some ONE full of benevolence, full of potency; heir of immortality—as this new “Saturnian kingdom” was to be of endless duration. Prophecies of the speedy coming of this New Era, abound in the literature of the last two centuries before Christ.

In 170 B. C., the third book of the Jewish Sibylline Oracles set forth the coming of “a King from heaven, judging the world in splendor of fire.” “The King whom God will send from the sun.”

The agreement of critics is substantial, that the *Book of Enoch* in its earlier portions dates at least 130 B. C. This foretells that “the Elect One” will sit upon “the Throne of his Glory, and dwell among his people,” “unrightness will flee as a shadow.” “He will select and own the just, rescuing them from Earth, Hades, Hell, and open up the secrets of all wisdom amid the universal joy of his ransomed.”

B. C. 50, the Psalter of Solomon, a collection of eighteen beautiful Psalms, was generally known among scholars. These songs, the last outpouring of the harmonious lyre of the Hebrew Church, have for theme a Coming One pure from sin: a Righteous King, God-taught. “The beauty of the King of Israel never faileth nor is infirm.” “Sinners shall be banished: Earth shall own and cherish the Holy.” This “looking for” was not limited to the Hebrew peoples. By means of the Dispersion, the hope and longing of the Hebrew had become the expectation of the world. The hastening of the Magi, whether from Chaldea, Persia or Arabia, to the Infant Christ, speaks a general assurance of a near event of world-interest of this kind. There was an universal waiting for his coming. Since Daniel’s day a large Jewish population had been settled in Chaldea and Assyria; the Jewish books were known to the scholars of the Orient, and learning-loving Hebrews studied and shared the lore of the Eastern sages.

Wherever there is a nation preserving its ancient literature, there are to be found traces of a belief in the return of the

Golden Age, or the earth's first era of innocence, happiness, and plenty. This return is always foretold as under the ægis of a Peaceful, Gracious, Munificent One, a divine brother to humanity. Some of the Jewish writings that date a very few years after the opening of the Christian Era—as, *e. g.*, the "Babylon Talmud"—represent Messiah as at Rome—"sitting at the gate of Imperial Rome." It is said that as Moses dwelt in Egypt among his enemies, so Messiah "shall dwell in Rome."

Probably such ideas did not spring up suddenly soon after the Incarnation, but had long been a matter of traditional belief. No wonder that with such hopes permeating literature and filling the very air, Virgil also expected marvels of his time. This in the poet was not a waiting in any spiritual sense, but the yearning after a purer moral atmosphere, and a higher temporal good. The patriot, the man of peace and culture, reached eagerly toward a promised period when war and vice and pauperism should be known no more.

The following translation of the Fourth Eclogue is very nearly literal, while no attempt has been made to copy the rhymless hexameters of the original. It is a translation in no wise scholarly, but popular; seeking to show the hopes of the age, and to convey some of the impressions which would be stamped upon the minds of his cotemporaries by Virgil's song to

POLLIO.

"Sicilian muses wake a loftier strain,
 Not all the trees delight, the tamarisks gain,
 The woods might woo our consul's ear in vain.
 Now comes the age the Cumæan Sibyl sung,
 Grand era from the faith of ages sprung.
 The Virgin¹ rules the world, the age of Saturn² waits
 Now a new race descends from heaven's gates.
 O chaste Diana, bless this growing child,
 To greet whose birth a golden age hath smiled;
 The age of iron yields, its tumults cease,
 And thy Apollo rules the world in peace!

¹Astræ, goddess of justice.

²The age of Saturn had been called the Golden Age, an age of Peace and Prosperity.

Thou being consul, Pollio, 'neath thy sway
 This glorious age begins its splendid way,
 If yet sad footsteps of our sins appear,
 Washed pure, the earth is free from ceaseless fear.
 This new-born child, to human adds divine,
 He sees the gods 'mongst earthly heroes shine,
 And clothed in patrial virtues, rules his line.
 Earth brings, Oh boy, spontaneous fruits to thee,
 The wand'ring ivies mixed with spikenard free,¹
 Smiling acanthus and the lotus² see.
 Back to the folds the flocks milk-laden come,
 Nor fear the herds the lions near their home.³
 About thy cradle fragrant blossoms blow ;
 The serpent⁴ dies ; no poisonous weeds dare grow,
 But streams of balsams free as rivers flow.
 Then, when the boy the praise of heroes reads
 And learns of virtue through his father's deeds,
 Untilled the yellow fields the grain have borne
 And flushing clusters clamber o'er the thorn.
 Down drips the honey from the strong oak trees,
 And every pathway knows the murmuring bees.
 Then the last token of injustice fails
 Which walled the towns, and vexed the sea with sails,
 Or o'er earth's breast the wounding furrow trails.
 Far other Tiphys then shall hold a place,
 Far other Argos bear a dauntless race,
 Far nobler heros seek a nobler Troy,
 Far nobler contests all the world employ.
 New towns, unwall'd, shall on the earth increase,
 And some new Jason guide the fleets of peace.
 But mariners shall leave the sea, Oh child,
 When the firm years that make the *man* have smiled.
 Commerce unneeded ; every land shall bear
 All things for all men, with a generous care ;
 Nor vine shall know the knife, nor earth the share.
 Then the strong ox shall bear the yoke no more,
 Nor various lying dyes false colors pour.
 Just as the flowers their beauteous colors gain,
 Scarlet and saffron, luti's primrose stain,
 Shall deck the lambs that feed along the plain.
 The peaceful Parcæ to their spindles sing
 The fixed decree of Time's Eternal King—
 'Run your bright ways, O blessed centuries run,

¹Compare the gifts of the Magi.

²All parts of the plant were eaten as luxuries.

³See Isaiah 11:6, 7.

⁴See Gen. 3:15.

O happy race of gods! O Jove's true Son!
 See how earth reels beneath its rounded weight.
 The lands, the wide spread seas, heaven's high estate,
 See how all joyful for this last age wait.
 O may my life prolong its waning day,
 With soul inspired thy mighty deeds to say.
 Then Orpheus nor Linus may compare
 With me, the highest meed of song to share,
 Though this his mother's that his father's care,
 While Pan's Arcadia conquered would forbear.
 Begin, Oh boy, to know thy mother's smile,
 Her hope for thee delayed a weary while;
 Begin, Oh boy! He by such smiles unbled,
 Knows not the feasts of gods, nor yet their rest."

Among the various beauties of this Ode, that description of the three Parcæ ceasing now to cut off human life, and instead sitting in the sunshine and singing to the twirling of their spindles, all drawing out the happy endless years, is particularly fine:

"Run your bright ways, Oh blessed centuries, run."

These three fateful sisters have all grown young and fair, and we hear their voices circling the world in rich harmonies. Virgil even in this period of his life felt the burden of that delicate constitution which interfered with his work, and frequently sent him abroad in search of health. Thus, yearning to live to see Pollio's son grown to man's estate, he prays for an *ultima pars* of life to see those great deeds which shall give him incomparable theme for his verse. Then he pictures the court of Pan in Arcadia at a festival of Song: Virgil, the laureate of the Golden Age Restored, sings, and with him vie Orpheus and Linus. Calliope, the muse, assists her son Orpheus, and the god Apollo aids his son Linus; Pan, himself a god, takes his pipes, but even his own Arcadian court proclaims him vanquished with Linus and Orpheus. So high great deeds and lofty moralities can carry him who sings them! We seem to see that joyous woodland court, the laughing Fauns, the eager gods and poets. We hear the whisper of south-west winds in the trees, we hear the ripple

of brooks, the rustle of grasses, the hushed sibilant music of the pines, the sunlight flickers on the grass—then the lute notes die away—again we are in the world of reality. And what was this Reality? The poet saw it run its sharp, painful course, in his own not-long life. Scarcely was the Ode completed and offered to Pollio, when the little babe lay waxen cold and still in the arms of the mother. He had never in those short nine days of life, learned to know her by her smile—he could not feel her dropping tears.

That peace of Brundisium, which Virgil trusted was to usher in the age of peace, perished as an oaten straw in flame. There was no peace until Antonius and Lepidus were dead, and Augustus, an Imperial Cæsar, ruled alone. And finally that “Young Marcellus” from whom so very much was to be hoped, gracious, accomplished, courageous youth, the bright particular promise of the age, gay bride-groom of Julia, the daughter of Augustus, prospective heir of the Empire, fell in his eighteenth year, like a flower when the mower’s scythe has divided its stem. So all this pomp and pageantry of the Fourth Eclogue grew dim under the chill cloud of disappointment and decay.

JULIA MCNAIR WRIGHT.

Fulton, Mo.

VII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

FOSTER'S GOD : NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES.

GOD : NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES. *By Randolph S. Foster, D. D., LL. D., Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church.* New York : Eaton & Mains ; Cincinnati : Curts & Jennings. 1897. Pp. 280. \$3.00

This bishop, amid multiform and manifold executive duties, has found the time to be a prolific author. On the page opposite the title-page is a list of twelve volumes from his pen. The one under review is the fifth in a series of "Studies in Theology," *Prolegomena, Theism, The Supernatural Book, Creation*, standing before it in the series.

The bishop's writing is prevailingly high wrought. He is fond of adjectives of the purplest hue, and of words of swelling sound and original coinage. This particular volume is, however, of soberer style and in better form than some of his publications. It abounds in long quotations from familiar standards in theology, suggesting sometimes that the author may have been too busy to think for himself ; yet, on the whole, the work is well done, and is very entertaining.

The topics discussed are the Spirituality, Unity, Eternity, Absoluteness, Personality, Morality, Attributes, Omnipresence, Omnipotence, Omniscience, Goodness, Justice and Truth of God.

All these topics have been treated from an Arminian point of view. The two most interesting to a Calvinist, for polemical reasons, and the two ablest discussions in the book, are those on the "Freedom of God" and the "Omniscience of God." For these reasons these two are selected for particular notice.

Is God free? This Arminian answers :

"If we suppose him to have a moral nature at all he must be free, and if free, must have ability to the alternative of acting according to the dictates of his eternal attributes, or adversely—must be able to renounce himself or revolutionize his own eternal perfections. That he remains loyal to himself must be a free self-determination, else God himself and the universe are bound in mere fate" (p. 52).

God is a moral being ; if so, he is free ; if free, he has the power to renounce himself—to act adversely to his eternal perfections. This is the bishop's premise, boldly, even recklessly, announced. It is likewise the premise of the theological system which he holds.

1. It follows from this premise that God is a voluntary, not a necessary, being. "That he remains loyal to himself must be a free self-determination, else God himself and the universe are bound up in mere fate." But the bishop has elsewhere said he is a "necessary" being. Then how can his very

existence be contingent upon his own will? He is a Fate, and not a God, according to our author, unless he has the power of suicide.

2. It follows from the bishop's premise that God is not an immutable being. Because free, he has the power to "revolutionize his eternal perfections." Our author thinks that God *will* not thus reconstruct himself, that he certainly will remain loyal to himself; but he holds that, being free, he certainly has the power to will every attribute into its opposite. He will not change himself into a demon, but he can do it. His character is not necessary, but voluntary.

3. The bishop's premise makes it possible for God to be a heartless fool. He says the "law of the soul" is (1) to know, (2) then to feel, and (3) then to act. The resultant of knowing and feeling is called "motive." Now he says, if "motives determine the man," he is "necessitated," and not free. When, therefore, a man acts according to his knowledge and feeling, he is not free. To be free, then, would necessitate his acting foolishly, and heartlessly. But God is free; therefore, he is without motives for his actions; for if he should happen to have motives, he would not be free, and not being free, he would not be moral. But our author says, "There could be no creative volition without a motive. There could be no motive without a sensibility to be moved" (p. 54). Again he says, "He cannot act at all volitionally without motives drawn from the logically antecedent, but really coincident, actions of these perfections; though being free, he has the power to act adversely thereto." If motives cause volitions, they are not free; but God cannot act volitionally without motives. He is free, therefore motives do not control him; he acts, therefore motives do control him.

4. The bishop's doctrine leaves us without any guarantee that God will be loyal to himself. He can renounce himself, and he can be faithless to every promise, because he is free. Will he be loyal, or will he renounce his word? The bishop answers, "His will immutably follows the dictates of his infinite wisdom and love." But he has the power to act to the very contrary of wisdom and love. What assures us that the will will immutably follow the dictates of wisdom and love? The bishop again answers, "I am the Lord, I change not." But he can change by an act of will from wisdom to folly and from love to hate. What insures his word?

5. The bishop is against the Scriptures. They say, "God cannot lie." Then the bishop says, He is not free; and if he is not free, he is not moral. The bishop's doctrine is, God will not lie; but to say, He cannot, is to deny the power to the contrary; and to deny the power to the contrary is to deny freedom. "When the power does not exist, no difference from what cause, the choice or action of the will comes under the law of necessity, and the act ceases to have ethical significance" (p. 63). But Paul said to Timothy, "He (God) cannot deny himself." The power of self-contradiction "does not exist;" therefore, our author must reason, self-consistency and self-loyalty come under the "law of necessity," and consequently God is not free, and his character is without "ethical significance."

These remarks feebly suggest some of the disastrous consequences which must follow from the attempt to apply the philosophy of Indeterminism to

God. The result is a portrayal of the Deity as a Being able to stand but liable to fall.

Bishop Foster believes in the omniscience of God and in his prescience of the free acts of men. Adam Clarke before him held that God, with respect to this class of events, was voluntarily ignorant. Dr. McCabe, a contemporary and an Arminian of Arminians, holds that God's prescience of free acts is impossible. Our author, however, thinks that God does foreknow the free acts of men, but if he were compelled to elect between contingency and prescience he would not hesitate to deny the divine foreknowledge. But he does not believe that he is in such a dilemma.

Events may be classified, (1) as *necessitated*, or those which must come to pass, (2) as *certain*, or those which will come to pass, and (3) as *contingent*, or those which may come to pass. *Must, may, will*—these are the auxiliaries of the verbs of eventuation. "Difficulties embarrassing the idea of prescience, it thus appears, all relate to contingent, that is, non-necessitated, events" (p. 176).

Our author finds his solution in the nature of the divine knowledge. It is intuitive, never discursive; immediate, not inferential. God is omnipresent, occupying every point in space and every moment of duration, Wherever he is, he must see. All the contents of space and duration are held in steady gaze. There is no past, nor future; all is present time with him. From eternity the free acts of men have been open and naked to his eye. No event can travel so far back into the past as to get out of the range of his vision, and no event can lie so far out in the future as to be out of his sight. Wherever he is he must know, and he is everywhere; and whenever he is he must see, and he inhabits eternity. "Suppose an eye could be so adjusted as to see all the time the events of a thousand years" (p. 190). To such a beholder the contents of the thousand years would always be present,—present before they had happened, present after they had happened. They would be future or past with respect to being, but they would be only present with respect to knowledge. God's eye is so adjusted as to take in the contents, not of a thousand years, but of eternity. They are future to cause, they are present to cognition. They are not yet for volition; they are for intelligence. Foreknowledge is cognitive, not causative. Prescience belongs to the vocabulary of the understanding, not to that of the will.

Somewhere in space, and at some moment in time, lies a free act, say, the first sin of Adam. From all eternity the omnipresent God has been at that precise spot, and at that exact moment, with his consciousness. That event, the sin of Adam, has never been out of his presence or sight. Adam's will caused it; God's eye saw it. Because God's knowledge is infinitely presentative, therefore he knows the free acts of men without at the same time causing them.

Now read this inferential paragraph which would delight the heart of Dr. Hodge:

"Still, it is said, what he knows will be will be, and we have no power to prevent it, and there is no use concerning ourselves about it. The first part of the statement is true; the remaining parts are not true. What he knows

will be will be. That is indisputable. That we have no power to prevent it is not true. It will be because we will have it, not because we have no power to have it otherwise. Therefore, there is reason why we should concern ourselves about it. If we cause the 'will be' to be evil, when we have the power to make it good; if we make it evil, when we are able to make it good, and when we know that we ought to make it good, we shall find, when too late to remedy the mistake, that there was great reason to concern ourselves about it. We shall find that it is not God, or certainty, or prescience, or fate that causes what will be to be, but we ourselves. For no one but ourselves can be responsible. The only relation that God has to it is that he so made us as to make it possible, and that he did not interfere to prevent it. That is his responsibility" (p. 193).

Are free acts certain? Our bishop answers, Certainly. Then are they necessitated? He rightly answers, No.

"But then, it is said, the knowledge of it necessitates it; it must now be. Why must it now be? Because of the prescience of it? It has no connection with it to make it necessary. It does not at all affect the question of its existence. It is simple cognition. That which exact truth warrants us in saying is: It will be; it might have been otherwise" (p. 215).

"Yes, but if an event or act of one mind is foreseen by another mind, it must necessarily come to pass. We answer: No, that does not follow. It follows that it will certainly come to pass, but that is not the same as saying that it must necessarily come to pass. It may come to pass freely, and be just as certain as if it came to pass necessarily; and in that case, if the foreknowledge were perfect, it would embrace precisely this state of facts. The event will certainly come to pass freely, and not necessarily. Being free, it might not have come to pass, and prescience would then be precisely the opposite to what it is—would be that the event will not come to pass. If the event is a necessary event, the prescience would be the event will certainly come to pass, and necessarily. But in either case the knowledge would have no influence whatever on its contingency or necessity. The sources of contingency or necessity are wholly independent of the fact of knowledge. Knowledge simply sees what is—causes nothing. Place an eye up in heaven, and let it look down upon the earth, and it, if open, will behold what is going on among men; but the transaction will go on all the same if it be shut; its being open or shut causes nothing. It is precisely so of the omniscient eye of God. What is free it sees as free; what is necessary, as necessary" (p. 218).

But this really fine argument ought to be read. Its main point is that foreknowledge is not causative, but cognitive. He reasons ably against necessitarianism on the one hand and contingency on the other, and for the Calvinistic doctrine of Certainty. But throughout the book, he makes the customary Arminian blunder of first classifying Calvinism as necessitarian, and then proceeds to batter away at the two indiscriminately. Dr. McCabe sees the issue, and teaches the nescience of God as to free acts. If the free act is certain, it will come to pass; if it will come to pass, there are no contingencies to God; the contents of time lie mapped in his plan and purpose.

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

DABNEY'S CHRIST OUR PENAL SUBSTITUTE.

CHRIST OUR PENAL SUBSTITUTE.¹ *By Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D.*
12 mo., pp. 115. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1898.

With Dr. Dabney, there has passed away the last of a remarkable company of theological thinkers to whose lot it fell to reassert the historical faith of the Presbyterian churches, after it had been endangered by the theological ferment which marked the earlier years of the present century,—a ferment which culminated, so far as the Presbyterian churches are concerned, in the division of 1838. The controversies which preceded and followed that event had, no doubt, a large place in forming their theological convictions and developing their power; for the succeeding third of a century their activity was at its height; the whole of the remainder of the century has felt their influence, and, by the blessing of God, has enjoyed some part of their living teaching. No one can estimate the steadying effect of the powerful advocacy of the historical faith of the Reformed churches by these men,—and that not only upon the life and thought of the churches which they more especially served, but also on the whole course of theological development on American soil. Under their guidance the Presbyterian churches not only rose above the Pelagianizing vagaries of the "improved Calvinism" pressing in from New England, but intrenched themselves to meet the neologies of German origin which had already begun to trouble the American churches by the middle of the century and have come in like a flood during its latter half. Such men as Charles Hodge (1797–1878), Robert J. Breckinridge (1800–1871), and James H. Thornwell (1812–1862), to whom may be added Henry B. Smith (1815–1877), though he was a few years their junior, were enough to cast a bright light on any period. Their personal work was closed with the opening of the last quarter of the century, but was ably continued by a group of like-minded successors, such as W. G. T. Shedd (1820–1894), Robert L. Dabney (1820–1898), and Archibald Alexander Hodge (1823–1886). Surely it is not often that a single group of churches is served at one time by such an assemblage of theological talent as is represented by these names.

It was not granted to all of these great thinkers to bequeath the products of their theological labors to posterity in a systematized exhibit. In one way or another only fragments of the systems of Drs. Breckinridge, Thornwell and Smith have been preserved for the world. Dr. Dabney belongs in the more fortunate company of those who were permitted to publish their systems in their entirety: and his concise *Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic Theology taught in Union Theological Seminary, Virginia*, worthily takes its place by the side of Dr. A. A. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology*, and may even, along with it, be ranged with the more elaborated systems of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Shedd, as something more than a *compendium* if

¹The lectures which compose this book were delivered by the author at Davidson College as the second series on the "Ottis Lectureship Foundation."—ED.

something less than an exhaustive discussion of the whole circle of theologoumena. Remaining with us, moreover, to the very end of the century, he has continued to the last to bear testimony to the truth contended for by the whole company of thinkers of which he was so vigorous a member. The little volume now before us is only one of several compositions, which, appearing from the press after his death, witness to his unquenchable activity and inexhaustible intellectual and spiritual strength up to the very moment of his departure to join again in the other world the company of students of the things of God with whom he had wrought in this.

As a volume intended for popular reading, it is not to be considered so much a contribution to theological science as a specimen of that high art of which Dr. Dabney was a master, of utilizing the results of theological thought for the instruction and protection of Christ's humble children. Its subject is the very core of the gospel. Its purpose is to clear from doubt the minds of the people of God, vexed by the assaults of unbelief, and to establish them in the faith that is in Jesus. Its manner has in it all the vigor of speech which has characterized Dr. Dabney from his youth up, and all the richness of thought which has come to him with the labor of years. We cannot imagine a docile reader rising from its perusal without having his conviction strengthened and his faith in the Redeemer of God's elect quickened.

In its very nature the book is polemic, having for its object rather to protect a well-established doctrine of Christian theology from persistent attack than to construct a new doctrine or offer a new construction of an old one. Certainly no one who will simply look about him with open eyes can judge such a polemic uncalled for. The substitutive sacrifice of Jesus Christ is so much the central fact of the Christian religion, that it may well be identified shortly with Christianity: Christianity is moribund when this central tenet loses its hold on the faith of men. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that it is very loosely held in very wide circles to-day, and is not infrequently absolutely rejected, with something like scorn. "Theories of the Atonement," is what we not very accurately call the attempts now making on all sides of us to construe Christianity without it: they disagree with one another on every conceivable matter except in their common rejection of the central truth of the gospel, that Christ bore our sins on his own body on the tree. Chancing to open a volume of lectures by one of the Bishops of our American Methodist Episcopal Church,—Bishop Foster's *Philosophy of Christian Experience*—my eye caught this sentence: "The whole theory of substitutional punishment as a ground either of conditional or unconditional pardon, is unethical, contradictory and subversive." There is nothing in this sentence peculiar to Bishop Foster: it is the characteristic note of modern theologizing. Dr. Dabney was governed by his usual clear insight into the conditions of the actual life of thought of our day, when he gave his latest hours on earth to the composition of a little volume designed to ward off this assault from the flocks of Christ. What more appropriate work could the servant do just before returning to his Master than spend his latest breath in defending that gospel of the blood of Christ to which he owed his own salvation, against an almost world-wide attempt to rob it of its power?

That he has done what he attempted with thoroughness and incisiveness, need not be said. Beginning with a statement of the "rationalistic objections to penal substitution," he proceeds to define and state the issue, and then enters in detail on a refutation of the objections, ending with a brief exhibition of the evidence of Scripture and the immanent consciousness of Christendom in behalf of the assailed doctrine. Special attention is paid to "the utilitarian theory of punishments" as underlying the assault, and to "the ethical objection" that it is impossible for God to punish one for another's sin. Not only in the chapter on "our opponents' self-contradictions," but throughout the volume the keenness of the logical analysis passes all praise. There is no need, however, of going into details. Suffice it to say that Dr. Dabney is in this volume, too, all himself.

Perhaps it may not be out of place in the pages of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY to express the hope that the proof-reader will revise again the text of this welcome little volume before it is issued in that second edition which it deserves. There are some errors, like the bungling of the Greek clause on page 10, and the printing of "effect" for "affect" on page 58, which may give occasion to the scoffer.

B. B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.

JAMES' ESSAYS IN POPULAR PHILOSOPHY.

THE WILL TO BELIEVE, AND OTHER ESSAYS IN POPULAR PHILOSOPHY.

By Wm. James. Published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York, London, and Bombay.

The popular lecturer and learned Professor of Psychology at Harvard has added immensely to his reputation by the publication of these essays. Many of them were read to philosophical clubs, and as such were no doubt a surprise to those who heard them. For they are considerably away from the thought which prevails in so-called scientific bodies. Four of them are high-class contributions to religious thinking. We may say that about half the book is concerned with theistic knowledge of the most useful kind. The other half is strictly philosophical, without any marked religious tendency. It is addressed as a whole to students of philosophy, and these alone of his readers will perceive the great power of the writer and the effective arraignment of the agnostic, the positivist, and the anti-theist.

In the first essay, "The Will to Believe," he opens with the somewhat startling words :

"I have brought with me to-night something like a sermon on justification by faith—I mean, an essay in justification of faith, a defence of our right to adopt a believing attitude in religious matters in spite of the fact that our merely logical intellect may not have been coerced."

He next proceeds to point out the kinds of hypotheses which obtain in scientific thinking, viz.: *living, forced, momentous*, with their respective antitheses, *dead, avoidable, trivial*. The decision between any two of these he calls an *option*. He then presents his thesis thus :

"Our passional nature not only may, but must, decide an option between

propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot by its nature be decided on intellectual grounds; for to say in such circumstances, 'Do not decide, but leave the question open,' is itself a passional decision,—just like deciding yes or no,—and is attended with the same risk of losing the truth.'

This thesis, although abstractly expressed, gives a clue to his psychological position. This position he proceeds to reinforce by reference to the two great divisions of philosophy, the dogmatic and the empirical. He points out the fact that the empiricist, apart from his ground of the reflective consciousness, becomes forthwith a dogmatist, or, as he puts it, "When left to their instincts, they—the empiricists—dogmatize like infallible popes." The question then arises, how shall we treat this universal tendency of human nature to sympathize? His answer is, that it must be treated as a weakness which should be brought under reflection and overcome. For this reason, that objective certitude and evidence have no universal determination in philosophy,—the material test of objective truth,—the long-sought philosopher's stone,—has never been found. In other words, the *a priori* test of objective knowledge is individual, not universal. There is also, he contends, another element which must not be overlooked. It is the ethical imperative, *to know the truth and avoid the error*. These, he holds, are distinct propositions. At least, they are not mutually inclusive. We may give all diligence to avoid error, but we do not *eo ipso* gain the truth. Conversely, we may regard the pursuit of truth as the one thing needful, and yet fall into error. But which course is the better? This he deems no idle question, since it is just here the philosophers come to the parting of the ways. To believe what we have no reason to believe is the lowest depth of immorality (Huxley), and to believe anything on insufficient evidence is always wrong (Clifford), and hence there is, it would seem, these authorities being judges, no thoroughfare—no option for our passional nature, even when our theoretical knowledge has come to a stand-still. Now, this dictum—this ethical imperative, which forbids belief except at the instance of demonstration, is itself an expression of the passional life. Do anything or do nothing, except believing something on insufficient evidence, is only an individual expression of horror of becoming a dupe. No doubt it is bad enough to be duped, but far worse if our excessive caution prevents even dangerous enterprises in search of the truth. It is better to risk drowning, in the hope of learning to swim, than be a slave to the possible alternative of "sink or swim" which accident may thrust upon him.

With this introduction, our author is prepared to come to close quarters with his subject :

"Wherever the option between losing truth and gaining it is not momentous, we can throw the chance of *gaining truth* away, and, at any rate, save ourselves from any chance of *believing falsehood*, by not making up our minds at all till objective evidence has come."

This is, he informs us, the correct principle in science and the ordinary affairs of life. Things can wait on our decisions. The heavens will not fall if we do not make up our minds at all. The option is not forced, and we have plenty of time to save ourselves from deception. But it is not so easy

to say this of all questions. Occasions arise when it is more important to gain truth than to shun error. In other words, there are cases where the truth does not come at all unless we go forth to meet it.

He enforces this position by reference to society and social co-operation in general. Our faith in one another serves to bring into existence that for which the organism was constituted—mutual protection, property, productiveness. Belief in the fact is a factor in its realization. It is the commonest experience of ordinary men that belief runs ahead of scientific evidence. It follows, then, that the acceptance of truth may be dependent upon our personal action.

He now approaches the question which is clearly his final purpose: *Is religion a forced option?* Momentous no doubt to some, dead to others, forced upon the remnant, is, in general, his answer. What does religion say? His reply is:

“Religion says essentially two things—first, she says that the best things are the more eternal things, the overlapping things, the things in the universe that throw the last stone and say the final word; and secondly, the other affirmation of religion is that we are better off even now, if we believe her first affirmation to be true.”

Logically, the first question involves the presupposition that religion is a living option. If not, it will excite no interest—is entitled to no discussion. If a living option, it is also momentous.

The question naturally arises, what is a living option? and in what consists the freedom to believe? Options which the intellect of the individual cannot resolve are within the field of freedom of belief.

“To preach scepticism to us as a duty until sufficient evidence for religion is obtained, is tantamount therefore to telling us, when in the presence of the religious hypotheses, that to yield to our fear of its being error is wiser and better than to yield to our hope that it may be true. It is not intellect against all passions, then; it is only intellect with one passion laying down its law. And by what, forsooth, is the supreme wisdom of this passion warranted? Dupery for dupery, what proof is there that dupery through hope is so much worse than dupery through fear?”

All this reasoning may seem to persons settled and grounded in the truths of Christianity as an exceedingly attenuated form of argument. But it is to be remembered as addressed to the volitional element in his hearers. Religion as spoken of by the lecturer as an effect of the will and as a belief, must be determined by action. If the resulting action is in no way differenced from the action which naturalism dictates, then religious belief as a term defining character is a mere euphemism and may as well be neglected. This the author does not believe. Religion affords a stimulus to action and to the attainment of character which the naturalistic hypothesis fails to explain. It is refreshing to find a philosopher who might well be supposed to be wrapped in the idols of the cave speaking with such earnestness to his own class of thinkers. And this is certainly timely. The empiricism of Herbert Spencer is still lofty and rampant and full of great swelling words of wisdom. And this empiricism has developed itself, among logical minds,

into either pessimism or naturalism or both, with its accompanying mechanical view of nature and mind, and the elimination of the ideals, God, freedom and immortality, from human life. Our author seeks to show that our passionate nature is entitled to some respect on its own account. The Christian spirit, with its hopefulness, is something to be desired, its enemies being judges, why should it be thought disloyal to the scientific spirit to believe Christianity? The whole book is a vindication of the right of individual to feel and to will as well as to think.

In our view—and this is the only criticism we would venture—the author of this essay does not sufficiently distinguish between the philosophies under notice and their ultimate tendencies. The empiricist and absolutist may occupy the two poles of philosophy, but as representatives of two philosophies they do not differ by a whole diameter. Their opposition, if their philosophies are to be considered from the side of religion, must be measured by their ethical positions. Here each has a concrete history. The crowning development of the one, as unmediated by conscious freedom, is agnosticism—that of the other, subject to the same condition, is pessimism. Which is the worse may be a matter of taste, but we fail to see how the absolutist suffers by the comparison.

In regard to the other essays of the book, we can hardly say *ex uno omnia*, yet our remarks on the one must suffice for all. W. J. WRIGHT.

Fulton, Mo.

BRUCE'S WITH OPEN FACE.

“WITH OPEN FACE: or Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.” *By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Free Church College, Glasgow.* Pp. 257. \$1.50. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

In this book, Dr. Bruce treats the Gospels with the freedom and irreverence of the rationalists. He depreciates harmony, and magnifies the peculiarities and differences of the Gospels.

He does not hesitate to set aside the testimony of the Evangelists, and to substitute his own opinion therefor. For instance, in giving another setting to the words of Jesus than that given in the Gospels, he remarks (p. 97):

“That the tradition is at fault here is not surprising. The primitive Christian society cared much more for the words of the Master than for the exact historical occasions. . . . And we have the remedy in our own hands. We are not bound by the connection assigned to them by Luke, or by the author of the First Gospel. We can give them the setting that is most fitting, and that brings out their full pathos.”

Sometimes, however, he finds that the Gospels are right, and then he remarks (p. 103):

“The word and the environment fit into each other so well as to leave little doubt that the Evangelist has given that word its true position in his story, and as little that we may legitimately interpret it in the light of its context.”

Having given up the reliability of the Evangelists' testimony, he has to determine the historicity of each statement for himself according to his own

preconceived ideas as to how things ought to have been. And here is one of his norms of criticism: "It makes for the historicity of the saying that the idea it embodies is *ethical*, not theological" (p. 203). He seems to think that our Saviour could teach the disciples ethics, but not theology;—that the theological statements must be relegated to a later day, when the disciples began to try to explain the significance of events and things.

The influence of the Spirit on the writers of the Gospels is ignored, and all is placed on a naturalistic basis. For instance, in reference to the "Sermon on the Mount," Dr. Bruce asks (p. 125): "Why has Mark not reported any of that memorable Preaching?" and answers:

"Possibly because he was not able. Such a body of deep thought could not be treasured up for long years in the memory of any disciple, however attentive or intelligent; therefore Peter, Mark's apostolic source, could not repeat it from memory in his preaching."

Again he says (p. 105):

"How was it possible for Matthew, years after the Master left the world, to compile that book of Logia, *i. e.*, Oracles of the Lord? Did he draw simply on a retentive memory? Is it not more likely that he had at command *memoranda* written in bygone disciples' days?"

We prefer the explanation to be found in the words of our Lord (John 14:26): "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." This explains how it was possible for Matthew to write the words of the Lord years after he heard them, and Jesus could not have said that the Holy Spirit shall "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," if at that very moment Matthew had *memoranda* of the Lord's sayings on which he would afterwards depend.

Dr. Bruce charges Luke with a religious bias or reverential attitude which made him leave out or tone down whatever related to the human weakness of Jesus. He claims that Luke wrote under the influence of a prudent reserve, not telling all that he knew about Jesus, lest it should shake the faith of his readers. He says (p. 114):

"It is the way of this Evangelist to exercise editorial discretion in reference to whatever affects the character of the Lord Jesus and his apostles, omitting, pruning, strongly stating, as the case might require."

He says that Luke keeps out of view the anger, indignation and passionate abhorrence of evil, which Jesus manifested on some occasions, as depicted by Mark (pp. 54, 60), and asserts Luke's "inability to do justice to the tragic element in our Lord's character and experience" (p. 114). And he says further as to Luke's bias:

"The holiness of Jesus is so zealously guarded that he appears, not only without sin, but even free from all that bears the most remote resemblance to moral infirmity in temper, word and action. The result is that the natural individuality of Jesus, so conspicuous in Mark, is seen in Luke only in faded outline. *Luke's picture of Jesus is one-sided*" (p. 59).

We think it is not Luke's but Dr. Bruce's picture of Jesus that is one-sided. He tells us in his sub-title that his book is: *Jesus as Mirrored in the Synoptic Gospels*, and we would not expect him to give us a one-sided picture. But the fact is that he magnifies out of proper proportion everything in the history that seems to suggest human weakness in Jesus, passionate utterances and actions, disappointments, real fear and soul distress;—all that bears any resemblance to moral infirmity in temper, word and action.

The one-sidedness of his picture is illustrated by the stress he lays on the fact that Jesus was a "carpenter." He says it is of more importance to the permanent significance of Christianity that Jesus was a Carpenter than that he was the Son of David (p. 23), and in this he shows how far he differs from the Evangelists, for they lay much stress on his being the Son of David, giving the genealogy and stating the fact time and again, while the information that he was a Carpenter is given incidentally merely in a question by his enemies: "Is not this the Carpenter?" (Mark 6:3). That he was the Son of David is vital to his Messianic claims, as we read the Scriptures (though Dr. Bruce does not think so); while his being a Carpenter was not vital to his official work, and is not emphasized in the Scriptures. This shows how Dr. Bruce cuts loose from the historical foundation laid in the Old Testament. He says (p. 24):

"Our faith that Jesus is the Christ does not depend on our being certain that he was physically descended from David."

We conceive that "the Christ" has no meaning when separated from the historic foundation laid in the Old Testament, the prophetic antecedents that went before defining the term and the office. And if Jesus does not fulfil those prophecies, if he be not the Son of David,—he may be never so good and great,—still he would not be "the Christ." Dr. Bruce says (p. 15):

"If Jesus can be the spiritual physician and moral guide of mankind, he is what the people of Israel meant by a Christ, one who satisfies the deepest needs and highest hopes of men."

And again:

"We may satisfy ourselves on independent grounds that he meets all our spiritual needs, and therefore is a true Christ for humanity."

In order to determine whether Jesus is the Christ, the question to be settled is not: Does Jesus meet any spiritual needs, I being the judge? I am a very poor judge. Men have often been satisfied with religious leaders as meeting all their spiritual needs,—some, for instance, with Buddha, others with Confucius, others with Mohammed. The question to be settled is: Does Jesus meet God's ideal? *Is he the LORD'S Anointed?* And this cannot be fully and satisfactorily answered independently of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Dr. Bruce dwells much upon the *disappointments* of Jesus. "That the Great Master had already found his own ministry disappointing is beyond doubt," he says (p. 114); and he thinks Luke is wrong in making the report of the seventy as to the success of their work move him to ecstatic joy. He says that in the Lord's parables (like the sower), there is a tone of disap-

pointment audible ; that they grew out of the Master's preaching experience,—he was dissatisfied (p. 128). He says that in Matt. xi. Jesus appears as a disappointed Teacher, and that in the gracious invitation, Matt. xi. 28–30, he expresses disappointment with the kind of disciples he had already gathered,—the "babes," and sighs for more apt disciples. We can see no evidence of disappointment. Jesus was human and was undoubtedly saddened by opposition, neglect and unbelief, as he was gladdened by success (for we accept Luke's statement, 10:21, though Dr. Bruce does not). But he believed too strongly in the sovereignty of God to be disappointed, being satisfied that all whom the Father gave to him would come to him, and that the unbelief of the Jews did not frustrate the Divine purposes (see John vi. 37 and Matt. xv. 13). And every impartial reader of the Gospels must see that he knew from the beginning of his ministry what the outcome would be, and there was no room for disappointment.

Dr. Bruce's picture of Jesus is one-sided not only in his magnifying unduly these traits of character which approach human frailty, but also in his saying nothing at all about the infinite greatness of Jesus. This side of Jesus' character is not omitted by the Synoptists, and should not be omitted by Dr. Bruce when he is presenting Jesus as mirrored in the Synoptic Gospels. Matt. xi. 19, 20 is a very interesting and important passage, but Dr. Bruce slurs over it without bringing out its meaning. In it our Lord testifies to his unlimited power, infinite knowledge, Divine Sonship, and the inscrutable depths of his being, that could be fathomed by no creature, but by the Father only. And though Dr. Bruce is handling this passage, he passes over it without one word as to our Lord's infinite greatness. He dwells upon and magnifies his human weaknesses on every opportunity, but not one word about his Divine greatness, even when passages treating it are right in his way.

Dr. Bruce is right in saying that trust and moral admiration for Jesus can be produced only by letting men see for themselves the qualities in him that inspire trust and admiration. "Orders to trust are futile, injunctions under pains and penalties to admire, vain."

"The best thing," he says, "one can do for his fellow-men is to let the object of faith and reverence speak for himself. Hold up the picture and let men look at it. Set it in a good light, hang it well on the wall, remove from the canvas obscuring dust and cobwebs, if such there be ; then stand aside and let men gaze till the Friend of Sinners, the Man of Sorrows, the great Teacher, begins to reveal himself to their souls" (p. 16).

Yes, we answer, let men see Jesus, but present him fully and faithfully, not partially. Why present him simply as the Friend of sinners, the Man of sorrows, the great Teacher, and not also as the Divine Son, the Atoning Sacrifice? Does Dr. Bruce consider these last features, which he has omitted, dust and cobwebs to be brushed aside?

At the end of his book he adds a chapter, "The Christian Primer," a catechism for children, in which his aim is to show to the children the Jesus of the Gospels "with open face," and not "through the somewhat opaque veil of theology," as he says existing catechisms do. It begins :

“Who was Jesus? He was the Son of Mary of Nazareth, in Galilee, whose husband Joseph was a carpenter.”

Not one word about his pre-existence or incarnation. The catechism closes (after referring to the death of Jesus) thus :

“Q. 123. Where is Jesus now? He is in the house of his Father in heaven, where he is preparing a place for all who bear his name and walk in his footsteps.”

Not one word about his having risen from the dead. The primer presents Jesus as a meek, humane, wise and good man, and a great Teacher, and gives his ethical teachings admirably ; but the impression left on the child's mind would be that he was simply a man, that he died and went to heaven as other good men do. This is the way the moderns get rid of *theology*.

It is men with such views as these who are laying claim to all the scholarship of the day. They are the ones who, in their own estimation, are brushing aside the dust and cobwebs, and getting down to the “historicity of the evangelistic tradition.” They write our commentaries, lexicons and textbooks, which are to be used by the next generation (and even write new catechisms for the children), and thus poison knowledge at the very fountain. Shall we, who bow reverently to the authority of the Scriptures, let them monopolize learning?

There is not much in Dr. Bruce's book that has not appeared in rationalistic works before. The novelty of it is that such views are taught by a Professor in a Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Scotland. Young men not only get their system of thought from their teachers, but also unconsciously imbibe their moral attitude. If their teacher reads his Bible in the class “with a shake of the head and a shrug of the shoulders,” the students will catch the contagion and go forth with the disease developed in probably a more malignant form. And with such religious guides, shaking the faith of men in the only rule of religion and morality, whither will we drift?

What the world needs to-day to counteract religious indifference is preachers of deep and profound faith in the authority of the Scriptures. As one of the greatest philosophers and theologians of our day has expressed it : “We need an era of conviction. We need the outbreak of an epidemic of faith.” This is to be brought about not by having in theological chairs men who spend their time in applying self-formed criteria to determine the historicity of the statements of the Bible, but by having men there who bow to the authority of God's Word.

It is possible that some may be found who will take Dr. Bruce as an authority in preference to the Evangelists. For our part, we prefer the picture of Jesus given us by the writers of the Gospels, and think they were in a better position to determine “historicity” than Dr. Bruce is.

Berkeley Springs, W. Va.

J. W. LAFFERTY.

RAMSAY'S CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE 170.

THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE 170. *By W. M. Ramsay, M. A., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen; formerly Professor of Classical Archæology, and Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; Author of "The Historical Geography of Asia Minor," etc. With maps and illustrations.* New York, London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, Knickerboker Press.

This book is by an author whose exceptionable qualifications for the work none can doubt. He is, perhaps, the very foremost authority on the geography and archæology of Asia Minor. He is a classical scholar of wide attainments. He is thoroughly conversant with the methods of historical criticism. He possesses great skill in research, indefatigable industry, candor, and courage in the exposition of his real conclusions.

The work before us is of great value: 1st. Because of its incidental criticisms of the results of German scholarship in the effort to reconstruct the history of the early church. The author says:

"The books of the New Testament are treated here simply as authorities for history; and their credit is estimated on the same principles as that of other historical documents. If I reach conclusions very different from those of the school of criticism whose originators and chief exponents are German, it is not that I differ from their method. I fully accept their principle, that the sense of these documents can be ascertained only by resolute criticism; but I think that they have often carried out their principle badly, and that their criticism often offends against critical method. True criticism must be sympathetic; but in investigations into religion, Greek, Roman, and Christian alike, there appears to me, if I may venture to say so, to be in many German scholars (the greatest excepted) a lack of that instinctive sympathy with the life and nature of a people which is essential to the right use of critical processes. For years, with much interest and zeal, but with little knowledge, I followed the critics and accepted their results. In recent years, as I came to understand Roman history better, I have realized that, in the case of almost all the books of the New Testament, it is as gross an outrage on criticism to hold them for second century forgeries as it would be to class the works of Horace and Virgil as forgeries of the time of Nero." P. 8.

He says again:

"The vice of many modern German discussions of the early history of Christianity—viz., falseness to the facts of contemporary life and the general history of the period—is becoming stereotyped and intensified by long repetition in the most recent commentators, and some criticism and protest against their treatment of the subject is required." Pp. 5, 6.

Nothing is more remarkable in modern history than the manner in which German scholars who are supposed to trust not in man, to accept nothing without sufficient grounds, acquiesce in their "hereditary circle of knowledge or error." Tradition is as powerful with them as anywhere in the world, provided only it be connected with the name of a great modern German scholar. But no one of the great German scholars has been infallible. They have, indeed, numbered among them men who by their research and productions have bought the world into their debt. But the labors and achieve-

ments of German scholars as a body are vastly overestimated. Without intending to show this, perhaps, our author nevertheless gives some fine and telling illustrations of it. For example, he sets forth as the best "statement of the historical arguments on which the first Epistle of Peter has been assigned to the period of Trojan or Hadrian," Holtzmann's article in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*. His exposition and criticism of the article are as follows :

"1. 'In the Epistle, iv. 15, the Christians of Bithynia and other provinces are warned against murder, theft, and other crimes; and according to Pliny, the Christians of Bithynia were in the habit of taking an oath to avoid such crimes.'

Such is one of Holtzmann's arguments, which would be irresistible if he could add the proof that the Christians first began to avoid these crimes about 112. This essential part of his argument he has omitted.

2. 'In the Epistle trials of Christians are alluded to, iii. 15, and such trials were held by Pliny in Bithynia.'

Again, Holtzmann omits the essential part of his argument—viz., the proof that such trials were first held by Pliny. When we find a series of trials of Christians before Roman officials, beginning with that of Jesus and reaching through the time of Paul and the whole of the first century, we can see no cogency in Holtzmann's reasoning.

3. 'In the Epistle it is implied that the issue in these trials turns on the simple question whether the accused is a Christian, and that question came to the front under Trojan.'

The first part of this argument we fully accept. It states, in brief, the essential and critical point, which distinguishes the language of this Epistle from all earlier references to persecution. But we have seen that, while the trials of Trojan's time were certainly conducted on this principle, the procedure was then settled by long usage." P. 289.

The feature of the book now illustrated, makes it entertaining reading to one who has long taken precisely the same view as to the value of many of the results of modern historical research as conducted by German scholars and their imitators. The book before us literally bristles with criticism, utterly annihilating many theories touching the rise of various New Testament writings.

2nd. The work is valuable, again, in illustrating the true method for reconstructing the history of the period with which it deals. The author carries his readers into his workshop and shows him the whole process by which his conclusions are reached; and the processes are in the main legitimate.

This was one of the author's aims in the construction of the book. He declared in the preface that it is intended to "exemplify to younger students the method of applying archæological, topographical and numismatic evidence to the investigation of early Christian history; and to suggest to others how to treat the subject better than he can.

Indeed, much of the criticism, with which as we have seen the book abounds, against the boasted results of German scholarship, is offered with the expressed desire of inculcating a true method of dealing with evidence. For this purpose he convicts Baur and the Tübingen school of bold assumption of knowledge where a clear comprehension of the situation is impossible, and where they, as matter of fact, were ignorant, and their reconstruction of history, therefore, valueless. For this purpose he shows that Dr. Pfeleiderer,

to whom "ingenious and highly abstract philosophic thought revealed the whole evolution of Christian history," enabling him to decide with secure confidence on the authenticity and date of historical documents, invented a mere *parergon*, a mere make-weight, of a historical argument, for appearance sake, to locate the first Epistle of Peter; and that Pfeleiderer's argument is worth nothing at all.

While not accepting all the conclusions of the author, we regard his work as very superior in method for the discovery of the truth.

It is equally valuable in polemics against rationalistic and higher criticism.

3rd. Another incidental value of this work is in the fact that it illustrates the truth that the Scriptures have nothing to fear from the most thoroughgoing investigation. In higher criticism a little learning may be dangerous, but much learning united with strong Anglo-Saxon common sense and a devout heart is not to be feared. Mr. Ramsay began with the Rationalistic destructive critics; in this work he appears as a great critic, but constructive.

4th. Coming now to the main purposes of the work, we would call attention to its great value in showing the entire harmony between Acts xiii., xiv., and the Epistle to the Galatians. In answer to the question: To whom was the Epistle to the Galatians written? the author takes the view that it was written to the people of the Roman province, Galatia, embracing parts of Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia; that it was not written to Asiatic Gauls, but to Phrygian, Lycaonian, and Pisidian peoples.

Having adopted this view, the author maintains it with a great wealth of learning and ingenuity. We believe he vindicates conclusively his position. But even if it be granted that some dubiety characterize this position, it has become clear again that there is no necessary want of harmony between these Scriptures; and that each writing implies the conditions that actually obtained in that part of the empire in the age of Paul, and not the conditions that obtained later. And this is all that the Apologist for these Scriptures need do to maintain their Apostolic character. The writings themselves do the rest.

5th. The supreme importance of this work lies in the light it throws on the relations of the Empire to the Church. Whether the author's view is to be accepted or not, all must admit that his comments on all historical references to this subject are most acute, suggestive and helpful.

His view in brief is that from the time of Nero to the reign of Trojan was the era of greatest hostility between Empire and Church; and that the correspondence between Trojan and Pliny marks a turning point in the history of their relations. From this time the general policy of the Emperors was practically less hostile to the Church. He teaches that Nero began imperial persecutions to divert suspicion of incendiarism from himself; that persecution continued during the later years of Nero against Christians on the ground of alleged crimes; that under the Flavian Emperors Christianity came to be regarded as treasonable and was persecuted as an organized unity; that Christians continued to be treated as political outlaws during the reigns of Trojan, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, though more mildly, but that the larger policy of Trojan and Hadrian was not understood by Marcus Aurelius, whose ideal

was to be a true Roman ; that a reaction occurred during his reign, a union of the Roman power and the Greek philosophic influence against Christianity, and that active pursuit of Christians became a marked feature of his reign.

This cuts across some prepossessions, but can hardly be doubted to contain a large elementary truth.

6th. Mr. Ramsay's work throws not a little light on several other subjects connected with the history of the early Church. For example, on the kind of people that was readiest to receive Christianity when it appeared, on the early phase of womanism with which parts of the Church in Asia Minor was afflicted, and others.

While holding that this volume is worthy of high praise, we do not mean to endorse every part of it.

At times the author seems to count failure to comprehend a historical situation as tantamount to a disproof of its historical character. The confidence of some of his conclusions appears to the reader rash. And his reverence for the Scriptures might be higher, if it is to be judged by his expression of it in this book. We believe he puts 1 Peter too late (75-80), but are glad that he maintains the Petrine authorship. We believe he assigns a date too early to the Ignatian Epistles, bases that early date on insufficient evidence, and assumes too easily their genuineness and authenticity as settled by Lightfoot. And we find not one particle of Biblical evidence for his theory that the "Episcopos was necessarily single," the agent of the Presbyteroi to perform some action. It is in the face of the plainest Scriptural teaching. Paul exhorted the Ephesian elders to feed and guide (shepherd) the Church of God over which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops. The bishops' *functions* here are identified with those of the elders. The bishop is identical with the presbyter in the Old Testament, albeit one aspect of the office may be more prominent when one word is used, another when the other is employed. He looks with too much approval on the development of the Episcopacy.

There are many things in the volume against which we would say a word, but time forbids. Suffice it to say, in conclusion, that we urge all our young brethren who think for themselves to read it.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sydney, Va.

ORR'S RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND THE EVANGELICAL FAITH.

THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND THE EVANGELICAL FAITH. *By James Orr, M. A., D. D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh.* New York: Thomas Whittaker. 12 mo. Pp. 276.

This is an exceedingly useful little book. It forms one of the best in that series known as *The Theological Educator*, edited by Dr. W. R. Nicoll. Its author, Professor Orr, is the vigorous Professor of Church History of the United Presbyterian Church in Edinburgh. His treatise on *The Christian View of God and the World*, published a few years ago, at once established his place as a thinker of the first rank. Since the death of Dr. John Cairus,

a few years ago, Dr. James Orr has been coming to the front as a not unworthy successor of Cairus.

Professor Orr has been giving special attention to the Ritschlian Theology for several years, and he has rendered the ordinary English reader excellent service by his various writings on this new type of theological thought. The book before us is simply invaluable in this respect, for it is really the first connected and thoroughgoing attempt to present to the ordinary reader a clear, compact view of Ritschlianism. In addition, it makes such a critical estimate of its relation to evangelical theology as to put the reader in full possession of what he desires most to know. It may be added that the exposition and criticism are made in a generous spirit, and yet with a firm hold upon the supernatural factors in the historical evangelical faith of the Church. Its temper and standpoint are alike admirable.

There are eight condensed chapters in the book, and one could scarcely suppose how so much could be so clearly and simply stated in such limited space till he has read these informing pages. The success of the author in this respect is all the greater when we remember how vague and almost obscure many things in Ritschlianism are.

In the first chapter we have a fine account of the rise of the Ritschlian school. Here much interesting information is given regarding Ritschl himself, and about his relations with other theologians in various German Universities. In addition, some account is given of the leading disciples of Ritschl, such as Hermann, Kaftan, Harnach, Wendt, Stade and others. The impression one gathers from this account is that Ritschl had a strong personality, and that his school now largely controls theology in Germany.

The second chapter treats of the inner genesis of the Ritschlian Theology, and of its "Method." Here its relation to philosophy and theology is finely brought out. On the side of philosophy its kinship with Kant is shown, and on the side of theology its dependence on Schleiermacher is indicated. Its method is shown to be not a little ambiguous, in that it claims to ignore the theoretic or speculative, and yet at the same time it often itself reverts to the speculative.

In the third chapter we have a good exposition of the Ritschlian theory of knowledge and of religion. As to the former, it ignores metaphysics, and stands on the phenomenalism of the neo-Kantian philosophy. As to the latter, it lays great stress on what it calls "judgments of value" in regard to the facts involved in religion. The "value judgment" is one of the controlling ideas of Ritschlianism. Here the Professor gives some excellent exposition and illustration.

In the fourth chapter a general view of the Ritschlian theology is taken, and this leads to a discussion of the positive principle of revelation as found in the Holy Scriptures. Here the relation of Christ to the Scriptures is considered, and Christ has "revelation worth" as the positive principle of Christianity. Here some points of expository criticism are made by our author, and a sketch of the Christian system, after Ritschl, is also given.

With the fifth chapter we are introduced into some of the Christian doctrines. The two main ones here considered are "God and his Kingdom"

and the "Person of Christ." Here all theoretic proofs are set aside and all reference to essences is studiously ignored. Love is the fundamental attribute of God, and the idea of the divine Fatherhood is strongly limited. The notion of the kingdom is made prominent, and the world exists merely as a means to this kingdom. Professor Orr points out some ambiguities in this view. Touching the Person of Christ, no assertion is allowed in regard to his essential deity, and his kingly office is made the chief one. At this point serious differences with evangelical views emerge, as Professor Orr points out in passing. The true deity, and the priestly function of Christ, are held in the background in a way not justified by the Scriptures. This is a very valuable chapter.

The sixth chapter continues the considerations of special Christian doctrines, turning now to the experimental side. Here sin and redemption, justification and reconciliation, another new life, are all considered in turn. The view of sin is rather that of defect or ignorance. There is no retributive justice, no real guilt, and no real atonement. So with justification, reconciliation, and all the experiences of the new life, it is shown that Ritschl's views are not in harmony with evangelical doctrines.

The seventh chapter gives in a most interesting way an account of the later development of the Ritschlian theology. Here the agreements and differences of his disciples are brought out. In general the tendency is to modify the doctrine of "value judgments," and to allow a larger place for metaphysics than Ritschl did. In addition, it appears that at almost every point there is dispute as to what Ritschl himself really taught, and great difference among those who are regarded as Ritschlians. Not a little of this may arise from the fact that, like Schelling in philosophy, Ritschl's theology passed through several distinct stages.

The last chapter is in some respects the most valuable of all, inasmuch as it gives in a general survey, the bearing of the Ritschlian theology upon the evangelical faith. We wish that we had space for considerable quotations from its pages, but we must be content with a mere summary.

In general, Professor Orr concludes that while there are some good features in this theology, yet it cannot be regarded as a worthy substitute for the older evangelical faith. This general conclusion our author fully vindicates.

He shows that in its claim to be uninfluenced by science and philosophy it utterly fails, for it often moves in the region of metaphysics, and theoretic thought. The fact is, religion and theoretic thought cannot be divorced. He also criticises the notion of "value judgments," indicating that this is an unnecessary and misleading idea, and pointing out that the "value" element in any judgment finally rests on the reality implied in it. Jesus Christ has the value of God to me, chiefly because I am assured that in the reality of his Person the nature of God is present. Our author shows that Ritschlianism tends to subjectivism, and lands us on the ground that "man is the measure of all things" in matters of religion. He also points out radical defects in Ritschl's theory of religion and revelation, and also in the view he takes of natural theology. He in like manner criticises the Ritschlian idea

of God, as overlooking the divine justice. He indicates the inadequacy of the idea of the Kingdom of God in various important respects, and shows that it cannot be harmonized with that of "the Church." So with the incarnation, propitiation, sin, death, resurrection, the Spirit's work and the new life, there is serious failure to do justice to Scripture and religious experience. In this way the verdict of our author is justified.

A very complete index gives information in regard to the extensive literature of the Ritschlian school. This will be found useful for those who wish to pursue their investigations further.

We have reason to thank Professor Orr for this little book. It is indeed a *multum in parvo*. This type of theological thought is already affecting the English-speaking world. It has already a foothold in Britain, both in England and Scotland. Its first notes are already sounded in this country. Dr. McGiffert is a disciple of Harnach, and Harnach is the Church Historian of Ritschlianism. We are inclined to think that this is the next movement with which evangelical theology in this country will have to deal. We do well to inform ourselves about it. Dr. Orr's book will greatly help in this. Moreover, it will revive and deepen interest in the study of systematic theology. This study CANNOT die.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

CROOKS' STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. *By George R. Crooks, D. D., LL. D., Late Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary.* 8vo., pp. 604. \$3.50. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1897.

Numerous compends of Church History for the use of students, and for general reference, have been published within the last few years. This is one of the most accurate, comprehensive, and readable of them all. It is a difficult task to undertake to condense the history of the Church for nineteen centuries within the limits of one volume of 600 pages, without making it a mere chronological table or skeleton of facts, devoid of interest to all except the antiquarian or statistician. In this case, however, the difficult task has been achieved by means of a most lucid arrangement, a judicious selection of details, and an agreeable style.

We are informed in the Prefatory Note that the volume contains, in a revised and enlarged form, the lectures which Dr. Crooks gave to his classes at the Drew Theological Seminary. The enlargement consists, no doubt, in the addition of certain topics in several connections, and not in the amplification and illustration, which would doubtless be more full in the oral lectures. The book was partly in the hands of the printer at the time of the distinguished author's death, and appears in its completed form as the result of the editorial supervision of his daughter, who had been for many years his assistant in literary work.

The Apostolic period of Church History is more fully treated than any other. This is as it should be, because of its greater importance in deter-

mining the true nature of the government and ordinances of the Church which ought to prevail in all ages. The account given of the primitive organization agrees substantially with that described by Neander, Mosheim, Schaff, and all anti-prelatic historians.

The controversies respecting the Trinity and the Person of Christ in the fourth and fifth centuries are clearly and succinctly described. The author's account of the Pelagian heresy and of Augustine's views is, of course, colored by his Arminianism, as when he says :

"Augustine holds that grace is indispensable to salvation, that it is unmerited, that it is irresistible, that it exerts over man an irresistible moral power, but is not a constraint imposed on the will ; that grace, therefore, in Augustine's view, is not inconsistent with freedom ;" and then adds : "Of course, this position is self-contradictory. To make or compel man to be willing, no matter what the means, is to coerce the will."

The inconsistencies of Arminianism strikingly appear when he undertakes to contrast it not only with Augustinianism but with Pelagianism.

It is remarkable that in a brief history of the whole Church, written by a pronounced Arminian, twenty-five pages are devoted to the character, work, and opinions of John Calvin. While differing very materially from the one prominent doctrine of Calvin's system, the doctrine of Predestination, and disapproving of his connection with the execution of Servetus, the author expresses a profound and discriminating respect for his character and his work.

"It was important," he says, "that the prophet (Luther) of the new Era should be followed by its legislator. Some one was needed to compact the Reformation by giving it a vigorous dogmatic system and the energy which always accrues from a well defined method of discipline. This need was supplied by Calvin, the organizer of Protestantism. Though the field in which he wrought was narrow, yet his church in Geneva became the model of the Reformed Churches of France, Holland, Scotland, and was for a time, during the Commonwealth, adopted as a model in England. He is still the master mind and disciplinarian of Protestant Churches throughout a large part of Christendom. Luther is remembered with enthusiasm ; Calvin is felt in the daily lives of men."

Despite what he calls Calvin's "unreasonable severities and the excesses of a fervent zeal," he regards him as the representative of a vital principle, the self-governing power of the Church, its independence of the State, the right of its Session, Consistory or Presbytery, consisting of its pastors and lay elders, in the proportion of two elders to each minister, to administer ecclesiastical discipline.

"Thus the Church of Geneva, independent, and with the old distinction between clergy and laity obliterated through the participation of both in its government, became the model of the Reformed Churches over all the world. The Protestants of France, Holland, Scotland, and the Presbyterians of the New World have adopted this system, and owe to it their ecclesiastical vigor. It is a system which conserves authority and liberty. The representation of the people in the Church carries with it, as a natural sequence, the representation of the people in the State."

Such remarks are creditable to the candor and intelligence of the author, and may be taken as an illustration of the spirit of the whole volume. The

account of the Arminian controversy in the sixteenth century and of the Council of Dort is given with an Arminian bias, but it is free from partisan bitterness. The work closes with a brief chapter on Arminianism after the Synod of Dort, ending with its revival and purification under John Wesley.

Clarksville, Tenn.

ROBERT PRICE.

BOYNTON'S REAL PREACHING.

REAL PREACHING. Three Addresses to the Theological Students of Oberlin. *By Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D. D.* Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 12mo. 75 cents.

These addresses are, in main, profitable reading. They were prepared for the young men of Oberlin Theological Seminary, not as compendiums of the topics suggested, but rather as transcripts of impressions and convictions. They present in a most entertaining way the royal character of the preacher's calling.

Three subjects make the contents of the book, viz., "The Real Man," "The Real Sermon," "The Real Audience." Discarding quotation marks, we will present some of the simple but forceful delineations of these three factors of Real Preaching:

The Real Man: The "Hero as Priest" is a ministerial pharmacopœia. When God calls for a preacher he calls *a man*, a whole man, a full man, especially in those things which are furthest removed from selfishness, and the nearest in alliance with true divine love. A man's ministry must be the natural, sequential, corollary of the real proposition of his life. Self-exploration is of first importance therefore. The preacher should be controlled by a true MOTIVE. He should enter the sacred ministry with sacred purposes. A superficial motive means a supercilious, emasculated ministry. There is but one consummation, but one finale, and that is absolute, irremediable disaster for the man who enters the ministry from a motive of unsanctified ambitious loungings, society influence, or mercenary considerations.

A true motive is the keystone of his life arch. It must be great enough to bring contentment in encountered limitations, to choke to death incipient jealousy: supreme enough to grant decision in peremptorily refusing to be high priest of expediency, and to officiate at the elaborate but evanescent ceremonials at which principle is slain, amid hosannas and hallelujahs, upon the brazen altar of policy.

The Church wants not the *mere* ecclesiastic, whose affection is set on organization, ritual, ceremony: not the *mere* theologian, displaying his hair-splitting and logic-chopping pyrotechnics: not the *mere* preacher, who toys with the ministry on Sunday, and during the week regrets his inability to visit the people: nor the *mere* pastor, dispensing through the week calling cards and keeping a most elaborate record of visitations, and on Sunday "occupies the pulpit." But wholeness—completeness—is the characteristic of Real Preaching. Let the whole life be delivered *to* its glorious purpose and *from* obstacles and hindrances.

Next to the masterful motive, the Real Man forever strives to inform him-

self. The profession should spring from the life ; not the life from the profession. Preparation of self is the most virile, conscientious, effective preparation for Sunday. Practice self-culture by the reading and study of books and men. The Real Man must be a leader. The present day problem, the burning question, is how to lead the great, strong, sleeping Church of God : not so much how to touch life *without* the church—any one can do that—but how to touch it *within* the church, by making the church esteem her privilege and accept her responsibility.

"Sermo animi est imago : qualis vir, talis et oratio est."

The Real Sermon : The *one* great business of the minister is to be the evangelist,—the herald of glad things, the preacher of righteousness. He is not to become an executive : not to spend his forces in "bringing things to pass : " not to be transformed into a "religious promoter," a church "captain of industry." He must plan sermons, not societies. "Preaching is making men think and feel in proportion as they think. The sermon thus is truth clarified in thought and kindled in feeling. It is potential when completed in the study : it is actual when sent forth from the pulpit." Healthy sermons have ancestors, antecedents. They are not made the week they are delivered.

For general preparation, Observation, Reading, Meditation, Note Books, are emphasized. For special preparation, to every man according to his own ability. No rule can be laid down. Every man must carry his own burden. However, this is absolute : No tyranny is so cruel as that of a dissipated homilectic habit. No slave ever drudges in utter loyalty for its master like the homilectic habit when once it has been thoroughly mastered. The theme in mind, it is valuable exercise to read its opposite. If the subject is love, read about hate : if hope, get the literature of despair.

The question of preaching the prepared sermon must be answered largely by a man's own habit, though it will be generally conceded that the spoken sermon for the average audience is the great present demand. The majority can become effective extemporaneous preachers if willing to make a sufficiently strenuous effort. "It is *dogged* as does it ;" not facility, not natural gifts. The aspirant for extemporaneous ability must be, beyond others, a wide observer, an omnivorous reader, and a constant thinker. The three great characteristics of a spoken sermon are point, picture and passion. Genuine, heartfelt, hot-souled "gude words for Jesus Christ," are not only the great urgency, but the rewarding satisfactions of our modern pulpit. The Real Sermon is truth kindled by the hot fires of an earnest purpose and a sincere heart. That man will preach who will deliver himself in God's stead : others will but parley.

The Real Audience. The real question about any service is not, What is there? but, Who is there? The congregation consists of what is there—the mere numerical total : the audience consists of who is there—the roster of spiritual or soul presence. When "heart leaps forth to wed with heart, ere thought can wed itself with speech : " when spirits fellowship, time stops the clock and eternity begins. The congregation thus is the transient ; the audience, the everlasting. The congregation hears the speech ; the audience

listens to the spirit. The great desideratum of a preacher is not a congregation, but an audience. This audience is an open soul into which the preacher pours spiritual nectar which has been distilled in his own. But this audience is not always in evidence : yet it is the precious audience.

There is also the occasional audience. In meeting the demands of public address, it is not proper on every occasion to conduct a revival service. But the minister has no business in, and no time for, any gathering in which his real spirit must wear a mask.

Then there is the usual audience, the congregation. This is composed of men of like passions with one's self. They are real flesh and blood. From this audience the minister must expect revelations ; he will surely have them. Yet, "He must trust God. See all, nor be afraid." In the congregation there will be sin-smitten souls. For their sakes be discreet. While truth is to be bravely and completely spoken, at the same time there is a proportion of truth, a stating of truth, as well as a broadside of truth. There will be also the leaders of our "best society." In their august presence retain the courage of conviction ; be tactful, but abidingly true, always adorning, never adulterating the profession ; remember that the preacher is not the minister of Mr. and Mrs. So-and-So, but of Jesus Christ. The inquirer will be there. Doubt need not be obnoxious. And the worshipper will be there. The minister is charged with the conduct of worship ; it is his mission to lead the services, to conduct the soul as it pays its vows in the sanctuary of the Most High. For this the greatest attention should be given to the Scripture lessons, to public prayer, whose importance or privilege no words can too strongly portray, and to the service of song rendered by the people. To recover the music to its right place in the service of public worship is an imperative necessity. A performance of any sort in the pulpit or in the choir gallery, is distinctly alien to the spirit of worship. Congregations must be delivered, liberated, rescued from the thralldom of the quartette and the choir master.

Real Preaching requires that ministers be real men ! Preach real sermons ! Discover real audiences ! This most glorious of all earthly callings will satisfy in proportion as sacrifice is made for it. Hard, splendidly hard, it is also noble, magnificently noble. Adorn it with the wealth of enthusiasm and fidelity, and its very difficulties will be revealed as its resplendent treasures.

With this array of good viands it seems inconsiderate to introduce at the close aught distasteful, yet to be faithful we must warn the reader against what appears to us to be, in some expressions of the writer, an extreme disparagement of severe simplicity and purity in public worship, as also in church architecture. Warning against this tendency of our author, we are pleased to commend his book to the young men of our ministry especially, but also to the more elderly.

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

ABBOTT'S SOUL'S QUEST AFTER GOD.

THE SOUL'S QUEST AFTER GOD. *By Lyman Abbott.* Boston : Thomas F. Crowell & Co.

This little book, according to the statement of its distinguished author, "assumes that God is, and that some men have communion with him." And "it is written to aid those who see and desire to see more clearly ; or who have seen and desire to renew their sight ; or who have heard the testimony of those who see, and wish to believe that testimony true and to enjoy a similar vision." It is designed, therefore, not for the hardened, or even the indifferent, but for those who are thirsting after God. It is divided into two parts : "First, some of the hindrances to be overcome ; Second, some of the aids which promote success in the soul's quest after God."

It is needless to say that it is written in the charming style, characteristic of its scholarly author. Much helpful truth is compressed into small compass, with a degree of freshness and vigor which holds the reader's unwearied attention. And yet the book is very unsatisfactory, both on account of what it contains, and especially on account of what it does not contain.

In the first place, it is a matter of regret that in a professedly practical work of this kind, designed for popular reading, the author should have felt constrained to interject certain views peculiar to himself and his school in current Biblical controversy. Among the hindrances in the Soul's quest after God, he mentions the putting of other things in the place of God, *i. e.*, idolatry. He then mentions three modern idols, viz., the Creed, the Church, and the Bible. These, he thinks, are designed to help us to God ; but many men rest in them and do not find God ; they stop at the image and do not reach up to God, just as the Buddhist does with his idol of wood or stone. There is doubtless some truth in this statement of the case, but it is greatly overdrawn, especially with regard to the Bible. But we soon discover that the author's estimate of the Bible is not a high one. Apparently he does not regard it as the word of God, but simply as "a book written concerning him." Or note this : "So long as the Bible is a collection of voices, every one saying : 'God tabernacles among men,' and we look in our heart and find God there, it is good." That is to say, the one permissible use of the Bible is to call the attention of men to the fact that God is in their hearts ! He then proceeds to defend and praise the work of those who, like himself, are engaged in the work of "idol destruction." He complains : "Belief in an infallible book has been made to take the place of faith in a living God." One would suppose that those who have believed the Bible to be "an infallible book," have been among the idolaters, and more than other men have failed to find God ! The indisputable fact is, that no members of the human race the world over have had such clear vision of God, and drawn as near to him in thought and character as those who have believed in "an infallible book." Certainly in their piety, godliness, zeal and achievements for God and humanity they are not inferior to those who reject the infallibility of the book, and whose magisterial utterances appear sometimes as full of conceit as their philosophy is barren of practical and beneficent fruits.

The animus of the author towards the Bible is displayed again, when in enumerating the aids which promote success in the Soul's quest after God, he makes no mention of the Bible whatever. He tells us we should "form the habit of looking for God in nature," and "a similar habit of looking for God in man," especially "in the earthly life of Jesus the Christ." He informs us that in seeking God, "whether in the world of nature or the world of men, most of us need a guide, a teacher," and he names certain men, "for whose guidance we should be profoundly grateful—Tyndall, Huxley, Darwin, Agassiz," among the scientists, and Browning, Wordsworth, and Whittier, among the poets. This is all well enough in its place; but have Moses, David, Isaiah, John, and Paul been of no help to souls in their quest after God? It is safe to say that more souls have come to a clear knowledge of God through a reverent use of the Bible than through all other writings combined, and yet our author does not so much as give it a place in his category of "aids which promote success in the Soul's quest after God." When we remember that the book is written not for atheists and scoffers, but "to aid those who see and desire to see more clearly," this omission of the Bible as one of the aids is inexplicable, except on the ground that the author is afraid of encouraging idolatry! Nature-worship and man-worship have no terrors for him, but bibliolatry! There is the great peril to the present generation. He is not the first nor only distinguished teacher who hesitates to recommend the Bible to the masses as an aid in seeking God. The reasons are obvious.

It is curious, but not surprising, to note that in enumerating the "hindrance," to finding God, sin is not once mentioned, nor is it referred to, unless under such language as, "loss of vision from non-use," "atrophy of the spiritual faculty," &c. The difference between the state described by this language and sin seems to be that the former is devoid of guilt. After quoting the hopeless language of one who has suffered this "atrophy of the spiritual faculty," our author says: "Heartrending is this testimony of a truly noble, genuine, pureminded man to the loss of the capacity to perceive the Infinite in the finite, the Divine behind the human, the Invisible behind the visible." The spirit of their words does not seem to be exactly that of Isaiah, Jesus and Paul. When speaking of the same class of persons, they say: "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted and I should heal them." (Matt. xiii. 15.)

Ignoring sin as a hindrance, of course repentance is not mentioned as a step in the Soul's quest after God, nor is it remotely referred to. It may be that such terms as "sin" and "repentance" are too harsh, and smack too much of creed, church, and Bible, for the esthetic ears of those for whom our author writes. But one cannot repress the thought, how far away he is as a teacher of men from the Baptist, from the Apostles, and from the great Teacher himself, who, when they would lead men to God, had as the burden of their message: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of God is at hand." If our author has really discovered a door into the kingdom, which may be entered,

or an approach to God, which may be trod, without repentance, then truly the servant is become "greater than his Lord," and the disciple "above his Master."

Once more, there is no intimation in the book that in the Soul's quest after God, any supernatural influence is called for. The necessity of the divine Spirit's power to enable a man to "see the kingdom of God," is not hinted at. And hence prayer is not once mentioned as an aid in finding closer communion with God.

Many of the truths of the book are helpful; but its omission of all reference to the deeper truths of the soul in its relations to God, forces on one the conclusion, that at most it can only lead one to an intellectual perception of God; and perhaps this is the author's only purpose. But if so, then his title, "*The Soul's Quest After God*," is, to say the least, misleading and mischievous; for the soul cannot find God in the true, saving sense, without repentance, expiation, and prayer.

A. B. CURRY.

Birmingham, Ala.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH'S "ZEPHANIAH," ETC.

THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE. Edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M. A., LL. D., Editor of "*The Expositor*." THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS. Vol. II. Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, I.-VIII., "Malachi," Joel, "Zechariah," IX.-XIV., and Jonah. By George Adam Smith, D. D., LL. D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1898. Large Cr. 8vo., pp. xx., 544. \$1.50.

This ample volume is the forty-ninth and last in the series to which it belongs, and which has often been noticed in these pages. The completion of this great work is worthy of note. That it is a great work all must admit, however much certain parts may be excepted to; and that it will find a permanent and popular place, its already large circulation clearly proves. The volumes are of unequal merit, but among them are some which cannot be surpassed in interest, ability, and soundness.

This second volume on the Minor Prophets is from the pen of Dr. George Adam Smith, who has contributed a number of volumes to the series, and whose attitude towards critical questions is well known. The title of the volume shows how he regards at least two of the books studied, viz., Malachi and Zechariah, which he names with quotation marks. He holds to the anonymity of the prophecy of Malachi, and maintains that the title is a purely artificial one, borrowed from chap. iii., 1, "Behold I send my messenger." The prophecy itself is, in his view, the combination of several anonymous prophecies. Zechariah he divides into two parts, which he treats as entirely separate and distinct books, the second part, embracing chapters ix.-xiv., being, in his opinion, from its style, subject matter, manner and conditions, without doubt the product of some other hand than Zechariah's. He opposes the theory that this part has a pre-exilic date, and inclines to the opinion of Stade, whom he regards as the most thorough analyst of these chapters, that they reflect the conditions prevailing during the early wars

between the Ptolemies and Seleucids, with perhaps an underlying prophecy of a pre-exilic time. Of Jonah, Dr. Smith maintains that its form, which upon the surface is narrative rather than prophetic, shows that it is not history but prophecy, presented in the form of allegory or parable. He holds that if it be regarded as history, it is too open to ridicule, or at least suggestive of humor, and that to avoid this and to obtain the sublime spirit of the book, one must regard it as a parable. He seems inclined to the belief that it was written about 300 B. C. Of our Lord's references to the book, he first intimates that the genuineness of a part of the text may be questioned, and next maintains that even if the text be entirely genuine, the vagueness of the parallel drawn in it between Jonah and himself shows that our Lord was not concerned about quoting facts, but was simply giving an illustration from a well known tale. The Lord's purpose in the illustration was, he holds, purely instructive, and therefore the reference could as well be to a parable as to actual history, his illustration be as well drawn from the realm of poetry as of fact. Of Joel, the author regards the evidence for an early date as inconclusive, and himself advocates some time after the establishment of the law by Ezra and Nehemiah, in 444 B. C. The first and chief argument for this is that the prophet alludes to the exile of Judah as past, as if it were not often the very business of the prophet to tell history before it occurred! The other books treated do not offer so favorable a field for the exploitation of critical notions, and therefore follow more nearly the usual lines of criticism and interpretation.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

Clarksville, Tenn.

BATTERSHALL'S INTERPRETATIONS OF LIFE AND RELIGION.

INTERPRETATIONS OF LIFE AND RELIGION. *By* Walton W. Battershall, D. D., Rector of St. Peter's Church, Albany. New York: A. S. Barnes & Company. 1897. Pp. 283. \$1.50.

Beware of this book. It is twenty sermons, which, without meaning to depreciate, should be called sermonettes. Each is short, suited to the service of the Episcopal Church. The spirit is reverent, the tone urgent, and the style fascinating. Without much sententious wit, the flavor pervades the book, and the writer strikes out many sentences of fine form and permanent practical value. The real and dangerous element of the book does not appear until the close, though its presence is felt. The inspiration of the Scriptures, the divinity of Christ, the immortality of the soul, are confessed. But the third chapter of John and the "being made partakers of the divine life" are not once in the thought of these religious essays. "Christ who is our life," comes alongside the human life rather than to it and into it as redemption and renewal and restoration. God has created man as a part of the whole creation, and as a part of Evolution. Man has developed from a "rudimentary condition," and by slow, steady progress is growing to the kingdom of heaven [*sic*].

Whoever can distinguish and appreciate Apologetics, will enjoy and may be helped by this book, provided that the errors are noted. The man of this

book is not lost and dead in trespasses and sins, but has the image of God hidden or covered up, to be uncovered and developed. The Christ here is not Saviour and Life, but Example and King. God is not sovereign and holy, but Creator and Loving Father only. "Life and immortality" brought to light through the Gospel are not by the new birth and spiritual growth, but making the most of natural powers in obedience to God's laws and under his providence. It may be inferred that the preacher is evangelical, and it is plain that he is a sacramentarian, but the fundamental and dangerous error of these sermons is that they do not recognize and show sin, and the necessity and value of the Atonement. The life and religion is, therefore, interpreted apart from and without the life of Christ or the merit of his death.

As literature, these essays are excellent. As statements of proper principles for moral lives, they are good. But they utterly fail to present motives and to furnish power to actuate such lives. Moreover, his description of scriptural sainthood is far removed from the growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. His notion of the "coming kingdom" is only that of spiritual development. In a word, this book is a better treatise on Christian knighthood and spiritual culture than on "life and immortality."

A. D. McCUER.

Wilmington, N. C.

BREWER'S HOW TO MAKE THE SUNDAY SCHOOL GO.

HOW TO MAKE THE SUNDAY SCHOOL GO. *By A. T. Brewer, Superintendent Epworth Memorial S. S., Cleveland, O.* New York: Eaton & Mains. Pp. 191. 60 cents.

This little book is dedicated to "Sunday School teachers, whose labors and religion are beyond price and above creed." Considering the ecclesiastical developments of the times, a Southern Presbyterian is suspicious of the phrase, "above creed." It suggests a class of Sunday School teachers whose "labors and religion" are creedless. Such "labors and religion" must stand sadly in need of instruction, "How to Go." How to make a Sunday School Go, when taught by such teachers, would be as difficult a problem as how to make a man go whose spinal column was composed of jelly.

From the brief introduction we learn "the object of this book is to present helpful methods of Sunday School work, all the plans described having been put into successful operation, receiving constant and intelligent commendation. The chapters were not all written by the ostensible author, but, at his request, others discussed various subjects on which they had more practical knowledge."

The book is divided into thirty-nine short chapters. The first urges that the enthusiasm natural to childhood be utilized. "You must assume that your school will grow, expand, develop, improve, on and on forever. There must be no final stopping-place in the grand program, no halt except to award honors, recognize merit, and take note of achievements."

Chapter II. recommends that a unanimous agreement of all teachers should be secured for all the methods and measures employed. Other chapters give

practical instructions regarding the "order of service," "order in the school," and the "time of day and length of the session." How to grade the school and keep it graded is very plainly told, and much helpful information is given as to the conduct of the various departments. The writer evidently has in view a large city Sunday School; but superintendents and teachers in smaller schools can gain useful knowledge here. The assignment of teachers and the provision of substitutes are among the most difficult problems in many Sunday Schools, and our author discusses them well.

It is recommended that the "superintendent, ordinarily, should make no speeches." Particularly should he discourage the "average person" who, "when presented to a school, is immediately possessed to say something funny." Variety of entertainment is recommended for the "superintendent's five minutes." It is suggested to get some one to read the lesson in a foreign language, or have "a number of little girls dressed in white, without their hats, sing or recite Scripture," or "have a bright woman give her impressions on first reading *Uncle Tom's Cabin*," or "some one can be secured to give chapters on slavery experiences and scenes before the war! These things should be made to connect, though distantly it may be, with some subject that is being studied." Of course, a skillful, up-to-date superintendent is able to make some sort of connection between any possible topics.

The usual things are said in regard to teachers' meetings. The social functions of the school are insisted upon and illustrated. Methods are given for "the training of parents." The various officers and their offices are described. It is recommended that Bibles should take the place of lesson papers, quarterlies, &c., during the school hour. The author even goes further: "The best lesson helps should be provided for teachers; but we deem it better, on the whole, to let scholars secure their own, if they desire to use any. . . . This may be the only possible way to insure the use of the Bible."

Reviews, Children's Day, Entertainments, and Special Days are all discussed.

This little book gives in readable form such instruction as we usually hear from the specialists who occupy the platform at Sunday School conventions. The directions given are plain and practicable, and, if followed, will doubtless make any Sunday School "Go." It is to be hoped, however, that our people will regard the direction we go as being as important a matter as the locomotion. The school following the directions of this book will go to much profit; but it will also go where ritualism entombs mediocrity, dead of self-complacency, in whitewashed sepulchers.

Oxford, Miss.

W. D. HEDLESTON.

MEYER'S PAUL, A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST.

PAUL, A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST. *By Rev. F. B. Meyer.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 12mo. Pp. 203. \$1.00.

We confess to a decided liking for the author of this latest life of Paul. His simplicity, his earnestness, his practicalness, his reverence for Scripture,

his usual evangelical soundness, in spite of the estimate usually set upon him in our Church, make us enjoy reading what he publishes. The book before us is a preacher's life of the Apostle, or this life exhibited in twenty-one brief discourses. It is not the work of a critic or literary specialist, who comes forward with much display of erudition, investigation and critical acumen to settle the mooted questions as to the life and writings of Paul. There is no attempt to exhibit the *pro* and *con.* of any of these ; there is no allusion to Baur, Pfleiderer, Harnack, etc. He tells us : "I have taken advantage of some of the latest books which have dealt with this subject ; but for the most part the following pages contain the essence of years of my own thinking and preaching." He has studied his subject sympathetically and given us the results. Little exception can be taken to the results reached. Mr. Meyer accepts implicitly the statements of the Bible ; he receives as Paul's the thirteen epistles accepted in all the ages as his ; Hebrews he makes no allusion to and doubtless does not assign to Paul. The epistles are relied on much for auto-biographical delineation, and flash-light glimpses of the sublime character under contemplation. When the admiration of the author for his hero is intense there is nothing strained or overdrawn, scarcely anything, indeed, which does not appear fairly warranted. Probably his inference from Phil. 18, 19, that Paul had a "business account" with Philemon is a little far-fetched.

His view as to several of the small debated matters in Paul's life may be briefly stated. He thinks the two names were given at circumcision, the one for family, the other for business. Paul received no Greek culture. Was probably away from Judea during John's and Christ's ministries, else he would surely have seen them and told us so. Was doubtless a married man—Farrar's view, based on Farrar's arguments. Was at Tarsus in retirement, before Barnabas sought him out, five or six years, plying his trade, studying, preaching as opportunity offered. The first visit to the Galatians was in the first journey, and due to his trouble, which was eye-trouble, probably—his "thorn in the flesh." The visit to Jerusalem referred to in Gal. ii., is the same as that in Acts xv. There were two imprisonments, with a two years' intermission, but Paul did not go to Spain.

Mr. Meyer is a firm believer in final perseverance, but he must be confused as to the extent of the Atonement ; at least he confuses us when we try to determine what his view is. On pp. 10, 11, occurs the brief paragraph that contains all of this nature in this volume. Treating of Paul as one of the "Fore-known," and having quoted Rom. viii. 29, he says :

"It is not a complete solution of the mystery of Predestination, and only removes it one stage further back : yet the suggestion casts a gleaming torch-light into the darkness of the impenetrable abyss when we are told that God included in the eternal purposes of life all those whom (*sic*) he foresaw would be attracted to an indissoluble union of faith and life with his Son. All who come to Jesus show that they were included in the Father's gift to his Son. The Father gave him all those who in the fulness of times should come. But why some have an affinity with the Man of the Cross and not others ; why some come and others stay away ; why some sheep hear the

Shepherd's voice and follow, while others persist in staying, is one of those secrets which are not revealed as yet to the children of men."

Certainly none of us is able to solve the mystery of predestination, why God chose some and passed by others: but we can all state the matter Scripturally, and Mr. Meyer has not done so here. The last sentence is not Scriptural, because the Bible does not call those that stay away "sheep." They stay away because they are not sheep, for the sheep know his voice and follow. See John x. The next to the last sentence, while true in one sense, is not intended, we fear, in that sense, and certainly inverts and transposes what Christ says in John vi. 37. The second sentence we make no objection to. In the first sentence the trouble is that "foresaw" is substituted for Paul's "foreknew," and the sentence becomes ambiguous, to say the best of it, more probably it is Arminian. Mr. Meyer certainly ought to know that *προγινώσκειν* is not the equivalent of *προιδείν* in Scripture, that it is more than simple prescience. It certainly involves choice in Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2, and 1 Pet. i. 20, the only passages where it has doctrinal significance in the New Testament. The cognates can be shown to agree in both Testaments. "The Lord knoweth them that are his;" "The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish," &c.

The book is worthy of the author and will not weary in perusal, though of course about all that is new to one who has studied other lives of the Apostle and is familiar with the New Testament, is the method of presentation. It is a very much better popular life of Paul than Iverach's, which is the best we can compare it with.

The volume is well printed, neatly and durably, but not strongly bound, paper excellent, type clear. We noticed but one typographical error—the omission of a period with lack of spacing in the third from last line on page 91.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

CORNILL'S PROPHETS OF ISRAEL.

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 Königsberg. Translated by Sutton F. Corkran. Second edition. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1897. Pp. 194.

The dimensions of this book are not to be taken as a fair index to its importance. It would be classed, I suppose, as a duodecimo. The paper upon which it is printed, while not specially fine, is rather thick. The type is bold, and the lines well leaded. Hence the amount of matter contained in its 198 pages is not more than a moderately rapid reader might compass in three or, at the outside, four hours. The importance of the book lies in the well known reputation of its author, the character of the positions which he takes, and verve with which he states and elaborates them. "The book," so its author informs us, "grew out of a course of lectures which I (he) was invited to deliver" in the city of Frankfort-on-the-Main. Professor Cornill is

not only a scholar, but is evidently also a man of fine gifts as a popular lecturer. More than once, while reading his pages, the wish has shaped itself that some conservative with similar gifts would undertake a similar service in a better cause. The times call for such books and lectures at the hands of those who, as we believe, hold the truth, as over against the errors of Cornill and his school. It is much to be regretted that the popular mind should receive its impressions of prophecy and history in Israel almost entirely from those who, like Cornill, hold that "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 pictures 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."

The book, taken for what it is, has decided merits and attractions. It will open the eyes of the discriminating reader to the underlying principles and assumptions, and to the logical and legitimate results of the speculations of the school represented in Britain and America by writers like Driver, Geo. F. Moore, Briggs, and others. Cornill, in his way, is as pious as they are. Indeed, he tells us that, though he "has read the Book of Jonah at least a hundred times," he "cannot even now take up this marvelous book, nay, nor even speak of it, without tears rising" to his eyes. Not only so, but, along with much that is as little flattering to the writers of Holy Writ as the first statement quoted above, he utters many sentiments in reference to them which have about them at once less of condescension and as much or more of appreciative insight as the pious phrases with which such a writer as, for instance, Canon Cheyne, is wont to interlard and honey his attacks upon the essential integrity and intelligence of the Old Testament writers. No one, however, can be in any doubt as to the real attitude of Cornill towards the prophets of Israel. He hales them, one and all, to his bar, and pronounces impartial (?) sentence upon them, justifying, modifying or reversing their respective teachings, as, in his judgment, the case may demand. He must be dull, indeed, who, after reading this book, fails to perceive that, should the principles of the school for which it stands prevail, then, in the future, we will have to turn not to the writers of the Old or, for that matter, to those of the New Testament for our religious views, but always, at least finally, to writers like Cornill.

Again, the book is valuable, because it makes it perfectly plain that at least one factor that has operated powerfully to shape the views expressed by Cornill is a lack of personal religious experience and of spiritual insight. There is, of course, a certain subjective element in this criticism for which the reader will have to make whatever allowance he may deem necessary. I speak from the standpoint of one who holds to what is usually known as the Reformed theology. In proof of my statement, I can only refer to one or two facts. One is that Cornill has evidently let go of the doctrine of justification by faith, and gives the impression that his doctrine of sin, and of the atonement, not to mention others, are hopelessly defective. Then, again, he juggles with the terms God and religion as a magician at a fair juggles with balls. Not only so, but he treats both God and religion alike as if they were

developments from a very inferior grade of original protoplasm. One wonders how much of objective reality is represented by these terms, and how far they stand for the mere objectified musings and speculations of minds passing from a state bordering closely on one of pure animalism to one of the high intelligence represented by "the best modern thought." One wonders further when and how, in the opinion of Cornill, god developed into God. The trouble is that one who regards God as a growth from so small and rotten a seed as god is clearly disqualified from being or becoming an intelligent and still more a sympathetic interpreter of Old Testament history and prophecy. The fact is that, the gulf between god and God is one that is simply impassable.

Further, the book is valuable for its concessions. I have space for only a single example. In closing, Professor Cornill says: "The whole history of humanity has produced nothing which can be compared in the remotest degree to the prophecy of Israel."

With all its excellencies, Professor Cornill's book is not without some obvious defects. A lack of space, however, will prevent the consideration of these.

The book is one which, if purchased, will be read with interest. It is one which, if read with discrimination, will be read with profit.

Columbia, S. C.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

CLARK'S SCHWESTER ANNA.

SCHWESTER ANNA. A tale of German home life. *By Felicia Buttz Clark.*
New York: Eaton & Mains. Cloth. 90 cents.

Although it is not stated on the title page, this is manifestly a translation from the German. It bears all the earmarks of such work. Excepting the imperfections which usually adhere even to the best translations, the work is well done. It is the story of of a German girl, raised in a Lutheran home by pious parents. It is really a love story. The affection of the tender girl for a companion of her youth ripens into genuine love with maturer years. Their union is prevented by the opposition of the lover's proud mother. He goes to America, and she, being thrown into contact with the Methodists, joins that church and enters their Society of Deaconesses. The book describes the noble work of these Protestant Sisters of Charity, in nursing the sick, visiting the poor, and rescuing the fallen. During the epidemic of cholera at Hamburg, whither the heroine had hastened to nurse the patients, she meets with her long lost lover, who is brought in suffering with the dread disease. He recovers, and the lovers are eventually united in marriage, for no vows are demanded of the deaconesses. The only matters in this book which are apt to create an unfavorable impression upon the reader, unless he be a Methodist, are the odious comparisons between the Methodist and the Lutheran denominations. Lutherans will hardly admit such statements concerning their church as the following:

"There is no life in the Church. They are nominally Christians, but they know not the joy of pardoned sin, nor the fellowship with Christ which the Church felt in days gone by." (Pp. 113-114.)

This book itself proves the injustice of such a sweeping assertion. The heroine, even before her "conversion" to the Methodist Church, as well as her parents, are examples showing that there is still genuine piety and life in the Lutheran Church in Germany. Then, again, the Methodist deaconesses are extolled above those of the State Church. The latter are, doubtless, doing as noble a work as their Methodist sisters. It should not be forgotten that it was a Lutheran, Pastor Theodor Fliedner, who first attempted the institution of deaconesses within the Protestant Church, in 1836, at Kaiserswerth, and in 1849 at Pittsburg, Pa. It is only recently that the Methodists in Germany and the United States have followed the example of the Lutherans, as did also the Church of England and the Episcopal Church of the United States. It is to be hoped that other Evangelical churches, especially the Presbyterian Church, will do likewise, and open up for their unmarried women an institution which has developed a great and most beneficial activity. If this book should only create an interest in this work among other churches in this country, its mission will not have been a fruitless one.

New Orleans, La.

LOUIS VOSS.

CARUS' HOMILIES OF SCIENCE.

HOMILIES OF SCIENCE. *By Dr. Paul Carus.* 2nd Edition. 1897. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 12mo. Pp. 317. Boards, 35c. Cloth, \$1.50.

We have here fifty-nine "Homilies" that were originally published as editorial matter in *The Open Court*. The author is the cultivated and versatile editor of *The Monist*, *The Open Court*, and *The Religion of Science Library*, as well as the author of a goodly number of works in the fields of Science, Philosophy, Religion and Ethics, and he evidently flatters himself that he is able to unite all these, draw from all sources, and dogmatically proclaim an eclectic religion that is a great advance on anything hitherto, and fully adapted to the needs of all men. He calls it "Natural Religion," "Religion of Science," "Religion of Humanity," "Cosmic Religion," "Religion of Life," and "Religion of Immortality," according to the point of view. The author gives the following account of himself which will help to give some idea of the book:

"From my childhood I was devout and pious, my faith was as confident as that of Simon, whom, for his firmness, Christ called the rock of his Church. On growing up, I decided to devote myself as a missionary to the service of Christianity. But alas! inquiring into the foundations of that fortress which I was going to defend, I found the whole of the building undermined. I grew unbelieving and an enemy to Christianity. Yet in the depth of my soul I remained thoroughly religious. I aroused myself and gathered the fragments from the wreck, which my heart had suffered. Instinctively I felt that some golden grain must be among the chaff."

We would call him a freethinker, but he repudiates that title in its accepted sense and calls himself probably a liberal. The book before us is a rather extensive exhibition of his confident solution of all religious problems. These Homilies are arranged in eight groups, viz: "Religions and Religious

Growth ;" "Progress and Religious Life ;" "God and World ;" "The Soul and the Laws of Soul-Life ;" "Death and Immortality ;" "Freethought, Doubt and Faith ;" "Ethics and Practical Life ;" and "Society and Politics." There is little to object to, indeed there is much that is very good, in the last two groups of papers. There is little to be commended, almost everything is censurable, in the other six groups, which deal with religious matters. There is no personal God, but a kind of Force immanent in all things. Immortality only consists in the influences that a man sets in motion, and which continue after he disintegrates, and in what he transmits to posterity. He is a materialistic monist and so admits no soul, no spirit, separable from the body. And so on.

Indeed, this writer is to all intents and purposes a Buddhist, a kind of Buddhist missionary, so to speak. Two volumes published some months ago by the Open Court Company in very attractive style on crêpe paper, with illustrations in Japanese art, entitled respectively, *Karma: A Story of Early Buddhism*, and *Nirvana: A Story of Buddhist Philosophy*,—priced respectively, 75c. and \$1.00—are, while attractive from a literary and artistic point of view, simply commendations of the doctrines of Buddhism, in which Dr. Carus has gathered up the teachings of Buddhist sages and clothed them with narrative garb. He has also published *The Gospel of Buddha* All of which, and more, sustains what we have said.

We can recommend the book only to those who would like to test their own faith to see if it is well founded. It is pleasantly written, popular in form, and so the more dangerous. The author makes too free a use of Scriptural ideas and language without acknowledgment. This is inadmissible; the more so because probably many of his readers do not know enough of the Bible to recognize it when thus quoted; more still because he frequently does make acknowledgment, which leads people to suppose that the other cases are original. A more extended review of the book is practically impossible, and really unnecessary, we think. It has a good index and is well printed.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

VIII. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

AN HUNDRED-FOLD ; or Mrs. Belmont's Harvest. *By Susan M. Griffith.*
Richmond, Va. : Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1898. Pp.
339. \$1.25.

A helpful story for girls, illustrating the power of a Christian life. Mrs. Belmont, by her sweet forgiveness and beautiful Christlike example, finally succeeds in winning the affection of her prejudiced step-children, and in leading them to the throne of grace.

"And some brought forth twenty, some thirty, and some an hundred-fold."

THREE OLD MAIDS IN HAWAII. *By Ellen Blackman Maxwell.* New York :
Eaton & Mains ; Cincinnati : Curts & Jennings. 1896. Pp. 394. \$1.50.

An entertaining and instructive novel, describing the visit of three unmarried women to Hawaii.

"Of the three, one was plain and one was pretty, and one neither plain nor pretty, but altogether charming."

The book abounds in beautiful descriptions, and takes us into the lives of the kamainas, or children of the island, as the natives style themselves. To one who wishes to gain a knowledge of the people and country, without mental effort, we recommend this book as the most satisfactory work of the kind that we have seen. The perusal will be pleasing to all.

SPRINKLING. The Mode of Baptism Taught by Jesus Christ and His Apostles. The Proofs Presented. *By Rev. R. M. Loughridge, D. D.* Richmond : Presbyterian Committee of Publication. *Third Edition.* 1897. 16mo. Pp. 77. 10 cents.

While little or nothing new can be said on this subject, yet the author has his own original way of presenting the matter after full reading and thorough examination. Of course not all is said that can be, in defense of Sprinkling as the true mode ; not even are all the arguments given ; but for brief compass this little pamphlet presents the matter quite conclusively, to our thinking.

DIGGING DITCHES, and Other Sermons to Boys and Girls. *By the Rev. Frederick B. Cowl.* New York : Eaton & Mains. 1898. 12mo. Pp. 158. 50 cents.

Twenty-eight short, illustrative sermons to children. The subjects chosen are practical and Scriptural, and the texts used are crisp and suggestive, though the treatment is often strained, and the conclusions and applications far-fetched.

HEROIC PERSONALITIES. *By Louis Albert Banks, D. D., Author of "The Christ Brotherhood," "Immortal Hymns and Their Story," "Christ and His Friends," etc.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 1898. 12mo. Pp., 237. Cloth, \$1.00.

A series of forty short character sketches, of men and women of modern times, or sketches of some leading incidents in the lives of as many prominent people. Each is designed to set forth some practical thought or principle, as it is drawn out in the career of the subject. The sketches, which are very short, are illustrated with a photogravure of each subject.

TALES OF THE CITY ROOM. *By Elizabeth G. Jordan.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 16mo. Pp. 232. \$1.00.

Tales of the City Room is a collection of ten stories centering in a city newspaper office. Each is teeming with life, so that after reading, one feels as if he had himself been on the reporters' staff and had a taste of reportorial life.

Like most such short stories there is an unsatisfied feeling when a story is concluded, and like Oliver Twist with his soup, the reader calls for *more*.

The book abounds in beautiful touches of human nature, and it is a pleasure in this modern time to find a story in which the romantic side of life does not figure conspicuously—to find that there are some other pictures of life worth painting besides those in which the little blind god is ever figuring.

We cordially recommend the book to those in search of good, readable, short stories.

APOSTOLIC AND MODERN MISSIONS. *By Rev. Chalmers Martin, A. M., Sometime Missionary in Siam, Elliott F. Shepard Instructor in the Old Testament Department, Princeton Theological Seminary.* New York, Chicago, and Toronto.: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898. 12mo. Pp. 235. \$1 00.

The reader will find in this volume the lectures delivered in 1895 by Professor Martin to the students of Princeton Theological Seminary, and afterwards published in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*. They appear almost as delivered, except that the four lectures are amplified into eight chapters. The topics dealt with are The Principles of Apostolic and Modern Missions, The Problem of Apostolic and Modern Missions, The Methods of Apostolic and Modern Missions, and The Results of Apostolic and Modern Missions. They are valuable discussions and will well repay the reader.

PIONEER PRESBYTERIANISM IN TENNESSEE. Addresses Delivered at the Tennessee Centennial Exposition, on Presbyterian Day, October 28th, 1897. *Edited by Rev. James I. Vance, D. D.* Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1898. 12mo. Pp. 83.

This collection takes its name from the first address which it contains—a succinct and most interesting sketch of early Presbyterianism in Tennessee,

by Judge Heiskell, of Memphis. Following this, one will find a sketch of the life and work of Rev. Samuel Doak, by Rev. J. W. Bachman, D. D., and an address on Presbyterianism and Education, by Rev. Walter W. Moore. All the addresses were delivered in celebration of the part taken by Presbyterians in the founding, about one hundred years ago, of the State of Tennessee. They show how large and important a part the people of this faith had in laying the foundations of the commonwealth. The addresses are well worth reading and preserving.

TYNE FOLK : MASKS, FACES AND SHADOWS. *By Joseph Parker.* New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1896. 12mo. Pp. 200. 75 cents.

A volume of character sketches, with a fair proportion of Northumbrian brogue, and a considerable tincture of false religious teaching. An imitation of Maclaren's "*Bonnie Brier Bush.*" An insidious, seductive method of teaching damnable error and instilling, by caricature, a false conception of the great system of theology taught by Paul. In the chapter on "Discriminating Grace," Antinomianism is held up to ridicule and contempt as a picture of Calvinism. Antinomianism is sufficiently contemptible, but to describe this nefarious error as Calvinism is contemptible not only for its pitiful ignorance, but for its sophistic unfairness. Dr. Parker surely never read the sixth chapter of Romans, and it is obvious that he knows nothing of Calvinism. Aside from its theological stuff, the book is light, simple and only reasonably interesting, though a writer in the *Expository Times* says :

"Of all Dr. Parker's works, *Tyne Folk* is the favorite. It is both himself and the folk, but chiefly himself, of course. And he is himself the most interesting personality, both to himself and to us, that any of his books contains. Dr. Parker is not a dramatist. Like Byron's *Cain*, his Nathan Oxley and his John Morra, and even his Miss Black, are just himself. And the delight of it is that we have him when he does not know, and see him when he thinks we are looking at some other."

THE LIBRARIAN OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.—A Manual. *By Elizabeth Louisa Foote, A. B., B. L. S.* With a Chapter of The Sunday School Library. *By Martha Thorne Wheeler.* New York : Eaton & Mains ; Cincinnati : Curts & Jennings. 1897. Pp. 86. Cloth, 35 cents.

Fifty-six pages of this little Manual are written for the instruction and aid of the Librarian of the Sabbath School. The subject is treated with adequate fullness, and the book is just what it claims to be, viz : A Manual for the Librarian. It would be of the greatest use to a wide-awake Librarian of a large city Sabbath School. It is, however, full of instruction and suggestions for any Librarian.

That part of the Introduction devoted to the "Reorganization of an Old Library" and the chapter on "Repairs," are especially useful.

The last thirty pages of the book contain a discussion of "The Sunday School Library," by Martha Thorne Wheeler. The argument in behalf of several Sunday School Libraries, as opposed to one Central Public Library,

is well sustained. The plea for greater discrimination and care in the selection of books for children is timely. The list of "Selected Books," and the addresses of "Prominent Publishers," appended, will be appreciated by many Superintendents and Librarians.

DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN, PART III. POST-DARWIN QUESTIONS: ISOLATION AND PHYSIOLOGICAL SELECTION. *By the Late George John Romanes.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1897. 8vo. Pp. 181. \$1.00.

This volume, the third of the series, was half in type at the time of the author's death. The latter half has been selected and arranged by the editor, Mr. C. Lloyd Morgan. There are six chapters and three lengthy appendices and an index. The author regards Heredity, Variability and Isolation as the three basal principles of the Evolution Hypothesis. The last of these is the subject of discussion in Chapters I. and II. Chapters III.-V. contain a discussion of Physiological Selection, which he regards as perhaps the most important form of Isolation. Chapter VI. gives a "Brief History of Isolation as a Factor in Organic Evolution." The discussions are mostly abstract theorizing, with very few concrete examples by way of proof. The work is largely controversial, being directed against the Weismann-Wallace branch of evolutionists, who hold that Natural Selection is sufficient to account for all the phenomena on which the evolutionists build their speculation. The name of the author is sufficient guaranty for the value of the work, which will certainly be interesting and profitable reading to those already familiar with the literature of Evolution from Darwin down, and of practically no service to any others. Probably a careful perusal of the first two volumes will prepare one to appreciate the third. So far as the merits of the controversy between the two Schools are concerned, Romanes' reasoning appears conclusive.

THE CHILDREN OF THE FUTURE. *By Nora Archibald Smith.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 16mo. Pp. 165. \$1.00.

The chapters of this book are largely essays which first appeared in *The Outlook* and in *Table Talk*, though most of them are considerably extended from their original form, while others have been written for this volume. The titles are as follows: "The Study of Children," "Training for Parenthood," "The Charm of the Lily," "The Priestly Office," "Sand and the Children," "A Dumb Devil," "An Unwalled City," "Perilous Times," "A Deviser of Mischiefs," "Tell Me a Story," "The Authentic in Kindergarten Training," "The Gospel of Work," "The Brotherhood of Saint Tumbler," "The Kindergarten in Neighborhood Work."

OUR REDEMPTION. Its Need, Method, and Result. *By Frederick A. Noble, D. D., Pastor Union Park Congregational Church, Chicago.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898. 12mo. Pp. 282. Cloth, \$1.25.

The subject, Redemption, is here discussed under three heads, dividing

the volume into as many books. First, Redemption made necessary by sin and its consequences, in which are shown the fact and ground of sin, its universality, its impossibility of final concealment, and its punishment. Second, how Redemption is secured, in which it is first shown that there is no power of self-recovery from sin, and that there is no free pardon for it, and then that the atonement is completely provided in Christ. Third, Redemption in the new spirit and the outlook it furnishes, in the redeemed sinner's nourishing his own spiritual life, in the redeemed sinner in his daily walk, in his work for the kingdom, and in heaven. As in all Dr. Noble's utterances and writings, there are great fervor and evangelical spirit and treatment throughout.

A HARMONY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL, KINGS AND CHRONICLES. In the text of the version of 1884. *By William Day Crockett, A. M., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Canton, Pennsylvania.* With an Introduction by Willis Judson Beecher, D. D., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Auburn Theological Seminary. New York: Press of Eaton & Mains. 1897. Sqr. 8vo. Pp. 365. \$2.00.

This work embodies first a careful Analytical Outline, and then the Harmony itself, of the books covered. The text used is that of the Revised Version. Suitable tables, indices, etc., are introduced to make the different parts or passages easy of reference. The Introduction, by Dr. Willis Beecher, is nothing more than an introduction of his friend rather than of the subject, and is very cautious as respects the book and its positions. One need not be told that the harmonist must here encounter many difficult problems of chronology, numbers, names, etc., and that there are likely to be departures from almost every reader's views in some point in the structure and arrangement. Notwithstanding this, however, the book is one which is likely to be of special use to students of the historical parts of the Old Testament.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES. Their Place and Power in Modern Christendom. *By the Rev. J. N. Ogilvie, M. A.* With a chapter on the Presbyterian Churches of America, by the Rev. Andrew C. Zenos, D. D., Author of "Compendium of Church History." New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1897. 16mo. Pp. 162. Flexible cloth, 40 cents.

This little work is a succinct account of the history and development of the Presbyterian Church in all its branches, in all lands, in all its career. In respect to its brevity and popular form, we know of no work better. It will be very useful to those who wish to obtain a bird's-eye view of the church which has gone under the name we bear. The account which it gives of the Southern Church is hardly fair, in its emphasis of the slavery question and the territorial idea as being the causes of the separation from the Northern Church. The historical distinctive position of our Church, in its declaration for the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, is evidently not appreciated by the author of that part of the book, a mere paragraph by the way, which deals with our branch of the American Presbyterian Churches.

THE INCARNATE SAVIOUR. A Life of Jesus Christ. *By the Rev. W. R. Nicoll, M. A.* New York : The American Tract Society. 12mo. Pp. 360. \$1.00.

Mr. Nicoll recognizes the excellency of the Lives of Christ which have been written and are now standard ; so his object in this work is to narrate in a popular form the *chief* events in the life of our Lord, and to show how these bear on the doctrines of the incarnation and atonement. These events are not studied critically, but popularly. The studies were delivered to the author's congregation in the ordinary course of his public ministration. The book is published in the interest of evangelical orthodoxy as the author understands it, yet the spirit of humility and charity pervades the entire work. In the selection of the events of Christ's life for discussion, the endeavor is made to illustrate three main propositions : First, Jesus Christ was God and man in two distinct natures and one person ; Second, That Jesus Christ came to suffer, in order that he might save ; Third, To show the sweet and perfect accord of Christ's words, works and thoughts.

The truth of the gospel history is assumed throughout. Inferences are drawn from the facts as true. Twenty-three chapters compose the book, all of which are interesting reading.

THE PRESBYTERIAN DIGEST OF 1898. A Compend of the Acts and Deliverances of the General Presbytery, General Synod, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, 1706-1897. Compiled by Authority and with the Co-operation of a Committee of the General Assembly. *By the Rev. William E. Moore, D. D., LL. D.* Philadelphia : Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1898. Pp. 950, 8vo. \$3.50 net.

This volume is the most extensive, and hence the most valuable, of the works on Presbyterian Law issued by the Board of Publication. The contents include the record of all the recent ecclesiastical discussions, and constitute a complete exhibit of the Acts and Deliverances of the supreme Judiciaries. The arrangement is excellent. Historical Documents constitute Part I. Part II., Part III., Part IV., and Part V. are respectively the Confession of Faith, the Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Directory of Worship, printed with the deliverances and decisions of the General Assembly given under the appropriate chapters and sections of each. A good syllabus and full index are furnished. Dr. Moore, as Editor, had the assistance of a Committee appointed by the Assembly, consisting of Drs. William H. Roberts and E. R. Craven.

THE MINISTERIAL DIRECTORY of the Ministers in "The Presbyterian Church in the United States" (Southern), and in "The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America" (Northern), Together with a Statement of the Work of the Executive Committees and Boards of the two Churches, with the Names and Location of their Educational Institutions and Church Papers. *By Edgar Sutton Robinson, D. D., Pastor of the First Presby-*

terian Church of Oxford, O. Oxford, O. : The Ministerial Directory Company. Vol. I. 1898. \$1.00.

This is the accomplishment of an undertaking of which most, if not all, of our ministers have been advised. In general, the work has been well done. To make a Directory of this kind was a task involving no little expenditure of money and labor. It is virtually a complete Directory of the Southern and Northern Presbyterian Churches. The data furnished are as follows : Name in full, with present address ; place of birth ; where and when graduated, or what college or seminary attended ; when licensed and ordained, and by what religious body ; what churches served and positions held ; and author of what books. We have thus given a laconic history of nearly every living minister in these two branches of the Presbyterian Church, together with other information and statistics. For an intelligent acquaintance with the personnel of the ministry, this book is not only amply adequate, but the only compilation of the kind known to us.

NOTES, CRITICAL, AND EXPLANATORY, On the Greek Text of Paul's Epistles to The Romans, The Corinthians, The Galatians, The Ephesians, The Philippians, The Colossians, The Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon. Text of Tischendorf, with a Constant Comparison of the Text of Wescott and Hort (third edition of Oscar de Gebhardt). *By James Robinson Boise, D. D., LL. D., late Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Theological Seminary, now the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.* Edited by Nathan E. Wood, D. D., Pastor First Baptist Church, Boston. Boston : Silver, Burdett & Company. 1896. Pp. 582, 8vo. Cloth, \$2.00.

As this title indicates, this book contains mere notes, not a full exposition or amplification of any passages or ideas. They are clear and scholarly throughout, displaying to an unusual extent the most elementary matters of grammar and construction. They were used by the author in his sixteen years of instruction of theological classes. Matters of textual criticism are omitted. Geographical, historical, and archæological questions and doctrinal discussions are left to other books. The author writes from the standpoint of the immersionist. The Epistles are arranged as in our Bibles, not chronologically. That to the Hebrews is omitted, indicating Dr. Boise's disbelief in its Pauline authorship. Certain introductory tables have been added by the editor. In chronology the editor departs from the larger number of scholars in assigning the writing of the Epistle to the Romans to the Spring of A. D. 59, making Paul's Third Missionary Tour extend from A. D. 54 to A. D. 59, and making two years between the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which was undoubtedly written just before he left Ephesus, in A. D. 57, and writing to the Romans from Corinth. Where did Paul spend these two years, and what shall we do with his hastening so eagerly towards Corinth after writing his first letter to that church? In the brief introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, the editor asserts that "tender personal

allusions of friendship are wanting" in this epistle! These editorial introductions, however, are entirely too scant for notice.

A DIGEST OF THE ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, From its Organization to the Assembly of 1887, inclusive, With Certain Historical and Explanatory Notes. *By Rev. W. A. Alexander.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE DIGEST OF THE ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, Published in 1888, Bringing the Same Down to Date. *By Rev. W. A. Alexander, D. D.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

With this *Digest* our Church is familiar. It has most satisfactorily filled its place for the past decade. Dr. Alexander placed the Church under lasting obligations to himself when he conceived and accomplished the idea of such a work. This volume has been the source of information for all our ecclesiastical bodies since its first publication.

The *Supplement* adheres mainly to the plan of the original volume. The section numbers are made continuous with the *Digest*, while a few changes in chapter divisions have been made necessary by changes in the methods and agencies of the Church.

The *Supplement* maintains the high standard of the *Digest* for thorough, pains-taking, accurate work. Everything seems to have been done which is in any way essential to a complete, comprehensive, intelligent record.

In both *Digest* and *Supplement* all Acts and Proceedings are grouped under the nine following heads: Book I., The Constitution; Book II., The Congregation; Book III., Church Courts; Book IV., The Agencies of the Church; Book V., The Ordinances; Book VI., Topics Moral and Secular; Book VII., Relations with Other Bodies; Book VIII., Judicial Cases; Book IX., General Statistical Information.

A wider use of the *Digest* would be found most beneficial. It would secure greater unity to the deliverances of the General Assembly, answer the many duplicated overtures, and "aid in crystalizing the methods and unifying the constructions of law in different parts of the church." We would wish, therefore, that every church court possessed this *Digest*, and possessing it, used it.

It is to be regretted that the *Supplement* could not have been embodied in the *Digest*. Knowing, however, the expense that this would have entailed, we must rest satisfied with, and be thankful for, what we have. The author is not simply to be congratulated on the excellency of the work, but to have the full gratitude of the Church.

Digest, with *Supplement*, sheep, \$3.00; cloth, \$2.50. *Supplement*, sheep, \$1.50; cloth, \$1.25; paper, \$1.00.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

APRIL—MAY—JUNE.

Albright & Stenton, Reading Pa.

BUTLER, Frederick. Goethe's Iphigenia in Tauris. A Translation.

The Alvord-Peters Co., Sandusky, Ohio.

VINCENT, Rev. C. A. Providence in America. Pp. 239. 12mo. 50 cents.

American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

EMINENT EUROPEAN DIVINES. The Bremen Lectures on Great Religious Questions of To-day. Translated from the German by David Heagle, D. D. 12mo. Pp. 406. \$1.50.

FAUNCE, D. D., W. H. P. A Scientist's Confession of Faith. Pp. 32. 10 cents.

FAUNCE, D. D., D. W. A Young Man's Difficulties with his Bible. 12mo. Pp. 196. \$1.00.

MAC ARTHUR, R. S. Current Questions for Thinking Men. 12mo. Pp. 327. \$1.50.

MOSES, Thomas. Half Hours with The Christ. 12mo. Pp. 260. \$1.00.

TUPPER, D. D., LL. D., K. B. Gladstone and Other Addresses. 16mo. Pp. 266. \$1.00.

American Book Co., New York.

DANA, LL. D., James D. Revised Text-book of Theology. Pp. 482. \$1.40.

KITCHEL, M. A., Rev. C. L. Plato's Apology of Socrates, Crito, and Phædo. Pp. 188. \$1.25.

American Sabbath Tract Society, New York.

LEWIS, D. D., A. H. Studies in Sabbath Reform. Paper. 16mo. Pp. 126. 10 cents.

American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia.

————— The Half-Price Home Library. Published Monthly. \$1.15.

COMEGYS, B. H. How to Get On.

SMITH, J. Denham. Life Truths.

SWENEY, Jno. R. and EUTWESLE, J. H. Gospel Hosannas. \$10.00 per 100 copies.

D. Appleton & Co., New York.

CROCKET, S. R. The Standard Bearer. 12mo. Pp. 359. \$1.50.

GARNETT, C. B., LL. D., Richard. A History of Italian Literature. Pp. 431. \$1.50.

MOORE, George. Evelyn Innes. 12mo. Pp. 435. \$1.50.

PEMBERTON, Max. Kronstadt. \$1.50.

ROYCE, Josiah. Studies of Good and Evil. 12mo. Pp. 384.

SHALER, Nathaniel Southgate. Outlines of the Earth's History. Pp. 417. 12mo. \$1.75.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

BROADUS, D. D., Rev. John A. A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. Edited by E. C. Dargan, D. D. Pp. 562. \$1.75.

The Baker & Taylor Company.

STRONG, D. D., Rev. Josiah. The Twentieth Century City. 16mo. Pp. 186. 50 cents.

A. S. Barnes & Co., New York.

BALLARD, D. D., Addison. Arrows: Or Teaching a Fine Art. 2nd Edition. 12mo. Pp. 100. 75 cents.

TRUMBULL, Annie Eliot. Rod's Salvation. Pp. 283. \$1.00.

George Bell & Sons, London.

SADLER, Rev. M. F. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. With Notes Critical and Practical. Pp. 494. \$1.50.

SADLER, Rev. M. F. The Gospel According to St. Mark. With Notes Critical and Practical. Pp. 449. \$1.50.

SADLER, Rev. M. F. The Gospel According to St. Luke. With Notes Critical and Practical. Pp. 634. \$1.50.

Benziger Bros., New York.

BUGG, L. H. The Prodigal's Daughter. Pp. 260. \$1.00.

KREBS, Rev. Jos. A. How to Comfort the Sick. Pp. 303. \$1.00.

ROBERTSON, Esther. The World Well Lost. Pp. 182. 75 cents.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.

MEYER, F. B. Meet for the Master's Use. 16mo. Pp. 121. \$1.20.

MOODY, D. L. Weighed and Wanting. 16mo. Pp. 125.

SPURGEON, Chas. H. John Ploughman's Folk. 16mo. Pp. 127. \$1.20.

STRETTON, Hesba. The Crew of the Dolphin. Pp. 122. 15 cents.

The Bloomingdale Church Press, New York.

PETERS, D. D., Rev. M. C. A Panacea for Poverty. 12mo. Pp. 207. \$1.00.

Bonnell, Silver & Co., New York.

JOHNSON, Mrs. Herrick. Comfort and Other Poems. 16mo. Pp. 211.

————— Sandy Scott's Bible Class. 12mo. Pp. 86. 50 cents.

J. W. Bouton, New York.

FLAGG, Wm. J. Yoga: or, Transformation. A Comparative Statement of the Various Religious Dogmas Concerning the Soul and its Destiny. Pp. 374.

The Century Company, New York.

BRUCE, James. William Ewart Gladstone: His Characteristics as Man and Statesman. 16mo. Pp. 104. \$1.00.

Christian Literature Co., New York.

BÜHLER, Geo. The Sacred Laws of the Aryas as Taught in the Schools of Apastamba, Gautama, Vâsishtha and Baudhâyana. Translation. 16mo. Pp. 360. \$3.00.

SPAETH, D. D., LL. D., Adolph. Charles Porterfield Krauth, D. D., LL. D. Vol. I. 12mo. Pp. 413. \$2.00.

Christian Publishing Co., St. Louis.

ELLIS, J. Breckenridge. In the Days of Jehu. Pp. 186.

The Church Press, Chicago.

SHELDON, Chas. M. Malcolm Kirk. 16mo. Pp. 264.

Robert Clarke Co., Cincinnati.

ADAMSON, B. D., Rev. Thos. Studies of the Mind in Christ. 8vo. \$2.50.

MASON, Caroline Alwater. A Minister of the World. 16mo. 50 cents.

SINKLER, D. D., Robert. Hezekiah and His Age. \$1.50.

SMITH, F. Hopkinson. Caleb West: Master Driver. \$1.50.

WILSON, Francis. The Eugene Field I Knew. 12mo. Pp. 128. \$1.25.

R. & R. Clark, Edinburgh.

GRAHAM, M. A., Rev. J. A. The Missionary Expansion of the Reformed Churches. Pp. 246. 35 cents.

Commercial Printing House, Los Angeles.

HAGOOD, HOPE. Ideals of the Immanent Love. Pp. 164.

W. F. Crafts, Washington.

CRAFTS, Wilbur F. Addresses on the Civil Sabbath from a Patriotic and Humanitarian Standpoint. Pp. 63. 15 cents.

T. Y. Crowell & Co., Boston.

BARNES, Irene H. Behind the Pardah. A Story of Zenana Work in India. Pp. 264. \$1.50.

DOLE, Chas. F. The Coming People.

PALMER, L.L. D., Geo. H. The Glory of the Imperfect. 12mo. Pp. 31. 35 cents.

WARD, Mrs. Humphrey. New Forms of Christian Education. Pp. 40. 35 cents.

Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, Nashville.

STEPHEN, Rev. J. V. The Causes Leading to the Organization of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Pp. 113. 40 cents.

Curts & Jennings, Cincinnati.

BANKS, D. D., Louis Albert. Heroic Personalities. Pp. 237. \$1.00.

"GEROME." Christ and the Critics. 16mo. Pp. 85. 50 cents.

LEE, Mrs. Ada. Chrindra Lela, the Converted Fakir.

MCGRADY, Rev. Thos. The Mistakes of Ingersoll. 12mo. Pp. 334. \$1.00.

SPURGEON, Chas. H. Autobiography. Pp. 373. \$2.50.

Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

DUNBAR, Paul L. Folks from Dixie. 12mo. Pp. 263. \$1.25.

WATSON, John. Companions of the Sorrowful Way. 18mo. Pp. 185. 75 cents.

Doubleday & McClure Co., New York.

MASON, Caroline Atwater. A Minister of the World. 18mo. Pp. 187.

PERRY, BLISS. Little Masterpieces of Daniel Webster. 18mo. Pp. 183.

Drexel Biddle, Philadelphia.

EVERETT, Edith Townsend. A Duel with Destiny. 12mo. Pp. 162. 75 cents.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

POTTER, Henry C. Addresses to Women Engaged in Church Work. Pp. 149. 16mo. \$1.00.

Eaton & Mains, New York.

BANKS, D. D., Louis Albert. Heroic Personalities. 12mo. Pp. 237.

BATES, Ph. M., J. H. Christian Science and its Problems. 16mo. Pp. 141. 50 cents.

BLACK, Jas. M. The Chorus of Praise. 12mo. Pp. 126. 20 cents. \$15 per hundred.

BRODBECK, W. N. Sermons and Addresses. Pp. 317. \$1.00.

MUDGE, D. D., Rev. James. The Best of Browning. 12mo. Pp. 252. \$1.50.

Eau Claire Book Co., Eau Claire, Wis.

SLOAN, Ph. D., Rev. W. N. The Gospel History of Jesus Christ. 12mo. Pp. 224.

Peter Eckler, New York.

SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur. The Wisdom of Life. 25 cents.

European Publishing Co., New York.

————— The Woman's Bible. Part II. Judges, Kings, Prophets, and Apostles. Pp. 217. 50 cents.

Eyere & Spottiswoode, New York.

TOMKINS, Henry G. "Abraham and His Age."

R. F. Fenno & Co., New York.

HATTON, Jos. The Dagger and the Cross. 50 cents.

MERRICK, Leonard. The Man Who Was Good. 50 cents.

Fords, Howard & Hulbert.

FOX, D. D., Norman. Christ in the Daily Meal: or the Ordinance of the Breaking of Bread. 16mo. Pp. 138. 50 cents.

PENNINGTON, Jeanne G. "Don't Worry" Nuggets. 40 cents.

Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York.

BANKS, D. D., Rev. Louis Albert. The Christian Gentleman. 12mo. Pp. 123. 75 cents.

BANKS, D. D., Rev. Louis Albert. Paul and His Friends. 12mo. Pp. 347. \$1.50.

Ginn & Co., Boston.

COMMITTEE OF CLASSICAL INSTRUCTORS. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. VIII. Pp. 185.

————— The Ethics of Hobbes. Introduction by E. H. Sneath, Ph. D. 12mo. Pp. 377. \$1.35.

TAPPAN, Wm. Homer's Iliad. Pope's Translation. Pp. 112.

TETTON, Jno. Virgil's Æneid. VIII. With Vocabulary. Pp. 191. 50 cents.

Harper & Brothers, New York.

————— Collections and Recollections. Pp. 375. \$2.50.

DU MAURIER, George. Social Pictorial Satire. \$1.50.

HINES, J. A. Milton's Paradise Lost. 12mo. Pp. 482. \$1.20.

HOWELLS, W. D. The Story of a Play. Pp. 312. \$1.50.

LUMMIS, C. F. The Awakening of a Nation.

NANSEN, Dr. Fridtjof. Farthest North. \$3.00.

STERN, H. I. The Gods of Our Fathers. A Study of Saxon Mythology. 12mo. Pp. 269. \$1.50.

THACKERAY, W. Makepeace. Vanity Fair. Biographical Edition. \$1.50.

WILKINS, Mary E. Silence. Pp. 280.

H. L. Hastings, Boston.

INGLIS, Jas. Home, Marriage, and Family Relations In The Light of Scripture. 8vo. Pp. 96.

REED, Mrs. H. V. The Bible Triumphant: Twelve Dozen Sceptical Arguments Refuted. 12mo. Pp. 160 and 44. 80 cents.

D. C. Heath & Co., Boston.

MACEWAN, E. J. The Essentials of Argumentations. Pp. 412. \$1.12.

E. R. Herrick & Co., New York.

FARRAR, D. D., F. R. S., F. W. The Herods.

HORTON, D. D., R. F. Women of the Old Testament.

MCMANUS, Blanche. How the Dutch Came to Manhattan. Small 4to. Pp. 82. \$1.25.

PULLAN, Leighton. The History of Early Christianity.

Henry Holt & Co., New York.

BURROW, Charles Kennett. The Fire of Life. Pp. 323. \$1.25.

John J. Hood, Philadelphia.

SWEENEY, ENTWISLE & DAVIS. Songs of Love and Praise, No. 5.

The Hope of Israel Movement, New York.

WEST, D. D., Rev. Nathaniel. Daniel's Great Prophecy. The Eastern Question. The Kingdom. Pp. 307.

Howard University Press, Washington.

EWELL, D. D., Jno. Lewis. A Synopsis of Church History. Pp. 39.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

DEBURG, Yetta Blaze. French Literature of To-day. 12mo. Pp. 279. \$1.50.

SMITH, F. Hopkinson. "Caleb West, Master Diver." 18mo. Pp. 378.

George H. Hughes & Co., New York.

PULLMAN, D. D., Rev. Jos. Rifted Clouds; or, Light on the Weary Path. Vol. II.

The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia.

GRÆTZ, Prof. H. History of the Jews. Pp. 644. \$3.00.

Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.

WILLIAMS, D. D., Jno. M. The Old Testament and the Critics. 12mo. Pp. 95.

Wilbur B. Ketcham, New York.

PETERS, D. D., M. C. The Panacea for Poverty. 12mo. Pp. 207. \$1.00.

————— "The Seed Basket for Preachers and Teachers." 18mo. Pp. 100. 50 cents.

Lee & Shepard, Boston.

WOOD, Henry. Victor Serenus; A Story of the Pauline Era. Pp. 478. \$1.50.

J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

MALONE, Walter. The Coming of the King. Pp. 174.

WINTER, John S. The Peacemakers. Pp. 317. \$1.25.

Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

GILLMAN, Henry. Hassan: A Fella. A Romance of Palestine. \$2.00.

JOHNSON, W. H. The King's Henchman: A Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century. \$1.50.

SIENKIEWICZ, Henry E. With Fire and Sword.

HOWISON, G. H. Soule's Dictionary of English Synonyms. \$2.00.

Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

LIDDON, D. D., LL. D., H. P. Sermons on Some Words of St. Paul. Pp. 290. \$2.00.

RAWLINSON, Canon. Memoir of Sir Henry C. Rawlinson, Bart.

TOLLEMACHE, Hon. L. A. Talks with Mr. Gladstone. Pp. 223. \$1.25.

WORDSWORTH, Elizabeth. Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer. Pp. 236. \$1.25.

Lutheran Pub. Society, Philadelphia.

STUMP, D. D., Rev. Adam, A. M. The Secret of the Canon. 12mo. Pp. 347. \$1.25.

SCHNETTE, W. E. Her Place Assigned. 12mo. Pp. 418. \$1.50.

The Macmillan Co., New York.

ADENEY, W. F. The New Testament Story Retold for Young People. 16mo. Pp. 199. 60 cents.

BASKETT, J. N. At You All's House. \$1.50.

BENNETT, W. H. The Old Testament Story Retold for Young People. 16mo. Pp. 199. 60 cents.

BLASS, Friedrich. Philology of the Gospels. Pp. 247. \$1.75.

BURY, J. B. Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Vols. IV. and V. \$2.00 each.

GEORGE, A. J. The Shorter Poems of John Milton. Pp. 299. 60 cents.

HAMBLE, H. E. The General Manager's Story.

HERRICK, Robert. The Gospel of Freedom. \$1.50.

HEWLITT, Maurice. The Forest Lovers. Pp. 384. \$1.50.

KIDD, Benjamin. Social Evolution. \$1.50.

MARSHALL, Emma. The Young Queen of Hearts. Pp. 284. \$1.25.

MOULTON, Ph.D., Richard G. The Modern Reader's Bible. The Psalms and Lamentations. In two Volumes. 32mo. Pp. 216 and 247. 50 cents per volume.

NOBLE, Chas. Studies in American Literature. Pp. 386. \$1.00.

OPENHEIMER, Nathan. The Development of the Child. Pp. 292. \$1.25.

WACE, D. D., Henry. The Sacrifice of Christ. Pp. 93. 50 cents.

WARD, Mrs. Humphrey. Halbeck of Bannisdale. 2 Vols. \$2.00.

WHEELER, B. I. Cornell University in Classical Philology. Pp. 231.

Maynard, Merrill & Co., New York.

TURPIN, Edna H. English Classic Series: The Water-Babies, Charles Kingsley. 24 cents.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

BARROWS, D. D., John H. A World Pilgrimage. \$2.00.

BARROWS, D. D., John H. Christianity the World-Religion.

Mennonite Publishing Co., Elkhart, Ind.

LAMBERT, George. India.

Methodist Publishing House, Nashville.

TIGERT, John J. The Making of Methodism. Pp. 175.

Ministerial Directory Co., Oxford, Ohio.

ROBINSON, D. D., E. S. The Ministerial Directory. Vol. I. 1898. Pp. 550.
\$1.00.

Nonfort & Co. Cincinnati.

NIELD, Rev. Thos. The Temple Harp. 16mo. Pp. 160.

George Munro's Sons, New York.

————— Her Heart's Desire. 25 cents.

F. Tennyson Neely, London and New York.

GILES, Marie Florence. Though Your Sins Be As Scarlet. Pp. 290. 50 cents.

KING, Capt. Chas. A Wounded Name. Pp. 353. \$1.25.

SAMELSON, Moses. How to Right a Wrong; The Ways and The Means.
12mo. Pp. 383. \$1.50.

J. S. Ogilvie Pub. Co., New York.

SIENKIEWICZ, Henryk. The Third Woman. 25 cents.

The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.

CARUS, Dr. Paul. Lao-Tze's Tao-Teh-King. Chinese-English. With Intro-
duction, Transliteration and Notes. Pp. 345. \$3.00.

L. C. Page & Co., Boston.

CORNFORD, L. Cope. Sons of Adversity. A Romance of Queen Elizabeth's
Time. 12mo. Pp. 315.

DORR, Julia C. R. In King's Houses. A Romance of the Days of Queen
Anne. 12mo. Pp. 372. \$1.50.

ROSS, Clinton. Bobbie McDuff. 16mo. Pp. 258. \$1.00.

The Peter Paul Book Co., Buffalo.

BARLOW, D. D., Rev. C. Day Dreams of a Doctor. Pp. 251.

LEISER, Joseph. Before the Dawn: A Book of Poems, Songs, and Sonnets.
Pp. 145.

Perry Mason & Co., Boston.

GLADSTONE, W. E. Companion Classics. Arthur Henry Hallman. Pp. 30.

The Pilgrim Press, Boston.

BAMFORD, Mary E. "Her Twenty Heathen," and other Missionary Stories.

HAGARD, M. C. An Elementary Catechism. Pp. 45. 10 cents.

HOLBROOK, D. D., LL. D., Rev. J. C. Recollections of a Nonagenarian. Pp.
351. 12mo.

James Potts & Co., New York.

BACON, D. D., Rev. T. S. The First and Great Commandment of God. Pp.
248. \$1.00.

HUTCHESON, Rev. J. T. A View of the Atonement.

Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia.

BENSON, D. D., Rev. L. F. The Chapel Hymnal. 8vo. Pp. 370. 60 cents.

MOORE, D. D., LL. D., Rev. W. E. The Presbyterian Digest of 1898. 8vo.
Pp. 950. \$3.50.

MURRAY, Rev. Andrew. "The True Vine."

NOBLE, D. D., F. A. "Our Redemption."

Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond.

- ALEXANDER, D. D., W. A. Presbyterian Digest and Supplement. 1897.
Pp. 551 and 201. Sheep, \$3.00; cloth, \$2.50.
- DABNEY, D. D., LL. D., R. L. Christ Our Penal Substitute. 12mo. Pp. 115.
60 cents.
- GRIFFITH, Mrs. Susan M. An Hundred Fold. 12mo. Pp. 340. \$1.25.

Publishing House of the U. S. Reformed Church, Cleveland, Ohio.

- GREYHER, F. Our Daily Bread. Crown, 8vo. Pp. 513. \$1.00.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

- BLOCK, L. J. Capriccios. Pp. 130. \$1.25.
- DAUDET, Alphonse. The Head of the Family. 12mo. Pp. 325. \$1.50.
- HADDON, A. C. The Study of Man.
- JACOBS, H. E. Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation. 8vo. Pp.
454. \$1.50.
- ROBINS, Edward. Benjamin Franklin. Pp. 354. \$1.50.
- SERGEANT, Lewis. The Franks, from Their Origin as a Confederacy to the
Establishment of the Kingdom of France and the German Empire.
12mo. Pp. 343. \$1.50.
- WALTHAM, G. W. The Philosophy of Government. Pp. 207. \$1.25.
- WHITE, A. M., Rev. Greenough. Matthew Arnold and the Spirit of the
Age. 8vo. Pp. 147. \$1.25.

Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago.

- BEATON, David. Selfhood and Service. 12mo. Pp. 220. \$1.00
- COMEGYS, B. B. Euchologion. A Book of Common Order: Forms of Prayer.
12mo. Pp. 158.
- CONDIT, D. D., Blackford. Short Studies of Familiar Bible Texts. Mis-
translated, Misinterpreted and Misquoted. 16mo. Pp. 171.
- FARRAR, D. D., Dean. Sin and Its Conquerors. Pp. 147.
- LEACH, D. D., Rev. Charles. Is my Bible True? Where Did We Get It?
12mo. Pp. 118. 50 cents.
- MARTINS, A. M., Charles. Apostolic and Modern Missions. 12mo. Pp.
235. \$1.00.
- MORGAN, Rev. G. Campbell. Discipleship. Pp. 142.
- MOORE, Joanna P. Kind and True. 16mo. Pp. 144.
- MOORE, Joanna P. For Mother. 16mo. Pp. 144.
- MORGAN, Rev. Campbell. The Hidden Years at Nazareth. 16mo. Pp. 48.
25 cents.
- MOSHER, Martha B. Child Culture in the Home. A Book for Mothers.
16mo. Pp. 240.
- MURRAY, Rev. Andrew. The Ministry of Intercession. 16mo. Pp. 226.
- POTWIN, L. S. Here and There in the Greek New Testament. 12mo. Pp.
201. \$1.00.
- SPURGEON, Chas. H. Autobiography. Vol. I. 8vo. Pp. 373.
- WENLEY, S. C., D. D., Phil., R. M. The Preparation for Chistianity in the
Ancient World. 16mo. Pp. 194. 75 cents.
- WHITE, Prof. W. W. Thirty Studies in the Revelation of Jesus Christ to
John. 16mo. Pp. 43. 35 cents.

Office of The Revivalist, Cincinnati.

- DASHIELL, E. H. The Spirit of Jesus. 10 cents.
- DEMPSTER, Jos. S. From Romanism to Pentecost. 10 cents.
- KNAPP, M. W. Lightning Bolts from Pentecostal Skies.
——— Commentary on The New Testament. Vol. III. Ephesians-
Philemon. 12mo. Pp. 350.

Rice & Hirst, Philadelphia.

- COMEGYS, B. B. How to Get On.
- SMITH, J. Denham. Life Truths. Pp. 128.

Roberts Bros., Boston.

- RENAN, Ernest. The Apostles. 8vo. Pp. 315. \$2.50.
 WARD, William G. Tennyson's Debt to Environment. 18mo. Pp. 100.
 50 cents.
 WHITING, Lilian. The World Beautiful. Third Series. \$1.00.

R. H. Russell, New York.

- PAGE, Thos. Nelson. Two Prisoners. Pp. 82. \$1.00.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

- ALEXANDER, Jas. W. Princeton—Old and New. 12mo. Pp. 189. \$1.25.
 BROWN, Jr., F. S. A., M. R. A. S., Robert. Semitic Influence in Hellenic
 Mythology. \$2.50.
 BURT, Mary E.; Ragozin, Zénaïde A. Odysseus, the Hero of Ithaca. 60 cents.
 CARLYLE, Thos. Volume VI. The History of Frederick the Great. Pp.
 410. \$1.25.
 CLARKE, D. D., W. N. An Outline of Christian Theology. 8vo. Pp. 488.
 \$2.50.
 CONRAD, Joseph. Tales of Unrest. 16mo. Pp. 348.
 DAVIDSON, Thos. Rousseau and Education According to Nature. 12mo.
 Pp. 253. \$1.00.
 EARLE, Alice Morse. In Old Narragansett. 18mo. Pp. 196. 75 cents.
 FIELD, Henry M. The Life of David Dudley Field. Pp. 360. \$3.00.
 FORREST, Rev. D. W. The Christ of History and of Experience. 8mo. \$4.20.
 FRAZER, L. S. B., R. W. A Literary History of India. 8vo. \$4.00.
 GLADDEN, D. D., LL. D., Washington. The Christian Pastor and the Work-
 ing Church. 8vo. Pp. 485. \$2.50.
 HASTINGS, D. D., Jas., and J. A. Selbie, M. A. A Dictionary of the Bible.
 Vol. I. Pp. 864. \$6.00.
 MEREDITH, Geo. Vittoria. 12mo. Pp. 516.
 PAGE, Thomas Nelson. Pastime Stories. 18mo. Pp. 220. \$1.25.
 PETRIE, W. M. Flinders. Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt. Pp.
 179. \$1.00.
 PETRIE, W. M. Flinders. Syria and Egypt, from Tell el Amarna Letters.
 Pp. 187. \$1.00.
 SMITH, Hannah. Music: How it Came to be What it is. 12mo. Pp. 254.
 \$1.25.
 STANLEY, Henry M. Through South Africa. 12mo. Pp. 140.
 SULLIVAN, T. R. Ars et Vita, and Other Stories. 12mo. Pp. 302. \$1.25.
 VAN DYKE, Henry. Sermons to Young Men. Pp. 250. \$1.25.

Scriptural Tract Repository, Boston.

- RAWLINSON, M. A. The Testimony of History to the Truth of Scripture.
 35 cents.

Silver, Burdett & Co., Boston.

- ARNOLD, Sarah Louise and GILBERT, C. B. Stepping Stones to Literature.
 12mo. Pp. 312. 60 cents.

Small, Maynard & Co., Boston.

- SLETSON, Charlotte P. In This Our World. Pp. 217. \$1.25.

Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York.

- KENEDY, Walker. Javan Ben Seir. Pp. 291. 75 cents.
 PEARY, R. E. Northward Over the Great Ice. In two volumes. 12mo.
 \$6.50.

H. S. Stone & Co., Chicago.

- DOWE, Carlton. A Bride of Japan. 16mo. Pp. 268.
 MAGRUDER, Julia. A Realized Ideal. 16mo. Pp. 135.
 SHERWOOD, M. E. W. Here and There and Everywhere. Pp. 300.

Sunshine Publishing Co., Philadelphia.

JAMES, Bushrod Washington. Alaska : Its Neglected Past, Its Brilliant Future.

Temple Publishing Co., Denver, Col.

WILLIAMS, W. H. Vibration of the Law of Life. \$1.25.

Truth Seeker Co., New York.

BRADLAUGH, Charles. A Few Words about the Devil. 50 cents.

United Brethren Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio.

ZUCK, Wm. Johnston. The Book of Job. 12mo. Pp. 210.

University Press, Cambridge.

KIRKPATRICK, D. D., A. F. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Pp. 251. \$1.00.

Volla Bureau, Washington, D. C.

BELL, Alexander M. Sermon Reading and Memoriter Delivery. Paper. 25 cents.

E. A. Weeks Co., Chicago.

CRAIG, Alexander. Ionia.

Thomas Whittaker, New York.

ADENEY, Walter F. The Construction of the Bible. 12mo. Pp. 86. 50 cents.

ARMSTRONG, R. A. Faith and Doubt in the Century's Poets. Pp. 136. \$1.00.

HORTON, M. A., R. F. The Conquered World. Pp. 128. 50 cents.

MACMILLAN, D. D., Rev. Hugh. The Spring of Day.

WALSH, D. D., Right Rev. W. Pakenham. Heroes of the Mission Field. Pp. 249. \$1.50.

WALSH, D. D., Right Rev. W. P. Modern Heroes of the Mission Field. \$1.00.
————— Comfortable Thoughts for those Bereaved.

W. A. Wilde & Co., Boston.

HODGE, Mrs. J. Aspinwall. The Palm Branch. 12mo. Pp. 106.

John C. Winston & Co., Philadelphia.

TILNEY, Robert. Gleanings from Poetic Fields. 16mo. Pp. 139.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 46.—OCTOBER, 1898.

I. INSPIRATION.

A few years before his death, Theodore D. Woolsey, President of Yale University, was asked by a leading Quarterly to write an article for its pages on Inspiration. He declined to do so, on the ground that the time had not yet arrived for such a thing to be successfully done. President Woolsey died in 1889, and during these intervening years perhaps no biblical subject has had fuller discussion. Yet inspiration is still regarded by most biblical students as a *question*; notwithstanding this, inspiration is generally regarded as also a *fact*.

“The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”¹ To every believer in the truthfulness of the Bible, these words of the apostle reveal the fact of inspiration, declare that the Scriptures are, in some sense, the product of a divine influence brought to bear upon human writers. The process by which the Scriptures were formed has been long and gradual. “At sundry times and in divers manners”² has God spoken to us in times past. The Koran was given all at once. Full-grown it sprang from the shield of Mahomet, a prophet who not only had no forerunner, but who, as the professed bearer of divine revelation, had no successor. The Bible, however, has come to us through many prophets, each

¹2 Pet. 1:21.

²Heb. 1:1, 2.

of whom delivered his message to his generation. While the Scriptures have come to us in these divers manners, and bear a marked diversity in their different parts, they form an articulated whole. Beneath the diversity there is evident a striking unity, testifying that all these parts, wrought though they have been through different agents, "worketh the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will."¹

To this influence, the sacred writers themselves, and following them, biblical students in every age, have given the name Inspiration. Its literal meaning is easily perceived from its derivation. It is an in-breathing; and so, where used of the Spirit of God, it is the in-breathing of a divine influence upon the sacred writer. When we seek, however, to frame a definition which describes the mode of the Spirit's operation, the results are almost as varied as the writers who attempt it. Much confusion has been occasioned in the consideration of the subject by identifying inspiration and revelation, two things which exact writers, of recent times at any rate, are careful to distinguish. Revelation imports truth not previously known, while inspiration refers to the divine influence on the writer as he records truth.

It is not strange that attempts have been made to eliminate from inspiration the element of the supernatural. Two of these attempts are notable. One of them identifies the inspiration which the sacred writers claim for themselves with the "inspiration" of any secular writer, the *afflatus* or fine frenzy of the poet, or the lofty mental state to which has been given the popular name of "a moment of fine inspiration." Even Jesus himself is said to have had occasions of this kind.² But the sacred writers plainly meant by the inspiration which they claimed something more than the possession of extraordinary human powers, the genius of a Michael Angelo, a Beethoven, a Shakespeare. Isaiah had something more, according to his own claim, than the *afflatus* under which Shakespeare wrote *Macbeth* and *King Lear*, or the oratorical fire that glowed in

¹ 1 Cor. 12:11.

² John Watson, *Mind of the Master*.

the speeches of Sheridan or Webster. These sacred writers claimed to speak as they were "moved by the Holy Ghost."

The second attempt may be said to identify inspiration with natural development. The inspired men in the days when the canon of Scripture was forming, it is said, and the inspired men now, are those who by the mere use of their natural advantages have gained and thus been able to import clearest knowledge of life's mysteries; who, by a faithful development of their own powers, have climbed highest up the side of that mountain from whose peak man gets clear vision of the true, the beautiful and the good. There is such a development as this, it is claimed, in the evolution of man's natural capacities; that by diligent use of the means at our hand we may grow outward and climb upward, till we become the high-priests in nature's temple of truth, and can speak with the clearness of a divine oracle.

There is much that is plausible in this. The world's great teachers in every age have been the men who dared to follow, reverently and faithfully, wherever divine truth led. The masters in every earthly sphere are those who have striven to get the divine view-point of life, and permeate their life-work with divine influences. The master painter has learned by ardent pursuit after the beautiful to dip his brush in the colors of the Great Artist; and the prophet-poet chants a message of truth and power only to the extent to which he has climbed the side of that mountain on which is enthroned the Great Omniscient.

But such an inspiration as this scarcely accounts for the conditions under which the Scriptures were written. Some of the writers were men of rare gifts and wide culture; but others, whose writings show even deeper spiritual penetration, were dullards in those spheres of knowledge and work which the world regards as thus educative. The inspiration of Peter and James and John, whatever it may have been, was not evolved by education. In human learning, they were untutored; yet they were the men who told the world about God.

There were many men who could catch fish as well as "the sons of Thunder," but there has been only one man who leaned on the Saviour's breast, till he became "the beloved Apostle," and learned to write "the Gospel according to Saint John."

The very fact of inspiration necessitates the divine element. The sacred writers themselves claim a supernatural influence in their work, and no definition which allows the veracity of the writers can fail to account for this divine presence.

Inspiration may, then, be stated as the Spirit of God so superintending and directing the sacred writer as to lead him to record, in language perfectly natural to himself, exactly what God wishes him to record, and thus to make a writing free from error. Or, in the words of Shedd: "Defining inspiration positively, it may be described as the influence of the Holy Spirit upon a human person, whereby he is infallibly moved and guided in all his statements while under this influence."¹ Or, as Strong expresses it,² "By the inspiration of the Scriptures, we mean that special divine influence upon the minds of the Scripture writers, in virtue of which their productions, apart from errors of transcription, and when rightly interpreted, constitute an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice." Manly makes an important distinction, already referred to, and says: "Revelation is that direct divine influence which imparts truth to the mind. Inspiration is that divine influence that secures the accurate transference of truth into human language by a speaker or writer so as to be communicated to other men."³ Charles Hodge says,⁴ "It is an influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of certain select men, which rendered them the organ of God for the infallible communication of his mind and will." Henry B. Smith points out the fact that the inspiration of the Bible presupposes a revelation as given, calls it a "special divine influence for a special purpose," and says "its object is the communica-

¹ *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. I., p. 88.

² *Systematic Theology*, p. 95.

³ *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 37.

⁴ *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I., p. 154.

tion of truth in an infallible manner, so that when rightly interpreted no error is conveyed."¹

While most biblical students are agreed that inspiration is a fact, the method by which it proceeds is the occasion of many and widely divergent theories. The method implies a union of divine and human forces, and our conception of this relation will, in the main, shape our theory of inspiration. Some writers emphasize the human element in the Bible at the expense of the divine, and others exaggerate the divine at the expense of the human. In either case, the exaggeration results in distortion, and we have either the rationalistic view of the nineteenth, or the mechanical amanuensis theory of the seventeenth century. Other writers picture the two elements as antagonistic to each other, and represent the divine under the form of light overcoming the human, which is darkness. The zone of light and truth in the Bible thus becomes, to a large extent, limited to that which is of distinctly divine origin; while in the human element we are taught to expect more or less of confusion and error. Yet another view regards the two elements as uniting harmoniously, the divine influence infusing and permeating the human agent. The human writer thus furnishes the machinery, which the Holy Ghost fills with power. This, it is claimed, accounts for the human element which is found in the Bible, and at the same time commends it to us as a revelation stamped in every part with the divine impress, and so made trustworthy. The writer was Spirit-filled, and yielding up his own choice to that divine influence, became a Spirit-guided-writer.

It is when we come to consider inspiration in its results, however, that we find the theories so multitudinous and so widely diverging as almost to defy classification. Biblical students have always attempted to formulate a doctrinal statement of inspiration, because they found a specific doctrine on this subject commended to them by the sacred writers and by Christ himself. This evidently explains why the church took

¹*Inspiration of Holy Scriptures*, pp. 8, 9.

hold of the doctrine of inspiration from the start, and has always clung to it so tenaciously.

In the church's history, two diverging lines of influence have clearly appeared. In common with the school represented by Erasmus, the Socinians introduced a theory which distinguished between what were characterized as the inspired and uninspired elements in the Bible. This view was taken up by the Arminians, crystallized by LeClerc (*Defense des Sentiments*, 1686), and introduced into England (1690) by the publication of *Five Letters Concerning the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Translated out of the French*. George Calixtus (died 1656) advocated this theory in Germany, but it made little headway till Baumgarten became its champion (1725).

The other extreme from this is of a mystical type, and tends to exalt the "inner light," which the Holy Spirit gives to each Christian, to a place of equal authority with the inspiration under which the Scriptures were written. This tendency has generally found expression in schismatic movements, rather than as a theory inside the main body of the church, but through Schleiermacher's influence the nineteenth century has seen it enter to a large extent the whole body of Protestant theology. Giving to this act of the human reason such names as "the spiritual instinct," "the Christian consciousness," "the witness of the Holy Spirit in the Heart," and the like, the whole contents of the Bible, scientific and historical, as well as ethical and religious, the deepest mysteries of faith, as well as those rational facts which the unaided human reason may discover, are brought under judgment.

Widely divergent as these two theories are in their start, rationalistic and mystic, their effect is identical,—to lower the authority of the Scriptures.

At the present day, all theories which admit a supernatural element in the religion of the Scriptures may be grouped somewhat roughly under three classes.

First are those which admit that the religion is of divine origin, but deny that the Holy Spirit had anything to do with

the formation of the record. This view identifies inspiration with revelation, and looks on the Bible as entirely a man-made record. While the religion is of truly divine origin, the writers were left to themselves in making the record of it. One branch of this school reduces inspiration to something essentially possessed by all men, the "religious genius;" and a man's degree of inspiration is determined with them by the extent to which his religious insight has been developed. This seems to be the view, though in higher or lower stages, of such writers as F. W. Newman and Theodore Parker, and Scherer and Morell. A higher form of this theory, held by the followers of Coleridge and the more evangelical wing of Schleiermacher's school, regards the inspired man as simply the man of special spiritual discernment. As it is expressed by F. W. Farrar: "To us, as to holy men of old, the Spirit still utters the living oracles of God." Of this nature seems to be the view also of such writers as Neander, Tholuck, Arnold, F. W. Robertson, and Maurice.

A yet higher form of this theory recognized a distinctly prophetic office, and confines revelation and inspiration to this office, but identifies the two and regards the records as made by unaided human powers. T. George Rooke calls it "the theory of sufficient knowledge," and says inspiration is "the inward spiritual preparation of a man to know and to feel what God chooses to communicate of his divine thought and will."¹ DeWitt, who may also be said to belong to this school, says that after God had revealed to the prophet his will, the writer was left to "express in human language the divine conception, with which he was inspired, as well as he could."² It is a decided advance on this which is advocated by Leonard Stählin,³ when he represents God as not only communicating to the sacred writers the matter to be recorded, but at the same time "fitting" them to "express that which

¹Cf. *Inspiration*, p. 158.

²De Witt, *What is Inspiration?* p. 82.

³*Neue Kirch Zeitschrift*, 1892, No. 71.

they say exactly in those particular words which appear in their writings."

The second class of theories confines the inspiration to certain portions or elements in the Bible, and while teaching that the Bible contains the word of God and is of divine origin, denies that God is the author of or can be held responsible for the entire book. The writers of this class teach a high ideal of inspiration, but they identify it very largely with revelation, claiming that it concerns only those spiritual truths which man could not know by the unaided powers of human reason. They differ among themselves as to the elements which are inspired. Some of them hold as to what has been called the theory of "partial inspiration," regarding certain parts of the Bible as inspired or uninspired. The line is drawn by some between the Old and New Testaments, or between the Law and the Prophets and the rest of the Bible. Dr. G. T. Ladd says: "A large proportion of its writings is inspired," and that the New Testament is inspired "in nearly all its extent."¹ R. F. Horton, in his *Revelation and the Bible*, undertakes to go through the entire Bible and point out in general what is inspired and what is not; while W. Fr. Gess, in his *Die Dusperration der Helden der Bible*, etc., declares himself prepared to separate the inspired and uninspired parts down even to the very clauses of a sentence—a most remarkable feat, to say the least of it.

Another branch of this class limits the inspiration to certain elements of the Scriptures. Walter R. Browne (*The Inspiration of the New Testament*) confines it to the *supernatural* element. Others limit it to what they term matters of *faith and practice*. This is usually regarded by Christian apologetics, who stand for any divine element in the Bible, as the minimum to be defended. Others, of whom Dean Alford seems to be a representative, limit the inspiration to the idea or concept, the writers being left to their own unaided powers in expressing the idea in language. A theory of "graded in-

¹Ladd's *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, I., 759, II., 508.

piration," as it has been termed, has also been advocated by members of this class. It regards some portions of the Scriptures as more inspired than others. This view, which was a favorite among English writers a half century since, such as Doddridge and Dica and Henderson, identifies inspiration with all the processes by which the divine will is revealed. In this sense, any one who believes in a divine revelation would concede their distinction. Some parts of the Bible are plainly more dependent on divine revelation than are others. But if revelation and inspiration are distinct, as most writers of to-day regard them, the point is gravely disputed.

The third class of writers on inspiration, who represent the conservative and at the same time the traditional doctrine of the church at large throughout its history, distinguish inspiration from revelation, and claim that it covers every part of the Bible as first given in its original languages. They claim that God's spirit so superintended the sacred writers in making the record, as to make God the responsible author of the Book; and that the Scriptures thus written are the infallible and authoritative word of God in all their parts and utterances. This is what has received the name of *plenary* inspiration. It exhibits two schools, one of which, the theory of verbal inspiration, is rapidly disappearing. The advocates of verbal inspiration claim that inspiration "excludes the working of the natural faculties of man's mind altogether;"¹ and that the sacred writers are not to be thought of save as pens, blind instruments under the Spirit's influence, who have given no personal characteristics of their own to the Scriptures, save as a musical instrument may contribute to the quality of music played on it. But the evident pressure of a human element in the Scriptures, differences in style and vocabulary and modes of argument, have modified this theory, till it can scarcely any longer be called *verbal*. It has had advocates in every period of the church's history, but it cannot be said ever to have dominated the church save in the Protestant

¹John Whill, *A Way to the Tree of Life*, p. 60.

theology of the seventeenth century. A revival of it in modern times has appeared in the Lutheran Church, chiefly through the influence of Walther in the United States, and in Germany by such writers as Kölling and Rohnert. It generally impresses even the most pliant theological student as a theory hard to defend and still harder to believe.

The great body of the church is still represented by the traditional view, which, sticking close to the language of the Bible, teaches a theory of inbreathing, a condition in which for the time the Holy Ghost fills the sacred writer and through his human words and human characteristics records truth infallibly. The sacred writers themselves do not confine this inspiration to any particular portions or elements of the Scriptures; and, still following their lead, this doctrine teaches that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,"¹ and on this account alone constitutes our ultimate appeal and infallible guide in all matters of doctrine and duty. Its philosophical basis, as Dr. Warfield expresses it, is "the Christian conception of God as immanent in his modes of working, as well as transcendent."

This last view, which regards the entire Bible, as first recorded by the sacred writers, as the inspired and therefore infallible word of God, commends itself by the following arguments:

1. It is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the most natural supposition. Once grant that God has given man a revelation, and it is most natural to suppose that he would guide him in the record of that revelation.² It is necessary,

¹2 Tim. 3:16.

²Dr. James Deumey, in his *Studies in Theology*, finds fault with the plan of opening a system of theology with a chapter on the Scriptures as the source of authority in religion, the plan followed by the Westminster Confession, and claims that the proper place to consider the Scriptures in a system of theology is under the rubric of the means of grace. (Cf. *Studies in Theology*, pp. 202f.) The implication is that an unbeliever should be allowed to approach the Bible as he would any other book, and find out for himself whether or not it has anything in it from God. This is not the place for any extended argument on the subject, but granting that an unbeliever's first use of the Bible should be as a means of grace, his point is not made. A system of theology is not intended, it seems to me, for men who have not

if a revelation is to acquire any wide-spread reach, that the record of it, through which alone it comes to others besides the original receiver of it, shall be as free from error as was the original revelation. It can scarcely be denied that, with the presence of the supernatural once granted, it is as easy for God to guide the writer to make an infallible record as it was to reveal to him an infallible revelation. It is highly improbable that God would reveal a truth to Moses, for example, and do nothing towards securing an infallible record of that truth.

2. The Scriptures themselves claim such an inspiration, and do not limit it to any particular elements or portions of the revelation. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."¹ "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."² "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."³ "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."⁴ It has been charged that this argument is reasoning in a circle; but notice that the argument is not that "the Scriptures are the word of God because they are inspired, and are inspired because they are the word of God." Their inspiration does not come under consideration until, by other evidence, their divine origin is already established. This divine origin, once established,

accepted the divine origin of Christianity, but for those who have. As the Westminster Confession explicitly states, "Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority [of the Bible] is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts." (Cf. *Confession of Faith*, Ch. I., Sec. V.) The Bible becomes the supreme tribunal of appeal, and consequently the starting point for any theological system, because it has already been evidenced to us as the word of God by the witness of the Holy Spirit. But it is also true that the Bible best becomes a means of grace when it is searched as the word of God. It is certainly true that the inspiration of the Scriptures cannot even be considered until this supernatural origin has been established by a wholly different line of argument. Inspiration pre-supposes a divine revelation as already proven. Its argument, therefore, is not of a merely *a priori* character, as the radical critics claim. Once concede that the Bible is of divine origin, and no witness is more authoritative as to the manner in which the revelation was given than are these sacred writers themselves.

¹2 Tim. 3:16.²Heb. 1:1, 2.³1 Cor. 1:13.⁴2 Pet. 1:21.

accredits their testimony ; and no other witness is of paramount importance on this subject with the Scriptures themselves.

3. It is the view of inspiration which seems to have been held by the Jews of Christ's day, by Christ himself and the apostles, and by the Christian Church as a whole throughout its history. The Jews of Christ's day believed in and taught in their schools the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. Christ seems to have accepted it, and both he and the apostles and all the New Testament writers make such a use of Scripture as implies it. Throughout the history of the Christian Church it has been held by the great body of believers, and taught by her great theologians, from Augustine to Henry B. Smith and Shedd and Dabney. Luther has been claimed as an opponent of it, on the ground of his calling the book of James "an epistle of straw ;" but Luther's attack on this matter was not on plenary inspiration, but on the divine origin of James' epistle ; he denied its right to a place in the canon.

The testimony of Christ and the apostles to plenary inspiration is an argument hard to meet, but attempts have been made. One of them, an attempt which could hardly be made by one who recognized its implication and at the same time revered Christ, claims that Christ, while committing himself to such a view, knew better, and simply accommodated himself to the teachings of the day, became party to a pious fraud. Another attempt, with more metaphysics, as well, as it is claimed, more reverence for Christ, attempts to explain it with the doctrine of the *κενώσις*, that Christ having emptied himself of his omniscience, did not know any better. Either of these attempts is of a sorry kind. Christ, in laying aside his "being on an equality with God," may have chosen to be ignorant of certain things, as to his human nature, but it could not possibly have been an ignorance which made him the victim of wrong views, especially on such a vital subject as this. As Sunday, himself one of the foremost champions of partial inspiration, says : "The one proof which in all ages has been the simplest and most effective as to the validity of

that idea, was the extent to which it was recognized in the sayings of Christ himself."¹ Now if Christ and his apostles are not infallible authority, even in the matter of this doctrinal teaching, if we cannot settle the question by their testimony, the question cannot even be discussed, for there is no earthly testimony of authority on the subject.

4. A partial inspiration cannot be maintained, because it necessitates the leadership of some one possessing plenary inspiration, who will take us through the Bible and infallibly show us what parts are inspired and what are not. The fact is, that at least two men of this kind have bravely offered themselves to fill the gap, R. F. Horton and W. Fr. Gess; but the Christian world has been slower to accept their leadership than they have been to decline that of the apostles and prophets. As to the claim that only the spiritual parts are inspired, while in matters of history, science, etc., the writers were left to themselves, the difficulty is that the elements of the Scriptures are so closely interwoven as to defy such a separation. Spiritual teaching is wrapped up in historical, and even geology is inseparably associated with the divine origin of the universe. Dr. Sonday says :² "In all that relates to the revelation of God and of his will, the writers assert for themselves a definite inspiration; they claim to speak with an authority higher than their own; but in regard to the narrative of events, and to processes of literary composition, there is nothing so exceptional about them as to exempt them from the conditions to which other works would be exposed at the same place and time." Why does not Dr. Sonday say that "in the narrative of events and in the process of literary composition" the sacred writers *disclaim* "an authority higher than their own?" Because he could not say it. They make no distinction between those elements and their revelations of God and his will. They claim the same kind of inspiration for their entire record. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

What has caused the advocates of partial inspiration to draw

¹ *Inspiration*, p. 393.

² *Oracles of God*, pp. 74, 75.

a distinction which is not drawn by the sacred writers themselves? There are probably two reasons. The first is the supposition that the presence of a human element in the Scriptures necessitates more or less of error; and the second is the actual presence, as it is claimed, of mistakes in the Scriptures.

1. The presence of the human element in the Scriptures cannot be denied; but it is quite another thing to argue that wherever the human element is a factor, there must be error. Inspiration is God's taking possession of the mind and hand and heart of the human writer, and this divine guidance certainly *can* preserve from all error. Moreover, and *nota bene*, if the human element can be instrumental in recording a revelation of spiritual truth and yet the record be free from error, by what possible law of logic can it be argued that God cannot use the human instrument to move an infallible record which involves matters of science or history? The fact is, the supposition in question is a false one. It is the same as that which claims that because Christ possessed a human nature he could not be free from sin, a theory exposed long ago in Christology, and just as untenable here. The figures which some writers use to express the relation between the human and divine elements in inspiration are not true to facts. Peter does compare the light of prophecy to a lamp shining in a dark place, and Christ compared the kingdom of heaven to leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, as Dr. Sondag claims;¹ but in no case is inspiration likened to either of these. The lamp in Peter's figure stands for the Scripture, a product of the human and divine elements. The darkness in the figure stands for the unregenerate world to whom the Scriptures are proclaimed. The figure of the leaven is used in the same way.

2. The alleged mistakes that have actually been found in the Bible are a more serious matter. Plenary inspiration may be a fine theory, but what if the Bible contains actual mis-

¹*Oracles of God*, p. 75.

takes? Dr. DeWitt, indeed, ridicules the advocate of plenary inspiration by comparing him to a fellow-student of his whose boasted process of reasoning was *to lay down his principles, and deduce his facts!*

It must be confessed that if, beyond controversy, it becomes established that there were mistakes in the original autographs of the Old and New Testaments, the theory of plenary inspiration is no longer tenable. But let us consider these alleged mistakes.

(1) One class of them embraces alleged discrepancies in the statements of different writers. In reference to the blind man or men whom Christ healed at Jericho, for example, Matthew says¹ that Jesus healed two blind men as he departed from Jericho, Mark² mentions blind Bartimeus as the one, while Luke³ speaks of only one man, and says that Jesus healed him as he came near to Jericho. Matthew says that the inscription on the cross was, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews;"⁴ Mark says it was, "The King of the Jews;"⁵ Luke says it was, "This is the King of the Jews;"⁶ while John gives it, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."⁷

These differences in statement were once made the occasion of much cavil against the Bible's infallibility; but, as has been clearly shown, they are not mistakes, being merely independent accounts of different eye-witnesses, corroborating instead of weakening each other's testimony. Thus are answered the claims of the entire class.

(2) A second class of alleged mistakes deals with the way in which New Testament writers quote from the Old Testament. It has been pointed out, however, that Christ and the New Testament writers quote in every way, sometimes literally, or again quite loosely, but in all cases giving the sense of the original. Indeed, should it even be proved that any writer uses any passage in a sense not in the mind of the original writer when he wrote it, this view of inspiration is not

¹Mt. 20:29f.

²Mark 10:46f.

³Luke 18:35f.

⁴Mt. 27:37.

⁵Mark 15:26.

⁶Luke 23:38.

⁷John 19:19.

invalidated ; for the sacred writer making the quotation may well be inspired to make such use of it.

(3) A third class deals with what are claimed to be moral blemishes. No writer, it is claimed, could record "the butchery of the Canaanites," and the treachery of Jael, and such horrible penalties as stoning a man to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath, as having the sanction of God, as directed by God, and lay claim to plenary inspiration. In answer to which it may be said that the moral judgment of the critic can scarcely be made the standard by which to judge God. "The butchery of the Canaanites," for example, is declared to have been a divine judgment, executed just as capital punishment is by a sheriff to-day. All that God's people did is not approved by God, much less made a moral standard for all ages ; and it is a dangerous thing, with our imperfect knowledge, to sit in judgment on what are recorded as God's providential dealings.

(4) A more serious class is found in the alleged historical inaccuracies of the Scriptures. Opponents of the divine origin of the Bible have found them a fertile field in every age. Many of these charges have caused Christians no little anxiety, but nearly all of them have been answered ; and it may be safely claimed that not one of these alleged historical inaccuracies of any long standing has not had a satisfactory solution. One of these was in reference to Belshazzar. Herodotus and Berosus, it was claimed, were utterly at variance with the Scriptural account, these two writers stating that Nabonnedus was king when Cyrus took Babylon, and that he was absent from the city at the time of its capture. Secular and sacred history seemed irreconcilable, until Sir Henry Rawlinson discovered inscriptions which showed that Nabonnedus had admitted his eldest son, Bel-sharezer, to a share in the government ; and thus a reason also appeared why Daniel had been made *third* ruler in the kingdom instead of *second*. A similar controversy waged about the statement of Luke (2:1), that the taxing which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem occurred

when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. Profane history, it was claimed, located the term of Cyrenius some six or seven years before this. The supposed discrepancy was explained by further discovery that Cyrenius was governor of Syria twice, and that the second term occurred at the time stated by Luke.

These two instances are very old. My only apology for employing them is this: If such serious historical discrepancies as these were cleared up, should they not teach us caution in charging historical inaccuracy in all Scriptural statements, and especially warn us against shaping our theory of inspiration by their claims? Emphasis is given to this by Hommel's recent refutation of some of the claims of Wellhausen. The latter says that the lists of names in Numbers i., vii., and xiii., are "nearly all cast in the same mould, and are in no way similar to genuine ancient personal names."¹ But Hommel has shown that "an examination of the Canaanite personal names, preserved in the Tel-el-Amarna texts, leads us to the conclusion that even as far back as 1500 B. C., the personal names of the inhabitants of Palestine presented essentially the same characteristics of form and meaning as are to be found in the Phœnician names of a later period."² A class of Bible critics has also affirmed that Jerusalem could not possibly have been called Salem before the time of David, since prior to that date its name had been Jebus; but Hommel has shown³ not only that in the year 1400 B. C. it bore the name Uru-salim (easily changed to Je-ru-salim), but that the very latest date at which this translation of Gen. xiv. could have been made must have been some time during the life of Moses.

Such recklessness on the part of the Bible's critics certainly justifies us in being cautious in following their lead, however pretentious may be their claims to scholarship.

The alleged mistakes in numbers and dates are easily accounted for on the ground of mistakes by the copyists or by

¹Cf. Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*, p. 334.

²Cf. *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 220.

³*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 220.

corruptions of the original text. The use of documents by an inspired compiler, granting that such a thing has been done, does not invalidate the plenary inspiration of those parts of the Scriptures. A writer may be as divinely guided in his use of documents as in other matters.

The mistakes of the Scriptures have yet to be established. It is a fact to make one very cautious, that as fast as the antagonists of the divine origin of the Scriptures crystallize their claims, God raises up from the dust of the dead or the mind of the living an alembic of truth which destroys them. As Prebendary Low has said, these apparent "discrepancies have been exaggerated to an extent that is absurd. A large number of them admit of an easy reconciliation, under the guidance of common sense. Others arise from the fragmentary nature of the narrative, and our ignorance of the entire facts. Not a few of the remainder owe their origin to the fact that the events have been grouped in reference to the religious purpose of the author, rather than to the order of direct historical sequence. Of a few, the reconciliation is difficult." As Dr. Shedd put it not long before he died:¹ "There is no list of conceded errors in the Scriptures. There are perplexities remaining, but while there is not an instance in which the controversy with the skeptic has resulted in establishing the fact of undoubted error in revelation, there are many instances in which it has resulted in demonstrating its truth and accuracy."

It has not been long since much noise was made about the mistakes of Moses in matters of science; but it was soon found that the interpreters of Moses were more to blame, and that in some way the Mosaic account of creation possessed a wonderful harmony with the very few really established facts of geology. The claim is still made that the opening chapters of the Bible are myths, Dr. James Denney, for example, claiming that to call them "supernaturally communicated history" is not only "utterly incapable of proof," but a "meaningless

¹*Theology, I.*, p. 101.

because a self-contradictory description."¹ But it is not so "self-contradictory." Why should it be thought a thing incredible for father to hand on to son for ten generations a revelation in the first case divinely given? Why should it be deemed a thing incredible, since the dead have been raised, that God's Spirit should infallibly guide Moses or some other sacred writer in such use, either of traditions handed down by mouth or of written documents, as would give us infallible records of what took place in these prehistoric times? Is it any harder for God's Spirit to let a writer know what took place then than to reveal to him the words with which Christ prayed in Gethsemane when Peter and James and John were asleep a stone's cast away?²

The supposition appears to me to be rather to the contrary. If God's Spirit did not infallibly direct the Scripture record in these matters, what has preserved them from the ridiculous statements which have crept into other accounts of these times? Compare the cosmogony of the Bible with that of the Koran, the Shastra, the Zendavesta. Put Moses beside Zoroaster and Confucius. Who preserved Moses from their foolish cosmogonies, if God did not? Plato, and even Kepler, considered the earth an intelligent being. In the light of these things, could Moses or any other writer have produced Genesis unless God's Spirit inspired him?

These things make the ground feel firm under my feet. I can conceive how John could infallibly tell us what is true Christian unity and how to attain it, and yet make a mistake about the words of the inscription on the cross; but until John's veracity on some point is hopelessly impeached, I prefer to look on him as a writer who told "nothing but the truth," and to regard all that he wrote and all the rest of Scripture as coming to us under the infallible guidance of the Spirit of all truth, constituting thereby, as the vehicle of the Holy Spirit's testimony, the infallible word of God, our ultimate appeal and source of authority in all things that pertain to godliness.

JOSEPH A. VANCE.

Baltimore, Md.

¹*Studies in Theology*, p. 217f.

²Luke 22:39f. ; Mark 14:32f.

II. A NEW MARIOLATRY.

In Boston there is a magnificent church, dedicated to Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Eddy, the "discoverer" and founder of Christian Science. The society under whose auspices it was built was established by Mrs. Eddy, who continued to be its pastor for some years, and is still recognized as such, though she has only been in the edifice three times. A striking feature of the services in this church, which are said to be always attended by immense crowds, is that a pew is always reserved for Mrs. Eddy, to whom the whole sect unite in giving the title of Mother. This vacant pew, we suppose, reminds her followers that, though absent in body, she is ever present with them in spirit. On the wall behind the pulpit are pictures of two books, side by side—the Bible and *Science and Health*, which these "scientific" Christians consider to be of equal authority.

There is also in this building a "circular apartment, with stained glass windows which symbolize, as does everything else in the building, some thought connected with religion." This room, built and furnished for Mrs. Eddy's exclusive use, was the offering of some four thousand children of the sect, and is said to be one of the most expensive private rooms in the city. It is, in fact, a sort of shrine to a human divinity.¹

¹The furniture in this room is of beautifully carved white mahogany, the chairs being upholstered in white and gold satin. The couch is filled with eider-down. A writing desk of costly material and exquisite workmanship has in its stationery case, for Mrs. Eddy's use, should she ever choose to occupy the chamber, paper with the words, "Mother's Room," stamped upon it in gold. An exquisite cabinet holds a complete edition of all Mrs. Eddy's works, bound in the prevailing white and gold. The mantel and table are of Mexican onyx, and on the former rest an elegant French clock, candelabra and imported vases. A rug of eider-down is on the floor. One significant thing in the room is an artistically draped picture, showing the chair in which Mrs. Eddy sat when composing her precious book, and the table on which she wrote, with scattered sheets of manuscript lying on the table and floor. On one side of the chamber is an elegantly furnished bed-room, and

The services in this church, dedicated to the "dearest mother" of all Christian Scientists, are unique. Mrs. Eddy, unwilling, it would seem, to have her doctrine diluted at the fountain head, has designated the Bible and her book, *Science and Health*, as the impersonal preachers in this particular church, the lesson sermon, as it is called, being an antiphonal reading from both books. Vocal prayer is not permitted, and the hymns used are chiefly those composed by various members of the new sect, in which Life, Truth, and Love are lauded, and the changes are rung upon the Allness of God, and the nothingness of matter, the supremacy of mind, etc. Of Christian Science hymnology, the following, by Ione G. Daniels, is perhaps a fair specimen :

Look forth, Oh, conscious child of God,
 Into the spirit realm of Mind ;
 The path that Jesus Christ hath trod
 Is thy celestial joy to find.
 Across the day no night hath spanned
 The sea, sun-kissed from land to land.
 Look forth ! and in the Master see
 The perfect life thine own should be.

Shut the material doors of Sense,
 And let the Soul look forth alone.
 The mortal mind is blind and dense,
 And hath no being of its own ;
 With Mary at the Savior's tomb
 Its gaze is downward in the womb
 Of sensuous elements, to find
 The Lord of Life, Immortal Mind !

The nebulous character of the teaching embodied in such hymns adds not a little to the mystifying effect of the antiphonal readings ; while the sense of complete stultification

on the other is a bath-room done in African marble, with faucets and pipes heavily plated with gold. A marble archway, opposite the central church door, leads to this chamber. On either side of this archway, which is draped with dark velvet hangings, stand white pots holding ornamental palms. The vestibule of the room is lighted from above, the light falling upon the door, and revealing over it a white marble tablet upon which in gold is inscribed the word "Love."

produced by the effort to believe the sublime and shadowy nonsense of Mrs. Eddy's philosophical theology, has in it all the elements of profound religious emotion for those who have entered upon the "life of science."

We have seen that it is impossible for Christian Scientists to worship God in any proper sense when they have made him a mere abstraction. But the extraordinary deference paid by all Christian Scientists to Mrs. Eddy suggests the question whether she is not herself the object of such a worship as justifies the title of this paper. She is accorded all and more than the rights of a prophet and of an apostle. She is accredited with having achieved more than Jesus did, and more than his disciples could. Her utterances are regarded as Divinely inspired. Her word is law; and it is matter of record that at one time, for reasons vouchsafed to no mortal, she dissolved her church, and at another time reorganized it. During the past year her followers were all interdicted from teaching classes, their work being confined, by her direction, to preaching and healing. "The key to happiness is in her hands," says Mrs. Josephine Curtis Woodbury, "and she is waiting until the slumbering world awakes to seek it before she can present it."¹

Of the nature of the homage paid her, we can gather some idea from Mrs. Woodbury's account of her appearance before the National Association of Christian Scientists in Chicago in 1888, premising only that as the number of her disciples has increased and the fame of her holy life and her marvelous achievements has gone abroad, the worship paid her has become more popular and pronounced. At Chicago, in the year aforesaid, eight hundred of Mrs. Eddy's followers came together, acknowledging "one Leader, one purpose, one cause." Memorable scenes followed her address on that occasion.

"The people," writes her most faithful, though long ago excommunicated, disciple, Mrs. Woodbury, "were in the presence of the woman whose book had healed them, and they

¹ *Christian Science Voices.*

knew it. They came in crowds to her side, begging for one hand-clasp, one look, one memorial from her whose name was a power and a sacred thing in their homes. Those whom she had never seen before,—invalids, benefited by her book, *Science and Health*,—each attempted to hurriedly tell her the wonderful story. A mother, who failed to get near, held aloft her babe, that the little one might behold her helper. Others touched the dress of their benefactor, not so much as asking for more. An aged woman, trembling with palsy, lifted her shaking hands at Mrs. Eddy's feet, crying, 'Help!' 'Help!' and the cry was answered. Many such people were known to go away healed. Strong men turned away to hide their tears, as the people thronged about her, with blessings and thanks." And it is added that "meekly and almost silently she received all this homage from the multitude," and that "the thoughts of those present went back in memory to scenes of eighteen hundred years ago, when through Jesus was manifested the healing power."¹

The parallel between this account of the thronging of Mrs. Eddy and the gospel story of the thronging of Jesus by the multitude, is palpably intentional, and the writer does not surprise us by her remark upon the resemblances between the two scenes. Her expressed conviction that in Jesus was manifest the (same) healing power that is now manifested in Mrs. Eddy, is itself evidence that this sect regards Mrs. Eddy as a Theophany. The worship accorded to Mary of Bethany by the intelligent Romanist amounts to little more than that accorded by Christian Scientists to Mrs. Eddy. He does not pretend that to Mary he is to look for the words of eternal life; whereas Mrs. Eddy is the accredited oracle of God to hundreds of thousands. Catholics are solicitous of Mary's favor, and attribute marvelous efficacy to her intercessions with her Divine Son, to whom, after all, they are looking for salvation; but they do not invest her with any Divine attributes. She does not take the place of the Savior as their

¹ *Christian Science Voices.*

teacher and exemplar. They place her between the sinner and his Savior, and yet do not pretend that she can save them without the grace of Jesus. But Christian Scientists declare for Mrs. Eddy, as she has declared for herself, that her teaching, and it alone, is the "Bread of Life," and that salvation is impossible to all who do not accept her doctrines and imitate her example. Only by adopting the theories of Christian Science can we learn to follow Christ. Besides, as we have seen, the "Scientist" considers the very name of Mrs. Eddy sacred, and deems it a privilege if he may but touch the hem of her garment. He counts her a healer, possessed of the same power that Christ had, and regards her as the "voice of God to this generation." It is the ambition of all true "Scientists" to "come closer to that wonderful life which is being lived among them for their example and hope."¹ It is said that many of her followers do not believe she will ever die. "The facts of Mary Eddy"² show that she is the recipient of a worship just as genuine, if not as elaborate, as that paid by Romanists to the Blessed Virgin. Mrs. Eddy is at once a new Pope and a new Divinity.

Perhaps the following rhapsody by Mrs. Josephine Curtis Woodbury, the most versatile of Mrs. Eddy's followers, being a poet, preacher, and healer of considerable fame, may be taken as a sample of Christian Science prayer to the "Dearest Mother" of the new church of Christ :

"Oh, faithful one! We can come into a true conception of thee, sharing thy love and thy power, only when we pattern our ways after thine, heeding thy precious words of warning and wisdom so freely given. Thou callest us from the worship of idols³ to close communion with the true and perfect Father, and biddest us *sup with thee* at the table spread with the gifts of daily food; but we are loath to listen until sharp struggles turn us, worn and weary, from the vanity of our ways. We test the purity and endurance of thy love and pity by ingratitude and disdain. We are cold and indifferent to thy pleadings, often turning a deaf ear to thy watchful, tender prayers; yet thou dost ever wait and watch and pray, yearning over

¹Mrs. Woodbury—*Christian Science Voices*. ²*Ibid.*

³Worship of idols, as we have seen, means "worship of the personal Jesus."

us thy children with that exquisite mother-love which knows no change nor abatement, repaying injustice and falsehood with blessing and healing.

"Oh, patient Mother! We see thee dearer as we grow older in truth. We learn that this book which thou hast bequeathed to us is the outgrowth and epitome of thy life. We are willing to follow as thou leadest, looking away from the personal sense of thee, as *thou revealest to us the Mother-heart of God!*"¹

How closely this prayer follows the thought of the Christian as he bows before the Divine Son, whose example he would fain imitate, and through whom he holds fellowship with the Divine Father, will be apparent to any one who will study its phrases a moment. It is a rhapsody embodying essential prayer. Most plainly does it recognize in Mrs. Eddy's life and character a new Theophany, and beseech her to pardon the sin of not having duly heeded her words of instruction. It recognizes her book as a new, authoritative Divine revelation, the key to happiness and salvation.

In our former paper the identity of "Christian Science" with Pantheism and Unitarianism was exhibited. We proceed now to show what it teaches as to man and his future life, as to unembodied spirits, and as to sacraments and worship.

Having made God the sum of all things, it would be impossible for Mrs. Eddy to consider Man as less than Divine.

"Man," she says, "was and is God's idea, even the infinite expression of infinite Mind, and co-existent and co-eternal with that Mind. Man has been forever in the eternal Mind, God . . . Man's consciousness and mentality are reflections of God . . . the emanations of him who is Life, Truth, and Love."

Again, "Let us rid ourselves of the belief that Man is a separate intelligence from God." "Man is the compound idea of God, including all right ideas; the generic term for all that reflects God's image and likeness; the *conscious identity of Being*, as found in Science, where Man is the *reflection* of God, or Mind, and, therefore, eternal; that which *has no separate mind from God.*"

Mrs. Eddy denies that she is a Pantheist; and yet it is manifestly impossible for her words to be understood in any other than a pantheistic sense. Man is, she says, not God himself, but only his eternal idea. But, nevertheless, Man has no sep-

¹ Mrs. Woodbury—*Christian Science Voices*.

arate intelligence from God. His intelligence is none other than the Divine intelligence. In him resides the "conscious identity of Being." That is, the only consciousness which God has of his own identity is found in the consciousness of man. In such statements she holds out to her followers the intoxicating thought that they themselves are not merely temples of the Holy One, but that all their thoughts are, in fact, God's thoughts, and that the only soul which anybody has is God himself. He is the Ego: that which says "I" in every human being is nothing less than the Spirit of the Eternal, conscious of its own identity.

How this doctrine affects some people, we may learn from Mrs. Woodbury:

"On all hands are victims believing themselves to be 'as Gods.' Estrangement in families, discords in the home circle, bitter alienations from pastors and churches, are inevitable results from such mal-teaching and mal-practice, while cases of ensuing insanity are not rare."¹

It is true that Mrs. Woodbury is here speaking, not of Christian Science as she understands it, and as she supposes Mrs. Eddy to teach it, but of certain other "ambitious teachers of the people, deluded by egotism and flattery from their blind followers," whom she represents as engaged in the work of disseminating "spurious adulterations of Christian healing." But such doctrine as that just now quoted from Mrs. Eddy herself is precisely adapted to induce insanity and all the other difficulties named, simply because of its tendency to make people count themselves "as gods." Let any man become possessed with this thought: "My intelligence is God's intelligence, my consciousness is his," and he will speedily conclude that his thoughts are in fact God's thoughts, and that in all his life he is acting and speaking by divine inspiration. Is not the man who is laboring under such a delusion already fit for the insane asylum?

Mrs. Eddy, however, would have us keep ourselves humble; and hence she adds to the very strong statements already

¹*Christian Science Voices.*

quoted as to the identity of God in Man this bit of sublimated idealism and "scientific" humility :

"Think of thyself as the orange just eaten, of which only the pleasant memory is left."¹

Just why, we are not told, unless it be because Man is not substantial, but only an idea ! This is predicating a very shadowy existence, indeed, for that exalted being of whom we have just been told that in him resides the "conscious identity" of God !

At this point, we notice another of the many exquisite absurdities of our "scientific" reasoner. The Scriptures tell us (Rom. viii : 9, and sundry other passages,) that God dwells in his children. This, however, is one of the texts quoted by her, without any attempt to explain or translate into the "new tongue" of Christian Science. Having defined man as God's idea, she is driven to keep up somehow the distinction between God and his own thoughts. Hence the following remarkable denial of the doctrine of God's immanence in his creation :

"God is the only Life, and life is no more in the forms which express it than Substance is in its Shadow."²

Her reasons for this denial, which she proceeds to give, are quite logical. First :

"If Life were in mortal man or in material things, it would be subject to their limitations and end in death."

How Life, which she regards as the only reality, could end in death, which she counts an unreality, she does not pause to explain. Second :

"If he dwelt within what he creates, God would not be reflected, but absorbed," etc.

Her reason, it appears, for denying a very plain Scripture, which she can not by any possibility reconcile with her philosophy, is simply to avoid cataclysms and take care of the universe. A dead God, or one to whom his universe has be-

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Ibid.*

come a fatal sponge to absorb or digest him, must not be tolerated in our thinking! We confess that quite as much as Mrs. Eddy herself do we repel all the "glittering audacity of diabolical and sinuous logic"¹ that would lead to such horrible conclusions. For this wondrously wise *reductio ad absurdum*,—a feat of inspired intellect which, we venture to assert, is without a parallel in the writings of Paul, of Bacon, of Berkeley, or even of Mother Goose,—Mrs. Eddy deserves the gratitude of the race she came to save.

Having shown us conclusively that God cannot be in his creation, it is quite as easy for Mrs. Eddy to show us that the Scriptural account of the creation is all wrong. To this position her system forces her. If Man is, and always was, God's idea, it follows that he was never created. If we devise any theory, upon the basis of her teaching, that gives to the race any beginning, we fall into other cataclysms that are too horrible to contemplate. One is, that if man, God's only idea, ever had a beginning, then, prior to that beginning, God had no ideas whatever! Again, since man's being is God's only identity, it follows that if there ever was a time when man did not exist, God at that time had no identity! And, further, since in man God's consciousness resides, it follows that if man were created, God had no consciousness prior to that creation! Moreover, God could not possibly have ideas without expressing them. This is a quite reasonable presumption, since man, who is God's image, has the same peculiarity, being, in many instances, utterly unable to keep his mouth shut. And who would believe in an empty-headed, idiotic sort of God, without any ideas? Or who would agree to any theory which would logically reduce God to a nonentity? "God," says our inspired author, "without the image and likeness of himself, would be a nonentity, or Mind unexpressed."² Of course, then, if the Bible gives any account of the creation of man, that account must be all wrong.

In expounding the Biblical account of creation, so as to

¹ *Science and Health*.

² *Ibid.*

compel it to harmonize with her teaching as to the eternity of man, Mrs. Eddy takes advanced ground in a way well adapted to abash the whole world of "traditional theologians." She is not satisfied to interpret Scripture by reversing its propositions, or even by substituting, in certain passages, for the word which denies her precious doctrines, another which affirms it. When she comes to speak of creation, she makes a dexterous movement, in keeping with the Napoleonic character of her genius, and puts herself in the very vanguard of the Higher Criticism, finding in the latest conclusions of "modern scholarship" abundant verifications of her teaching! In fact, she captures the whole camp of the critics, and appears, as it were, in triumphal procession, dragging Drs. Driver, Cheyne, Briggs, *et id omne genus*, captive in her train! And, with the conceded right of conquest, she proceeds to make such use of their stock in trade as suits the exigencies of her argument.

These infallible critics are all agreed that, notwithstanding the fact, which they claim to have verified, that the account of creation, as given in Genesis, is a patchwork story made by dove-tailing two narratives together, there is truth in each story. These narratives of the writers may be regarded as mythical, poetical, or what not; but, nevertheless, each is full of profound truth. But to Mrs. Eddy there is no beauty in one of them that she should admire it. She regards the first chapter of Genesis as all true and inspired, and also the first five verses of the second. But the story of Eden and the fall she finds all wrong, and all else connected with it. This second chapter of Genesis gives us, she has discovered, "a material view of God and the universe which is the exact opposite of scientific truth."¹ It "chronicles man as mutable and mortal,—as having broken away from Deity, and as revolving in an orbit of his own." This cannot be, since "existence, separate from Deity, is impossible." The second account is pantheistic, teaching that "Spirit co-operated with matter in

¹ *Science and Health.*

creating man," which, of course, is false! Besides, it is contradictory of the first, etc. Hence her efforts to explain this portion of the Scripture are mainly efforts to show its falsity, and yet she seeks to make it at the same time a sort of allegory, teaching her doctrine. We give one specimen of her reasoning in the premises:

"Is Spirit, God, injected into dust, and eventually ejected at the demand of matter? Does Spirit enter into dust, and lose therein the Divine nature and omnipotence?"

Of course not; and if not, we must agree with Mrs. Eddy, or remain dead in trespasses and in sins.

Aside from the necessity of so explaining the Bible as to make it support her peculiar view of the dignity of man, as "God's eternal idea," there is another reason for the wrath in this celestial mind, burning, as it does, with steady glow, against the Biblical account of man's creation and fall. That account of the origin of woman does not suit her. She has been commissioned to teach the world that "Woman is the highest species of Man," and she can in no wise admit the truth of a story which makes woman's subjection to man a part of the creative plan, and a fundamental law of human society. Accordingly, she indulges a scorn quite Ingersollian in her remarks upon the ancient myth, which she would fain effectually explode.

"Falsity, error," she explains, in commenting upon Gen. ii: 21, "charges Truth, God, with inducing a *hypnotic state* in Adam, in order to *perform a surgical operation* on him, and thereby create a woman."

Following this refined and delicate piece of wit, she makes some jocular remarks upon surgery and obstetrics, as illustrated in this story of woman's creation. But where did the various orders of created things come from? Mrs. Eddy answers:

"Beholding the creations of his own dream, and calling them real and God-given, Adam—*alias* error—gives them names. Afterwards, he becomes the basis of the creation of woman and of his own kind, calling them mankind."

This is a most remarkable account of creation. God was not the Creator, unless in creating woman, which point Mrs. Eddy leaves undecided. Adam dreamed, and the objects first seen in his vision become the supposed realities of his waking hours. He errs in calling them real and God-given. Not even the sun and the moon, as we have seen, are to be considered as real things,¹ but as subjective states of human thought.

But where did Adam come from? How did the "man of God's creating" become associated with this "embodied falsity," whose *alias* is Error? The reader of Mrs. Eddy's works will look in vain for a clear and unambiguous answer to this question. She has told us that Adam was the man Jesus in a previous state of existence. He was the ideal man, and he was Adam, but Adam was not the ideal man. Here is another glimpse of our author's Buddhism. Evidently, she believes that Adam had to learn sundry things in his successive incarnations, before he could pose before the world as a model over whom, to use Mr. Mason's apt expression, we could cast the "various habiliments of our thought and study their effects." Some theosophists allow fifteen hundred years, more or less, for the completion of the "devachanic period," or interval between death and re-incarnation. So there was time for our Lord to make proof of life in the flesh a second time, if not a third, before he was born as the Son of Mary!

In this connection, Mrs. Eddy's scientific remarks upon the name of the first man are worthy of note.

"Adam," she says, "is from the Hebrew *Adamah*, signifying the red color of the ground, dust, nothingness."²

This will surprise Hebraists of all calibres. The following, too, is another "ray of infinite Truth," as perceived by our new prophetess, and is luminosity itself:

"Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads *a dam*, or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something fluid, or mortal mind mixed in solution, of the darkness which seemed to appear when darkness was upon the face of the deep and matter stood as opposed to Spirit, as that

¹*Rem. of Class Room, p. 5.*

²*Science and Health.*

which was accursed. Jehovah declared the ground—matter or earth—accursed, and from this earth or matter sprang Adam, although God had blessed the earth for man's sake."

Now for one of her startling inferences :

"From this it follows that Adam was not the ideal man for whom the earth was blessed. The ideal man was revealed in due time, and known as Jesus the Christ." ¹

This is all we can gather from the new Word of God as to the creation of Adam. He sprang out of the earth somehow, notwithstanding God had blessed it for man's sake ; and the fact that Adam sprang out of the ground is proof positive that he was not the ideal man, the "man of God's creating."

But how came Man, the infinite idea of the infinite God, perfect, co-existent and co-eternal with God, to be associated with Adam, that embodied falsity? Whence came "mortal mind" and all its train of illusions, such as the dream of human personality, the five senses, and the rest? We have searched the pages of this new and only infallible revelation in vain for any answer to these questions. The only clue to her views we can find is in her scattered remarks upon man and mortals. In our common parlance, to which all educated and sane writers conform, these terms are synonymous. But she has invented a new tongue, which, so far as we can gather, is an entirely original method of spiritualizing, contradicting, dividing, allegorizing, or otherwise distorting plain Scripture, to make it bear some semblance of agreement with her doctrines. Hence, she must have a glossary, that the reader may understand passages in which she uses old words in a new sense. According to her vocabulary, Man stands for the spiritual man, the Idea of God, while the terms, mortal, mankind, and human, all stand for the illusory and transient phases of our life. Here is her account of "mortals :"

"Mortals will disappear, and immortals, or the children of God, will appear as the only and eternal verities of Man. Mortals are not fallen children of God. They never had a perfect state of being which may be regained.

¹*Science and Health.*

They were, from the beginning of human history, conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. Mortals are material falsities, . . . 'without hope and without God in the world,' . . . errors, made up of sin, sickness, and death, which must disappear, to give place to the facts that belong to immortal man."¹

Again: "Mortals have a very feeble and imperfect idea of the spiritual man and the infinite range of his thought. To him belongs eternal life. Never born and never dying, it is an impossibility for Being, under the government of eternal science, to fall from its high estate."

And still more specifically :

"Man represents God ; mankind represents the Adamic race, and is a human, not a Divine creation. . . : The senses represent Man as having untimely birth, and his death as irresistible, as if he were a weed growing apace, or a flower withered by the sun, or nipped by untimely frosts. But this is true only of mortals, not man. The Truth of Being is perennial."²

This is another conspicuous instance of her pantheistic teaching. The Scriptures, which represent man as being born and as destined to untimely death, etc., are wrong, because man is God. "The senses" give this testimony as to the race, but their testimony is false, because the Truth of Being, which is God, is perennial.

Man, then, we must understand, is not to be confounded with the Adamic race. The former is spiritual and perfect ; the latter is an embodied falsity, a mass of sin, sickness, and death. The former is never born and never dies, being co-existent and co-eternal with God ; the latter are brought forth in sin, and destined every one to pass through the "belief of death," to "disappear," and so "give place to the eternal verities which belong to man." And yet in all Mrs. Eddy has to say about the creation and the fall, she has not one plain word in accounting for the origin of "mortal sense," with all its train of woe. The fall she represents as a myth, and "mortal sense" is smuggled into her scheme, so far as the writer can find, without so much as a word of introduction.

We are now prepared to see that Mrs. Eddy is logically compelled to deny human accountability. The only sinner, observe, is the mortal ; but he is not the man. Moreover, sin

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Ibid.*

itself is not a fact in the universe, but an illusion, or false sense, which is destined to be lost or to disappear. This disappearance, or destruction of sin, is at once hell and heaven; since the destruction of sin is God's only method of either pardon or punishment, and the loss of the sense of sin restores the sinner to "harmony," which is heaven. Now, it is evident that no amount of argument, no repetitions, however multitudinous, of the text, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," can prevent such doctrines from effecting in those who accept them a complete deliverance from all the wholesome fears wrought by the old doctrine of human accountability, with its corollaries of future reward and retribution. No matter if Mrs. Eddy does insist that sin must inevitably produce suffering: what is the force of such orthodox statements, when accompanied by the invariable proviso that both the sin and the suffering are alike "errors," whose reality needs only to be denied in order to be destroyed?

But, lest her disciples should fail to follow her doctrines into their logical consequences, she enters against the doctrine of human accountability a most positive denial. She is even driven to adopt the threadbare arguments of infidelity, in order to give to the shadowy fancies of her crazy creed some semblance of reasonableness. Infidels have argued that God would not and could not make man capable of sin, and then damn him for sinning. She, in like manner, argues that this would be to perpetrate a "fraud on humanity." "In common justice," she cries, "we must admit that God will not punish man for doing what he created him capable of doing, and knew from the outset that he would do."¹ Just why she should go to the trouble of denying human accountability in such explicit terms, when she has already denied the reality of sin, and has made the loss of the soul consist in the loss of the sense of sin, we cannot imagine.

Her denial of human accountability accords well with her denial of human personality. She has defined man as an idea.

¹*Science and Health.*

It follows, necessarily, that if he is an idea, he is not a person. Further, if man is an infinite idea, as she contends, it follows that if he is a person, he must be an infinite person; and God being infinite, we would have two infinite persons. Mrs. Eddy holds to "a sweet and sacred sense of Man's unity with his Maker," and she cannot admit any view of human personality that would seem to contradict what she has already said of the Divine personality, of which, it will be remembered, she is so doubtful. In all her scattered remarks upon this question, her thought is muddy as the Tiber. She never anywhere gets away from the notion that personality, as commonly understood, means a personality that is confined within the body. Hence she rejects the idea of personality as applied to God, as being anthropomorphism, or "a humanization of deity." And since the race as a whole, cannot be confined within the limits of any particular body, she denies personality for the race. By a human personality we mean an individual human being, differentiated from his maker; conscious, intelligent, possessing moral agency, and, if sane, responsible for his conduct as a creature under divine law. And in connection with this idea of the human personality, as it exists in this life, we hold the doctrine of man's personal immortality. Death cannot destroy personality. The body dies but the soul, which is the personal man, lives on. Does Mrs. Eddy teach any such doctrine? On the contrary, she denies as explicitly as possible that human beings have individual souls. In answering the question, What are body and soul, she informs us oracularly that "identity is the reflection of spirit in the multifarious forms of this living Principle;" and that "Soul," which in her terminology, is but another name for the Divine Being, "is the Substance, Life, and Intelligence of Man." She has defined Man as that which has no separate Mind from God. To admit his real personality, as one "revolving in an orbit of his own," would be to admit that he is somehow so independent of his Maker as to have no relations with him whatever. More than one mind would mean, to her, more than one God,

since she defines God as Mind. Hence she solemnly waives aside the notion that man has a distinct personality, with oracular and sententious brevity :

“*Verily, I say unto you, God is All-in-All, and you can never be outside of his one-ness.*”

Elsewhere she seems to admit the fact of human personality as a real fact to be reckoned with in our mortal career. On page 8 of *Rudiments and Rules*, we read :

“*The human person is finite, and, therefore, I prefer to retain a proper sense of deity by using the phrase an individual God, rather than a personal God ; for there can be but one infinite individual Being, whom mortals have named God.*”

But in *Science and Health* she says we “run into error when we divide soul into souls, and multiply mind into minds.” So there is, after all, no such thing as a human personality. “Upon this stage of existence goes on the dance of mortal mind,” in which “mortal thoughts chase each other like snow-flakes ;”¹ but the “mortal thought of personality” is at variance with the “only true and scientific statement of personality.” Still again she tells us that “personality includes *more* than is implied by the term person as commonly used.”² What then? Without giving any very definite reply to this question, she informs us that Christ was crucified because his enemies were incensed by his “truly Christian and scientific statement of personality and Man’s relation to God.” From this we can only infer that the statement in question was our Lord’s answer to the high priest’s inquiry, “Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” *Man’s only true personality consists, then, in being, or in becoming, in precisely the same sense that Christ is, the Son of God.* If “the word Christ is not properly a synonym for Jesus,” and if Christ “expresses God’s spiritual and eternal idea,” which idea, as we have seen, is Man, does not this mean that man’s destiny,—the destiny, that is, of the whole race,—is to become all that Christ now is? “When his personality disappears, man is immortal.

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Ibid.*

Who can say what his personality becomes as the image and likeness of his maker."¹ Man, then, has a personality of some sort, which is destined to disappear and become something else,—just what, nobody can tell, unless it be Mrs. Eddy. But we are still in the dark. What does Mrs. Eddy mean by human personality in this life? In the absence of any clear definition by herself, perhaps the following from her pupil, Mr. Mason, may be accepted as a definition of human personality, according to Mrs. Eddy :

“The so-called material man is an incorporate belief of carnality, and the dissolution of the component parts or beliefs which constitute him we term death.”²

Man, if we are able to comprehend this mysterious doctrine, is a creature composed of a Divine idea or consciousness, which is common to all the individuals of the race, united to an innumerable number of “incorporate beliefs of carnality.” At death these incorporate beliefs, or personalities, will all disappear, and nothing else will be left but the impersonal, eternal idea which has existed from the beginning. Human personality, then, like all other facts of consciousness, as viewed in this peculiar system, is illusory and transient. Man is, in the distant future, to become identified with the Christ-Principle, and all the distinct personalities of whom the race was composed will have disappeared when the “man of God’s creating” shall have been revealed. Thus do we find the doctrine of human individuality and of personal immortality also distinctly denied.

But it may be asked, How does Mrs. Eddy reconcile her denial of personal immortality, etc., with the plain teachings of our Lord? He said, “Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” Mrs. Eddy’s interpretation of this passage, which was undeniably the product of her most careful study, is a striking instance of her facility in cutting Gordian knots of difficulty when they stand in the way of a

¹*Science and Health.*

²*The Seed*, April 1, 1890.

complete and unquestioning acceptance of her theories. She says:

"A careful study of the text shows that the word soul meant corporeal consciousness, and that the command was a warning to beware, not of Rome, Satan, or God, but of sin."

It was, indeed, then, a fearful warning, as appears from the following :

"In Science we learn that it is material sense, not Soul, which sins ; and it will be found that it is the sense of sin which is lost, and not man's sinful soul. When reading the Scriptures, the substitution of the word *sense* for soul, gives the exact meaning in a majority of cases."

"All sin is of the flesh," she has told us elsewhere ; "it cannot be spiritual." Flesh being matter is an unreality, and sin, being of the flesh, is an unreality ; and hence the salvation promised in Holy Writ, and for which Jesus seemed to die that it might be ours, is nothing but salvation from unrealities. "The real man cannot depart from holiness," nor can God, "by whom Man was evolved, engender the capacity or freedom to sin." True, there are sinners, but these are not, properly speaking, men. "Mortals are man's counterfeits . . . the children of the Wicked One, or one evil, which declares that man begins as a material embryo." Hence all men are sinners and mortals, and destined to pass ultimately through the gateway of Divine Science into the estate of real manhood. Till then, they are but counterfeits of humanity. A profound reason this, we may remark in passing, to convince us of our duty to ground the arms of our rebellion against Mrs. Eddy and her gospel of healing !

The denial of all commonly accepted doctrines as to the future life follows necessarily upon Mrs. Eddy's denial of human personality, and her view of the final destiny of the race. Already we have scented in her identification of Christ with Adam the unmistakable odor of Theosophy. The more one compares the teachings of Madame Blavatsky and other modern Buddhists with those of Mrs. Eddy, the more numerous will the resemblances between the two systems appear. That

Mrs. Eddy hurls her anathemas against theosophy, is a fact no more to be considered than her denial of Pantheism. The evidence is overwhelming, that many of the most prominent features of her theology are plagiarized from theosophical sources. It is surely not a matter of mere accidental coincidence that so many of the terms chosen by her and her followers as the symbols of the new thoughts with which they would fain revolutionize the current theology and philosophy of Christendom, are identical with those in which modern theosophy is set forth. "Divine Science" is but a translation of theosophy. In the Christ-Principle of Mrs. Eddy we recognize the "Christos Principle" of which Madame Blavatsky has somewhat to say; and both are agreed that this Christ-Principle incarnated itself in others before it was manifested in Jesus of Nazareth. In terming the Divine Being Substance, Principle, Life, Good, the Infinite, etc., Mrs. Eddy but follows in the wake of those who profess their belief in a "Universal Divine Principle, the root of all, from which all proceeds, and within which all shall be absorbed at the end of a great cycle of Being."¹ So also in teaching that all are destined to become identified with the Christ-Principle, is Mrs. Eddy in agreement with theosophists, who urge the "necessity of endeavoring to elevate oneself to the Christos or Buddhi state."² She has much to say about the illusions of mortal life, and if we turn to the pages of Madame Blavatsky, Wm. Q. Judge, Jerome A. Anderson and others, we can read to our heart's content about the "evanescent illusion" of objective and material nature. In her division of Man into "mortal sense," the Christ-Principle, and the Divine Mind or Ego, all of which she considers as possessed by each of us, we recognize a crude and bungling effort to appropriate the main ideas of the "higher trinity" of modern theosophy,—Manas, the Thinker, Buddhi, or the Christos Principle, and Atman, the Supreme Ego. To this last Madame Blavatsky gives the further names of the "Universal Life," the "One Self," and

¹ Madame Blavatsky : *Key to Theosophy*.

² *Ibid.*

the "Higher Self;" and he who finds such expressions after reading Mrs. Eddy's wandering dissertations will be led to suspect that he has seen them before; and certainly there is little difference between the "Higher Self" of theosophy and the "Ego" of Christian Scientism.

The same affinity shows itself in the animus of the two systems towards the doctrines of vicarious atonement, gracious pardon, and Divine sovereignty. We have seen how Mrs. Eddy sneers at "pinning one's faith to another's vicarious effort,"¹ and we find Madame Blavatsky repudiating the atonement, which, whether the vicarious actor be "God or man, is most revolting" to her, and also "most degrading to human dignity." Again, she pronounces that a dangerous doctrine which teaches that "no matter how enormous our crimes against the laws of God and of man, we have but to believe in the self-sacrifice of Jesus for the salvation of the mankind, and his blood will wash out every stain." As to pardon, says Mrs. Eddy, "mercy cancels the debt only when justice approves;"² and Madame Blavatsky remarks that one's innate sense of justice is perverted if taught that his sins will be forgiven because another man has been put to death for his sake. Mrs. Eddy goes out of her way to scout and repudiate "the old doctrine of foreordination;" Madame Blavatsky and her followers take pains to quote and condemn the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the madame herself roundly denounces election as a "cruel and idiotic doctrine which makes of God a senseless fiend."³ The writer confesses that as he has studied these new gospels his respect for Calvinism has increased in proportion to his acquaintance with its latest enemies. Still further, theosophists claim that Jesus was an adept, one of the "Elder Brothers of Humanity," a member of the "Great Lodge," and therefore entitled to our most profound reverence; while Mrs. Eddy, denying his divinity and his atonement with quite as much zeal as other heathen writers have

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Ibid.*

³*Key to Theosophy.*

done, nevertheless counts him worthy of all praise, because he was "the most *scientific* man that ever trod the globe!"

The affinity between Mrs. Eddy's system and modern theosophy, or, more correctly, ancient Buddhism, appears still more plainly in her teachings as to the future life. It is a fundamental notion of this popular form of heathenism that human beings are in a constant state of transition, and destined to continue so until finally absorbed into the Divine essence. We have seen how Christian Scientism teaches that mortals are all destined to "disappear," and man to become at last identified with the Christ-Principle. We observe in all its literature a studious avoidance of anything that looks like the doctrine that human personality, as we are conscious of it here, is to survive and characterize the eternal state of man. Nor do we find anything definite in the system touching heaven and hell, and the experiences of the soul in the future life. Heaven is harmony, and hell is discord, both here and hereafter,—so much, and no more, are we told concerning our future life. The explanation of all this significant silence and nebulous dogma is that Mrs. Eddy believes in re-birth and in the transmigration of souls! True, she does not tell it out plainly, but she does tell it nevertheless.

"Those who reach this transition called death, without having rightly improved the lessons of this primary school of mortal existence,—and still believe in matter's reality, pleasure and pain,—are not ready to understand immortality. Hence they awaken only to another sphere of experience and must pass through another probationary state, before it can be truly said of them, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord."¹ Again she says, "Man is not annihilated, nor does he lose his identity by passing through the belief called death. After this momentary belief passes, at the moment of death, from the erring mortal mind, man finds himself still in a conscious state of existence, and that he has but passed through an extreme moment of mortal fear to awake with thoughts and being *as material as before*."² Still again: "Spiritualization of thought is not attained by the death of the body but by conscious union with God. When we are on the same plane of conscious existence with those gone before, we shall be able to communicate with them and recognize them, and when we have done our work here well enough not to have to do it over again, that change increases all our joys and means of advancement."³

¹ *U. of G.*

² *Science and Health.*

³ *Ibid.*

The Buddhism of these extracts is plain. Theosophical writers have much to say about "planes of being" and "planes of consciousness," and it is a favorite doctrine of theirs that in the future life we will be able to recognize and hold intercourse with none but those who are on the same "astral plane" as we ourselves. In the extract just quoted we have observed the same doctrine. But some Buddhists believe that men may be re-born as apes or peacocks. Mrs. Eddy seems to be in doubt upon this point. She only ventures to hint that unless we accept her gospel there is danger of our being doomed to a second experience of material existence. And where, pray, shall we do our work, if doomed to do it over again, unless the effort be repeated in this world? Has she not taught us that Jesus failed as Adam, and so had to be re-incarnated? And again, if we may be doomed to a second experience of mortal existence, why not, if unfaithful, to a third and a fourth? Why not, also, be in danger of sinking to the plane of bestial life? For these questions our oracle has no answers. Having taught the general principle, she leaves her pupils to work out such applications as may be suggested by the hardihood of their faith.

Mrs. Eddy is silent touching the rapture, the song, and the exalted praise and holy service of the heavenly state. Madame Blavatsky speaks out plainly: "What between truncated angels, brass trumpets, golden harps, and material hell-fires, the Christian heaven seems like a fairy scene at a Christmas pantomime." Mrs. Eddy is less candid and more politic. She does not denounce orthodox teaching and contradict the Scriptures on these points as she does on so many others, but she does not discuss particularly the question of the future life of the blessed. Why this silence touching the most precious hopes which the gospel brings to our fallen race? Evidently, because in her system immortality is the immortality of God himself, and nothing else. The hope of Christian Scientism is the hope of Buddhism, of Brahmanism, and of Pantheism. It is to be merged at last in the Divine essence,

and to have no being or consciousness distinct from God's. Such a hope seems to be flattering to our self-importance until it is examined in the light of calm reason, and then it is seen that it is not one whit better than blank atheism. It is but another form of the doctrine that death is an eternal sleep. God himself, in any wise, knows us altogether, and Divine memory will register our fleeting life. If our human personality is at last to disappear or be merged into that of God, then it is as if death ushered us into eternal oblivion.

Lastly, in this comparison, we note that Christian Scientism resembles Buddhism in that it discounts the evidence of the material senses, and makes it the chief effort of human life to escape from their imperious rule. The differences between them are differences of terms, and even these, as we have seen, are only apparent and superficial. Both agree that the misery of the world is due to discord between the soul and its fleshly environment. Mrs. Eddy bids her followers discredit the testimony of the senses, and thus attain the "consciousness of oneness with God." Buddhism teaches that through the destruction of the senses we may attain nirvana, or complete peace, which is entire and final unconsciousness. In the Hindoo fakir, lying on his back in the scorching sunshine of a tropical summer, his face plastered with mud, in which he has sown seeds which must germinate before his painful vigil ends, or standing on a post for days and years together in constant effort to silence the voice of his rebellious senses, we see a spiritual kinsman of Mrs. Eddy and her followers. The latter teach that the way to harmony, which is their term for *nirvana*, is the destruction of our senses by the denial of their testimony to the reality of the external world and the facts of our conscious experience. Both are aiming at the destruction of sin and misery through the extinction of all passion and sensibility, and both look forward to a state in which all material "illusions" will have passed away forever.

Compare the following passages. The first two are from Buddhistic authorities. One is quoted by Dr. DuBose, in his

masterly work on the three religions of China, and describes the famous meditation of Buddha under the Bodhi tree :

“He forced his mind as the night wore on to a strict sequence of thought, and as morning dawned the light he so long sought broke upon him, and he reached the goal of absolute intelligence ; freed from the bondage of sense, perception and self, he has *broken with the material* world, and lives in eternity.”

The second is from that favorite classic of theosophists, the *Bhagavad Ghita*, and describes the “indestructible path” entered by those who are “free from attachments,” and are “laboring for salvation :”

“He who closeth all the doors of his senses, imprisoneth his mind in his heart, fixeth his vital powers in his head, standing firm in meditation, repeating the monosyllable OM, and thus continues when he is quitting the body, goeth to the supreme goal.”

These two passages, observe, are from recognized heathen writers. The third passage I quote is from Mrs. Eddy, who claims to be an entirely original Christian :

“Detach sense from the body, or matter, which is only a form of human belief, and you may learn the meaning of God, or Good, and the nature of the immutable and immortal. *Breaking away from the mutations of time and sense*, . . . fixing your gaze upon the realities supernal, you may rise to the spiritual consciousness of Being, even as the bird which has burst the egg, and preens its wings for a skyward flight.”

This passage reminds us, also, of a passage in the sixth chapter of the *Bhagavad Ghita*, in which Krishna advises that for the soul’s purification one should

“Practice meditation with his mind fixed on one point, the modifications of the thinking principle controlled, and the action of the senses and organs restrained. Keeping his body, head and neck firm and erect, with mind determined, and gaze directed to the tip of his nose, without looking in any direction, with heart at peace and free from fear, the Yogee should remain, . . . his thoughts controlled, and heart fixed on me. The devotee of controlled mind, who thus always bringeth his heart to rest in the Supreme, reacheth that tranquility, the supreme assimilation with me.”

By “the spiritual consciousness of Being,” it is plain Mrs. Eddy means just what the Buddhist does by “absolute intelligence,” “tranquility,” and “assimilation” with Krishna, which

latter is one of the names of the "Christos Principle" of theosophy; and by "breaking away from the mutations of time and sense," she means just what the Buddhist does by becoming "freed from the bondage of sense, perception and self." In order to do either, we must act upon the Buddhistic plan, shutting the door and silencing the voice of the senses, and so "breaking with the material world."

No ingenuity of forced exposition, and no argument, however plausible, can convince any rational soul that all this heathenism is in accord with the teachings of Christ. The labored efforts made by Mrs. Eddy and her tribe to reconcile their borrowed philosophy with the plain and unequivocal statements of Holy Writ,—which reconciliation need not trouble them at all, since, as we have seen, they do not regard the Scriptures as "in any special sense inspired,"—are only useful in blunting the sense of shock which the neophyte must inevitably experience in becoming acquainted with the high doctrines of the new revelation. Christian Scientists claim to be Christian, and profess reverence for that Revelation without which there would be no Christianity in the world; but after the first few lessons are learned, and the beginner is able to subscribe the doctrine that God is all, and that matter and sin are unrealities, the road to "harmony" is plain, and all pretense of loyalty to Christ may be dropped.

The doctrine of personal devils and of personal angels, Mrs. Eddy waives aside without ceremony and without explanation. She cannot, of course, admit that there is any other personal being in the Universe when she has refused to allow us to think of men as persons. Accordingly, she informs us that our angels are "God's impartations to man,—not *messengers*, or persons, but *messages* of the true idea of divinity, . . . upward soaring thoughts." This is conclusive, and not to be denied. As to devils, she gets rid of the whole dark hierarchy of hell by the simplest possible operation. She merely decapitates the words that stand for them, and Satan, the Devil, becomes abstract *evil*, while his fellow-angels of darkness become

evils. Christian Science thus delivers its followers from all necessity of taking precautions against Satan's devices, not only depriving Beelzebub of "a local habitation and a name," but annihilating him altogether.

We will conclude this examination by noticing briefly Mrs. Eddy's teaching in regard to the sacraments and prayer.

Obviously, in a system which has for its supreme tenet the unreality of the external world, there is no room for any sacraments in which material symbols are used. Water, if used in baptism, and bread and wine, if used in the eucharist, would tend of themselves to upset the whole system by keeping alive some faith in a material world. Hence Mrs. Eddy's definition of baptism is "purification from error," and "submergence in Truth," both of which are accomplished by accepting her doctrines. As to baptism, she quotes 2 Cor. v. : 8, as intimating, also, that the only baptism which she believes in is assimilation with the Universal Life. So, also, as to the Lord's Supper. Her "eucharist is spiritual communion with the one God;" her Bread, which "cometh down from heaven," is Truth. Her "cup is the cross," her wine the "inspiration of Love,—the draught our Master drank, and commended to his followers." ¹

Of prayer, as understood by Christians generally, there can be none in any system which regards man's mentality as an emanation from God, and destined to be absorbed into its source. Madame Blavatsky, speaking for theosophists, is perfectly candid. "Being well-occupied persons, we can hardly afford," she tells us, "to lose time in addressing verbal prayers to a pure abstraction. . . . We cannot pray to the Absolute . . . therefore we try to replace fruitless and useless prayer by meritorious and good-producing actions."² With this view Mrs. Eddy is in perfect accord. The doctrine of pardon, which, as we have already seen, is discarded by her, is vitally connected with the duty of prayer. That God does, upon certain conditions, pardon sin in answer to prayer, has been in all ages a

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Key to Theosophy.*

cardinal doctrine of the church. It is one of the chief particulars which differentiates the religion of Christ from Buddhism. The Buddhist, aside from the difficulty of addressing prayers to a pure abstraction, does not believe in pardon. He recognizes his subjection to the law of an inexorable karma, or retribution, which visits upon the soul in its present state of existence the consequences of all sins committed in a former, and will visit upon it in its future life the results of sins unexpiated by the sufferings of this. Did he believe in a personal God, he could not, if he would, change this law of karma, through which the Divine justice operates in every age, and upon every plane of existence. His only plan of salvation is to extinguish his passions and desires, and, by avoiding new sins, to exhaust the accumulated karma of his past lives, and so at last to enter *nirvana*. And Mrs. Eddy's doctrine is the same.

"The destruction of sin," she affirms, "is the divine method of pardon. Divine life destroys death, truth destroys error, love destroys hate. Being destroyed, sin needs no other form of forgiveness. Does not God's pardon, destroying any one sin, prophesy and involve the destruction of all sin?"¹

It is not "scientific" to believe that God discriminates between the objects of his mercy. If he saves one soul, he must save all. In the same strain, Mr. Mason declares, quoting "our Teacher,"

That "by the destruction of sin, every one must at some time be freed from it. . . . Man can never be lost, nor can he ever cease to exist. But if he is a wilful sinner he will suffer until the chastening or natural result of the broken law has become so severe that he will seek the repose and happiness of right doing."²

From which, it must be evident that there is little room for prayer in the system of Christian Scientism.

Hence it follows that in their system prayer is nothing but an egoistic meditation, resembling a Buddhistic formula, without petition or thanksgiving. "The Infinite cannot do less than bestow all good, since he is unchanging wisdom and

¹*Science and Health.*

²*Seed.*

love," declares Pope Mary; and this being so, she hesitates to approve any definite requests in prayer. True, our petitions may have some subjective effect. The broadest of Christians will admit so much. But we must not imagine that God is in any wise affected by our prayers. "We can perhaps do more for ourselves by our petitions; but the All-Perfect does not grant them simply on the ground of lip-service"—the opposite, of course, being the orthodox doctrine in the premises. Our Lord commended importunity in prayer. But Mrs. Eddy is wiser than he.

"Goodness alone reaches the demonstration of truth," she says. "The habit of pleading with the Divine Mind, as one pleads with a human being, perpetuates the belief in God as humanly circumscribed,—an error which impedes spiritual growth."

Here is the wisdom of the serpent. By inducing her followers to surrender the habit of asking God for needed grace, she will succeed in cutting up all rational faith by the roots. So long as they continue to repeat such humble ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving as God's saints in all ages have been wont to use, they will be proof against her vague doctrines in regard to the conglomerate abstractions which she would fain substitute for the God and Savior revealed in the Word of truth. She proceeds, therefore, to argue against prayer with as much cogency of logic as a Voltaire or a Tom Payne ever exhibited.

"God is Love. Can we ask Him to be more? God is Intelligence. Can we inform the Infinite Mind, or tell him anything he does not comprehend? Do we hope to change perfection? Shall we plead for more at the open fount, which always pours forth more than we receive? Does spoken prayer bring us nearer the source of all existence and blessedness?"

Of course not, we are to understand. This would be but asking God to be God, and would therefore be but a vain repetition. It would be to "stand before the blackboard and ask the principle of mathematics to work out the problem." It is not a sensible thing to do, this thing of pleading for pardon and asking a liberal outpouring of benefactions. "It is only

necessary to avail ourselves of God's rule, in order to receive a blessing."

True prayer, according to this new reformer, is "the habitual struggle to be good." To enter into our closet, means to enter "the sanctuary of Spirit, whose door shuts out sinful sense, but opens to Truth, Life, and Love." There can be no real prayer in the spiritual exercises of those who refuse to obey the new gospel. They deliberately refuse to enter into their closets! Moreover, the world at large is making a grave mistake in uttering audible prayers. In order to pray aright, we must "close the lips and silence the material senses." This was a part of the matter which the poor carpenter of Nazareth did not know enough to explain. But Mrs. Eddy, having quenched her soul's thirst by studying Buddhism, has a "Master thought" which makes her wiser than the ancients. In the simplicity of his mind, Jesus approved audible prayers, himself prayed aloud, and gave to his disciples a form of prayer. But, says Mrs. Eddy, while "audible prayer is impressive," and "gives momentary solemnity and elevation to thought," it cannot produce "any lasting benefit," its motives embracing "too much error to greatly forward Christian sentiment." Here, also, is evident the Satanic method in her madness. She sees that if any man or woman prays as Jesus taught his disciples to pray, such a person will not be likely to heed her teachings. Hence she urges gravely that such prayer "gives occasion for reaction unfavorable to spiritual growth,"—*i. e.*, for advancement in her way of thinking,—and "militates against sober resolve, and a wholesome perception of God's requirements." Such "wholesome perception" must, of necessity, include the conviction that our chief duty is to take *Science and Health* as the only rule of our faith and practice. And having argued against prayer in such fashion, she indulges in a little mild ridicule of orthodox prayer. She hints that it is usually a self-satisfied ventilation of fervent sentiments, and declares that it makes us hypocrites and leads us into temptation, etc.

Much that she says about prayer is true and just, and were it not in an essay against all real prayer, would serve some good purpose. But prayer that is not petition is not prayer at all. It may be praise or thanksgiving, both of which are required and are indispensable; but it is not prayer. Our Lord himself defines it as asking, and whenever sinful man ceases to ask, he will cease to receive the grace he needs. No amount of sentimental desire and devout meditation can avail to substitute this duty. It is a primary law of the spiritual kingdom: "Ask and ye shall receive."

How Mrs. Eddy would have us pray, we may understand from her new version of the Lord's prayer, which is perhaps the most successful of all her efforts to translate the Scriptures into the "new tongue" of Christian Science:

Our Father who art in heaven,

Our Father and Mother God, all-harmonious,

Hallowed be Thy name,

Adorable One,

Thy kingdom come.

Ever just and omnipotent.

Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Thy supremacy appears as matter disappears.

Give us this day our daily bread;

Thou fillest our famished affections;

And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.

And love is reflected in love.

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil;

*And leavest us not in temptation, but freest us from sin,
sickness and death;*

For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

For Thou art all Substance, Life, Truth and Love forever. So be it.

This italicized version is a "scientific" prayer. It eliminates the heaven of ignorant Christian faith, and gives us instead the disappearance of matter. Instead of asking deliv-

erance from all evil and all temptation, it acknowledges actual deliverance, not only from temptation and from evil, but also from sin, sickness and death ; and instead of ascribing to God sovereignty over the universe, it pronounces him to be the sum total of all the life, substance, truth, and love in the universe forever. It is no longer a prayer, but a creed, and such a creed as no intelligent and sane Christian can ever accept.

Christian Science is a science which is based not upon facts, but upon irrational assumptions ; a religion which reduces God to an abstraction, and makes rational worship an impossibility ; a Christianity which, after dishonoring Christ by every possible denial of his word, presents him to us a Savior who disappeared eighteen hundred years ago, never more to reappear among men. It is, in fine, a philosophy without reason, a theology without a God, a faith without a hope, a religion without worship, and a Christianity without a Christ.

Graham, N. C.

WM. P. MCCORKLE.

III. THE PERSONAL CHRIST, THE GOSPEL FOR OUR TIME.

From the spiritual side of our age it stands confessed an age of scepticism. The testimony of others and the observation of each one of us affirms that there is a profound and wide-spread unsettlement of soul in regard to the fundamental truths of religion, and also in regard to the nature and existence of the so-called spiritual faculties by which alone these truths can be perceived. The manifestation of this doubt takes the form of uncertainty rather than of positive denial ; of general scepticism rather than of specific infidelity. It not only challenges particular doctrines, such as the Being of God, the inspiration of the Bible, the possibility of a future life, the future punishment of the wicked : but it presents itself everywhere, asking for a reason in the shape of a scientific demonstration. The answers which have been given to these, the most difficult problems of man's inner life, are declared to be unsatisfactory, and without foundation. It is claimed that all of these and kindred questions remain unsolved.

The doubting spirit of to-day is severe but not bitter ; restless but not frivolous. It is not that spirit of mocking atheism such as Bishop Butler described at the close of the last century, which led people of discernment to set up religion "as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule," but the unbelieving spirit of our day takes itself very seriously ; it is also keenly intellectual, nobly artistic, and splendidly humane. Many of its advocates take high rank in science ; they are unsurpassed in literature ; are numbered among the most astute and painstaking politicians, and sometimes claim to possess the highest culture of the religious school with which they are associated. Modern thought, whether expressed in terms of science, or general literature, or even in much that claims the name of religious, supports this indictment. Physical science, with purblind infatuation, refusing to recognize

the fact that there are different kinds of truth, and different faculties and methods of pursuit, claims to tread the foot-prints of the Creator, examines minutely his handiwork, and finds no trace nor suggestion of so-called spiritual phenomena. "The world," it is claimed, "is made up of atoms and ether, and there is no room for ghosts." The spirit of this school tacitly divides all beliefs which are held among men into two classes: Those which are supported by scientific proofs, and these must be accepted; and those which are not thus supported, and these must either be rejected or may safely and properly be disregarded as matters of no consequence. Moreover, current literature is saturated with this religious uncertainty. There is, of course, a strong religious current in the literature of to-day. But in much of it, and in some that is quasi-religious, there is hardly any definite religious belief. Some authors have taken the rich colors of Biblical thought and Biblical characters and used them to paint forms of other than the Christ,—forms sometimes as shadowy and indefinite as the shapeless shapes of Milton's fancy. Others again have evoked magical and charming forms to float above an abyss of disenchantment and nothingness.

To illustrate, I refer to the lay sermons and essays of Huxley and Tyndall, where scepticism appears militant and trenchant. I have only to hint at the fragmentary but majestic life philosophies of Carlyle and Emerson. Over Carlyle hangs forever the shadow of a moody tempest, full of darkness and tumult and muttering thunder; over Emerson the spirit of imaginative scepticism floats like a cumulus of evening vapors, luminous and beautiful, alluringly transfigured,

"In the golden lightning
Of the sunken sun."

I have but to recall the scepticism at once inimical, idealistic and dogmatic which pervades the vivid and picturesque studies of Renan and Froude. I need only refer to the penetrative and intelligent critiques of Scherer and Morley, where it adheres

with proud but illogical persistence to the ethical consequences of the faith with which logic has broken.

The scepticism of our literature is perhaps more insidious in the form of the modern novel. Even a superficial acquaintance with such writers as Zola and Thomas Hardy,—representing unflinchingly the school of Naturalism,—will evidence how in them scepticism speaks with a harsh and menacing accent of the emptiness of all life and the futility of all endeavor. In the psychological romances of George Elliot and Mrs. Humphrey Ward, it holds the mirror up to human nature to disclose a face darkened with inconsolable regret for lost dreams. Current fiction in its more superficial form, betrays its scepticism by a serene, unconscious disregard of the part which religion plays in real life. In how many of the lighter novels of the day do we find any recognition, even between the lines, of the influence which the idea of God or its absence, the practice of prayer or its neglect, actually exercise upon the character and conduct of men?

In the poetry of to-day we again hear the voice of this scepticism, and hear it clearly. As another says, "Listen to the sonorous chantings as they come from France, and we hear either the celebrations of the unknown and mighty tyrant who agitates them endlessly for his own amusement, or else the sounding of the delicate lyrics that sing of defeat in life, and man's thirst for annihilation." If we turn to our English tongue, we hear Matthew Arnold, with cool, sad, melodious tones, confessing,—

"Forgive me, Masters of the mind,
 At whose behest I long ago
 So much unlearned, so much resigned—
 I come not here to be your foe ;
 I seek these anchorites not in ruth,
 To curse and to deny your truth ;—
 Not as their friend, or child, I speak,
 But as on some far northern strand,
 Thinking of his own gods, a Greek,
 In pity and mournful awe might stand
 Before a fallen Runic Stone,—
 For both were faiths, and both are gone."

Only a poetic song, you say : Yes, only a poet's song, but how many souls to-day are feeling the same vague sadness, as, standing by the fair shrines of immortal desire and aspiration and of a traditional faith, they see the ancient land-marks disappearing in the onward waves, silently creeping or surging with sombre music out of the vast deep of doubt,—

“The unplumbed, salt, estranging Sea.”

But possibly the most serious form of current unbelief is that found in our *Christian Congregations*. I refer to the spirit of criticism abroad in the church. A criticism which undertakes to review and revise the integrity, the authenticity, the literary features and the credibility of the sacred writings. I come not here with the proud boast of “expert” in these matters. I confess that in my limited study in this field, I have become confused. Prof. Edwin Bissle speaks for me, touching the whole subject. He says: “We have seen one scheme of the origin and structure of Genesis and its companion books give place in quick succession to another, until it would seem the very limit of possible combinations had been reached,” and we are left in confusion amid the wrangling of the schools. I believe that in spite of my tender and jealous regard for my mother's Bible, I would not impose an unreasonable restriction upon the reverent and scholarly investigation of its every claim. Nevertheless, I am troubled at the iconoclastic spirit of that class of critics which comprehensively we call the Destructive School. “That school which challenges the gem of a plenary inspiration set in the crown of scripture, which avows that the pentateuch as we have it is simply a five-fold imposition, a neatly written composite of mingled cleverness and fraud. That school which leaves us nothing of patriarchal history except some floating myths ; nothing of Mosaic history, except some scattered debris borne downward on the heaving waters of a beclouded tide ; of the Old Testament properly speaking, practically nothing. A criticism which readjusts the whole idea of the ancient sacrifice on a

different plane, and proposes for it a totally different aim. A criticism which altogether leaves the history of redemption without an orderly beginning and without a sufficient end. A criticism which, denying the one fitting consummation of the national life and religion of Israel to be Jesus, the Christ, of the seed of David, whose day Abraham saw and was glad, and declares the intention of the whole thing was a prophecy of the political catastrophe which overtook the Jewish state seventy years after our era began." And what is the influence of such leaven as this among the people? Is it not true the masses of men are being affected with the spirit of these teachings? As a result, do not we on every hand encounter uncertainty of view, restlessness of spirit, and impatience with the old doctrines and the old applications of the principles of the word of God? I very greatly fear that in the minds of many representative people of our congregations the Scriptures are no longer regarded as "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The conviction of some of them, plainly stated, is that the doctrines of these Scriptures, both of the New Testament and the Old, are but the imperfect utterances of half-taught enthusiasts, and their application is not to be taken seriously; or else they were intended only for local application in point of time and people, and so need not,—nay, must not, fetter us in the larger liberty and boasted humanitarianism of our time. With unflinching hand we may now lay hold of the Ark of God without fear of judgment.

If these things are true, then it cannot seem strange that the historical creeds of the church should suffer. It *is* true, and no intelligent man will deny it, these venerable symbols are in many minds almost contemptuously regarded. To some they are nothing better than magnificent mausoleums, in which are enshrined the genius of their authors; to others they are only the imperfect utterances of the mind of the church in the days before her swaddling clothes were taken away, and her infancy gave place to intellectual manhood. Amid all this confusion and destruction, let us not forget the further and

significant fact that there has not yet arisen a constructive genius capable of building the torn down and scattered stones of truth into a temple sufficiently unique to suit the tastes of his contemporaries.

Unquestionably, our age stands in doubt ; such is its spiritual character. And so ominous is it that some pious minds find therein the fulfilment of the Apostle's prediction that "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived ;" or again, "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils."

In the face of all this, which I have sadly enough confessed, are there no symptoms which seem to promise better things? I believe there are. I incline to look upon "the sunnier side of doubt." In brief order I will submit some of the signs which seem to me to promise us a better state of things.

Strangely enough it may seem, I find my first hopeful sign in the general, yea, the universal sadness of our time. We have seen how deep and widespread is the wave of scepticism : I raise the question,—What is the result of all this unbelief? Are men happy because of it? Nay, there is acknowledged discontent and pain everywhere. Says an observant student of the times, "Never, I believe, have men been more universally sad than in the present hour." For the most part, modern doubt shows a sad and pain-drawn face, heavy with grief and dark with apprehension. The pessimism which goes hand in hand with scepticism is a cry of suffering.

But conscious and exquisite pain is not only a warning of disease, but a sign of life as well. If despair is settling like a storm cloud in the night over the souls of men, "why despair, unless, indeed, because man in his very nature and inmost essence is framed for an immortal hope." As Van Dyke¹ de-

¹In the preparation of this paper, I am greatly indebted to "The Yale Lectures on Preaching for 1896," by Rev. Henry Van Dyke, D. D., of the Brick Church, New York City, and now published by The Macmillan Company in book form under the title, *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt*.—J. T. P.

clares, "No other creature is filled with disgust and anger by mere recognition of its own environment and the realization of its own destiny. This strange issue of a purely physical evolution in a profound revolt against itself is incredibly miraculous. Can a vast universe of atoms and ether, unfolding out of darkness into darkness, produce at some point in its progress, and that point apparently the highest, a feeling of disappointment with its partially discovered processes and resentful grief at its dimly foreseen ends?" There are but two solutions which really face the facts. One is the black unspeakable creed, that the source of all things is an unknown, mocking, malignant power, whose last and most cruel jest is the misery of disenchanting man. The other is the hopeful creed that the very pain which man suffers when his spiritual nature is denied, is proof that it exists, and is part of the discipline by which a loving God would lead man to himself. Let the world judge which is the more reasonable faith; for my part, I will cling to the creed of hope; and see in the shadow that doubt casts the evidence of a light behind it.

I find a second hopeful sign in the fact that many of the finest minds are to-day recoiling from the voice of absolute scepticism. In his book, *The Return to Faith*, Prof. A. C. Armstrong, Jr., one of the most cautious students of philosophy, has noted with care the indications that "the day of doubt is drawing to a close." Such a statesman as Signor Crispi does not hesitate to cut loose from his former atheistic connections and declare that "the belief in God is the fundamental basis of the healthy life of the people, while atheism puts in it the germ of irreparable decay." Mr. Benjamin Kidd, a noted sociologist of England, assures us that "since man became a social creature, the development of his intellectual character has become subordinate to the development of his religious character," and concludes "that religion affords the only permanent sanction for progress." Romanes, the famous biologist, who once professed the most absolute rejection of revealed, and the most unqualified scepticism of natural reli-

gion, thinks his way soberly back from the painful void to a position where he confesses that "it is reasonable to be a Christian believer," and dies in the full communion of the church of Jesus.

All along the line we see men who once thought it necessary, desirable, to abandon forever the soul's abode of faith in the unseen, returning by many and devious ways from the far country of doubt, driven by homesickness and hunger to seek some path which shall at least bring them in sight of the Father's house.

In the same connection, we must not overlook a third fact,—as an able writer points it out to us,—viz: the sublime contradiction between the unhappy view of man "as the hero of a lamentable drama," and the doctrine that it is his supreme duty to sacrifice himself for the good of humanity. "How," inquires he, "shall we explain the splendid courage and patience of the ethical instinct of mankind, without the foundation stone of faith in God and man's responsibility to him?" How strangely contradictory for men to love truth and justice and moral enthusiasm, and at the same time suspect that themselves are the products of a nature which is blind and dumb and heartless. "Never have the obligations of self-restraint, and helpfulness, and equity, and universal brotherhood been preached more fervently than by some of the English Agnostics," and I might add, by some of our American Agnostics as well.

A fourth ground of hope for the future lies in the teaching which comes from the history of the formulation of our Christian faith. Let it not be forgotten that Theology in every department of it is the outcome of agitation and conflict, not passive inactivity. In his *Cure of Souls*, Ian MacLaren says truthfully, "The history of doctrine is rather in the way of a series of circles than of a straight line, each circle as a rule having its four segments. There is the predoctrinal period, when truth is held in solution, we may almost say sentimentally, before it has crystalized. The Christian simply believes

in Christ, lives with him, learns from him, loves him, follows him to death, and yet the church has not formulated her creed. Then comes a period, when, under pressure of speculation or the attack of unbelief, the church pauses in the current of her emotions and inquires what she believes. Slowly and painfully, with fierce intellectual tumult and often disgraceful commotions, the church discovers her mind, and formulates her doctrine. This period has been succeeded by the age of scholasticism, a period characterized by unexpected applications, hair-splitting distinctions; cold metaphysical discussions take the place of truth flowing molten from hearts fired with divine love. Then comes reversion, when the church, weary of the heartlessness of refined and icy forms, goes back to her first love, and in confusion and grief, assumes again Peter's position and exclaims, 'Lord, unto whom can we go but unto thee? Thou hast the words of everlasting life.' " Some observant minds believe the church is upon the eve of this last period, reverting to simple, adoring adherence to the Person, the work, and authority of her divine Master and his apostles. I cannot agree that this will prove a loss, nay, it will prove an inestimable gain; but before it comes the battle must be fought, and the Lord must "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."

These several signs, if accounted no more than riftings in the cloud, are yet reassuring. But for the consummation of their promise there must be some sure method. The supreme question of the hour, back of and more fundamental than any political or social economy, is, What Gospel shall be preached that will have in it the certain power to dispel the unbelief and lift the shadow from the souls of men?

In looking for such a gospel, how hoarsely does the pessimistic doctrine of Max Nordau grate upon us, as in his curious book, *Degeneration*, he tells us that there is no cure but in social and individual degeneration. Says he, "We have become a race of degenerates." The trouble with us and our time is not a loss of faith, but a fatal increase of nervous irritability produced by the strain of an intricate civilization.

What is the cure? Why, he says bluntly, "there is no cure." The malady must run its course; and the only palliation for it will be found in an invincible aversion to progress. In other words, the world's unbelief and all its ills must be healed by a universal and voluntary relapse into a peaceful and contented barbarism. Surely such a prescription is not inviting to the palate, nor does it furnish prospect for bettering the patient.

At the opposite extreme of opinion, we hear the optimistic voice of science claiming that speedily she will provide the antidote for all scepticism and despair. New discoveries will be made, new arguments will be constructed, and these together will supersede the necessity for faith, because they will furnish demonstration. For one, I do not depreciate the march of science, nor am I disposed to circumscribe a limit to its future advancement, nor to measure the degree of its possible ministry to the well-being of man. In this, as in other views of it, I believe we live

"In an age on ages telling."

But it seems improbable that science is about to make any such advance as is claimed either in methods or results. Conservative leaders among scientists admit this, and warn us that there are "limitations in the nature of the universe which must circumscribe the achievements of speculative research." Besides this, it may as well be admitted now as any time later that all knowledge is not thought knowledge, there is faith knowledge as well; all truth is not speculative truth, some truths are experimental.

In the field of spiritual phenomena, it is not and can never be possible for pure science to solve the deep problems which now and hereafter shall invite investigation. Men will see with clearer and clearer vision, not only this, but they will see further that different kinds of facts and different faculties and different methods must be employed to answer the question in the different spheres of inquiry,—"What is Truth?"

Men will come to judge the claims of truth by the principles and faculties which legitimately apply to the kind of truth under investigation. The investigator will settle clearly and first of all the field of knowledge to which the subject of his proposed investigation belongs. If the subject to be considered is physical, he will collect his facts through his physical senses ; upon these he will experiment, analyzing them and then putting together the result of his physical experiments. If his facts are well chosen and exhaustive, his analysis thorough, his inductions complete, no man will dispute his principle. It will be accepted as established upon the incontrovertible basis of fact and reason. But if the subject proposed be moral, if it raise such questions as God, his moral character and his relations to man ; or if it be the question of human character and human responsibility ; or if it seek to inquire, "What after Death?" then it will be recognized that the facts here to be studied are not *physical*, but *spiritual*, and that not the physical senses but the spiritual faculties must direct the investigation and pronounce upon the issue. I do not believe it chimerical to hold that in the brighter future, towards which I trust we are drifting, men will cease to put the human soul and all that is involved in spiritual experience into their retorts as if they were bits of metal, and, because, forsooth, they cannot separate them into material elements, reject their claim as truth. Nor is it beyond my hope that theologians will cease to dogmatize in questions of pure science. Religion will come to know that Gallileo was truly a martyr for truth's sake ; and science will join in the ascription of praise to those who died by torture for the faith once delivered to the saints. Science shall not envy religion, and religion shall not vex science. Righteousness and science shall meet together, and all men will recognize them each as a distinct and demonstrable revelation, each exhibiting in its sphere and by its appropriate evidence the being and purpose of him who is Eternal Truth.

Another proposed gospel for the ills of our time is the gos-

pel of culture. The culturist says remove ignorance and you put an end to every evil. Advocates for culture as man's redemption seem to present themselves under a two-fold classification, those advocating scientific culture, of whom I mention Huxley as a type; and those advocating literary culture after the fashion of Mr. Matthew Arnold. Let us glance at the pretentious claims of this gospel as presented by these admitted champions. Mr. Huxley defines education as "in learning the laws of nature and training oneself to obey them." And within the laws of nature which we have to learn, he includes not only the physical laws but also those moral laws which govern man and his ways. This view of the conditions of our existence, Mr. Huxley sets forth under the striking figure of a game of chess. Education or culture with him is the learning of the rules of this mighty game. As the result of this learning, Mr. Huxley's ideally educated man will have his passions trained to obey a strong will; his will becomes the servant of a tender conscience; he will love beauty, hate vileness, and respect others as himself. I promptly admit there is much in all this worthy the claim of a high ideal education. There are serious objections to it, however; among others I mention that while it implies that life is a game of chess, and that while there is probably some power behind the phenomena of our experience, we have no means of ascertaining what the mind and character of that power is; or what purpose it has in creating and upholding this universe, if indeed it did create and does uphold it.

Another defect in the theory is its failure to make clear the origin of these virtues which persuade and enable us to choose the better part. For instance, when he tells us that "the ideal man is to respect others as himself," I submit if there is one fact in human experience more continuously displayed than that men do not respect the welfare of others. If experience teaches us anything, it is, that every man seeketh the things that make for his own, rather than those things which make for the welfare of others. Man is constitutionally selfish, and

lie cannot seek the welfare of others rather than his own except by being taken out of himself as his center of thought and feeling and desire, and finding a new center about which these energies centralize and from which they will draw inspiration. But Prof. Huxley's theory supplies no such new center. Again, he tells us that in the ideal man "a vigorous will is to be the servant of a tender conscience." But whence the conscience? Surely, in the light of human history and experience, it will not be claimed that a tender conscience, a true and quick sense of right, is born full formed in men. The elements of such a conscience may, indeed, lie in all men, but it requires long and careful training to bring them to maturity. Mr. Huxley has not told us what resources his theory supplies for maturing such a conscience. The fact, destructive and final of Mr. Huxley's theory, is, God in himself and God in his relation to man is altogether ignored. And let me say it solemnly, slowly, not as a dogma of theology, but as the expression of human life, that no theory which leaves God out of account is adequate to explain life's phenomena, and for this reason, every such theory will be ultimately rejected.

A different view of culture as a cure-all for human ills,—a view which may be called the literary or æsthetic view,—is presented us by Mr. Matthew Arnold. Let me hasten to state that whatever seems lacking in Prof. Huxley's theory, as leaving out of sight the spiritual needs of man, the same objection cannot be urged *in the same way* against Mr. Arnold's theory of culture. He fully recognizes religion as an element, and a very important one, in his theory. We do, however, promptly object to the relative place which he assigns religion in his system. With Mr. Arnold, "culture is the perfection of our human nature on all its sides and in all its capacities." First, it tries to determine in what this perfection consists, and in order to solve this question, it consults the manifold human experience that has expressed itself throughout science, poetry, philosophy, history, as well as through religion. As a conclusion, it places human perfection in an internal condition

of the soul, in the growth and predominance of our humanity proper, as distinguished from our animality.

The firm and uncompromising objection we raise to Mr. Arnold's theory by which he proposes to realize all this is, that religion, while recognized and admitted among the elements of culture, is yet regarded as only a subordinate division in the general distribution of a perfect culture. Says he, "Culture is an harmonious expansion of all the powers which make for the beauty and worth of human nature; culture goes beyond and means more than religion." Religion, according to Mr. Arnold, aims only at the cultivation of *some* of the powers of the soul; so it falls short of the many-sided, even-balanced, all-embracing totality of development which is the aim of the highest culture. Mr. Arnold graciously grants church organizations have done something. They have helped to subdue the grosser animalities, they have made life more orderly, moral, serious. But when we go further than this, and look at the standards of perfection which these religious organizations have held up, he finds them poor and miserable, starving more than half, and that the finest part of human nature. Turning to modern religious life, he inquires, contemptuously, "What do we find there? A life of jealousy of other churches, disputes, tea meetings, opening of chapels, sermons," and then he exclaims, "Think of this as an ideal of human life, completing itself on all sides, and aspiring with all its organs after sweetness, light, and perfection!" While recognizing the merits of Mr. Arnold's theory, I am profoundly impressed that it is unsatisfactory, and doomed to rejection. It will be rejected, because, first of all, there are some things which are either of first account or they are of none; things which are either an end in themselves, or they are nothing; and such I conceive religion is. It is either supreme, a good in itself and for its own sake, or it is no good at all. In every man there is the feeling, deep and abiding, that the first and greatest commandment must be so set before us as to be obeyed, entered into, *in and for itself*, or it cannot be obeyed at all.

Another thought showing the insufficiency of this theory, is, this so-called gospel would raise men by bringing them into contact and sympathy with whatever of best and greatest the past has produced. But is not a large portion of what is best in the literature and lives of past generations based on faith in God, and on the reality of communion with him as the first and chief good? Would this best any longer live and grow in men if you cut them off from direct access to its fountain head, and confined them to the results which it has produced in past ages? If, in brief, you made the object of the soul's contemplation, not God, but past humanity? If not, then are we of these latter days to be content with the communion of others, and not have direct access to God ourselves? To read and admire the high thoughts of à Kempis, Pascal, Leighton, and such men, and not to go on and drink for ourselves from the same living well-heads from which they drank. Arnold's theory brings us to the very threshold of man's inheritance, God, and then forbids our entrance. This will never satisfy.

And then again, while through all this literary culture there runs the oft repeated word "perfection," yet in estimating its value let it be remembered that this perfection is meant only for us *here and now*. When this is done what a mockery indeed does it become! Surely that was a higher and truer idea of perfection which Leighton had, when he wrote "It is an union with a Higher Good by love, that alone is endless perfection. The only sufficient object for man must be something that adds to and perfects his nature, to which he must be united in love; somewhat higher than himself; yea, the highest of all, the Father of Spirits. That alone completes a spirit and blesses it, to love him, the Spring of spirits." For such reasons, I am sure it may be predicted of this theory, "this too will pass away."

In the travail of a sympathetic pastor's heart, I have thought my way through the boastful claims of these pseudo-gospels; and as I measured their intrinsic ability to meet the wants of

my people, I have written over against them all, "Weighed in the balance and found wanting." The healing and the comforting of man to-day cannot come from such as these; it must come alone from the divinely simple and divinely true gospel of the Son of God. By the gospel of the Son of God, I mean the whole Word of God as it is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Herein *alone* have we the wisdom of God and the power of God not only to salvation, but to education and civilization as well. My conviction is profound that what this age needs is not argument about Christianity, not learned and elaborate defenses of its truth, not so much criticisms upon the received text—all these are serviceable in their place and when presented by men furnished and trained—but what our age as an age needs from us as preachers is the authoritative preaching by manly men of these Scriptures in their entirety and of these Scriptures *without admixture*. The sermon for our times is the simple, impassioned, uncompromising expression of a personal conviction of the truth revealed in these Scriptures; and spoken in a spirit that breathes forth love for all humanity and enjoins a service of practical righteousness.

But, if in a word I may be more specific, the pulpit that meets the want of to-day must preach a personal Christ, with a persistency and prominence hardly as yet achieved. This I say, because, as some German writer has expressed it, our age is one that "hungers for facts." This gospel of a personal Christ meets that hunger. It comes to an age benumbed with doubt, and says, *Here is a fact*, a personality, real and imperishable. It is not merely a doctrine, not a history only, but it is a some One who was born and who lived among men. We need not fear to do this, for the person of Jesus Christ stands solid in the history of men; all attempts to resolve him into a myth, a legend, an idea,—and many such attempts have been made,—have drifted over the enduring reality of his character and left not a rack behind. The fact abides that a real Christ appeared in the world and created Christianity. Moreover, our gospel

has in it the fact of Christ's personal force. The world is only moved by personality. "Truth," says one, "is mighty and must prevail, but it never does prevail actually until it gets itself embodied, incarnate in personality." Now, then, Christianity has its organization, and it has its doctrines too, but the force that gives power to the whole is Christ, whose personality gives vitality to the organization and reality to the doctrine. If as preachers we forget this, we shall be shorn of our power. I do not go beyond the truth in saying, that his own personality was the core of Christ's own ministry. He offered *Himself* to the world as the solution of its unbeliefs and its sorrows. His universal invitation was, "Come unto *Me* all ye that labour and *I* will give you rest." It was the same personal element that gave force to the Apostles and life to their Epistles. In the Acts and the Epistles this personal Christ is the all and the everything. The offices of the church, as set forth, are simply forms of service to him, as Master; the doctrines are simply the unfolding of what has been received from him, as Teacher; the worship is but the adoration of him, as Lord. As an elegant writer says, "The music of that name rang through all the temple of the church and to its harmonies her walls were builded. The acknowledgment of that name was the mark of Christian-discipleship. To confess that 'Jesus is the Christ' was the way to enter the Church, and from his personality proceeded every symbol and rite and work." The same thing is true as we follow that church down the current of her history. The inward, vitalizing, self-propagating power of Christianity as a religion has always come from the person of Jesus Christ, who stands at the center of it.

A third fact in our gospel, and one peculiarly adapting it to our materialistic age, is, that the influence of this personal Christ has always been to bring men to an immediate sense of spiritual things. All who came in contact with him while he was bodily in the world, felt that, in love, if they believed; in repulsion, if they refused to believe. In his presence, faith

in the invisible, in the soul, in the future life, in God, in every spiritual truth revived and unfolded with new bloom and color. And this faith did not grow out of doubting hearts by merely what Jesus said to men, but there was a something in *Himself*, an atmosphere surrounding him that made it necessary for them to believe. This effect has not vanished from the world with Christ's return to his Father.

Another fact testified to by the whole company of believers is, that this force which resides in the personal Christ goes beyond the single result of a vivid sense of the reality of the unseen, and carries with it a purifying, cleansing, delivering, uplifting and sanctifying effect. In other words, this personal Christ has always in the past and to-day gives evidence of a power to save men from the guilt, the power, the defilement, the consequences of sin. The publican and the harlot find in him somehow not alone that which is beautiful, but as they gaze upon his cross they experience a sense of profound change of moral relation, an unutterable relief; and a sweet quietude diffuses itself through all the recesses of their troubled hearts; they feel their sins forgiven and they are at peace with God and with themselves.

Now the only explanation of this strange and abiding power of Christ is that in him there is the incarnation of God; in his humanity Jesus is the unveiling of the Father to men. In the shining of his face men see the personality of God; in his cross they discover the righteousness of God; in his suffering they find assurance of the goodness of God; in his saving power they learn the purpose of God to reconcile the world unto himself; in his "delighting to suffer" they spell out the true meaning of filial obedience; in his resurrection they learn that those who sleep in him will God bring with him when he comes again. The only gospel which has in it the power to redeem our age from scepticism and lift it out of the veil of sadness, is the gospel which preaches this personal Christ, in all the fulness of his personal constitution; in all the majesty of his claims; in all the efficacy of his death; in all the

power of his resurrection ; in all the promise of joint heirship with him in glory. If then we are to prove efficient to our age and in our work, we must, first of all, deeply, experimentally, and vitally *ourselves know Him*, and the power of *His* death and resurrection ; and then preach *Him*, the hope of the World.

In conclusion, let us say over again, slowly and in faith, the ancient creed for the comfort and refreshing of our hope:

"We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only begotten of the Father, that is of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father ; by Whom all things were made which are in heaven and earth : Who for us men and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man, and suffered and rose the third day, and ascended into the heavens, and shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

Augusta, Ga.

J. T. PLUNKET.

IV. REVIVALS.

The word revival, when applied to religion, "is renewed interest in it, after indifference and decline," according to Mr. Webster. Mr. Finney says "it is the renewal of the first love of Christians, resulting in the awakening and conversion of sinners to God." It is plain therefore, from both these definitions, that a revival is possible only where there has been life, and where there has been a decline in it. A revival in the church "presupposes that it is sunk down into a backslidden state." It is the purpose of this paper to find if that is the condition of the church now, and if so, to ascertain, if possible, what is necessary to bring it back to its first love and devotion to its Lord and Master.

It is both significant, and, at the same time, a hopeful sign, that the ministry has become restless, in view of the condition of the churches. Significant, in that it argues that the church is in need of a revival, and hopeful that we are at the threshold of such an awakening, because one of the first conditions of a revival, is the discovery on the part of the leaders in the church that there is such a need. Not long since the pastors of the churches in the city of New York called for a day of prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit upon the churches in the metropolis, and the clergy throughout the land were urged to join in the prayer for such a baptism. It is also quite apparent that the same sentiment is held by the ministry throughout the whole country, from the sad lamentation which we hear on every hand over the condition of the churches and the indifference with which the unconverted treat religion.

One of the most painful manifestations of this depression in religion is the appalling lack of it in the home. It is a trite saying, but true nevertheless, "that the religious life of a community will not rise to a higher level than that which is found in the home," and it may be said with equal truth that many

of the evils of which we now justly complain, may be traced to this lack of religion in the home as their legitimate source. The demands which are now made on men and women, by business and society, are so imperative and exorbitant, that they claim with some show of reason that they have no time for the cultivation of the religious life of the family, and this lack of opportunity has gradually robbed them of what was once a strong inclination to do such service. Family worship, where the whole household gathers about the altar, and the word of God is reverently read, and thanksgiving is returned to him for protection during the day closing, and prayer for his protection during the night, and guidance in the coming day, seems now to be among the lost arts. Instead of this, children, as soon as they are born, are turned over to a nurse until they are of proper age to be put into school, and thenceforth they are left to the training of the teacher, whose convictions upon the subject of religion are very shallow indeed; and by the time the boy has grown to be a man and goes into business, and the girl has grown to be a woman and goes out into society, they are almost entirely without religious culture, and, what is worse, have lost their respect for religion. I do not believe that this is an overdrawn picture, but, from a somewhat careful study of the facts, it seems to me to exhibit the condition of things at the present time, and it is my deliberate conviction that we may bombard sin from our pulpits, and mourn over our failure to move it from its intrenchments, but until this evil, which is doing its deadly work at the vitals of the community, has been abolished, we may mourn in vain.

It is held also by many that the prayer-meeting is a spiritual test of the congregation—a sort of thermometer by which we determine its spiritual temper and devotion. If this is true, then we are forced to the admission that the spiritual life of our churches is alarmingly feeble. Some years ago the test was made in the city of St. Louis, as to the attendance at this service, and pastors of various churches were asked to count the number of people present on a specific evening, and when

this number was compared with the number of their enrolled membership, in not a single instance was it found that one-fifth of the enrolled membership was at the prayer-meeting on that evening, though it was most favorable for such attendance. In churches, with a membership of four and five hundred, it was found that the attendance at the prayer-meeting was not more than fifty and seventy-five.

When the church is aroused and interested in the salvation of men, and when men take delight in the communion and fellowship of the children of God, it is not a difficult thing to gather a large congregation, on any day of the week, for such communion.

Then the decline in religion is seen in the character of these midweek services, or in most of them. They are not in the strictest sense prayer-meetings at all, and might with propriety be called everywhere, as they are in some places, midweek lectures, for that is what they amount to. Dr. Parker has been the pastor of the City Temple Church in London for twenty-nine years, and an officer in his church told me last summer that he had not had a prayer-meeting for twenty-eight years. Instead of this, he preaches every Thursday at twelve o'clock, and when I was present, there was a large gathering of people, but however interesting such a service was, it was not a prayer-meeting, and could not take the place of the gathering of the people for prayer and the interchange of their experiences so as to be helpful to each other in the labors of life. It does not satisfy the case to say, that the need of such conference has passed, by reason of the fact that the people are in almost daily contact in business and society. This might be true, if, when they are so brought together, there should be an interchange of Christian experiences, but it is well known that this is the last thing to be mentioned.

Then the need of a revival is seen in the character of our public worship upon the Sabbath day. Much that is done at this service is, in my judgment, very far from that upon which the Lord can look with favor.

In the first place, much of the music is simply a *performance* to be judged rather from the artistic point of view than from the sentiment of the hymn, the character of the singer, or the fervor with which the hymn is sung. So it has become a serious question whether the pipe organ has been a blessing or a curse. It is not what the creation of this kind of instruments has made possible, but what it has actually brought into being. It has created the demand for a highly trained man or woman, whose services require the expenditure of large sums of money in a way which, to say the least, is somewhat questionable: and, then, this organist can not tolerate any thing but the most classical music, which must be sung by the most highly cultivated voices, and oftentimes without any regard whatever to the character of the singer. The people are, therefore, demanding now that they be furnished entertainment in the Lord's house. Instead of acknowledging their obligation to praise him in service of song, they seek to be delighted with some artistic musical performance, which considers little more than the display of the talent of the singer and the pleasure of the listeners. It seems to me that there is no disguising the fact that most of our people have lost sight of the truth that they are placed here to minister, not to be ministered unto, and the present character of our public service is adding strength to this sentiment, however much we may deprecate it. When we remonstrate with those who have the music in charge, we are told plainly that the people demand this, and that we can not afford to do otherwise, lest we lose our hold upon them; and so we have prostituted what was meant as a means of worship, into an attraction by which we hope to draw people to the house of God.

This same spirit is having its effects upon our preaching, say what we may about getting the key to it from the Master. It is a difficult thing for a man to rise above his environment. So the need for a revival is seen in the character of many of the sermons delivered, or reported to have been delivered, in our churches. Allowance is made for incomplete reports of

good sermons and the desire which seems to possess the press to-day for the sensational and startling; and yet we are forced, as it seems, to the humiliating admission that much that is presented from our pulpits has little of the saving power of the gospel in it. Such great truths as the power and universality of sin, the condemnation which a righteous God has already passed upon the world, the judgment, the need of repentance, faith, and regeneration, before men can hope for fellowship with God, seem to have been passed by for lighter and more attractive subjects which, to say the least, present a greatly adulterated gospel that does not stir the depths of the souls of men: and consequently there is little depth and strength to the convictions of those who make application for membership in our churches. To join the church appears to be the proper thing, and so men and women who have not, so far as we can ascertain, a particle of repentance for sin or any adequate conception of it, will boldly claim to be Christians and will answer glibly any questions which a church board may choose to ask, and are received as members, and this seems to be the end of their religious aspirations.

Then again, the frequency with which men who hold prominent places in our orthodox churches speak lightly of the most sacred truths of our religion, is both a result of religious depression, and at the same time indicates the need of a revival. If the church was living as near to its divine Lord as it is her privilege and duty to do, men would hesitate a long time before making *public* their doubts upon questions of the most vital concern. The very conditions which environ men oftentimes shape their attitude toward great questions, and, while adverse opinions might in some cases be held, they would be less frequently expressed to the unsettling of Christian faith in those who are weak.

There is space for no more than the mere mention of such indications of depression in religious matters now, as the attendance of the people upon the public services of the sanctuary on the Sabbath day. It is entirely within the limits of

the fact to say that not more than two-thirds of the enrolled members of our churches regularly attend the Sabbath morning services, and the attendance upon the Sabbath evening service is a subject too tender for public treatment. Every pastor knows that in his preparation of the evening sermon, he is continually confronted with the depressing fact that he can not reckon upon the attendance of the people at that service; and in some cases men have chosen to give this hour over to what they called a "sacred concert" with a sermonette as an interlude, which is so skillfully thrown in that the harmony of the service is not disturbed.

Further, it is painfully true that men do not now reverence the Lord's day as God commands. It is not an uncommon thing for members of our churches to leave home on the Sabbath for a business or pleasure trip, and so to plan the outing as to return on that day. It avails little for us to proclaim from our pulpits against the desecration of the Lord's day, while men prominent in our churches, yea even officers therein, persistently trample upon its sacredness.

A similar painful symptom meets us when we examine the beneficence of the churches. Almost all the agencies chosen to administer the contributions of the church, are heavily in debt, and are seriously debating whether the forces in the foreign field shall not be reduced, in order that those who are retained may have even a mere living support. We are informed that this failure of the church to support properly this work abroad, is resulting in good, in that it has awakened both the missionaries and the native Christians to the fact that they should labor towards self-support; but this does not relieve the church of its obligation to give the gospel to the millions who have never heard of the Christ. Moreover, an equally sad condition of things is to be found at home. Scarcely any of our churches come to the close of the year without finding themselves confronted with a deficit running from five hundred to as many thousand dollars. It may be true that much of this indebtedness has been created by an

unwise expenditure of the Lord's money, but this does not relieve the church of the obligation which God has laid upon it to give unto him what is his due, and no argument is needed to show that there is now in the possession of the members of our churches money which belongs to God, and the charge which was made against Israel, by the prophet Malachi, may justly be made against the church to-day, that they "have robbed God," and he can not and will not bless us, until we bring the tithes into the storehouses and prove him therewith. We may plan for the revival and pray for it, but, in my judgment, while this debt remains unpaid, God will be true to himself and the best interests of his church, and refuse to bless us with any thing like a great outpouring of the Spirit upon his people, which will result in the "conversion of sinners to God." Such an outpouring we have not had for years. There have been little summer showers here and there with a little spurt, apparently, in religious awakening; but we need the revival which will mean the awakening of the public conscience upon questions of the greatest moment, and which will bring men and women who are now strangers to God to a recognition of his just claims upon them and theirs. There are many members of our churches, whom we call liberal givers to the Lord's cause, who are giving comparatively nothing when their gifts are estimated upon the basis of what they are able to give. Many of these could amply support a magnificent work in neglected districts, and not know that virtue had gone out of them, if only they had the spirit of sacrifice which close communion with their Lord would beget in them. We call them liberal and great benefactors when they give a few thousand dollars to a local enterprise, or assist their own denomination in a financial stringency; but the word of God calls them "*robbers*." I do not know a pastor who will say that the members of his church give according to their ability; and yet, the people are commanded in the word of God to lay by them "on the first day of the week, as God has prospered them," and to give unto him "according to

the ability" with which he has blessed them. I have a profound conviction that we need not hope for a sweeping revival, until these locked up treasures which belong unto the Lord are brought out and put to service in those fields where service can be rendered only by money.

But how is this revival to be secured or begun? First, let me say, that the revival which the church needs, and which it must have in order to do its legitimate work, does not come from below but from above. It is not the result of plans, laid never so wisely, but the fruit of prayer and earnest waiting upon God. The day has passed, yea, never was, when we could appoint a time and place, and call to our aid a man to "get up" a revival in our churches. It seems that God means to hold his people to the single thought announced over and over again in his word, that he will be enquired of by his people, that all "power in heaven and in earth" belongs to him, and that his church is to have power only after the Holy Spirit has come on it, to the end that its testimony may be efficient in bringing men to the saving knowledge of him, as he is presented in the gospel. This revival then must begin with a pastor or some one else closeted with his Lord. We pray for our people and for the fruitfulness of the sermons we preach upon the holy day, but we have not yet learned to trust God for the full efficiency of the word which we preach.

The greatest sensation which could be created to-day would be by a man on fire with the spirit of Pentecost. There has never been a time when such a man would not draw the people together and win them to Christ. A man in earnest on any subject is a mighty magnet; what must a man be who is mightily in earnest on such a subject as the salvation of the lost and the glory of God! But we have refined our sermons, and have subjected them to such rigid homiletical rules and to the chronometer, until these have acted like Delilah's razor upon the head of Samson. The spirit of organization, which is so rampant now in all circles, has dared to creep into the study and, as it has done in the church, makes such heavy

drafts for its own sake, that it has left only a little reserved power to emphasize the truth which the sermon contains. Our Lord said to his disciples that they should tarry in the city until "they were clothed with power from on high," and they were held back from the work until they received such power. The administration so far as we are informed is the same to-day.

Then truth, so delivered from the pulpit, must not only receive the sanction of the men who are associated with the pastor in official capacities, but it must be illustrated in their lives; and unless this happy result can be secured, the official board should be cultivated and pruned until there is a correspondence between what is delivered by the minister on the Sabbath and what is lived by the officers during the week. This method of procedure might cut off from our boards some whom we now regard as pillars of strength in our work, but in the end we would find that what we considered a source of strength, is in fact a cause of weakness. The men who rule in the Lord's house, should be men who have respect unto the Lord's law and word, and, where this is not found in the officers, it is far better that they be plainly told that they would better resign for the good of the flock, and it will be found that this will be for the betterment of the church and the glory of God.

There is great lamentation now about malfeasance in civil office, and men are heartily scorned who will publicly violate the law, while they assume to be judges of it. What is true in civil relations, will have greater emphasis in the church, by as much as the Church is greater than State.

There must be more prayer on the part of the people of God; not that formal prayer which is now so common, but a fervent waiting upon God for his guidance and blessing; and that this reckoning with God may mean most, there must be a solemn reckoning with men which means downright honesty between man and man. It is little less than mockery for men to pray for blessings, while the wages of those who do their

work, and carry forward their great enterprises, from which they receive large returns, are not sufficient to keep those who depend on them above want, or are cruelly held back.

Now it is clear that all this will call for plain, loving, and fearless presentation of the word of God, by the men who occupy the sacred desk, and the faithful application of it to the practical affairs of business and social life. It demands heroic treatment of what I believe is a dangerous form of a most malignant disease. It may thin the ranks of the ministry, for some may prefer to surrender their credentials rather than declare those truths, whose declaration means the sacrifice of a peace which has heretofore been maintained at far too great a price. It may cost a man his pastorate, but it will make for righteousness. If I rightly interpret our commission, we are not sent to hold a pastorate at any price, but to preach the gospel, the whole gospel, to preach it in love, but with that plainness of speech which will bear the closest scrutiny of the great Judge, to whom we must give account of our stewardship at the last day.

Above all it will mean a fresh baptism of the Holy Ghost to bring such a result, and when this has been received the Revival is already here.

B. P. FULLERTON.

St. Louis, Mo.

V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY—NEW ORLEANS— 1898.

The General Assembly which sat in New Orleans last May was one of the best and most harmonious of our Assemblies. Twice before had the First Church of that city had the honor of entertaining the highest court of the Church: in 1858 and in 1877. Before noticing the Assembly of this year, let us sketch the character and work of these two former bodies.

In 1858, New Orleans was a frontier city. The larger part of the membership of the Old School Church was in the Northern States. Commissioners came from as far east as New Hampshire and as far west as California. A large portion of them came by boat down the Mississippi. Great revivals of religion had been experienced all over the Church. Political agitation was raging in the land. But the influence of the Assembly was for unity and peace. Brethren from the older parts of the Church were delighted to see the growth and sturdy vigor of Presbyterianism in this great metropolis of the South and center of Romish power. Dr. Scott, of San Francisco, a former pastor of the church in which the Assembly met, was moderator. Among the leading members were Van Rensselaer, W. J. Hoge, Howe, Palmer, and that most aggressive of leaders, R. J. Breckinridge. A feature of the Assembly was the centennial celebration of the reunion of the two mother synods of New York and Philadelphia and the healing of the Old and New Side breach. The Assembly threw itself against the tendency of the American Bible Society to introduce verbal changes in its publication of the Authorized version of the English Bible. It discussed Dr. Breckinridge's favorite scheme for the preparation of a distinctively Presbyterian commentary on the whole Bible by representatives to be chosen by the Church. The overtures of two Southwestern Synods for the establishment in New Orleans of a local com-

mittee of the Board of Domestic Missions elicited able advocacy from Dr. Palmer and spirited opposition from Dr. Musgrove, secretary of the Board. The ground of the application was the remoteness of the territory contemplated as the field for this committee's operations from New York, the home of the Board, and the conviction that the Board, pressed with claims in every direction, was in no position to judge of the urgency of local necessities. As a consequence, these and other synods were being driven more and more to work outside of the Board. The reply was a plea for economy and centralism. The establishment of branch Boards would tend to sectionalize the Church. The nationality of the Church, it was affirmed, was mainly due to its centralization through its various Boards. The matter went over to the next Assembly, and eventuated in the ultimate granting of the overtures and the establishing of that agency in New Orleans, under the leadership of Dr. Leyburn as secretary, which became later the nucleus of the Southern Assembly's earliest organized missionary efforts. The Assembly was stirred to its depths over the account of the great destruction of mission property in India, in the Sepoy revolt, and the bloody massacre of our missionaries and their families at Futtehgurh by the Mohammedan rebels. Other subjects of debate were organic union with Associate Reformed Synod of the South and the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. Negotiations with the former body were continued. The proposition of this latter body that a committee be appointed to negotiate on the subject of union was rejected, because the declaration of principles adopted by the United Synod as instructions to its committee, and declared by it to be indispensable as terms of union, involved a condemnation of the Assembly and of its course in the very matters which led to the New School secession twenty years before. Five years later a union was effected between this honorable Synod and the Southern Assembly on the basis of their acceptance of the same doctrinal standards understood in the same sense by both of the contracting parties.

The Assembly of 1877 was one of the fullest and strongest of our Assemblies. Its unanimity in voting on all questions was declared by Dr. Adger to be "wonderful." Dr. Stillman was the moderator. The Church was in the throes of discussion over the Revised Book of Order. The revision of the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline, begun before the civil war, was resumed by the Assembly of 1861, and after repeated drafts made by successive committees of revision had been rejected by the presbyteries, this Assembly sent down a draft, with several alternative sections to be voted on separately. The result of this vote in the presbyteries was the rejection, by a majority of three presbyteries, of the proposed Book as it then stood. But such agreement was reached as to the alternative sections and amendments, that the next Assembly had no difficulty in constructing a new revision that was overwhelmingly adopted in 1879, and constitutes with a few subsequent changes the organic law under which we now live, and which the late Dr. A. T. McGill, of Princeton, declared to be the highest and truest expression of Scriptural Presbyterianism ever formulated. The Assembly declined to order collections for the American Bible Society in the churches, and that a column be added for that cause to our statistical tables, on the ground that the society was a voluntary society, not under our control, and that its contributions were made through other channels than the church. The Bible Society itself felt this difficulty and was even then seeking to meet it and remove it. In view of changes subsequently made in the plan and principles upon which this Society conducted its work, the Assembly thirteen years later adopted it as one of its agencies, placed this cause among the objects of beneficence, and recommended the churches to make annual collections for the society. Lively debates were had on the method of theological education, and on discipline in cases of card playing and dancing. On the subject of fraternal relations with the Northern Church, the Assembly insisted on the terms laid down in the Baltimore conference of 1875, and approved by

the Assembly of 1876, as its ultimatum. The whole subject of the Church's Publication work, in view of the disasters which had come upon the business through the mismanagement of the late secretary, came up for patient study. Looking back across a score of years, and contrasting the present prosperous state of our publishing interests with the condition of debt and discouragement then existing, we cannot but feel that Providence did, indeed, guide that Assembly in its resolve heroically to maintain the honor of the Church, continue confidence in its committee, and above all in selecting Dr. Hazen as its secretary. This year marked the definite organization of our present work for colored evangelization. Already a plan had been evolved, the outcome of which had been the opening of Tuscaloosa Institute under the conduct of that staunch friend of the colored people, the moderator of this Assembly. And now the Assembly gives permanency to the work by erecting for it an executive committee and designating a fixed day for collections to support it. This committee was continued as thus constituted until 1891, when its scope was widened to embrace the whole subject of colored evangelization.

This running review of two previous New Orleans Assemblies may help to show the trend of the Church's development and by comparison with its present state to estimate its progress.

The arrangements for the comfort and entertainment of the Assembly of 1898 were perfect, and not only reflected the characteristic hospitality of the New Orleans Presbyterians, but also the greatest forethought in the committee of arrangements. One evening was marked by a social entertainment in the spacious rooms of the Y. M. C. A., which was attended by overflowing crowds of citizens and commissioners. Later the tedium of business was relieved by a pleasure ride on the Father of Waters in a chartered steamer along the entire city front, and extending down as far as the Chalmette monument and the battlefield where Jackson achieved fame and the presidency. Much time was saved for business, and the social en-

joyment of the Assembly and its royal entertainers greatly promoted, by the arrangement for daily luncheon in the Washington Artillery Hall, distant less than two blocks from the First Church.

Four members of this Assembly had been members of the Assembly of 1877, to wit: Rev. J. W. Montgomery and Prof. E. H. Carter, of Texas, Rev. A. Cowan, of Tennessee, and Rev. G. W. Finley, D. D., of Virginia. Every presbytery was represented by its full complement of ministerial members, and only seven elders who were appointed to the Assembly failed to attend, making this the largest and fullest Assembly ever held. In its membership were an unusually large number of college presidents and professors, two theological professors, and three moderators of former Assemblies. The Assembly on the second ballot chose for its moderator the Rev. E. M. Green, D. D., of Danville, Ky., after a lively race, over Chancellor Fulton and Drs. Kerr, Finley and Boude. This selection proved to be a happy one. Dr. Green discharged his office with tact, dignity and great impartiality. No appeal was taken from any of his rulings. The best of temper prevailed among the members throughout the sittings, which continued through eight days devoted to unremitting work. No harsh notes were sounded and no divisive questions sprung to mar the harmony of the body. The debates were brief and eminently courteous. The Assembly developed no bore. The report of the committee on leave of absence showed that only twenty-three out of 187 commissioners obtained leave to depart before the final adjournment. Three of these were absent from only the last two hours of the Assembly, and thirteen for only the last day. The repeated injunction that only such men be appointed commissioners as can stay through the entire sessions is bearing fruit. In 1897, thirty-three were granted leave of absence, and in 1893, seventy-seven, before final adjournment. It should be borne in mind that the business of the last day or two of an Assembly is of much more importance than that of the first few days, which are devoted mainly to organization

and the reception of business. The Assembly was in everything conservative. There was no restlessness, no tinkering with machinery, no changing of plans and methods just for the sake of change. This meeting was marked by the election of two new secretaries, Rev. J. H. Lumpkin to succeed the lamented Dr. Richardson as secretary of the Executive Committee of Education for the Ministry, and Rev. D. C. Lilly as secretary of Colored Evangelization to succeed Dr. A. L. Phillips, who had resigned; also by the advent of a new stated clerk.

A solemn and spiritual meeting was that on Wednesday evening, when the Assembly sat down at the table of our Lord to observe the Supper that celebrates his death. More than one thousand communicants filled the spacious sanctuary. Drs. Farris and Hopkins dispensed the elements and four and twenty elders distributed them to the communicants. The sermon was preached by the venerable and best loved of all the members of the Assembly, Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D., pastor of the church in which the services were held. In a strong doctrinal sermon from Gen. 22 : 8, this prince of preachers and master of Assemblies unfolded the necessity for an atonement for sin, and a divine-human mediator, and with the deepest pathos and stirring eloquence appealed to the brethren of the Assembly to magnify their office as ambassadors of the gospel of reconciliation. This service was the feature of the Assembly, and the recollection of it will linger as a hallowed memory in the minds of every one of the assembled multitude present as long as life shall last, and will furnish a theme of contemplation in eternity itself. Many of the younger commissioners had never heard a sermon from this eminent leader in Zion. It was at their special request that this service was appointed and Dr. Palmer designated to preach. Their motive was not curiosity, but sprang from the affection felt for Dr. Palmer as a father in the Church, one of the few surviving formulators of its principles and policies in its day of organization and transition, and one of their ablest champions and expositors. These younger brethren have

drunk at the fountain of testimony the fathers of 1861 gave to the world, and have imbibed their faith. The Church has not swerved from the moorings where these sought to anchor her, and now, in perhaps the last Assembly in which this godly and gifted octogenarian may be privileged to sit, the representatives of the Church desired, as children sitting at the feet of an honored father, to hear a sweet gospel message from one who could speak with such authority and be heard with such confidence and love. It was a matter of wonder how marvelously this revered leader of the Assembly of 1898 has preserved his powers as a speaker and thinker. Darkness is creeping over his vision, but the music of his eloquence, the vigor of his mind and his force of expression are unabated. His sermon on that solemn night will compare with his best when his strength was unbroken. It was the prayer of every member present that Dr. Palmer may be spared yet many years to publish with his matchless power the message of life, and never will our Southern Zion cease to thank the great Head of the Church that among his richest ascension gifts, he gave us Dr. Palmer. It is needless to say that this brother's influence dominated the Assembly. Not that he sought to lead, for he never spoke save briefly, and then only to tersely state his convictions on the matter under discussion. His views prevailed because with lucid analysis he laid bare the principle that justified his position, and that principle was generally one that met a response in the judgment of the Assembly. And here we cannot but remark on the advantage to a church, and the great power and strength that result, from a pervading unity of conviction and principles. A homogeneous church is more powerful than one that is heterogeneous in its elements and divergent in its views and practices. To-day peace prevails throughout our borders. Our Church is rent by no divisive matters of doctrine, policy or sentiment. No disturbing questions agitate its bosom. Fraternal confidence, a community of ideas and unity of worship characterize its life and membership. It would mar its efficiency to have this happy state

of affairs disturbed by contentions arising within or by heterogeneous alliances without. This period of unity and quiet summons us to work. What we need is to brace ourselves more than ever to the support of all branches of our work as now organized and to move forward upon a new era of evangelization.

Dr. Palmer has been a member of thirteen General Assemblies, three of them of the original Old School Church. No branch of the Presbyterian Church has a moderator yet living whose year of service dates back to that in which this venerable father presided over the first Assembly in Augusta. Dr. J. C. Lowrie, moderator of Old School Assembly, North, in 1865, and Dr. S. M. Hopkins, of the New School Assembly, North, in 1866, yet survive. Rev. P. G. Rea, still living, was moderator of the Cumberland Assembly in 1862, while all his predecessors have passed away. It should be remarked, however, that we have still abiding with us two moderators of the United Synod, the highest judicatory of the New School Presbyterians of the South, which became an organic part of our Church in 1864, namely, Dr. C. H. Read, moderator at Knoxville in 1858, and Dr. C. M. Atkinson, moderator at Huntsville in 1860.

The conservatism of the Assembly was shown in that eighteen separate overtures making specific requests were, on recommendation of the Committee on Overtures, either refused or referred to existing laws and decisions; while only two such overtures were granted. The harmony of the body was shown in that only one final action drew out a protest, which was signed by but two members.

To a memorial from the Sabbath School department of the W. C. T. U. of the United States, requesting the appointment of the fourth Sabbath in November as an annual Temperance Day, the Assembly, while bearing testimony against intemperance, made a negative answer. This memorial was part of an effort to secure a union of all the churches of America in observing one such day annually, in accordance with the plan

of the London Sabbath School Union. But this day is not needed of us. 1. Because it would tend to injure as much as help the cause of temperance, by the temptation it would present for pressing upon the Church extreme views of a political and divisive nature on this subject. The Church must guard zealously lest she be drawn off into support of mere human schemes of reform. The door should not be opened that might lead to discussion of political measures in our pulpits and courts. 2. We must guard against the beginning even of a calendar of special and holy days. The appointment of annual days of prayer for colleges and of children's days has, in the opinion of some, begun to take on this stereotyped aspect. The observance of such days, becoming matters of annual routine, may grow into so much formalism and be continued when the spirit of the day is but little entered into.

Alike conservative was the adoption, in view of the war excitement, of a paper calling attention to the historic position of the Church on such matters, and while affirming our duty to pray for our rulers and our armies, yet urging on the ministry the duty of proclaiming from their pulpits at all times nothing but the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and on the people the duty of abstaining on the Sabbath from such reading and conversation as may be inconsistent with the proper observance of the day. While in the Assembly's devotional meetings constant prayer was offered for our army and navy, a righteous issue of the conflict and a speedy peace, yet there were no unseemly references to the war, no loud professions of patriotism, and no public meetings of a political nature. In view of the many subtle forms in which error exists around us, threatening the Church in her doctrine, polity and spirituality, an able committee was appointed to prepare and circulate a pastoral letter warning against these errors. In answer to an overture, the Committee on Young People's Societies presented an elaborate constitution, with by-laws, for such societies, as an amendment to the plan adopted in 1894. But it went too much into minutia, and by its very multiplicity of

details, would only have impeded the activity and usefulness of these societies. We should guard against making a church within the Church. The more imposing these organizations are made the more will they arrogate the functions of a church. There is a fascination for young people in such a parade of organization and activity, especially in their great interdenominational conventions, but our young people cannot always see where mischief lies.

The executive agencies of the Church have all had a good year and all show increase in receipts over the previous year, except in the case of the invalid fund, where a falling off of \$1,000 is reported. Here, to the shame of the Church be it said, a steady decline has been going on for years. The Committee of Foreign Missions had the largest receipts it ever had in any one year. Yet these were less by \$7,000 than the necessary disbursements, which was satisfactorily explained by the committee. Assembly Home Missions received \$10,000 more than last year. Both "The Missionary" and "The Children's Missionary" show increase of circulation. There was also an increase in the number of communicants added in the foreign field over last year. Eight new missionaries were sent out, making 155 now under commission as against 150 last year. In view of delay on part of many churches in sending on their contributions, the executive committee asked that the churches be recommended to appoint special treasurers for benevolent funds, so that these might be kept separate from collections for general church expenses, and so be more promptly transmitted. There may be cases where this plan would work well, but it would not in every case. Many churches take up weekly in one envelope the gifts of each contributor for both benevolent and congregational purposes, and distribute them from time to time as the delinquents are reached and the totals classified. Special treasurers would be no better than general ones, and would have to wait on the latter in many instances. The Assembly contented itself with directing the attention of the presbyteries to the suggestion,

and urging them to devise plans for remedying this evil of delay. Approval was given to the committee's determination to proceed at once to the building of the Congo boat. But now the word is that the progress of railroad building on the Congo, and the projection of new lines, make it doubtful whether after all the building of this boat will be so necessary to the comfort and safety of our missionaries as has been supposed. Of addresses before the Assembly should be noted that of Rev. G. E. Henderlite, bearing fraternal salutations from the Synod of Brazil; that of Commander A. L. Wadham, of the Navy, bearing testimony to the high character and courage of foreign missionaries, and the great value of their work as viewed by a civilian who has travelled largely in mission lands; and that of our secretary giving his observations on the work in Korea and the East. This latter address was declared by many to be the most effective missionary address they had ever heard, and produced as deep an impression on the Assembly as did that of the venerable secretary, the Hon. Walter Lowrie, in 1858, before the Assembly in the same church; in which, after referring to the fate of his own martyred missionary son whose bones lay rolling under the China Sea, where they fell ten years before by the hand of pirates, he pictured the sufferings of the native Christians in the fort of Allahabad and the martyrdom of Cawnpore. The Assembly authorized the founding of a mission in Cuba when the way is clear.

Dr. Craig's report told of prosperity in our frontier work among the Mexicans, nearly 700 pupils in our mission schools in Indian Territory, and made honorable mention of twenty or more churches which had sent boxes of clothing and other articles to our home missionaries and the schools. The situation in Florida resulting from the late freezes has been but little improved. Yet our Church in that State has grown nearly 250 per cent. in the past twenty-four years. In all the field aided by the committee ninety-two ministers conducted during the year 12,000 services, attended by 1,200 professions of faith,

while not less than twenty-five churches have been erected, repaired or freed from debt. While the population in these fields has doubled in the past eighteen years, our Church members have increased nearly five fold. In view of this good progress, showing the divine blessing on our frontier work as now conducted, we see no merit in the restless suggestions made from time to time, that we remand the whole work of home missions to the Synods, or otherwise modify the machinery of administration. One presbytery overtured the Assembly "to have its committee so constituted that every Synod of the Assembly shall be represented in said committee, in order that there may be a larger and more extended interest in the work; that the work may be more thoroughly overlooked and so prove more efficient; that the responsibility for the execution of the work may be shared by representatives of the various Synods and so give general satisfaction to those that contribute to this great object." This overture, proper enough as to its subject matter, yet bristles with insinuations in every line, and proposes in the interest of reform a ponderous, expensive and entirely impracticable mode of administration. The commissioners from the presbytery sending it uttered not a word in its advocacy, and without debate it was answered unanimously in the negative. But the report proposing this answer was so drawn as to embody in full the overture which it so summarily recommended for slaughter, and the overture lives on the Minutes of the Assembly as an unsanctioned reflection on the Executive Committee and the Assembly's plan of selecting and constituting its committees. It is sufficient to merely give the scope and purpose of such a paper, where it does not become the basis for affirmative action. In the Assembly's initial action in 1866, constituting this Executive Committee, the chairman of each presbyterial committee was made a corresponding member of the Central Committee, and it was made his duty to keep the Central Committee informed of the condition and wants of his presbytery, and also to see that all the churches in his presbytery take up regular col-

lections for the Central Committee, he acting at the same time as agent for the presbytery and the Central Committee. This adequately connects every part of the Church with the control of this work. It must be confessed, however, that in some of the older and stronger Synods this committee does not receive the support which as a missionary agency it should. We will have to guard lest the Assembly's missions suffer from the pressure of local missions.

An overture from Lexington Presbytery that the Assembly direct its Board of Trustees to appropriate, out of a legacy of \$5,000 left by Miss M. J. Baldwin, late of Staunton, Va., to the Assembly's Board of Trustees for the Domestic Mission work of the Southern Presbyterian Church, \$1,000 to the local Missions of the Presbytery of Lexington and \$500 to the Evangelistic work of the Synod of Virginia, brought on a general debate. A petition had previously been made by this presbytery to the trustees to appropriate a part of this legacy to it and the Synod's local work, fortified by an array of facts and arguments which indicated that the presbytery was much set upon getting a share of this liberal bequest, but which seemingly, under the plan of Home Missions in force when Miss Baldwin made her will and still in force, would, according to the terms of the will, have been expended in other more frontier and destitute Synods. The endorsement of the petition by the Synod of Virginia was first sought. Then argument was adduced to show that the donor must have intended the legacy to be expended according to the plan which went out of vogue some two years before the will was drawn, and which would have allowed the appropriation of a portion of it by the Atlanta Committee to the older and richer Synods, that formerly received aid from the central treasury. During the three years before her death, after the change in the plan of Home Missions had gone into effect, Miss Baldwin had been a liberal contributor to this cause of Assembly's Missions, doubling her gifts the second year, and almost trebling them the third, while curtailing considerably her gifts to the local

home work this last year. This is hardly compatible with the plea that a lady of such discriminating charity and marked intelligence understood that a gift to the Assembly's work was to be distributed also to the support of the local work of her presbytery, of whose separate existence she was aware, and to which she contributed with great liberality. Emphasis was also laid upon the pressing needs of the newly opened up mining and lumber regions of the Synod of Virginia. On these grounds the presbytery claimed that a substantial share of the legacy should go to it and its Synod. The trustees replied that they had no discretion as to the disbursement of moneys left to the different objects of the Church, and suggested that the equities in the case be laid before the Assembly. Thereupon the presbytery transferred its overture to the Assembly. It was advocated in a very able and adroit speech by Rev. A. M. Fraser, D. D., a commissioner from Lexington Presbytery. He had studied his case well. He seemed to feel that on its face, the case was against him. He fortified his ground by the opinion of able jurists. His aim was to create the presumption that Miss Baldwin was thinking of Virginia and not the border destitutions of the Church in drawing her will. A brother who heard this speech declared that it was one which in a civil court would have commanded a fee of five hundred dollars. The overture, however, was vigorously combated by Revs. A. W. Wilson and E. E. Bigger of Texas, who plead that the presbytery sought to set aside the will and that in its own interest, and against the interests of the far more destitute frontier; that it was scarcely generous in one of the largest, most compact and wealthy presbyteries to deprive the struggling West of what would afford so much relief to it and save much of its work from disaster. The question was asked by another whether in case the Assembly declined to direct that the thirty per cent. of the legacy asked for be set apart for the presbytery and Synod soliciting it, it would not be such a disappointment to their churches and contributors as would lead to a decline of liberality in support of the

Atlanta Committee on the part of many, and a tendency to concentrate more exclusively in support of local missions, on the ground that help being denied them by the Assembly, it behooved them to help themselves. Judge Hutton of Abingdon Presbytery declared that in his judgment it would have that effect, and this confession accomplished what Dr. Fraser's argument had not accomplished. It determined the Assembly to grant the overture. One brother of influence had prepared notes for a reply to Dr. Fraser, taking issue with him at every point, but when he heard this acknowledgment of the extent to which some back in the Virginias would take a defeat to heart, declined to make his speech and voted for the appropriation. It must be admitted that there is great need for sustentation and evangelistic activity in the more settled parts of our Church. The development of business enterprise is constantly opening up new territory, and creating new towns and cities, that call loudly for us to enter promptly and occupy. Nor is there anything to prevent the Central Committee from extending aid to these points as well as to the newer synods. Yet the claim that any section has a special claim on a general bequest, left to the Church at large to expend according to its own policy at any time in vogue, is one that is fraught with danger. The locality from which any legacy comes could at any time present as plausible a plea for the return to it of a larger share than should go to other sections, as that so ardently urged by Lexington Presbytery before the Assembly. There is no reason why Kentucky or Alabama should not have urged, that as Miss Baldwin, perhaps, did not fully understand that these States were not to share in her generous legacy, they, too, should have special legislation directing a liberal per cent. be set aside for their use. The granting of this overture has not directed the money where it will not be wisely and usefully expended, but a precedent has been set that is not good; and that is the writer's reason for dwelling on this case more than its importance might seem to warrant. His criticism is not on the Assembly for granting,

but on the presbytery for asking. We applaud the zeal of the Lexington brethren and expect to see them stand nobly by the Central Committee and its work, as they certainly will. It will be permitted the writer to say that he voted for the overture. He voted for it, because the Lexington brethren were earnest in wanting it. He felt with others, that to grant it would in the long run bring more money to the support of the frontier work than if the sum contended for should all be turned west of the Mississippi, and a portion of the Church left aggrieved.

The steady falling off in the invalid fund, it has been suggested, is due to the fact that the summer outing of people in our cities and towns are on the increase, so that in July, when the collections are taken, an increasingly large number of church members are absent, if in some instances the churches themselves are not closed during this month. If this be true, it calls for some reconstruction in the time or in the method of raising this noblest of all our benefactions.

The Assembly had the usual overture before it to unite the Executive Committees of Education and Publication. Those with whom such overtures originate forget that the members of the Executive Committees are overloaded pastors and busy laymen who give their services gratuitously, and cannot easily spare the time for the administration of more than one great cause.

The Committee of Education for the Ministry reported all appropriations to students paid. The Assembly ordered the committee to discontinue aid to academical students not in college classes. It discouraged attendance upon Colleges and Theological Seminaries other than our own by candidates receiving aid, but allowed that in extraordinary cases the matter of giving aid from the Assembly's funds to candidates attending outside institutions shall be left to the decision of the presbyterial committees, after consultation with the Assembly's Executive Committee.

The Committee of Publication reported increased sales, in-

creased issue of Sunday School periodicals and increased receipts from the churches for its colportage and benevolent work. No year in the history of the work has been marked by greater activity in the publishing department than this, fully 100,000 books and tracts having been issued from the press by it during the year. These include the memorial volume of the Westminster Assembly, which has had a gratifying sale, and a Supplement to the Assembly's Digest. The Assembly urged the Synods and Presbyteries to purchase copies of the Digest and place them in the hands of their stated clerks.

The work of Colored Evangelization presents peculiar complications at this time. The statistical tables show that \$12,383 were contributed to this cause this year, which is nearly \$2,000 more than in any previous year, and over \$3,000 more than last year. Of this only \$6,069 went into the general fund, which is \$360 less than the year previous. The remainder was given to the development or building fund for Stillman Institute, raised by the unremitting and unpaid labors of Rev. O. B. Wilson, or was expended privately. The committee has become through shortage of revenues burdened with a debt of unpaid appropriations to laborers in the field, and while progress has been made in reducing these debts, there yet remained, when its report was made, \$1,346 unpaid. The Assembly gave special approbation to the purpose of its committee to meet these obligations as speedily as possible. It has been for some time the conviction of the committee that it should expend a larger portion of its income in its evangelistic work than it has hitherto done, and less in the support of its educational work. Hence it has for several years studied to devise a plan to minimize this latter expense, and make the Institute as nearly self-sustaining as possible. The plan of a farm in connection with the Institute, where students could supplement their incomes by labor, was settled upon. Hitherto it has owned no property save a school building in Tuskalooza, valued at perhaps less than \$1,000. This is to be

sold and a farm of twenty acres, with a large two-story brick residence on it, adjoining Tuskalooza, has been bought for \$5,000, all of which but about \$1,666 has been paid out of the special development fund as it was received, and there are subscriptions for other sums. As a result of the efforts to thus change the method of operating the Institute and to discharge its contracts with laborers to whom arrearages were due, both the teaching force and the number of students supported in the Institute had to be reduced. Only the year before the Academic department of the Institute had to be closed because of financial stringency. The illiberality of the churches in their support of this work further compelled a double loss in the resignations of Dr. Phillips as secretary, and Rev. R. B. McAlpine as professor of theology, for want of means to sustain them. This was much to be deplored. No tributes were ever more richly deserved than those in which the Assembly expressed its appreciation of the faithful services of these two brethren. Whatever the future may have in store for the work among our colored population, it will never have connected with it any more self-sacrificing laborers than Brothers McAlpine and Phillips. In the direction of further economy the Assembly elected Rev. D. C. Lilly, pastor of the Tuskalooza church, as secretary, who it is understood tenders his services gratuitously, and the committee has elected Dr. John Little, of Tuskalooza, its treasurer in place of Mr. W. A. Powell, of Atlanta.

In the direction of carrying out the settled policy of the Church to aid in the establishment and development of a separate and self-sustaining Colored Presbyterian Church, the Assembly of 1891 appointed Rev. A. L. Phillips a commissioner to correspond with the various colored presbyteries, and gather information of their wishes, and to endeavor to secure from the Synods concerned such action as would permit the colored presbyteries, if they so desire, to form an independent Synod. This commissioner reported a year later that there were in our territory and aided by us five presbyteries composed

wholly of colored ministers and churches, besides a number of ministers and churches yet connected with white presbyteries. Three of these presbyteries were independent bodies. One, Ethel, was connected with the Synod of Mississippi. Another, Central Alabama, had till this time been a part of the Synod of Alabama, but now went into independency, in response to the recommendation of the Assembly, and in contemplation of the organization of the proposed Independent Synod. In 1895, however, it went back into the Synod of Alabama. He further reported great diversity of opinion among the colored brethren as to what was best for them to do, and though he had urged reasons why independent organization might now seem practicable, these two latter presbyteries voted not to enter the organization. Thereupon the Assembly reappointed this same commissioner to express to these churches its confident hope that the time will soon arrive when they can unanimously and cordially unite to form an Independent Church, and to assure them that the Assembly renews its pledge of financial and educational support, and its willingness to enter into correspondence with said Church. It further appointed a committee to call a convention of colored Presbyterian ministers in our bounds at Birmingham, to confer with them on this subject and any other matter pertaining to the interests of Presbyterianism among the colored people. The chairman of this committee having ascertained by correspondence that these brethren were not yet prepared for this step, did not call the convention. The matter came up again in 1895, on an overture from Charleston Presbytery asking for the immediate organization of the proposed Independent Colored Church. In response, the Assembly ordered a collection in the following August to defray the expenses connected with effecting the organization of the said Synod, and again referred the question to the presbyteries and Synods concerned, and appointed five commissioners to decide on the time and place for effecting the organization and to represent the Assembly on that occasion. But the presbyteries of Ethel and Central Alabama

again decided that they did not think the time had come for such a movement. The meeting, therefore, was not called, and the Assembly of 1896, feeling that the formation of this independent Synod should be the result of healthful and substantial growth, deferred further action. But next year, having expression from at least two-thirds of the fifty-five colored ministers that they were desirous of proceeding at once, and learning that the three independent presbyteries intended calling a meeting at an early day for the purpose of organizing, the Assembly again expressed its approbation of the movement and appointed commissioners to represent it in the event the convocation was held, and to convey to these brethren afresh the assurance of its help and co-operation. This convention was held in November last in Birmingham, with all five of the presbyteries represented. It expressed its conviction that the time had come when an efficient and stable colored Presbyterian Synod could be launched forth, and requested each presbytery to send two ministers and two ruling elders as commissioners to a meeting to be held in New Orleans, simultaneously with the Assembly, for the purpose of perfecting the organization. It did this under the conviction that to place the control of all the business of their churches in the hands of colored men would conduce to the progress of Presbyterianism among their race, at the same time throwing itself in all good faith and thankfulness upon the Assembly's repeated assurances of continued financial help and co-operation. This second convention met in the Berean Church in New Orleans, May 19th, and perfected the organization by adopting the standards of doctrine and polity of the Southern Presbyterian Church, and took the title, "Colored Presbyterian Synod of the United States and the Dominion of Canada," expressing the purpose of its constituent presbyteries to establish, when the way shall be clear, a separate Colored Presbyterian General Assembly. The new Synod constituted four executive committees as the agencies for its organized work. It would be a pleasure to know that the culmination of this movement

has the approbation of all our colored ministers and presbyteries. But we fear that this is not the case. They had not reached a general agreement as to the timeliness of immediate separation. Some hesitated because of the poverty of their people, the smallness of their numbers, and the great distances between their various centers of membership, which would make meetings of their highest court difficult and expensive. The advantages of review and control by a superior court were still desired. There might be some trouble about the titles to their church property. The chief difficulty was the lack of money. It is a matter of regret that some of these brethren felt constrained to protest to the Assembly against the action of the convention in setting up a government for itself. The Assembly directed its secretary of Colored Evangelization to visit the two presbyteries, Ethel and Central Alabama, in which the dissentients are found, at their next spring meeting, and express to them its earnest hope that all difficulties in the way of united action in this movement may be overcome by further careful consideration. The moderator of this new, independent Synod is Rev. E. W. Williams, of Abbeville, S. C.; its permanent clerk is Rev. A. E. Reed, of Chester, S. C. Its next meeting will be held in Chester. With this body our Assembly is now in fraternal correspondence, and by the most solemn and reiterated assurances we are committed to lend it the support of our contributions. With solicitude we will watch its course and unceasingly pray for its peace and enlargement.

The trustees of the Assembly's Home and School reported, that in accordance with the instructions given by the last Assembly, all connection between the Fredericksburg College and the Home and School had been severed, so that the Assembly was now entirely relieved of responsibility for the conduct and support of the College. The College property has been sold. The collections last December, ordered by the Assembly, together with private gifts, had sufficed to pay off about twenty per cent. of the old debts, and the cost of supporting the Home and School had been reduced to the lowest

point consistent with the proper care of the children gathered in it. All current expenses had been met and a further reduction of the indebtedness had been effected under the efficient management of the superintendent, Mr. S. W. Somerville. In the Home there have been thirty-five students. The Assembly authorized the trustees to employ a financial agent to raise funds to liquidate the debt, and directed the discontinuance of the department for training women missionaries.

A complaint from Rev. S. S. Laws, D. D., till this year a professor in the Columbia Seminary, against the Synod of South Carolina, was regarded as not technically a complaint but a memorial, and was considered as such. Two professors in this institution had failed to receive re-election to their respective chairs by the Board of Directors of the Seminary, at its annual meeting in May, the board having announced one year before that, under the operation of the age-rule in the Constitution of the Seminary, it would not continue them in their positions longer than this year. This age-rule declares that whenever a professor shall hereafter become seventy years of age he shall be retired at the close of that scholastic year, unless retained in office by an annual election in which he shall receive the votes of a majority of the board. Each of these professors were several years beyond the age when this rule became operative, and had been continued by annual re-election in their chairs, till in 1897 the board, acting under the Constitution, gave these professors due notice that their services would not be continued after the ensuing scholastic year. This action of the board was perfectly regular and constitutional, and was taken in no desire to reflect upon these venerable and esteemed professors, but as a faithful effort to discharge their duties under the charter and rules governing them. This rule was adopted more than a score of years ago as a protection to the institution against the recurrence of complications that had previously been a source of disquiet. Till this year it never had been found necessary to apply this rule. Dr. Laws overtured the controlling Synods to withdraw

its approval of this age-rule, as liable to misconstruction and to do more harm than good. The overture was accompanied with a printed argument, in which the rule was characterized as most obnoxious and unjust. The Synods of Alabama and Georgia voted for its repeal. The Synod of South Carolina by a small majority refused its consent to the repeal. No response was received from the Synod of Florida. As it requires the concurrent vote of three of the governing Synods to alter the Constitution, the overture was lost.

Dr. Laws complained against this action of the Synod of South Carolina. The matter was heard, however, by resolution and not in a judicial way. The Assembly has no control over the Seminary, save the right of general supervision which it retains over all educational institutions conducted within the Church, which right is distinctly recognized in the Constitution of the Seminary. The memorialist asked that the Assembly advise the Synods to repeal the age-rule in the Constitution of the Seminary. He declared that he regarded the action of the Board in his case as a finality, and that he was seeking no personal relief. Yet there was a feeling that this was a case that should not have been brought before the Assembly. The facts as to the working of the rule, its origin and the expediency of its retention, were fully before the governing Synods. Representatives from at least two of the Synods protested that this was a matter that could better be considered without the intervention of the Assembly with advice, and that such advice might lead to complications and embarrass the Synods, many of whose members thought the rule salutary and one that should be preserved. But after a vigorous presentation of the objections to the rule by Dr. Laws and an expression from Dr. Palmer that he regarded the rule as harmful to the Seminary and unjust to our older men, the Assembly granted the request and gave its advice to the Synods to abolish the rule. There was a feeling that the existence of this rule lends sanction to the pernicious practice in the churches of discounting the value and effect-

iveness of our older men, and of drawing a so-called dead line across the pathway of some of the most competent and useful ministers of the Church.

The committee appointed in 1897 to consider the subject of a Summer School of Theology, to be conducted by the joint faculties of our four Seminaries, recommended that such an enterprise be attempted, and suggested Monteagle, Tenn., as the place and the month of August annually as the time. An Executive Committee, of which Dr. Summey is chairman, was appointed to arrange details. The Assembly assumed no financial responsibility for the school. Doubt was expressed whether the enterprise was one that called for Assembly action. Let the project have a trial. It is to be hoped the results will justify the experiment.

The only judicial case heard by the Assembly was the complaint of Rev. Dr. W. M. McPheeters and others against an action of the Synod of South Carolina in addressing an official communication to the civil Commonwealth, to wit: a petition to the Postmaster General of the United States to forbid the transmission of mails on Sunday and order the closing of all post offices throughout the United States on that day. This action, the complainants alleged, was an error of judgment and a violation of the Church's Constitution, in its nature tending to produce effects prejudicial to the purity and peace of the Church. They specified: 1. Its tendency and effect will be to make void the testimony of our Church in reference to the doctrine of the spirituality of the Church. 2. It initiates a policy calculated to divert the thought and energies of the Church from her true mission, and to disqualify her to bring to human governments many blessings that would flow incidentally but inevitably from a vigorous prosecution upon her part of her proper work. 3. Its effect will be to weaken the hands of God's people and to encourage their enemies. 4. It is fraught with peculiar perils at this time, when the tendency of the Church is to forget her mission and to transcend her commission. 5. It tends to put the

whole matter of Sabbath observance and desecration in a false light by diverting men from their individual responsibility in patronizing Sabbath trains and post offices, and encouraging them to shift off upon the State their responsibility for their personal violations of the Sabbath. The complainants took the ground that Christ has not authorized his representatives in his spiritual kingdom to have any official intercourse, negotiations or relations whatever with the representatives of any human governments in their official character, neither has he authorized the Church to call human governments to her aid in securing reverence for and obedience to his law. The Church should employ no other forms of agency than those divinely appointed for her spiritual ends. As for the section of the Confession of Faith, which concedes the right of humble petition to the Commonwealth in cases extraordinary, the complainants took the ground that Sabbath violation by the State does not fall under the provision here signalized, and that the case the Synod had before it was in no true sense an extraordinary case. They went further and attacked that section of the Confession as not in harmony with Scripture or with other parts of the Confession and of the Form of Government, but in such radical opposition with them as either to nullify them or to be nullified by them, an anachronism, and a reminder of the times when the Church was fettered in its life by its union with the State. A constitution framed by men for the Church can confer no power which Christ has not conferred in his word. The Synod erred because it assumed a power which the Constitution does not and could never render legitimate, for the reason that it is a power which Christ in his word has not granted. The complainants held that we have here to deal exclusively with the Sabbath of the State, which is distinctly a civil institution, and that petition to the State for its regulation by a Church court is political action that the Church cannot take without intermeddling with what lies beyond her province.

Hon. W. F. Stevenson, of Cheraw, and Dr. C. W. Humphreys,

of Lancaster, appeared for the respondent. They claimed that such petition to the civil government by a Church court does not fall in the category of political action, that the right of such petition in cases extraordinary was not only granted in the Constitution and recognized by the Church in its Address to all the Churches of Christ throughout the Earth, in 1861, but had repeatedly and is being constantly exercised by our courts. This very question of Sabbath observance by the State has been on repeated occasions the subject of memorial by our highest court to the civil government, as was shown by citations from the digests. We are not here dealing with a mere civil institution, but with the Christian Sabbath. The State has gone out of its sphere and invaded that of the Church, and is obstructing her in her rightful observance of the Sabbath. Such petition was warranted on the ground of self-protection. It was but the Church asking the State to recede from its invasion of her orbit. This right of self-protection, even in the absence of any rule for extraordinary cases, sufficiently guarantees this right of petition. The enormity of the evil protested against certainly constitutes this an extraordinary case. The extreme contention of the complainants, that all official communication whatever between Church and State should be excluded, was vigorously combatted. The Church could not appear by representatives before the officers of the State to secure a charter or act of incorporation. It could not defend its property rights, ask the upholding of a will or contend for a legacy left to it, or ask the State's protection for its missionaries in time of peril, if this doctrine obtained.

The Assembly voted nineteen to sustain, six to sustain in part, and 145 not to sustain, and in its minute, expressing its verdict, declared that the action of the Synod was based on chapter 31, section 4, of the Confession of Faith. The complainants, taking the ground that the Synod's action was unconstitutional, attempted to sustain it by declaring that the Constitution, in conceding the right of petition in any case, is out of harmony with itself and with the Word of God. But

the cause had to be judged by the Constitution as it stands. To appeal from the standards to the Bible is not permitted to ground a judicial case, since the standards are the Church's understanding of what the Bible teaches. If the former contains anachronisms, they should be amended. It may not be contended that the Constitution is itself unconstitutional. Yet the complainants were right in holding that this "extraordinary clause" opens the door to many abuses and is a serious temptation to our Church courts to transcend their province. Every important case will be looked at by some as extraordinary, and this clause can be stretched to any latitude. The Constitution is not carefully drawn here and could be bettered by amendment, more carefully guarding the nature of the relations the Church may sustain to the civil government. Dr. McPheeters lost his case, but in the emphasis he gave to the doctrine of the Church's exclusively spiritual functions, and the necessity of guarding well against departures from her exclusively spiritual mission, he did great good and wrested a substantial victory out of defeat. The petition of the Synod was utterly useless. It could and would obtain no hearing. Again and again has the Church been rebuffed and ignored by the State when she has approached it with humble petitions. The action of the Synod was not necessary as a testimony, and had the issue at New Orleans been whether the Synod acted judiciously, instead of whether a constitutional act was unconstitutional because the Constitution itself was not perfect, the vote would have been overwhelmingly against the folly of this appeal to Cæsar. The Assembly itself was asked to join in this very same petition and declined to do so. By delivering faithful testimony from the pulpit the Church can best promote the observance of the Sabbath. As Christian citizens and not as Church courts should we bring pressure to bear on the State when it is needful to invoke its power.

We cannot forbear two criticisms. There was not submitted to the Assembly such a "record of the cause" in this case as is contemplated in Par. 189 of the Rules of Discipline.

Instead there was put into the clerk's hands a copy of the complaint, in which the reasons were blended with twenty printed pages of argument, and a full copy of the minutes of the session of the Synod at which the action complained against was taken. When the clerk of the Assembly was called on to read the record in the case, he knew not what or how much of the fifty pages of matter put in his hands to read, and the parties in the case had to be called on to select out and read such parts as they judged to be pertinent to the cause, the whole perhaps not more than a page. This is not the only instance in which such imperfect preparation of the papers in a judicial case has been known in our Assemblies. Our second criticism is on the inadequate way in which this, together with the greater part of the judicial cases passed on by former Assemblies, has been recorded in the Assembly's minutes. The committee to prepare the verdict expressive of the sense of the court should be required to embody in its paper such a full statement of the facts, history of the case in its various stages, grounds of appeal and complaint, as will make a full and clear record of what has been under consideration and what has been decided. We defy any one to ascertain from the minutes of 1898 what was the issue or what was decided. Who were the "others" associated with Dr. McPheeters is no where to be found. The complaint of E. M. Richardson and others in 1896 was decided adversely to the complainants, but the minutes are sealed even as to the subject matter of the complaint. There was merit in that part of the memorial of Revs. W. H. Workman and J. R. Riley which asked that our law be so changed as to require that the record be placed in the hands of the committee appointed to formulate the judgment of the court, which committee shall state clearly the errors found to exist in the court or courts below, to which shall be added such explanatory matter as may be deemed advisable, all of which shall be entered in the record of the case. Other needless features in this memorial caused it to receive scant considera-

tion, but the Assembly without any constitutional requirement should see that its records are full and complete. Our criticism has no bearing on the manner in which the permanent clerk has done his work.

The Assembly appointed an able committee to prepare a new Hymn and Tune Book for the use of our churches, and adopted a body of rules for the committee's guidance. This committee is not to do its work hastily, yet it is contemplated that its work shall be complete by 1903, when, it was understood, all arrangements of our publishers for the sale of other hymn books will have expired. But in compliance with an authorization of the Assembly, the Committee of Publication has, since the Assembly adjourned, bought from the owner of "The Hymns of the Ages" the copyright and plates of the work, and his entire stock of books on hand, so that the expiration of the ten year contract for the handling of this book in 1903 need now cut no figure in the committee's work. The completion of a new hymn book, adapted to present needs and the product of our Church's own life and effort, will be hailed with delight. The demand for it was evinced by the fact that nine overtures from different presbyteries and Synods, covering one-third of the Church, asked that this work be inaugurated. The use of a uniform book in all our congregations has long been desired. But the requirements of our churches, rural, village and city, are so diverse that we doubt if such practical uniformity can be attained—many will continue to use the books they now have. Yet we believe that the book whose preparation is now so auspiciously undertaken will, if the work is well done, come nearer to securing the desired uniformity than any of those now in use. The Assembly has reposed great confidence in its committee and granted it large powers. It has not expressly reserved to itself the right of inspecting and approving the work, though this reservation exists inherently. It empowered the committee to fill any vacancies that may occur in its membership.

Called on to interpret section 6, chapter 24, of the Confes-

sion, the Assembly declared that wilful desertion which can in no way be remedied by the Church or civil magistrate, as a sufficient cause for divorce, applies in a case where both husband and wife are believers, and that where parties have been divorced by the civil law, if the divorce has been correctly granted, the innocent party has the right to marry again.

To the question whether it is agreeable to our order to hold an entertainment in a church building, it was replied that the affairs of the local church are under the control of the session. This was as far as the Assembly needed to go. To thus use our churches is ordinarily if not invariably wrong. But the Assembly is not, by this decision, liable to the criticism of a protest that was made, that by failing to give a categorical answer, it was indirectly sanctioning these practices. The onus of government should be thrown on the proper court, and the Assembly should not decide too many things.

The Assembly appointed a committee, of which Rev. F. B. Webb, D. D., is chairman, to confer with the Associate Reformed Synod of the South with reference to organic union, and to request the appointment of a similar committee of conference by that Church. Here take a retrospect. More than forty years ago negotiations were opened between this Synod and the Synod of South Carolina with reference to union. But these two bodies were not co-ordinate and could not treat with each other. The matter was therefore taken up by the Old School Assembly and committees of conference were appointed by the two bodies. Nothing came of this conference. At an informal convention of ministers and elders of the respective churches, held in Columbia, S. C., in March, 1858, to find out on what terms the two bodies might be brought together, it was ascertained that the chief if not only bar to this union was the practice of the two bodies on the subject of psalmody. The Associate brethren, in common with all bodies of Presbyterians in other lands speaking the English tongue, using Rouse's version of the Psalms, and they as a Church making it a matter of conscience to use in divine worship only

what had been divinely authorized, and therefore insisting heretofore that the Psalms are to be used alone, and in a version as nearly literal as the laws of meter will admit. The brethren of the Synod proposed that a new version of the Psalms should be made by translation or collation, and when approved by both bodies to be employed by each denomination, not on the principle of accommodation but as authorized by the Head of the Church and by the Church itself. While they did not feel at liberty to use anything else as songs but the Psalms, yet they believed many persons in their body for the sake of union would be willing to forbear with their Presbyterian brethren in the use of uninspired songs. The Presbyterians replied that if the Associate brethren meant that a praise book shall be prepared in which there *shall* be a literal version of the Psalms, and in which there *may* be a collection of hymns and spiritual songs, and if this version was not designed to supersede the book of hymns and Watts' imitation of the Psalms in use throughout the Assembly, they could not see anything to hinder an immediate union of the two bodies. They were prepared to concede to their Associate brethren the exclusive use of their version of the Psalms and to take steps for having it incorporated in the Presbyterian book. But if these brethren meant to exclude from our churches the songs of praise then in use by us and their new version to supersede our hymns in our congregations, the Presbyterians replied that this would be asking us to abandon our whole doctrine on the subject of psalmody. This convention came to no further results than to ascertain these facts and to part with fraternal regards, and perhaps with a conviction that things were not yet ripe for union.

Our Assembly in 1861 reopened the question of union with the A. R. Synod. The hymn book at that time in use among us contained fifty-two of the Psalms used by the Associate brethren, and the Assembly proposed that when another edition was published, to put the entire 150 Psalms at the beginning of the book, if so desired. After four years the

negotiations were terminated by the Synod. But this action gave dissatisfaction in some parts of the Synod. Its Presbytery of Alabama expressed its dissent from that action and its determination to persevere in the fear of God to final accomplishment of the union. On learning these facts the Assembly of 1866 authorized the Synod of Alabama to receive that body into union with itself, conceding to its members the right to use the old psalmody and to protect its ministers and churches in such continued use. Similar instructions were given to the Synod of Kentucky with reference to the A. R. Presbytery of Kentucky in 1870, and the Committee of Publication was instructed to insert Rouse's version of the Psalms in the book of praise, as a part of the authorized psalmody of the Church. Later, in 1896, the Assembly declined to co-operate in a movement of the U. P. General Assembly, looking to an improved metrical version of the Psalms. The Associate Synod numbers 101 ministers and more than 11,000 members. Its greatest strength is in the Carolinas. Its total contributions last year amounted to \$55,000. Its College and Theological Seminary are in Due West, S. C. Its stated clerk is Rev. James Boyce, Huntersville, N. C. Its ninety-fifth session will be held in Chester, S. C., November 10th, 1898. It co-operates with the U. P. Church in Home Missions, and efforts have been made in the past to formally unite these two bodies. We greatly hope the time has come when these estimable brethren, so heartily at one with us in doctrine and polity, may become one with us in organic life and work. The fact that we were about to undertake the preparation of a new hymn book was suggested in the overture from Columbia Presbytery, which proposed the conference, as making this an auspicious time for reopening negotiations. If we are one, let us unite. Unions should never be forced. Organic unity should ground on genuine unity.

The amendment to chapter 13, section 4, of the Rules of Discipline, designed to conform the law to the principle that the courts are not parties in cases of process, obtained the

sanction of a majority of the presbyteries and was enacted into law. Two amendments to the Constitution were sent down to be voted on. The first proposes to so change the baptismal formula in the Directory for Worship as to restore the original form: "I baptize thee *in* the name, &c.," instead of "*into* the name," that the formula may be in harmony with all other parts of the Standards in which the sentence occurs. The draft for a Directory of Worship as submitted by the committee of revision in 1893 contained the old formula, but it was changed by the Assembly so as to read "into" instead of "in," on the ground that this more nearly translates the original Greek of the New Testament. This is true, yet it is doubtful if its incorporation in the Directory can ever make the use of the new formula general. The standards elsewhere use the other expression. If the use of "in the name of" conveys the impression of "by the authority of," which is not its meaning, the use of "into," to one not accustomed to classical construction, who does not grasp the symbolical relations signified, conveys no meaning whatever. The difficulty to plain minds is in the word "name." One is baptized in, or into, the *name* of the Father, &c. Now the name of Christ stands for Christ. To believe on the name of the Son is to believe on the Son. To call on the name of the Lord is to call on the Lord. What we do is to baptize into the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Baptism signifies our engrafting into Christ, our union with him by the Spirit, and so our entrance into the family of God. It symbolically effects this union. It does not do this literally. The problem of interpretation here is solved, if we bear in mind that common principle by which the sacraments and other symbolical acts are spoken of as doing that which they only picture and represent to our faith. As the formula needs explanation in either case, it were best to change it back to the old familiar word.

The second amendment sent down was to so modify the law governing installations as more clearly to recognize the right, if it exists, or to confer the right, if it does not exist,

upon ruling elders to deliver one of the charges in the installation of a pastor. There is evident confusion in the law on this point, due to the fact that the book provides specifically for an installation only when it immediately follows an ordination to the pastoral office. Ordination is primarily by a presbytery, but may be by a commission after the requisite examinations have been held before the presbytery, which commission shall consist of a quorum of the presbytery. Now when one already ordained is to be installed, we have to eliminate such parts of the section prescribing its conduct as pertain exclusively to the ordination service. And as such installations are seldom conducted by the presbytery itself, but by special brethren deputed for that purpose, the law, by reason of this complication of two separable things in one, might seem to require that this commission also shall consist of a quorum of the presbytery. And many presbyteries always appoint in installations three ministers and one ruling elder. Furthermore, when the Assembly went through the book some years ago to reduce its features into harmony with the newly formulated law sanctioning the elder-moderatorship of presbytery and the higher courts, by oversight the section on installation and ordination was, at least in one clause, left unconformed, as contemplating a minister as presbytery's moderator presiding in the ordination, and ergo in the installation. And when the installation is had, without the accompanying ordination, then the old, superseded feature requiring (if it be a presbytery) a minister to preside, stands before us in the un-reconstructed law. The installation must be by the presbytery, and by defect in the uncured law, a minister must preside. After the sermon come the two charges. If these three duties are divided among the three ministers, what, it is asked, is the duty of the elder on the commission? We might ask further, what is the duty of the third or even the second minister, since the book requires that both charges shall be by the same person, and even provides that this duty may devolve on him who preaches the sermon. Plainly their duty,

if their presence is necessary, is to make the quorum of the presbytery. But the law of commissions does not declare that a quorum of presbytery is necessary to an installation. We eliminate from section 119 all that is peculiar to ordination when we proceed to install one already ordained, and this sweeps away the requirement that the commission effecting the installation shall consist of a quorum of the court, and abrogates the necessity for the presence of a ruling elder, if he is debarred from presiding and delivering the charges. It abrogates the necessity for a third, or even a second minister. Now the Assembly of 1894 had made a ruling that an elder may not deliver either charge in an installation. This deliverance we believe was wrong. It gave dissatisfaction throughout the Church. It interfered with a practice that was quite general. Hence, when the Committee on Overtures this year reported on the inquiry of the Presbytery of Central Texas, renewing the question as to the constitutionality of thus employing the elder, and asking, if he may not deliver a charge, what is his duty when appointed on such commission, a laugh went up from the entire Assembly when Hon. W. F. Stevenson, having respect to the ruling of 1894, moved as a substitute for the answer proposed this reply: "It is his duty to be there." According to the tight construction, this answer was not only correct but exhaustive of his onerous and honorary functions on that occasion. The climax of absurdity was thus shown in that line of construction which requires the elder to be there and do nothing. The Assembly, we think wisely, relieved the elder of this embarrassing situation by adopting the substitute of Dr. J. Albert Wallace, that an elder may deliver the charge. The "some other" in section 119 may mean some other person, or presbyter. It is an indefinite pronoun. That this construction is easily admissible may be shown in that, in the first part of the section, the parallel and synonymous expression is "some other member." Here we were content to rest. But the action did not give satisfaction. Dr. Finley gave notice of a protest against this answer as

violative of the Constitution, and it gained many influential signatures. Evidently here is a point in our law which is anything but clear, on which one Assembly reverses another. What is needed is not deliverances of doubtful validity, but a clearing up of the law itself by amending away its ambiguity. Private conference among brethren representing the opposing views revealed that there was no difference of opinion as to the inherent propriety of an elder delivering the charge, but only as to whether as the law now stands such action is lawful. To cure the Church of this distraction and reach a result that would harmonize the Assembly, it was proposed that the Assembly reconsider its action, that the advocates of that action concede for the time the correctness of the decision of 1894, that the elder is debarred from the charges, and that both sides unite in proposing such a change in the law as would make it legitimate for the presbytery to lay this duty upon competent elders whenever it should seem expedient. This was done with great unanimity, and the notice of protest was withdrawn. We believe this is a wise result. Conflicting interpretations of a law generate confusion. All recognize that at times this duty can admirably and appropriately be discharged by our gifted and godly elders, that in the sparser parts of the Church, especially where one is to be installed over several churches, it is often feasible to get a suitable elder for this work when it is difficult to secure a minister, and that often there is an eminent propriety growing out of local and personal relations in the appointment of an elder to this work. Many would ask for no change in the law to make this legitimate. Even if it infringes the letter, it is in one of those points which involve no vital principle, one of those circumstantial features of the law, departure from which is no more serious than many which are constantly tolerated without censure; certainly no more serious an infringement than the appointment of two ministers to deliver charges, one to the pastor and one to the people, when the law provides for only one to deliver both charges. Every year we read of presbyteries being opened

“by request” with a sermon by some one else than the moderating minister, which is without warrant in the law. Brethren who stand in peculiar relations to the pastor or the church, are brought from other presbyteries to preach the sermon or deliver the charge, which the law contemplates shall be only by members of the presbytery effecting the relation. When Dr. Palmer went recently to Athens Presbytery to assist in the installation of a friend; when Dr. Price went to Little Rock to take part in the service, where the minister was his son-in-law, or to Trenton, where the pastor-elect was a former pupil; when Dr. Beattie performed a similar service out of his presbytery, in Anchorage,—these brethren in one sense transgressed the law; and yet they did not, for the law is not thus to be judged. The employment of an elder, in the extremist view of it, is no worse than these and others that we lend sanction to. A prudent latitude makes for flexibility, and can be productive of no harm. The circumstantial features of a law cannot be lifted into co-ordinate importance with its fundamental principles.

But as others, not opposed to the thing itself, do not regard the delivery of a charge by an elder as an infraction of the law, let us change the law and conserve a practice that is widespread and useful. We have heard one or two declare that this is intruding the elder into a work that, as it involves a teaching element, should be reserved exclusively to ministers. This is a strange criticism to hear in a Church that exalts the eldership as does the Southern Presbyterian Church. The ruling elder has also a teaching function. Over and over have our higher courts urged the elders in vacant churches to gather the congregation on the Sabbath and preach to them, to exhort and teach in the prayer meetings and on other occasions. But bear in mind after all, that the pastoral relation is determined and ordered by presbytery, which judges of the conditions, and that the function of the commission is largely declarative. The bearer of the charge is but the messenger of the court sending him. An elder may, in the name of the

presbytery, counsel a church and admonish to faithfulness, without arrogating the office of a minister.

The amendment proposes to authorize the presbytery to employ an elder in delivering only the charge to the people. It is presumed that no installation will likely occur at which there is not at least one minister present, appointed to preach. If no other is sent, this one can be required to deliver the charge to the pastor. This much amendment will secure sufficient flexibility. Yet the overture might have gone farther, with no impropriety and expressly empowered the elder to deliver either charge. But in its present shape it is a compromise, a solution proposed by the General Assembly for the correction of divergent views and practices under the present law. If it is adopted and works well, the question may sometime in the future be considered of further amending the law.

At this Assembly its venerable stated clerk, Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., LL. D., constrained by growing feebleness and the weight of years, tendered his resignation of the office which he had held for a third of a century, and in which he had achieved great usefulness. Prior to his election to the stated clerkship, he had served the Assembly for four years as its permanent clerk. He entered upon this work in the prime of his young manhood, and from no one of our thirty-eight Assemblies has he been absent. His commanding figure, his rich and mellow voice, his overflowing fund of humor, his acknowledged ability and wide acquaintance with ecclesiastical affairs, made him a marked personage in our General Assemblies, in which he so long wielded a powerful and conservative influence. In parting with its aged servant the Assembly by a unanimous resolution bore testimony to his distinguished and appreciated services, and invoked upon him during all the remaining years of his life the blessing of Almighty God.

Clarksville, Tenn.

W. A. ALEXANDER.

VI. THE NORTHERN GENERAL ASSEMBLY— WINONA—1898.

The General Assembly met again at Winona, a vast new park in the North West, of great beauty, growing into increased popularity as a summer resort, especially suitable for summer schools, and seeking to divide honors with Saratoga as a favorite place for the meetings of the General Assembly. Winona has many advantages on its side as a place of meeting. It is quiet and retired, and the managers of it have put forth most strenuous exertions to make it in every way convenient for the General Assembly, and they have succeeded just as far as it is possible to succeed under the limitations. The Assembly appreciated the work which had been done and the advantages which were afforded in a very cordial vote of thanks. Minneapolis was chosen as the next place of meeting.

The opening sermon was preached by the retiring Moderator, the Rev. Sheldon Jackson, D. D., one of the heroic figures in the Home Mission work in the Presbyterian Church, who is now United States Superintendent of Education for the territory of Alaska. The Moderator was Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, pastor of the New York Avenue Church, Washington. He was suave and courteous, and his responses to the various addresses were very appropriate.

The reports of the year showed that the Board of Foreign Missions had been freed from debt, although this result was obtained by the use of almost drastic methods of retrenchment and economy. The contributions were less for this year than they were ten years ago. The average being 92 cents a member, while it has passed \$1.00. One of the pleasing features of the Assembly was the large and generous recognition given to the representatives of the foreign field upon the platform of the Assembly. Conspicuous were Dr. Ewing and Dr. Wood-

side of India and Dr. Noyes of Canton. The Board of Home Missions reported total receipts of \$702,400 and a debt of \$167,000. The Woman's Board received \$278,700 and paid off its debt. Dr. Thompson, the new Secretary, made a fine impression by his spirited and courageous address, and infused new hope into the Assembly that under his wise leadership the debt would be wiped out. Dr. John Dixon of Trenton, N. J., who was one of the conspicuous figures in the General Assembly, has since been chosen assistant Secretary of Home Missions and it is announced that he has accepted. The Board of Freedmen reported an increase in its debt. Its work extends at present to 187 ministers and 322 churches. The Board of Aid for Colleges reported a debt, due to the embezzlement by its former Treasurer, which amounted to over \$60,000. Through the strenuous efforts of the President of the Board, Dr. Herrick Johnson, and the Secretary, Dr. Ray, this debt was paid off with the exception of \$4,000. It was announced that the Synod had contributed seventy-five per cent. of the funds that replaced those stolen. The Board of Ministerial Relief reported that its debt had been paid, although it had cared for 875 families at an expense of \$197,136. The Board of Publication reported a net profit of \$31,000, and pointed to 472 churches organized as the result of this Sabbath School work in the last ten years. The Board of Church Erection announced that its total receipts had been \$137,349, its disbursements \$129,040, and that during the year it had made 127 grants and 20 loans for the erection of church buildings. The general result of these reports was cheering, and the Commissioners were impressed with the bright prospects which were before the Church for the future.

One of the most important administrative questions which came before the General Assembly, was the report of a committee of fifteen on the reorganization of the Home Mission work, of which the Rev. Dr. Withrow, who is now pastor of the Park Street Congregational Church of Boston, was Chairman. This report is a series of compromises between the

central idea represented by the Board of Home Missions and the Synodical idea now prevailing in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. The report was submitted and adopted with scarcely any discussion, and there has been no mention of it in the public press since the Assembly adjourned. It is impossible, therefore, to predict what its effect will be, especially in the frontier work of the Church.

A very spirited debate arose upon a report from a Committee on Church Periodicals, of which the Rev. Dr. Holmes, Pittsburg, was Chairman. This Committee recommended the discontinuance of the *Church at Home and Abroad* and the *Assembly Herald*, and the publication of a new journal in New York, not in Philadelphia, to begin the first of January. No debate in the Assembly elicited more interest than this, and the report of the Committee was carried by a very large vote.

Various questions bearing on church polity came before the General Assembly. The amendment to the Book of Church Order on the powers of sessions in reference to church property was reported to have been adopted by vote of a large majority of Presbyteries. The corresponding amendment, recommending that, as far as possible, the deacons of the church shall be the trustees of church property, was lost for the want of not more than a dozen votes.

In answer to an overture, an *ad interim* committee was appointed to consider the question of reducing the size of the General Assembly, which, in the judgment of many, is becoming unwieldy. No action, however, was taken on the proposition to introduce biennial or triennial meetings of the Assembly. The finances of the Assembly are in a prosperous condition, a large surplus being on hand, sufficient to warrant the reduction of the Assembly's *per capita* from six cents to four cents a communicant.

A very earnest debate took place upon the report of the Committee on Temperance. The debate centered upon the question of bar-rooms in college towns and the responsibility of colleges for this. The Assembly was heartily united in

the purpose to suppress, by every legitimate means, the evils of drink, and to exercise the authority of the Church to this end whenever possible. It recognized, however, that this was largely a civil as well as a moral question, and that its wisest course was to counsel parents, teachers and college faculties to the most zealous watchfulness against these evils.

The spirit of patriotic devotion made itself felt through the meetings of the General Assembly. On the first Saturday afternoon of the meeting the General Assembly adjourned and gave way to a patriotic meeting, at which addresses were delivered by representative men, both of the ministry and of the eldership, largely from those who had participated in the civil war. A most enthusiastic reception was given to the address of the Rev. J. M. Barkley of Detroit, who had been in the Confederate army, and who spoke with great eloquence on the reunion of North and South. The patriotic meeting adopted the following resolutions:

To the General Assembly—Your committee, to whom was referred the foregoing resolution, beg leave to report the following for consideration and adoption:

“The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, in session at Winona Lake, Ind., congratulates the country upon the wise course pursued by the President in first exhausting every method of diplomatic negotiation in his endeavor to settle the question at issue between this country and Spain before declaring for armed intervention, thereby deserving and commanding the sympathetic approval not only of all the people of this country, but the considerate judgment of mankind.

The government of the United States in this great contest is presenting the spectacle the like of which is not recorded in the world's history—a nation calling upon its citizens to go forth to battle, not for our own country, not for gain, not for glory, but for humanity, for freedom to a down-trodden people, who are fighting against the tyrannical and murderous domination of Spain, who have sacrificed their homes, their families

and hundreds of thousands of lives—all that is near and dear to them—that they and their children after them may be free.

The Christian conscience of the whole civilized world has been shocked at the inhuman atrocities committed by the Spanish government upon the citizens of Cuba, whose sole offense is striving to be free.

The great Presbyterian Church represented here to-day has always been loyal to God, to humanity and to country, and believing that the cause in which this government is engaged is a just cause, a righteous cause, and that the pulsations of the 4,000,000 of its adherents is now beating in patriotic emotion for the success of our arms upon land and sea; be it, therefore,

Resolved, That the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America indorse the wise and patriotic course pursued by the President in his conduct of the war, and hereby pledge to him and to the army and navy our sympathy, our prayers and our support.

Resolved, That the General Assembly recommend to pastors of its churches throughout the land that these resolutions be read from the pulpits at the memorial services on Sunday, May 29, and that the prayers of our ministers and people be continually offered to the Throne of Grace for the success of our arms for the extension of human freedom and independence, and for the further spread among this freedom-seeking people of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be engrossed by the Stated Clerk and entered upon the Minutes of the Assembly, and that he be and is hereby requested to forthwith forward by telegraph a copy to the President."

GEO. W. HULICK,
A. NOEL BLAKEMAN, } *Committee.*
WM. C. ROBERTS,

These resolutions being communicated to the General Assembly, were referred to a Committee on Bills and Overtures, which Committee brought in the following action, that was unanimously adopted:

“The Presbyterian Church has always stood for loyalty to the nation, and its sons have ever manifested their loyalty by deeds, not words, and therefore, in view of the action taken at the patriotic meetings on Saturday last, in which the members of this Assembly generally participated, this Assembly does not deem it necessary to take action at this time, further than to declare the loyalty of its members, and to voice its prayer, that our chief magistrate, his counsellors, as well as our Senators and Representatives, may be divinely guided in the solemn issues of the present hour, and that the blessing of God may rest upon our sailors and our soldiers, and that the result of this war may be the deliverance of the oppressed and the extension of Christ’s kingdom.”

This action was one in which, doubtless, all Presbyterians might heartily join, notwithstanding the differences of opinion as to the so-called political deliverances, and it ought to be clearly distinguished from the action of the patriotic meeting to which it alludes.

A resolution of respectful congratulation to the Queen of Great Britain and a message of hearty good will to our brethren across the sea were also adopted.

In answer to certain papers sent up by certain churches in Texas and to a resolution offered in the Assembly on the subject of organic union with the Southern Presbyterian Church, the following was adopted :

“The Assembly deems no action necessary in response to the overtures from certain churches in Texas, or the resolution offered in the body, relating to organic union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States, further than to refer to the expression of its attitude in the premises as found in the Minutes of the Assembly of 1894, p. 140.”

This action is as follows :

“In the matter of the Special Committee of Conference with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States with a view to organize union,

It was *Resolved*, That while this Assembly accepts the action

of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, of which it has been notified, as sufficiently indicating the wisdom of suspending for the present everything like overtures looking to a union with that body, it desires to put on record its regret for such suspension."

The Presbytery of Pittsburg sent up an overture calling the attention of the Assembly to a recently published book, entitled *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, written by the Rev. A. C. McGiffert, D. D., a Professor in Union Seminary, who is also and at the same time a member of the Presbytery of New York. The overture was referred without debate to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, which Committee gave it a long and careful consideration, and as a result three reports were submitted. The first of these reports, offered by the Rev. Dr. Sheldon Jackson, Chairman, and signed by a majority of the committee, was in substance as follows :

* * * * * *

"The General Assembly deplores the renewal of controversy occasioned by the publication of this book at a time when our recent divisions were scarcely healed. It sympathizes with the wide-spread belief that the utterances of Dr. McGiffert are inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture as interpreted by the Presbyterian Church, and by Evangelical Christendom. And the Assembly stamps with its emphatic disapproval, all utterances in the book called to its attention by the Presbytery of Pittsburg, not in accord with the standards of our Church.

* * * * * *

"The Assembly, therefore, deems it wise to take no action at present, in the earnest hope that Dr. McGiffert may be led to make a satisfactory explanation of his position in relation to the Standards of our Church, or in default thereof, peaceably to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministry."

The first minority report, signed by Rev. Dr. Bryan and six other members of the Committee, was as follows :

"The Assembly deplores the renewal of controversy occasioned by the publication of this book at a time when our

recent divisions were scarcely healed ; it recognizes the widespread belief that the utterances of Dr. McGiffert are inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture as interpreted by the Presbyterian Church and by evangelical Christendom ; and it notes the painful anxiety which is being felt concerning the effect of these utterances on the life and work of the Church.

“Therefore, without pronouncing judgment upon the teachings of this book, or upon the views of its author, the Assembly directs the Presbytery of New York, of which Dr. McGiffert is a member, to confer with Dr. McGiffert for the relief of the Church, either by a satisfactory explanation or otherwise, and to take such further action as the peace and purity of the Church may require.”

The third minority report, signed by Dr. Francis Brown, colleague of Dr. McGiffert, was as follows :

“The Assembly is confident that no one acquainted with the history of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America can doubt its condemnation of the false and pernicious teaching charged against the book in question by the Presbytery of Pittsburg, involving such matters as the irreverent handling of the New Testament ; ‘the setting aside of its authority as a divine rule of faith and practice ;’ the ‘denial of fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Christendom ;’ the ‘treating with open contempt the obligations by which the author and all other Presbyterian ministers have bound themselves,’ and the like.

“But the Church just now needs peace—the union of all its forces, the co-operation of all its members, the spirit of brotherhood and mutual confidence—that it may address itself with intense zeal and no waste of energy to its great, pressing and practical work of saving the souls of men.

“The Assembly, therefore, without pronouncing upon the question as to how far the terms employed by the Presbytery of Pittsburg are, or are not, justified by the actual teachings of the book referred to, deems it wise that no further action be taken.”

These reports were presented on Wednesday afternoon, and an hour was taken for the consideration of them on Friday. As the time of the Assembly was drawing to a close, this consideration was limited to Friday afternoon, and the Assembly having heard the speeches in support of the three reports, engaged in a very brief debate and then adopted the majority report, amended in its last paragraph by Dr. John Dixon of New Jersey, as follows :

“The Assembly, therefore, in a spirit of kindness, no less than in devotion to the truth, counsels Dr. McGiffert to reconsider the questionable views set forth in his book, and if he cannot conform his views to the standards of our Church, then peaceably to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministry.”

One of the most interesting features of the Assembly was the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Westminster Standards. The whole of Thursday was given to this celebration and twelve addresses were delivered, four at each session, and sustaining to one another a close relation. These addresses were of a very high order and were listened to with profound interest by the General Assembly. They are to be published in a volume and will form a worthy recognition of the anniversary.

VII. THE FIRST ATTEMPT AT CHURCH UNION IN AMERICA.

“Calvinism is divisive,” it is said. We do not accept this charge as true. Calvinists are not more guilty of this than other Christian denominations, for there are divisions also among Methodists and Lutherans in this country. That a Calvinist is generally tenacious of what he believes to be true, is a truism. Better indeed a schism for right than a union with wrong. It has been the glory of Calvinism that its motto has been, “there must be no compromise with evil.” We believe, however, that the tendency of Calvinism is not toward division, but toward union. Division is not in the essential nature of Calvinism. Its cause lies not in Calvinism itself but in the circumstances that have surrounded some of the branches of that far-reaching family. The famous words of Calvin may be taken as its keynote. In writing to Archbishop Cranmer, in 1552, about church union, he says: “The body of Christ is torn asunder, because the members are separated. So far as I am concerned, if I can be of any use, I will readily pass over ten seas to effect the object in view.” In fulfilment of these irenic words of Calvin, it is interesting to note that the first attempt at union of denomination in the new world was made by Calvin’s followers, namely, a union of the Dutch and German Reformed with the Scotch Presbyterians in 1744. It is true, the attempt was ineffectual. But it presents an interesting phase of Reformed and Presbyterian Church History. It was one of the most important religious movements of the last century; and although abortive, it is a helpful study in Church unity, of whose science we learn more by failures than by successes.

In his *American Presbyterianism*, page 284, Rev. Dr. Briggs speaks of this attempted union thus: “Divine Providence, in 1744, afforded the American (Presbyterian) Synod a magnifi-

cent opportunity for combining the entire Presbyterian and Reformed strength in the colonies into one grand organization." Dr. Briggs' description of this movement is based on Presbyterian sources. We have just found the original correspondence between the Presbyterians of America and the Reformed of Holland about this subject, which throws much additional light on it. Our Presbyterian friends may not know how long this subject was under consideration by the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, who discussed it for twelve years, 1741-53. Nor do they know how near it came to being an actuality. The history of it is as follows :

I. THE FIRST EFFORT (1743-47).

The union of the Reformed of America with the Presbyterians came up in the Church of Holland earlier than it has been supposed. It appeared in connection especially with the German Reformed Churches of Pennsylvania, whom the Reformed Church of the Netherlands (owing to the poverty of the Reformed Church of Germany) had promised to foster. It was first suggested by the Holland deputies (who had charge of the Pennsylvania affairs) three years before it was generally supposed to be. As early as 1741, the deputies wrote to Rev. Mr. Dorsius, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in Bucks County, Pa., and to Rev. Mr. Frelinghuysen, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church on the Raritan, N. J., about it, but they do not seem to have received any reply. When Rev. Mr. Dorsius visited Holland in 1743, the deputies very earnestly asked him what the Presbyterian Coetus (Synod) was, and whether the Dutch and German congregations could not be united with it, and thus the Holland Church be relieved from the care of them. They gave him two letters to take with him when he went back to America. One was to the German Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania, urging them to unite with the Presbyterians; the other was to the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia. Dorsius soon after his return in January, 1744, went to Philadelphia and laid the second letter

before the two Presbyterian ministers there. He translated the letter into English and brought it before the Presbyterian Synod in 1744, who took the following action, May 25, 1744: "The Rev. Mr. Dorsius, pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church in Bucks County, laid a letter before us from the deputies of North and South Holland, wherein they desire of the Synod an account of the High and Low Dutch Churches in this province and also of the Churches belonging to the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia, and whether the Dutch Churches may not be joined in communion with said Synod; or if this can not be, that they form themselves into a regular body and government among themselves. In pursuance of which letter, the Synod agree that letters be wrote to the deputies of these Synods in Holland in Latin and to the Scotch ministers of Rotterdam, giving them an account of the Churches here and declaring their willingness to join with the Calvinistic Dutch Churches here to assist each other as far as possible in promoting the common interests of religion among us, and signifying the present great want of ministers among the High and Low Dutch, with desire that they help in educating men for the work of the ministry." To carry this out the Presbyterian Synod appointed a committee to correspond with the deputies of the Church of Holland, consisting of the president of the Synod, Rev. Mr. McHenry, and Rev. Messrs. Andrews, Cross, and Evans, Jr. Mr. McHenry wrote, June 14, 1744. In his letter he reciprocates the kindly feeling of the Dutch toward the Presbyterians. He speaks of the respect that the Presbyterians had for the German Reformed, who hold to Calvin's doctrine. He says there are a great number of German Reformed in the colony with only one or two ministers to serve them, and that through neglect they are in danger of being led astray by adventurers or the sects, especially by the Moravians, who are multiplying. He declared that the Presbyterians were favorable to union, but if that could not be brought about, he trusts that the Church of Holland would aid them in their high school, by which ministers could be educated for the

ministry of the German or Dutch Churches in this continent. In addition to this letter he also wrote a letter to Rev. Mr. Kennedy, pastor of the Scotch Church at Rotterdam, in Holland, who in all these negotiations acted as a mediator between the Presbyterians of Pennsylvania and the deputies of the Holland Church.

These letters were not brought before the Holland Synods till the next year. The mails were slow and so were the Dutch. On April 28th, the Holland deputies mention the receipt of the letters, and reported them to the Synod at their meeting in the summer of 1745. The Synod listened to them with great pleasure, and referred them back to the deputies for more information. The deputies continued their work, and on November 16th, Deputy Du Vignon reported that he had had a long conference at Rotterdam with Rev. Mr. Kennedy, who thought that there would be no trouble about the union in Pennsylvania.

But although everything seemed auspicious, yet difficulties began to spring up. The nearer two denominations are to a union, the farther often they are from it, for then the little differences are sometimes magnified out of all proportion.

The first difficulty was the refusal of the German Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania to enter the union. They looked upon it as a giving up of all that was dear to them. Rev. John Philip Boehm, the founder of that Church, gives five reasons: 1. They did not wish to give up their Church Constitution, which he had drawn up. 2. They did not understand English; and a union would, therefore, be useless. 3. They did not wish to give up their Heidelberg Catechism. 4. Nor did they wish to give up the Canons of Dort to which they were pledged. 5. Nor did they wish to give up their use of liturgical forms at sacraments and marriages. (The Sabbath service of the Reformed was a free service like the Presbyterians, but for extraordinary occasions they used liturgical forms. Their liturgies were not responsive like the Episcopal or Lu-

theran.) For these reasons, Boehm declined with the German congregations to go into the union.

The second opposition came from the Dutch ministers of New York. They had always been strongly Calvinistic, and looked on the Presbyterian Synod as having some elements in it, who were Arminian. The Presbyterian Synod had been torn by dissensions about the Whitfield movement until it divided, in 1741. However, although the Synod of Philadelphia represented the conservative Calvinistic element, the Dutch of New York were still suspicious.

The Holland Synods, when they heard of this opposition, referred the matter to the deputies for more information. The Presbyterians in Pennsylvania, however, did not let the matter rest. They were hurt by the charges against their Calvinistic orthodoxy. On October 16, 1746, Rev. Mr. Cross, of Philadelphia, wrote a letter to Rev. Mr. Kennedy, of Rotterdam, defending them. He said the Presbyterians of Philadelphia favored union. He thought that the objections of the Germans on the ground of the Heidelberg Catechism and Synod of Dort were of little importance. He thought they could retain their creed and yet be in the same organization with the Presbyterians. He also repelled the charges of unsoundness of doctrine made by the Dutch ministers of New York. He denied any Arminianism or Pelagianism among them. On the contrary, the Synod had been careful to exclude the followers of Whitfield. He closed with thanks to Rev. Mr. Kennedy for maintaining their cause before the Holland deputies. So closed the first effort at union. It left the Presbyterians willing and the Holland Church waiting.

THE SECOND EFFORT (1750-52).

But the subject of union would not remain quiet. Church union, like hope, springs eternal in the human breast; like truth when crushed to earth will rise again. It was only laid on the table, as we Americans say. It is not the Presbyterians who start the movement this second time, but the Holland

Church. Suddenly it reasserted itself in 1750. It came up in this way: In 1746, the deputies of Holland had sent Rev. Michael Schlatter to Pennsylvania to organize the German Churches, which he did September 29, 1747, by organizing them into a Coetus. But, in 1749, an unfortunate quarrel broke out in the Reformed congregation of Philadelphia. Rev. Mr. Schlatter was dismissed by that congregation and Rev. Mr. Steiner took his place, and the congregation divided. By 1750 the Holland deputies were weary of the quarrel. They were unable to get very much light on the subject, as they were so far away. Other important matters concerning the Pennsylvania Churches were waiting for decision. In this somewhat confused state of affairs, the project of union with the Presbyterians came up again. The Holland Church was beginning to feel it was too far away to decide the difficult questions of Pennsylvania; while the Presbyterians were on the ground and would be better able to do so. The deputies reported to the South Holland Synod, asking whether, in view of the strife in Pennsylvania, it would not be better to revive the union of the Coetus with the Presbyterians. This overture was seconded by one of the classis of that Synod, the Classis of Leyden. The South Holland Synod approved of the union. The deputies reported the same suggestion to the North Holland Synod that year. The Synod was pleased with the project and returned it to the deputies for more information. Thus both of the Synods who had the special charge of the Pennsylvania affairs acted favorably. This action met with a hearty response from the Dutch. At the next meeting of the South Holland Synod, four of its classis overtured in favor of the union. The Synod urged Rev. Mr. Schlatter, who was then in Europe, to try and bring about the union on his return to Philadelphia. He himself was favorable to it, for in May, 1751, he says: "The reasons why there is no union of the German Reformed with the Presbyterians do not touch religion, for they live together as brethren—yes, even wish to be united. But the ignorance of the Germans and their obstinacy and

wonderful misgivings would not permit it, because they looked upon it as a change of religion." This seems to be rather strong language by a German about the Germans, but it also reveals the tenacious love of the German Reformed for their own faith and for their excellent Heidelberg Catechism.

However, at the meeting of the North Holland Synod that year (it met later than the South Holland Synod), opposition to the proposed union appeared. The Synod said it had learned that the Presbyterian Synod of Pennsylvania was not the same as the Church of Scotland, whose creed and cultus agreed with the Dutch, but an independent denomination, without creed or church government or simple liturgy, such as the Dutch had. Their information must have made them think it was a Congregationalist body. It, therefore, declined to go any further in the matter of union, but urged Mr. Schlatter to build up the German Reformed Coetus of Pennsylvania, and requested it to keep in correspondence with the Dutch Reformed Coetus of New York. They also ordered the deputies to write to Rev. Mr. DuBois of the Dutch Church of New York for more information. As a result of this action the South Holland Synod of 1752, which the year before had been so favorable, withdrew its permission for the same reason; and the North Holland Synod, in 1753, reaffirmed its decision. All this shows the anxiety of the Holland Church to preserve its children in America in the strictest Calvinism. This shows that Dr. Briggs in his *American Presbyterianism* is wrong. He there charges the conservatives, in the Synod of the Presbyterian Church, who drove out the Whitfield party, with having prevented the union of the Dutch, German and Scotch Calvinists. The very reverse is true, according to the Holland minutes. The Church of Holland never would have allowed her children in America to go into a union with a Synod that had the Whitfield men in it, because it suspected them of herodoxy, and disliked their Moravian pietism. It was so opposed to a union with anything that savored of this, that it would not unite with the Synod because it had once had Whitfieldians

in it, though it had cast them out. Thus the attempted union failed. This second attempt bade fair at first to be successful. But Schlatter's success in organizing the German Coetus of Pennsylvania, and the opposition of the North Holland Synod to any Arminianism in the Presbyterian Synod, stopped it.

So ended the union movement. Had it occurred, it would have been one of the most important religious movements of the last century. Its political effect would have been far-reaching. Calvinism would have gained ascendancy in the colonies as the Scotch, German, Dutch and French united in one. As the war of the revolution, viewed religiously, was a union of all Calvinists in doctrine, Presbyterians, Reformed, Congregationalists, Baptists (the only Arminian denomination favoring liberty was the Lutheran), against Episcopacy, it would have greatly strengthened that union and been of large political significance. It was not only an important movement, but an interesting study in the new science of irenics or Church Union. The time has now come when Church Union should be lifted out of the mists and confusion that has surrounded it, and be elevated into a science. The principles of interdenominational union should be as clear as those of international law. Had the various forms of union, [fellowship for practical work, federation and fusion,] been understood then, it would probably have taken place. The idea of federation would have answered Boehm's objections to it. It has remained for this nineteenth century to develop the idea of federation, which seems destined to be the most popular form of union in the future. But in the providence of God, these three denominations, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed and German Reformed, were permitted to remain separate. Each was thus permitted to develop its own type of Calvinism. Had the union occurred, the Dutch and German elements would have been absorbed in the larger and continually increasing English Presbyterian element. But each was allowed to develop, and we have, the conservatism of the Dutch, the irenics of the German, and the breadth of sympathy of the Presbyterian.

Besides, as denominations are growing so large in this country as to be unwieldy and unable to give proper representation in the upper courts, it was well that they remained apart and formed smaller denominations. With the spirit of a Calvinist we say philosophically, "it was to be so," and we therefore have to-day a more varied type of Calvinism in America than if there had been union.

Finally, even if the proposed union did not take place, it was a prophecy, which has been fulfilled in the "Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system." Had that been known of in 1744, it would have solved the problem of union. Let us rejoice that in our day, we have such an Alliance to show the essential unity of historic Calvinism while still perpetuating its distinctive types.

Reading, Pa.

JAS. I. GOOD.

VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BUDDE'S DAS BUCH DER RICHTER.

DAS BUCH DER RICHTER, *erklärt von Dr. Karl Budde.* Ord. Professor der Theologie in Strassburg. Leipsic: J. C. B. Mohr.

The very latest production of the teeming German religious press is the *Kurzer Hand Commentar zum Alten Testament*, published in Liepsic by J. C. B. Mohr. Of the six volumes at hand we latterly ventured some observations in these pages upon Proverbs and Job. Since then Judges, expounded by Dr. Budde, has mainly attracted our attention. We have recently spent many a perplexed hour over this interesting and difficult portion of the Bible. We have not, of course, come to any very satisfactory solution of the literary and historical problems presented by its contents. But neither, we are bound to add, do Dr. Budde's labors assist us to any better conclusions. Indeed, they only add to our confusion.

This is pre-eminently a "critical" commentary. There is, therefore, no occasion for surprise to find its method characterized by the freest freedom of criticism and its conclusions shaped and controlled by critical principles exclusively.

At the very threshold of his work Dr. Budde makes it plain that he comes to the treatment of his subject with a distinct bias. He brings to the book he examines the conclusions which he pretends to draw from it. He is a prejudiced witness in favor of the reigning critical mania for disintegration. This explains the constant assumption of the truth of theories and facts of which the reader of the book has had no proof. Dr. Budde builds his critical work upon foundations laid elsewhere. He takes it for granted that the hypotheses of modern criticism concerning, let us say, the Hexateuch—hypotheses that played such havoc alike with the history and the literature of the Bible—have been incontrovertibly demonstrated, and apply, without further argument, with equal force, to Judges. But this, as every candid scholar will admit, is by no means true. Thus far the presumption must still be held to be on the side of the traditional view.

The most casual perusal of Dr. Budde's pages indicate that he deals with this book solely and altogether along the lines of that primal canon of criticism which demands that the literature of the Bible must be treated just like any other literature in the trial of its merits. But in Dr. Budde's hands this rule means the reduction of the book to a purely human plane. There is no acknowledgment, explicit or implied, of any kind of inspiration whatsoever. The treatment is, therefore, wholly mechanical. Thought and time are exhausted in minute examinations of who wrote, re-wrote, edited and re-edited every section, paragraph and verse, and in nicely balancing the probabilities for and against annotations, amendments of and omissions from the text.

In treating, for instance, the Gideon story, such queries as the following are put into the foreground: 1. Can the present status of 6, 1-8, 3 be explained as the revision of a once consistent story, or must it be assumed that two narratives are here combined? 2. If the latter, how far does the combination extend? 3. May portions of 6, 1-8, 3 be used to supplement and complete 8, 4-21, either as an introduction to or as a part of the latter narrative itself? 4. Is ch. 9 merely a continuation of the single narrative in 8, 4-21, or is it the conclusion of the double story in 6, 1-8, 3? 5. Is the main thread of 6-7 only a poorer conception of what is related in 8, 4-21, is it spun out of these verses, or is it an independent, even though later tradition? 6. Can the two names, Jerubbaal and Gideon, be divided between the two main stories? If so, what is their relation? Is it possible that the two names describe two distinct persons? 7. Is there any ground for dividing the two strands of the narrative between J. and E.?

Here is a task peculiarly *apropos* of a critical commentary. Here certainly are problems worthy of a whole corps of German professors. But what, after this kind of work has been done, is the sum total of results? Well, as Dr. Budde's book itself abundantly testifies, granting that these purely critical processes have all been satisfactorily accomplished, absolutely nothing substantial is thereby gained. Granted that a correct and properly applied principle of literary analysis can succeed in separating the component parts of this ancient book, there still remains the determination of their dates, their mutual dependence, their effects on the history, or *vice versa*. And of these things, as well as of the divisive process, the different critics give very different accounts indeed. And when it comes to the vastly more important question whether this or any other book of the Bible can be adequately dealt with in this way, whether the office, dignity and worth of the Scriptures, or any part of them, can be even faintly grasped by such treatment, we are content to leave the answer to the intelligent judgment of the Christian reader.

Further examination of Dr. Budde's work brings to light the fact that, in his eagerness to make good his theories, he has fallen into the curious but common critical error of looking for and demanding nineteenth century literary, historical and critical ideals in productions thousands of years old. Unless these ancient Biblical documents can be made to conform to the canons of modern literary excellence, the conclusion, according to Dr. Budde is irresistible, that they have been seriously and injuriously tampered with by second and third hands, or, as we shall see, by "schools" of hands. But the ancient historiographer was no artist. His *stylus*, whether used to write upon stones or skins, handled by Assyrian or Hebrew, was not the modern pen, Mr. Huxley's so-called "weapon of precision." Exaggeration and contradiction do not, even now, necessarily imply double or treble "sources." Because Dr. Budde lacks the true historical feeling, he cannot measure men and their works by their times.

Still further examination of this commentary reveals the interesting circumstance, that with all his painstaking care, with all of his marvelous induction of related, correlated, interrelated, and unrelated facts, Dr. Budde habitually fails to take cognizance of the human element as a factor in the

production of this book. This may seem to be rather seriously at variance with our other observation, that Dr. Budde looks upon the book as a wholly human piece of work. But there is a difference between knowing a man and knowing something about human nature. Dr. Budde is quite sure the book was made by men, and by men only, but he does not even begin to faintly appreciate the kind of men who made it. Here Dr. Budde is seriously deficient. He lacks sympathy with human nature. He needs a little common sense. He would then be able to appreciate the fact that men are not and never were all alike, that they frequently contradict themselves, that they often exaggerate, that ancient Hebrew chroniclers could be as incomprehensible as any modern German professor! Could Dr. Budde keep such commonplaces in view, it would enable him properly to bend his theories to the facts, instead of always doing the reverse.

Another striking thing about this commentary is the often almost pitiful drivel to which it frequently descends in its treatment of the linguistic and rhetorical phenomena of our book. It would seem that here, at least, Dr. Budde's observations, as those of a trained Hebraist, as a specialist, would be decisive. But it has been well said that "specialists are very prone to become theorists, and a specialist with a theory is a very unsafe guide." This is amply illustrated in the book under review. Take, purely at random, some of the comments in the discussion of Gideon's call. Thus 6 : 14, "And the Lord looked upon him," is said to be "suspicious," even though, as Dr. Budde himself adds, "it would be difficult to say why and from whence it had been added." Then why suspicious? For no other reason than that Dr. Budde's sense that the dramatic proprieties are violated by its, to Dr. Budde, premature revelation of the identity of Gideon's supernatural visitor. But this whole account describes what is evidently a theophanic manifestation. In such accounts the messenger is always more or less distinctly identified with the Lord himself. All the Old Testament writers were saturated with this idea. Can it, then, reasonably surprise us if a writer's deep conviction of this truth should occasionally dominate his sense of the strict dramatic proprieties, if he ever had any, and by such a *lapsus calamus* anticipate his climax? "Have not I sent thee?" in the same verse, is also a later addition, and for the same reason. In 6 : 15, we are told to read אֲדֹנָי instead of אֲדֹנָיִ. Why? Because the latter vocalization being the form always used when God is spoken of, κατ' ἐξοχήν, its use here also indicates a breach of the dramatic proprieties, in that it makes Gideon recognize Jehovah's messenger before, in Dr. Budde's judgment, he ought to be allowed to recognize him.

The second half of this verse *seems* to Dr. Budde to be an amplification based on 1 Samuel 9, 21. Dr. Budde can make this suggestion because he holds, contrary to most of his compeers, that 1 Samuel 9, 21, belongs to a *pre*-Deuteronomic work. In 6, 16, again, for the same reason, Dr. Budde prefers the third person, יְהוָה, of the LXX., to the

first person, **אָהֵב**, of the Receptus. In 6, 17, the request for a sign again presumes too much upon Gideon's perspicacity, and is "surely fore-ign." The latter part of the verse arouses that dreadful critical "suspicion" because of the late (?) form of the relative pronoun **שֶׁ**. The occurrence of this form here indisputably shows the clause to be a gloss, because it occurs in 5, 7. But 5, 7 is by Dr. Budde referred to as a gloss, because *its* peculiar relative form is found in 6, 17! Could any one more correctly reason in a circle? And, anyway, "Shew me a sign that it is thou that talkest with me" is illogical and scarcely possible in a connection in which "I am Yahweh" had gone before. That, of course, is purely a matter of opinion between Dr. Budde and the ancient worthy who penned this account. In 6, 18, **מִנְחָה** *must* mean "sacrificial offering," and is, therefore, an amendment by a later hand, in order, once again, to harmonize with Gideon's all too previous and somewhat persistent recognition of his guest. The second half of this verse, "And he said, I will tarry until thou come again," is graciously put down as "original." But what a pity Dr. Budde does not tell us how he knows it. For our part, we would like to hear his reasons for this truly startling judgment, for back of that simple statement there surely lurks the keenest kind of historical insight, the profoundest scholarship! Bah! Such examples might be multiplied. But enough has been said to show how thoroughly Dr. Budde understands the art of critical legerdemain.

It is time to say something of Dr. Budde's division of the book into its supposedly component parts. Since our space precludes an examination in detail of the whole work, we must content ourselves with an analysis of the Gideon story, a fairly representative portion of Judges and of Dr. Budde's manipulation of it. To this end a bird's-eye view of his division of the entire book will be helpful.

Dr. Budde holds that the authors of our present book of Judges, Rp, lived probably about 400 B. C. These unknown authors had before them a work compiled by D₁ and another slightly later one by D₂. These represented the views of the so-called Deuteronomistic school, the "pragmatists" of the fifth century. D₁ and D₂, in turn, got their material from Rje, a succession of writers who performed about 650. Rje got their material from E and E₂, north-israelitish, theocratic historians of the eighth century, and from J, Judaic writers of the ninth century. J and E, finally, drew upon the popular traditions current in their day.

In harmony with this theory of the composite authorship of the book, its several parts are microscopically divided among no less than nine different "schools," for the reader must bear in mind that the critical symbols J, E, Rje, etc., no longer represent "individual authors, but a succession of writers, the historiography of a certain period and school." This is one of the latest requirements of criticism. It seems to us to knock the last prop from under any possible linguistic or rhetorical argument. Dr. Budde tells us that the separation and restoration of the sources of the complicated Gideon story have recently been frequently attempted, but not with satisfactory results.

He modestly offers the following simple (?) scheme as a contribution toward the solution of the problem. He divides chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 thus :

J	E	E ₂	Rje	D ₂	Rp	Unidentified.
6, 2b-6a, 11, 12b, 18a, 14, 15a, 16, 17a, 18a, 18b, 19, 21-24, 34. 8, 4-9, 10a, 11. 7, 16, 17a, 18b, 19a, 20, 21b. 8, 12a. 7, 22b. 8, 12b, 13-17a, 18-21b, 22?, 24-26, 27a, 30-32. 9, 1-6, 21, 22? 26, 27b, 28-31, 33b, 34b, 35a, 36-40, 46-55.	[6, 12a, 13b, 14, 15b, 16, 17b, 18a, 19a, 20. Possibly to J ₂ ?] 6, 25-31, 33, 36-40. 7, 1, 9-11, 13-15, 16, 17b, 18, 19a, 19b, 20a, 21a, 22a, 22b, 24f. 8, 1-3, 22f? 29. 9, 7-16a, 19b, 20-21, 23-25a, 27a, 25b, 32, 33a, 34a, 43a, 42a, 35b, 43b, 44f, 56f.	6, 7-10. 10, 10-16.	6, 32, 35. 9, 16b-19a? 41, 42b, 43b.	6, 12a, 6b. 8, 28, 33-35.	7, 2-8, 12, 14, 23. 8, 10a, 21b. 9, 16b-19a?	7, 13. 8, 26b.

This scheme is taken bodily from Dr. Budde's pages, but modified by the omission of numerous signs intended to show the several borrowed and revised portions, and how one school omitted certain passages as incompatible with its theories of the history, and how a succeeding school reinserted the discarded statements. In other words, this critic professes to be able to determine with the nicest accuracy, down to the necessary vowel pointings, not only what the different "schools" may have added to, but also what some of them omitted from their compilations. And all from the examination of the one hard and fast Massoretic text, with an occasional hint from the LXX. We leave it to the reader to pass judgment upon the possibility of such a task.

How, now, does Dr. Budde support this intricately elaborate scheme? Is it sustained by arguments to which the ordinary intelligence will yield assent? Or is it largely based upon arbitrary assertion and unproved assertion? Does it rest upon a solid foundation, or does it hang in the air?

We cannot, of course, review the astonishing division of these hapless chapters verse by verse. That would require a volume. We must still further limit our review to a few typical passages.

Why, for instance, does Dr. Budde assign 6^{1-2a} to D₂? Because, he says, it contains the ordinary Deuteronomistic introductory formula. That is to say, Dr. Budde finds certain particular phrases employed in this book (and in other historical works) to introduce certain portions of the narrative. These phrases are supposed to reveal the "pragmatism" in the work. But this pragmatism was the result of prophetic influence in the eighth and seventh centuries. Dr. Budde knows this because Amos and Hosea *first* promulgated the idea. Therefore these stereotyped phrases necessarily belong to a whole school of writers who lived after the seventh century. *Quod est demonstrandum*. In other words, Dr. Budde's reasons for assigning this verse to D₂ resolve themselves, upon analysis, into, (1), the old mechanical

application of the rule and compass, that the use of certain words and phrases always infallibly characterizes one particular writer, and that, therefore, all sentences in which they occur must be assigned to that writer, but with this interesting, even though impossible, addition, that the use of such words and phrases is now held always, infallibly, to characterize a whole school of writers during, let us say, an entire century of literary activity. And that is saying, in effect, that they were *worden* men! (2), The testimony of history as read by Dr. Budde. The history of Israel is a divine discipline. This was *first* taught by the prophets of the eighth century, of whose activity the reader will recall, only one literary monument remains in the book of Amos. Any reference to such an idea in a work dealing with the anterior history is, therefore, proof positive that its author lived after the eighth century. But Dr. Budde forgets that according to the cherished development hypothesis of his own school, ideas of the present must have had their roots in the past. Why cannot the prophetic elaboration of the moral phases of Yahweh's dealings with his people be based upon the cruder "pragmatism" of the book of Judges? To our inferior intelligence that would seem the more natural development. Why? Simply because Dr. Budde is compelled to assume the contrary. His preconceived ideas of the course of Israelitish history will not permit him to do otherwise.

Again, why does Dr. Budde assign 6, 7-10 to E, or with still subtler critical instinct, to E₂, "an Elohist hand." Or should we say a "school of Elohist hands?" In these verses there is certainly a distinct tincture of the "pragmatism" of the Deuteronomistic school, as that pragmatism is conceived by the critics. Indeed, Dr. Moore, of Andover, with refreshing candor, admits that they may "equally well be attributed to a post-Deuteronomistic editor." But Dr. Budde finds certain "proper mates" for these verses in Joshua and 1 Samuel, portions of Scripture which he has previously assigned to E. Infallibly, therefore, 6, 7-10 must be assigned to the same school. This conclusion is bolstered by the statement that "nameless prophets," such as the one introduced here, "never belong to a first hand, any more than moralizing retrospects." We would like to know how Dr. Budde knows this. Unnamed prophets do not figure very conspicuously in the Biblical narratives, the present instance being one of only three or four.

Verses 11-24 are declared to be inconsistent with 7-10, and not by the same "hand." The reason given is, they represent the national distress under discussion by Gideon and his guest as undeserved, contrary to the representation in 7-10, where the trouble is traced to national apostacy. Granted. But does that fact justify Dr. Budde's judgment of their utter irreconcilability with consequent diverse authorship? Certainly not. In 7-10 it is the unnamed prophet's diagnosis of the case that is chronicled. In 11-24 Gideon's view of the matter is recorded. As becomes a good historian the writer tells what he knows to be the facts, without any higher critical attempts at reconciling them. The inconsistency is not his. It is found in the divergent view-point of the two men who figure in his tale. We have here a clear example of the critical doctrine of imputation. A false or needless meaning is first given to a passage, and then that meaning is heralded as an incorrigible difficulty to

the acceptance of the "traditional" view. If a scholar like Dr. Budde can be either so exegetically blind, or driven by stress to such a perversity of argument, what is the theory worth that is based upon such a foundation?

Passing at random to 7, 16-22, the account of Gideon's strategy, we read the astonishing comment that "two hands are needed to carry a burning torch within an inverted pot, and none is left for holding the trumpet, or the reverse. Likewise, one cannot at the same time blow a trumpet and raise a battle-cry. This kind of overloading is characteristic of the whole passage, and causes the worst kind of confusion."

Really, "it gives one pause" to meet such utter drivel as this in the writings of such a Corypheus of learning as Dr. Budde. Where, in all the narrative, is it said that torches were borne in *inverted* pitchers, or pots, as Dr. Budde puts it? And where has Dr. Budde acquired his preternatural knowledge of what Gideon's ancient mechanical and military skill could or could not accomplish in the way of surprising a hostile camp? Are we to understand that just because Dr. Budde cannot comprehend the *how*, therefore the thing could not have been done? Dr. Budde does not know to this day *how* the Egyptians embalmed their dead, but there are the mummies! And where, in the narrative, is it said that each and every one of Gideon's 300 both blew his trumpet and raised the battle-cry in the same breath? We venture that such an absurd interpretation of the occurrence could by no possibility enter any other than a higher critical head. It is a monumental example of scores of similar oracular interpretations in these and other "scholarly" pages.

In attempting to solve his self-created difficulties, Dr. Budde discards the possibility of a single narrative, decides that the "supplementary hypothesis" proposed by some of the critics is not equal to the occasion, and maintains that the combination of two original accounts alone meets the demand of the problem. And the result of this conclusion? Let the reader study it for himself in the following effort to display Dr. Budde's divided text to the eye. Capitals indicate the portions that belong to J, ordinary type those attributed to E, italics the additions of Rje, and small capitals those of post-exilic editors.

"AND HE DIVIDED THE 300 MEN INTO THREE COMPANIES, AND HE PUT INTO THE HANDS OF ALL OF THEM TRUMPETS, AND EMPTY PITCHERS, WITH TORCHES WITHIN THE PITCHERS. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, LOOK ON ME, AND DO LIKEWISE: and, behold, when I come to the outermost part of the camp, it shall be that, as I do, so shall ye do. When I blow the trumpet, I and all that are with me, then blow ye the trumpets also on every side of all the camp, AND SAY, FOR THE LORD AND FOR GIDEON. SO GIDEON, AND THE 300 MEN THAT WERE WITH HIM, CAME UNTO THE OUTERMOST PART OF THE CAMP IN THE BEGINNING OF THE MIDDLE WATCH, WHEN THEY HAD BUT NEWLY SET THE WATCH; AND THEY BLEW THE TRUMPETS, and brake in pieces the pitchers that were in their hands. *And the three companies blew the trumpets, and brake the pitchers, and held the torches in their left hands, and the trumpets in their*

right hands to blow withal : and they cried, The sword of the Lord and of Gideon. And they stood every man in his place round about the camp : and all the host ran : AND THEY SHOUTED AND PUT THEM TO FLIGHT. And they blew the 300 trumpets, and the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, and against all the host : and the host fled AS FAR AS BETH-SHITTAH, TOWARD ZERERAH, as far as the border of Abel-meholah, by Tabbath."

Now, the value of this sort of thing is probably best exhibited by contrasting it with another prominent critic's analysis of this passage. A glance will be sufficient to show that it differs, *toto cælo*, from Dr. Budde's. According to Dr. G. F. Moore, in his polychrome edition of Judges, the correct division of these verses is the following :

"And he divided the 300 men into three companies, and he put into the hands of all of them trumpets, AND EMPTY PITCHERS, WITH TORCHES WITHIN THE PITCHERS. AND HE SAID UNTO THEM, LOOK ON ME, AND DO LIKEWISE : and, behold, when I come to the outermost part of the camp, it shall be that, as I do, so shall ye do. When I blow the trumpet, I and all that are with me, then blow ye the trumpets also on every side of all the camp, AND SAY, FOR THE LORD AND FOR GIDEON. So Gideon and the 300 men that were with him, came unto the outermost part of the camp in the beginnig of the middle watch, when they had but newly set the watch : and they blew the trumpets, AND BRAKE IN PIECES THE PITCHERS THAT WERE IN THEIR HANDS. And the three companies blew the trumpets, AND BRAKE THE PITCHERS, AND HELD THE TORCHES *in their left hands, and the trumpets in their right hands to blow withal* : AND THEY CRIED, THE SWORD OF THE LORD AND OF GIDEON. And they stood every man in his place round about the camp : and all the host ran ; and they shouted, and put them to flight. AND THEY BLEW THE 300 TRUMPETS, and the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow, and against all the host : and the host fled as far as Beth-Shittah TOWARD ZERERAH, AS FAR AS THE BORDER OF ABEL-MEHOLAH, BY TABBATH."

The reader can take his choice. For ourselves, until the critics can come to some agreement we will be content to "hold fast that which is good," in this case the "traditional" view of the text as a consistent, even though not always intelligible, whole. For in reply to the inquiry why Dr. Budde so confidently dismembers this story in such a precise way and into such minute fragments, one cannot but be amazed at the extreme subjectivity of the entire proceeding. If Dr. Budde relies upon anything beside his own judgment in his furious slashing of the text he does not so inform his readers. But a conclusion is only as strong as the strongest argument on which it is reared. If, therefore, one be prepared to exalt Dr. Budde to the position of critical pope, his dictum here and elsewhere must be looked upon as final. But if one be disposed to remember that nearly everything which former critics have said has usually been unsaid by their own successors ; and if one reflects that Dr. Budde's critical confreres do not agree with him in his dissection, the force of his conclusions is considerably weakened, if not entirely destroyed.

The *odium theologicum*, happily enough, is fast disappearing, but the *odium*

criticum is as rapidly taking its place. In venturing the foregoing observations upon Dr. Budde's work we are fully aware that we are exposing ourselves to the burden of the latter. For the critics are the fashion now-a-days. But we have no excuse to offer for our temerity except that we are bold because we have the truth. We believe in criticism. We are aware that many of its results are now recognized and valued truths. But we know also that many more of its most positive assertions have been utterly refuted. The opponents of our "traditional Bible" have shown themselves to be without fear. Its defenders should be no less so.

The careful study we have given this work of Dr. Budde only renews our profound conviction that the Scriptures have nothing to fear at the hands of the destructive critics. We close the pages of this commentary more than ever convinced of the Bible's Gibraltar-like character as the Word of God written.

W. W. ELWANG.

Orlando, Fla.

LANG'S THE MAKING OF RELIGION.

THE MAKING OF RELIGION. *By Andrew Lang, M. A., LL. D.* Sometime Gifford Lecturer of St. Andrews. Longmans, Green & Co., 1898.

This book cannot be classed as a Christian apologetic. It inclines, however, strongly to the theistic view. Those who have kept pace with the literature of the so-called Science of Religion, especially those who have followed the dreary speculations of Huxley and Spencer and the more patient labors of Whitney, Hopkins, Max Müller, and Pfeleiderer, in the study of Comparative Religions, will not be surprised at the appearance of this book.

The author undertakes to refute some of the more popular theories about religion which have been suggested, if not generated, by the necessities of evolution. The author does not explicitly commit himself to any recognized philosophical basis, but he seems to reject the *tabula rasa* theory of knowledge, or, in other words, the dictum *nihil in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*. While not defining himself with sufficient certainty he appears to make a discriminating and careful use of his material, which is not small. Of course it would require a rare library and much time to verify his data. Possibly it may be taken on trust. His method seems chiefly to be to gather the evidences hitherto condemned by modern science, such as visions, clairvoyance, hallucinations, in fine, any kind of neglected knowledge of God and spirit common in savage and civilized life, for the purpose of enforcing a suggestion that these fancies, rude and often absurd, point to faculties and possessions of human nature, which are not allowed for in the popular systems of materialism. In the introductory chapter his design is stated to be :

"To suggest that the savage theory of the soul may be based, at least in part, on experiences which cannot, at present, be made to fit into any materialistic system of the universe. We shall also bring evidences tending to prove that the idea of God, in its earliest known shape, need not be logically derived from the idea of spirit, however that idea may have been attained or evolved."

It is manifest that if these two positions can be maintained, the supposed fair structure of the Science of Religion must come down from coping-stone to foundation. For, as the reader will see, the author's contention is chiefly concerned with theories which are inspired by the hypothesis of evolution. These he calls, by implication, materialistic theories. This is by no means a new allegation. Its pungency has been, however, so often softened by theological writers, who have endeavored to capture the evolutionary doctrines in the interests of religion, that it now requires some hardihood to repeat it. It may be doubted if these writers have gained the prizes for which they have labored. Certainly we know how the high priests of evolution have received them. They have not been recognized as brethren. They have been dismissed with the simple statement that their methods and conclusions were wholly "unscientific." It is true such reflections nowhere appear in the book, and possibly the author might not regard them as legitimate.

Conservative to the last degree he proceeds toward his object without arousing latent prejudices. He illustrates his meaning by a story of the Northern Indians :

"The Northern Indians call the *Aurora Borealis* 'Edthin,' that is, 'deer.' Their ideas in this respect are founded on a principle one would not imagine. Experience has shown them that when a hairy deer-skin is briskly stroked with the hand on a dark night, it will emit many sparks of electrical fire."

This anecdote he regards as a kind of parable illustrative of his ideas. The Indians arrived unconsciously at the notion of electricity. Not that it was in any way recognized as such, but they connected the phenomena of the Northern sky with the sparks of the deer-skin, concluding that herds of deer in the far-away heavens were rubbing the sparks from each other.

"Now my purpose in the earlier portions of this essay is to suggest that certain phenomena of human nature, apparently as trivial as the sparks rubbed out of a deer's hide in a dark night, may indicate and may be allied to a force or forces which, like the *Aurora Borealis*, may shine from one end of the heavens to the other, strangely illuminating the darkness of our destiny."

The phenomena referred to are the mystical, sporadic and odd experiences of the race—dreams, trances, crystal gazing and clairvoyance—corresponding to the sparks of the Indians. Inferences not wholly and demonstrably wrong have been drawn from these in all ages of our history ; and as the sparks indicated electricity as a scientific fact, so may the fantastic lights in the darkness of human nature exhibit proof of faculties unrecognized by science.

As to his second position, viz : that the conception of God may not be derived nor evolved from reflections on dreams and ghosts, he proceeds by the anthropological rather than the psychological method. That is, he examines those by-products of human nature, the so-called traveller's tales—collecting a vast array of savage beliefs, visions, clairvoyance, &c., and comparing these with verified records of similar experiences among the educated and civilized classes. He confesses that this does not appear to be a very hopeful task, inasmuch as it must be done in the face of great prejudice. On this point, he cites the action of the British Association which formerly rejected papers

on anthropology as vain dreams of travellers, and would now, he believes, look on clairvoyance as based on old wives' fables, or hysterical imposture—that same prejudice against which Psychical Research is now struggling.

Now it is this portion of anthropology, so long neglected, which he wishes re-examined. His first effort, then, is to break down the inveterate prejudice which he confesses educated men have exhibited towards his material. To effect this, he proceeds in his second chapter to show that the treatment which has been accorded to Miracles by Science has not been fair. Science, he complains, is unjustly opposed to the reception of evidence concerning the wonderful,—the so-called illusions, hallucinations, telepathy, &c. Science receives evidence only as to "possible" facts. Miracles, like a vast amount of odd physical phenomena, it declares, are impossible. At this point comes in a treatment of the inevitable Hume. While his treatment of Hume's argument against miracles is well worthy of notice, it is too extended to be introduced here. It will be sufficient to say, in justice to the author, that he seems moved by the same spirit as Professor James, when he said, "I was attracted to the subject of Psychical Research some years ago by my love of fair play in science." In this spirit he proceeds to examine a great variety of cases, savage and civilized, with the purpose of showing that "the actual modern condition of men is not fundamental, and that hallucination represents, at least in its nascent condition, the main trunk of our psychical existence."

Following his anthropological chapter is an interesting account of the Zulu seers, illustrated by Scottish examples of the same nature. This peculiar action is styled by the Zulus "opening the gates of distance," and this is the heading of his chapter, in which and the following chapter, "Crystal Visions," he supplies the evidence for their belief in this sort of phenomena, and furthermore sustains still further the evidence in the savages' belief of the "wandering soul." How else, it is inquired, could a knowledge of distant scenes and places be acquired if the soul could not wander and gaze upon realities with which the senses have no contact?

He next takes up more particularly "hallucinations," "demoniacal possession," "fetishism and spiritualism."

In these chapters the author finds sufficient data to settle the question as to the origin of the idea of spirit both in its savage and civilized form. And he concludes from this part of his subject "that clairvoyance, thought transference and telepathy cannot be dismissed as mere fables by a cautious inquirer."

The soul, then, as separable from the body, cannot be explained by materialism. There is a faculty in man capable of gaining knowledge apart from sense, which faculty, it is assumed to be proved, can act independently of the body.

The author next considers the origin of the idea of God. He dissents at once from the common belief of the anthropologists, that "from the notion of ghosts a belief has arisen, but very gradually, in higher spirits, and eventually in a Highest Spirit."

It will be sufficient to notice the results of his inquiries extended through several chapters as to the origin and place in time of the savage idea of God.

He concludes, (1) that Animism followed, but did not precede, Theism; (2) that the idea of Father and Maker did not come last, as commonly believed by evolutionists, rather precisely the reverse is the case. "Nor can the belief indicated in such words as Father and Maker be satisfactorily explained as a refinement of ancestor-worship, because it occurs where ancestors are not worshipped."

When our author passes to the consideration of the "degeneration theory," he becomes more interesting and more orthodox. He finds that ancestor-worship was a degenerate rite compared with the moral faith in unfed gods. It is an erroneous view, he holds, that the religion of most backwoods' races always is non-moral.

How could all mankind forget a pure religion? Such degeneration he explains by the very nature of animism. A Supreme Being in need of nothing which man can offer, and opposed to lust and evil designs, could not be propitiated by charms and sacrifices nor be supposed to take part in the malevolent actions of one tribe against another; but the imagined gods and ghost-gods, conceived of as in need of food and afraid of incantations, would be useful if bribed and dangerous if made angry. If the priest or soothsayer is immoral, he will seek to ally himself with an immoral force, and with such forces he finds himself environed under the generative influence of the animistic spirit. Even in Israel the author finds evidence of that kind of degeneration for which he contends. He says:

"The shivering Black Man (of the Fuegians) is nearer the morality of our Lord than the Jehovah of Judges."

On the whole, inasmuch as the author finds degeneration in all religions and in every aspect of religion, he concludes that the old degenerative theory must stand. The assumption that Israel passed through a tutelage of ghost-worship, ancestor-worship, Fetishism and Totemism till it arrived at the level ascribed to it in Judges cannot, he thinks, be maintained. According to Huxley, all references to ancestor-worship in the Bible would be carefully eliminated by later monotheistic editors; possibly the Ark of the Covenant may have been a relic of ancestor-worship. The speculation of Spencer that Jehovah was developed out of ghost-worship is met by his own admission that nomadic life is unfavorable to the evolution of a ghost-theory, and that ancestor-worship is inconsistent with nomadic habits, and yet the Australian and many other nomads have somehow attained to the idea of a Supreme Being, which by hypothesis arises, is evolved through, a process of ghost-worship.

He, therefore, submits that these modern theories of evolutionists are cancelled by their own inner contradictions.

His concluding chapter is a summary of his arguments. The result is, then, all in "the making of religion" two grand fundamental sources: 1. "The belief, how attained we know not, in a powerful, moral, eternal omniscient Father and Judge of men." In a foot-note to this syllabus, the author adds this somewhat astonishing information: "*The hypothesis of St. Paul seems not the most unsatisfactory!*" And 2. The form of religion is developed from the belief that "something in man survives the grave."

In reference to the latter position he thinks the Hebrews were not much moved by posthumous possibilities. Greece and Rome, on the contrary, were deeply interested in the future of individual souls. Not in the Papacy alone has flourished the indulgence-seller. Armed with his magic mirror the Grecian pardoner perceived the sin and purified the sinner. The credulous subject once initiated into the sphere of the Conjuror's rites and influence became thenceforth an exempt from an evil lot in a future life.

It is not necessary in this brief review to notice the great number of rites and ceremonies, savage and civilized, which are considered at some length in this book.

Those interested in the history of religious opinions, and especially those engaged somewhat in watching the trend of religious speculation, will find here much material for reflection.

W. J. WRIGHT.

Fulton, Mo.

JEVONS' INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. *By Frank Byron Jevons, M. A., Litt. D., Classical Tutor in the University of Durham.* New York: MacMillan & Co., 1896. Pp. 442. \$2.50.

This is a valuable treatise in the wide field of the comparative study of Religion. It does not profess to cover the whole of this field, but claims to make a special use of the materials which other writers have made ready. It aims to deal with the history of religion in close connection with Anthropology. Indeed, it is a study pursued in accordance with the methods and principles of anthropology, and in a careful way the inductive mode of inquiry and inference is followed.

Further, this work does not claim to be a History of Religion, in which a full account of the history, growth, and present condition of the various religions of men, is given. It is an Introduction, rather, to the History of Religion, and it seeks to present the right attitude and mode, in accordance with which the study of the Science of Religion should be pursued.

The author is careful not to go back speculatively to the very beginnings of the race, but to deal with the phenomena of religion as its facts actually appear among men. By this he leaves an open way for the hypothesis of a primitive monotheism and a primæval revelation. On a *priori* grounds, he is inclined to this view, but he does not work out as fully as he might the significance of the facts stated in the Bible, which antedate many of the facts which he unfolds. Nor does he, in our judgment, do justice to the facts of oriental religions, as these are presented in their ancient literature, which is certainly as old, and as reliable, as are many of the traditions and customs with which he deals. Being a student of classical lore, he naturally gives prominence to the religions of Greece and Rome, and we have felt that this has produced a somewhat one-sided treatment of the great theme he handles with so much ability.

In regard to the way in which religion has developed he holds a position which is eminently satisfactory. He asserts that those who believe in the

Bible must consider the notion of the evolution of religion, as a slow natural development, through successive stages of fetichism, ancestorism, and polytheism as essentially inapplicable to religion. "Monotheism," he says, "according to Genesis, was revealed, to begin with, and, therefore, cannot be reached by a process of development. The truth was given to man at the beginning, and, therefore, cannot be the outcome of evolution."

In this connection, our author very properly points out that, while evolution in the sense of *progress* is inapplicable to religion, there may be an evolution which is a decay, or a degeneration. He points out that institutions not only grow, but also decay, and that religion is constantly subject to the same law. In this way very many things in pagan religions are to be accounted for. Here, then, is the evolution of error. Uniform progress in religion, he maintains, is exceptional, and Judaism and Christianity are the grand exceptions. This being our author's standpoint, we may expect to find him a reliable guide in the paths along which he leads us; and we shall now attempt to indicate his line of argument.

After two chapters of an introductory nature, there follows a good exposition of the way in which the savage man, that anthropology has to deal with, regarded the presence of the supernatural about him in nature. This savage came to regard the objects about him as personal, and possessed of powers more than natural. In this way he obtained the conception of the supernatural. This is a sort of animism, according to which lifeless things were regarded as animated by a power and personality like our own, or far greater.

The fourth chapter deals with what is called Sympathetic Magic, and here our author combats the view that early men did not distinguish between the natural and supernatural, and that out of this fact magic arose, and then that religion developed out of magic. Religion, he maintains, is fundamental, and makes the notion of magical power possible. Men sought to establish proper relations with those supernatural powers in nature, and religion marked this early stage, and in a sense was an innate impulse.

In the fifth chapter Life and Death are briefly considered, and the souls of the departed are shown to be spirits, and to be regarded as in relation with supernatural powers. The result of this discussion is to show, in a most satisfactory way, that, instead of religion growing out of ancestor worship, religion rendered this worship possible. Here there is a fine reply given to positivists and agnostics, who explain religion entirely as a product from ancestorism.

In the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters the nature and transmutability of Taboo, and of its relation to morality and religion, are considered with the utmost care, and in a way which is suggestive and valuable. He explains that Taboo is a Polynesian word which means "strongly marked," and it denotes something which is thought to be dangerous to handle, or indeed to have anything to do with. It includes things holy and things unclean; and the list of such things held to be dangerous is very large, including persons and things alike. Taboo is transmissible as from a dead body to the mourner, yet it does not imply hostility or desire to injure. It leads to the conviction that there are certain things to be avoided, and these are known as "Things

Taboo." In relation to morality and religion these things have a deep meaning as unfolding moral obligation and religious duty.

In the ninth chapter we have an informing study of Totemism, together with the recital of many interesting facts which come under this term. Totemism consists in a blood covenant between a human kind and an animal species, whereby the animal chosen becomes the sign or token of the tribe. There are also certain vegetable totems to be found. The discussion of this point is very thorough, and our author shows that we have in totemism the result of an attempt on the part of primitive man to establish friendly relations with the powers about him, to whom also he ascribed a personality like his own. Then he observed that as men were organized into families, so animals were grouped into species. Then, as alliances between families or clans were ratified by the blood covenant in such a way that men of diverse clans became blood brothers, so in like manner men sought alliances with objects of nature, especially animals, and in this way totemism arose. This, our author shows, accounts for animal worship, and for the domestication of the animals which were taken as totems, the latter being a survival of totemism.

In the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters the line of reasoning suggested by the chapter on totemism is followed out. Here it is shown, not only that animal worship and animal domestication, but other important customs and facts, are explained. It accounts for the animal form of certain gods, and the connection of certain animals with certain gods. It also accounts for the idol, and for animal sacrifice, and for the sacramental meal. Here there is much of interest, though we would hesitate to concur in all the details expressed by our author.

An important chapter is the thirteenth, which takes up in a fresh way the very much discussed topic of Fetichism, and with this we may couple the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, the former of which deals with Family Gods and Guardian Spirits, and the latter with Ancestor Worship. Fetichism resulted from an illicit way by which the individual sought to commend himself to supernatural protection, and Family Gods were the product of a licit mode of doing the same thing. In the former case, the individual addressed himself to one of the supernatural powers which had, by means of the totem, no friendly relations with his tribe, or any other, and which was resented in such a way as to cause harm by way of penalty. Thus Fetichism arose, and implied already a religious basis. In the latter case, the individual might, with the approval of the community, and by the service of the priest, place himself under the immediate protection of one of the gods of the community. Thus originated family gods and special guardian spirits, and in this way the true explanation of ancestor worship is to be found. The worship of ancestors grew out of, and was modelled according to, the public worship of the tribe or community. Ancestorism is subsequent to totemism, and both imply the existence of religious sentiment in its simple terms.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters, Tree and Plant Worship, and Nature Worship are considered in order. As already hinted, certain species of trees might be taken for totems, as well as animal species. This led to

the domestication of plants ; and, further, it also resulted in the sacrificial meal, as in the case of animals came the sacrifice. Bread and wine were used in this meal. Hence plants and trees, as well as animals, came to be held in religious regard, and thus Nature Worship came into practice.

In the eighteenth chapter, the somewhat peculiar topic of Syncretism and Polytheism is taken up ; and a quite original explanation of polytheism is given in this chapter. Agriculture and the rearing of cattle led early men to seek a settled mode of life, and this resulted in a political union of several tribes or clans. From this flowed a fusion of their religious ideas and modes of worship. This ran in two directions. If the gods of two tribes were alike, they might gradually come to be regarded as one. This was syncretism, which tended, by fusion, to reduce the number of deities. If, on the other hand, the gods were unlike and remained separate after the fusion of several clans took place, the result was polytheism. This is ingenious, but we doubt if it is adequate to explain *all* polytheism, as, for example, that of India. There, and in Egypt, too, polytheism seems rather to have been the result of degeneration from monotheism, through pantheism. When the idea of personality faded away, monotheism became pantheism ; and when the oneness of pantheism permeated with the divine was broken up into fragments, each fragment came to be regarded as a part of deity, and held to be divine. In this way polytheism, and perhaps nature worship, in the orient, can be more adequately explained.

In chapter nineteen, Mythology, and in chapter twenty, Priesthood, are discussed. The myth is an attempt, on the part of primitive man, to explain the modifications in tribal worship which resulted from syncretism and polytheism. A strong case is made out for the view that religion is not the product of Mythology. Rather the reverse is true. The discussion of Priesthood is brief but satisfactory, and the view is well established that the priests did not *make* religion nor the myths, but that religion really made both. Our author is exceedingly satisfactory at this point.

The Next Life, and Transmigration form the subjects of the twenty-first and twenty-second chapters. Our author here argues that the next life is sometimes regarded as a continuation of this life ; and sometimes it is held regarding it that a man at death assumed the form of his totem. The former resulted in simple belief in immortality, which our author regards as a native instinct of man. The latter produced the idea and belief of transmigration.

In the twenty-third and twenty-fourth chapters, the Mysteries, and especially the Eleusinian Mysteries among the Greeks are explained. Transmigration was not satisfactory to primitive man, so that about the sixth century B. C., a belief spread abroad, which our author asserts, was to the effect that future happiness depended on communion with some deity. In the present life this communion was effected by means of a sacrament of some kind. This resulted in the Mysteries ; and this communion was also continued by the same means after death. In Greece the Elusinia are prominent in this connection.

In the two closing chapters the origin of Monotheism, and the development of the belief in one God are discussed in an able and generally satisfactory way. Monotheism is not a natural development from polytheism. It is

primitive and original, and the result, in part, of man's innate capacity, and, in part, of God's personal revelation of himself, in the soul or personal spirit of man. This point is elaborated in a careful and thorough manner, and in such a way as to leave the way open in the field of revealed religion for all the revelations which are set forth in the Holy Scriptures, and by the incarnation of Christ. But we cannot enlarge, though we would like to.

We have been at some pains to exhibit the contents of this able and generally satisfactory book, partly to show the reader the thorough work that is now being done in this field, and partly to indicate the lines of defence of the sound theistic and Christian positions which it marks out. More and more the consensus of scholars is coming round to the positions, that man is an inherently personal, spiritual, religious being; that God is the infinite personal spirit; and that he makes himself known in the spirit of man, as well as by outward revelation. The result is that a solid ground is laid for the belief in a primitive monotheism and a primæval revelation; and that the philosophy of the non-biblical religions is to be found in the law of degeneration (the product of sin), which has been constantly in operation.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

TWO NEW TRANSLATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE EMPHASIZED NEW TESTAMENT. A new Translation, designed to set forth the exact meaning, the proper terminology, and the graphic style of the sacred original; arranged to show at a glance, Narrative, Speech, Parallelism, and Logical Analysis; and emphasized throughout after the Idioms of the Greek Tongue. With select References and an Appendix of Notes. *By Joseph Bryant Rotherham.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1897. Large 8vo. Pp. 274. Buckram, \$2.00.

Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ: THE NEW DISPENSATION. The New Testament translated from the Greek. *By Robert D. Weekes.* New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1897. 8vo. Pp. VIII, 525.

We have here two, in many respects, valuable contributions to the literature of the New Testament. Coming at just this time they are all the more interesting because of the movement by the American revisers to publish their own revision of the New Testament. Ere long we will have three versions of the Bible competing for supremacy in the Church and among Bible students. This is not to be deprecated, however, for people are too prone to think that one version or another is authoritative, and to accept it as *verbatim et literatim et punctuatim* the Word of God. But under present circumstances many will be led and some will be forced to investigate the principles of translation adopted by Committees and by individuals such as the two now before us, and decide for themselves which is best. They will be forced to recognize more fully their personal responsibility for adopting one rendering rather than another, instead of blindly following a chosen authority. While men are more or less gregarious in everything, in nothing do they seem so prone to traditionalism as in matters of religious faith. Better study of and greater familiarity with the Scriptures will also result.

Although we shall have some strictures to make on these two latest versions, we wish that they might have a very wide circulation. We cannot suggest a more profitable course of study to any one than to take these two versions and go carefully, critically, and systematically through the entire New Testament, comparing them with each other and with the Common and the Revised versions, and, where one can spell out the Greek, with the Greek text also, using the text of Westcott and Hort by preference.

I. We will first describe these two versions. They are both, in a sense, a protest against the imperfections of the recent Revision as well as of the Old version, which has held sway for 287 years. They have the common purpose of trying to enable us better to understand the revealed Word. They have no distinctly sectarian purpose, as is the case with many versions that have been made, though we shall subsequently have to qualify this statement with respect to one. They have both been made from the text of Westcott and Hort in the main, which makes comparison less difficult. They both subordinate the old and unfortunate chapter and verse divisions to the logical analysis and arrangement. The use of italics for supplied words is sensibly discarded by both. This they have in common, but they differ widely in other respects.

Mr. Rotherham's version appears in the third edition, the first having been issued in 1872, and the second in 1878. But this is an entirely new translation from a different text, with various modifications. The text of Westcott and Hort is adopted throughout, though alternative renderings are given at times. Marginal notes and references are given—not numerous, but judicious and useful. By breaking up the text, using capitals, and drawing in the lines, the author's idea of the logical connection of clauses is indicated. Quotations and adaptations from the Old Testament are printed in italics. Then the author's ideas of variations in emphasis are indicated by the use of double parallels, parallels, enclosing angles, and accents, the force of emphasis diminishing in that order. For example: Mt., 13: 45, 46, he prints:

“⁴⁵ || Again || the Kingdom of the heavens is | like | unto | a merchant, seeking beautiful' pearls | ,—⁴⁶and < finding one' very' precious' pearl > departing, he at once sold all things, whatsoever he had, and bought it.”

This device seems not to be altogether happy. A lady who was asked to read a chapter in the book carefully and give her impression, said that it bothered her. We think this is the natural tendency of the device, although it might be obviated by greater familiarity. A half comma is employed for pauses of less strength than is required by a comma. This is good. We have often wished that such a pause was recognized and provided for. He divides the Historical Books into sections or chapters of his own: Matthew, 93; Mark, 75; Luke, 97; John, 30; Acts, 47.

Mr. Weekes has followed Westcott and Hort “in general, but not exclusively.” Happily the chapter and verse division has been ignored, the contents of each page according to the old division being indicated at the bottom of the page in parentheses. For other features, we will let the author describe his own work:

“Redundant words have been sometimes omitted, and words obviously implied have been inserted; obsolete and antiquated words and forms of expression, found in the older versions, as well as words whose signification has become changed, have been replaced by others; mistranslations have been corrected; and euphemistic language has been used in some instances. Parenthetic clauses have been so indicated. Punctuation has been carefully revised, alternative renderings and occasional explanations are given in the foot-notes.”

Quotations and adaptations from the Old Testament, and particularly emphatic words and passages—the Lord’s Prayer, for instance—are indicated by full-face type. The foot-notes, though not numerous, are valuable. The style of the page is altogether that of any modern book, no divisions being employed except for paragraphs. If the chapter and verse divisions had been indicated in the inner margin, the book could be consulted much more readily. While these divisions were made very awkwardly by Cardinal Hugo, or Stephen Langton, and Robert Stephen, still they were made for facility of consultation with a concordance, and are necessary as a time-saver. But the continuity of the text should not be broken by them. They should not interfere with proper paragraphing. The Revised version is better than the Old version, or either of these new ones, in this respect. Paul’s Epistles are given in their probable historical order.

II. Criticism. We suppose that neither of these translators had any idea that his version would ever be generally adopted by English Christendom, and so they were not trammelled as the King James translators and the revised translators were. These had definite rules laid down for them. There was reason for this, though we do not admit the correctness of all the rules. The individual translator has an additional advantage in being allowed to follow out consistently his principles without continual interference from others. Multitude of counsellors insures *safety*, but not always *wisdom*, perhaps. A single man of depth and breadth of scholarship, niceness of taste, and freedom from sectarian bias ought to give us the best version possible—a version that all might adopt.

When we come to apply what we believe to be correct principles of translation, we find that both of these translations fail in varying degrees—

1. Translation is the exact transference of thought or ideas from the idiom of one language into the idiom of another. Of course it becomes the more difficult the wider apart the two languages are in their genius. So-called “literal translations” are renderings, useful in certain cases, but not for the masses, nor even for the critical student, always. The translation is necessarily an interpretation, and he wants the exact shades of thought of the original expressed in his own language. Greek is said to be the most translatable of all languages, and English is probably the best of all modern languages into which to make a translation. Its literature is so extensive, its construction so varied, its vocabulary practically unlimited. The two are, therefore, virtually coterminous, the limits of variation reduced nearly to the vanishing point. The genius is pretty much the same. Mr. Rotherham has failed egregiously here. About half his work may be classed as literal but not idiomatic. There is probably not a page in the book in which there may

not be found a half dozen infelicitous sentences due to this. True, he does this consciously, but mistakenly in our judgment. "The kingdom of the heavens;" "come may thy kingdom;" "seeing that Christ we being weak as yet seasonably, in behalf of such as were ungodly died;" "Let us be loving one another," &c. Examples can be multiplied indefinitely, where following the Greek order, or translating some form literally, makes very awkward English. Mr. Weekes has given us a more literary and elegant translation, but too frequently introduces unnecessary words, and sometimes omits words, and very commonly translates forms literally, particularly Participles and Tenses, of which we shall speak later.

2. While the periodic structure of the Greek sentence calls for the use of many Participles, it is not so in English. The circumstantial Participle is really contrary to the genius of our language, and but for these more or less literal translations, would probably not be used at all. They should always be rendered by the proper kind of subordinate clause. Yet we find both of these translations continually failing in this respect, though either is better than the two current versions. There is probably not a page in either in which there are not a considerable number of mistranslated Participles. We started out to make a complete count but found the task too onerous. In the first chapter of Matthew, last seven verses, Weekes has six mistakes of this nature, and Rotherham five; in the first chapter of James, Rotherham has seven improperly rendered Participles, and Weekes six. For instance, Rotherham reads in Acts, 7:4, "Then coming forth out of the land of the Chaldeans he dwelt in Haran," Weekes has correctly, "Then he went out from the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Haran;" in verse 5, Rotherham, "When as yet he had not a child," Weekes correctly, "Though as yet he had no child." The phrase "as yet" is introduced needlessly by both. In the ninth verse, Rotherham, "being jealous," not regarding tense or circumstance either, Weekes has "having become jealous," giving tense but not circumstance. Correctly, "because they had become jealous." Both are wrong in verse 12, *ἀκούσας*; Rotherham in verse 14, *ἀποστείλας*; both fail on *ἰδών* in verse 24; and so on, not to specify further. There is nothing more important than the Participle in the interpretation of the New Testament, nothing more abused. The carelessness of exegetes in reference to it is astonishing.

3. Another matter in which translators, expositors, and students generally are amazingly careless, is the determination and exhibition of the exact force of the tenses, both in the Indicative and in the dependent Moods. And here we find our two translators very frequently defective. No language can afford a tense apparatus sufficient to exhibit by an independent form all the shades of tense conception involving both the time and state ideas; and so, just as in the case of Participles, and, indeed, nearly all words and all grammatical accidents, around a root notion there must spring up a whole bunch or cluster of related notions or meanings. Consequently, we find the Present Indicative with at least seven distinct phases of usage, the Imperfect with four, the Future with five, the Aorist with eight, etc. The Participle has a similar variety in its tense-usage, and the dependent moods have distinct variations of the state idea in their tenses.

Neither Rotherham nor Weekes has kept all this variety in mind, and carefully weighed and exhibited it in each case. They have even confused the tenses, particularly the Aorist and Perfect, at times. The English, it is true, has not the tense-apparatus that the Greek has, but our experience is that only very seldom do we find it anyways impossible to exhibit the exact force in the mind of the original writer, in elegant English. Mr. Rotherham, particularly, even when he shows that he understands the force of the original form, seems to forget, in his effort, what his own language is capable of, that it also has a certain latitude of tense usage. Take, for example, this translation: "Let him be asking in faith." In his effort here to exhibit the continuity in the Present Imperative, he introduces a foreign shade. The real significance of the Present here is that it must be his habitual practice, and "let him ask in faith" expresses that in English. Mr. Weekes, not being controlled by the desire of being literal, has not sinned so often in this way. We need not go far for a mistake, however. Mt. 1:19, ἐβουλήθη he renders "was intending," as though it was ἐβούλετο. In the next verse, ἐνθυμηθέντος he turns into "while he was considering," as though it were ἐνθυμούμενος. When the English would be naturally rendered into a different Greek form from that in the text, the interpretation is bad. He evidently has not considered the psychology of that case anyway. In Mt. 2:2, both say "we have come," ἤκομεν or ἐληλύθαμεν. But Matthew says ἦλθομεν, "we came," just exactly what they had in mind, their whole journey from the time they saw the star. Instances might be multiplied at great length.

4. Another matter which we have found commentators, exegetes, grammarians and translators, all, very negligent in, or ignorant of, is the emphasis of the original, that which lies at the very root of the structure of Greek and Latin sentences, and without which their arrangement is simply haphazard and nonsensical. English has a remnant of it, but we generally make use of other devices, italics, capitals, etc. In our acquaintance, Dr. Broadus alone seems to bear in mind that the order of words has any reference to emphasis. Works on Hermeneutics do not touch the subject, or if they do treat of emphasis, they pile up a mass of blunders and useless rules, as Horne for example. We thought we had found what we were looking for at last in Mr. Rotherham's work, for it is "The *Emphasized* New Testament;" but alas! what a disappointment! With all this paraphernalia for exhibiting emphasis, we find that, whether or not he pretends to give us the emphasis of the Greek, he has simply given us that of the elocutionist, not of the exegete. Of course they frequently coincide, but we doubt whether he had a single principle of Greek emphasis that he consciously made use of, as such. True he frequently, indeed commonly, gives us the very order of the Greek words, but obviously that does not give emphasis in English. And we sometimes find his heaviest emphasis on words that have no emphasis in Greek at all, and find all his different devices in a sentence, no part of which was intended to be emphatic. " | Abraham | begat Isaac, And | Isaac | begat Jacob," might just as well be "Abraham begat | Isaac | , And Isaac begat | Jacob | ." Indeed, since the

Article does give a certain degree of emphasis, the latter is more probable, for the Greek is Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰακώβ. There is no need to go further to illustrate. Three-fourths of his emphasis is of no service to a student, and is simply a bother to an intelligent reader. Mr. Weekes has been sparing and judicious in his indication of emphasis, using full-face type for an occasional, strongly emphatic Pronoun or other word. He makes no claim to regarding or indicating the emphasis of the original, and we can only criticize his not paying heed to this and giving us the benefit of his conclusions.

5. As to consistency, we can only speak briefly. Some would lay down a hard and fast rule that the translator must uniformly employ the same English word to render the same Greek word, and not employ it to render any other. One of the objections often urged against the Old Version is that it sacrifices consistency and scientific exactness to variety. This is frequently true. On the other hand the revisors have probably swung to the other extreme in the effort to avoid what was considered the vice of their predecessors. But, as a matter of fact, there are two truths that seem to be lost sight of by critics, frequently. The first is that no language can have a vocabulary extensive enough to express by a separate word every shade of thought that the human mind is capable of. Even English, with its ponderous technical, provincial, literary, and scientific vocabulary of about 500,000 words, it is said, is incapable of meeting the demands of thought for nice distinctions. Consequently, a group of ideas, united by mental relationship, dwell together, as brothers, in unity, and one word is made to do duty for all. There are very few words that are univocal. The more limited one's vocabulary is the wider becomes the application of many of the words, and so we find that many of the most familiar words have the widest field to cover. The practical bearing of this is that while a word may do duty for several more or less related ideas in Greek, there may be words to express all these ideas in English. The context will determine the sense of the Greek word and the translator should use the proper English word to express that exact style of thought. Surely it would be folly to adopt one rendering for all when they differ. A simple illustration is found in the word *προσαγωγή*, the general idea of which is that of *approach to*. It may mean, therefore, "access," "admission," "introduction," and it has these three meanings, respectively, in the three passages in which it occurs.

The other truth grows naturally out of the first, and is, that scarcely any two words in different languages are absolutely coterminous, with the same connotation, intention, extension. Consequently they overlap more or less, and frequently the same word in English may properly represent ideas expressed by different Greek words. Anyone can easily verify this by examining an Analytical Greek or English Concordance. While this is all true, yet when a word means palpably the same thing in several passages it should be translated by the same word. Accuracy should not then be sacrificed to variety. The translator should be consistent in his renderings. These authors are not always so. We scarcely begin to read in Rotherham before we find an example. Unquestionably *προσκυνεῖν* has the same meaning in

Mat. 2:2, 8, 11. But he renders, "bow down to," "bow down myself to," and "prostrate themselves unto." Weekes consistently and correctly translates it by "do homage to." Weekes follows the Revised version and practically the Common, in translating *ἀνωθεν* "anew" twice, and "from above" once, in the discourse to Nicodemus. There is not much likelihood that Christ used the word in two different senses, however Nicodemus may have understood him. Rotherham is consistent, translating it "from above." So far as we have been able to compare, Weekes is more consistent than Rotherham, and both more consistent than the current versions. But the consistency might have been carried further.

6. When we come to particular words, we might say a great deal, for we continually differ from both. We do not think anything is gained by avoiding theological words, such as "grace," "justify," &c. We refer Mr. Weekes to Sanday-Headlam for convincing proof that *δικαιοῦν* *never* means "to make righteous." He shows bad theology, too, as well as bad grammar in translating *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, "God was the Word."

7. We would like to go into a discussion with Mr. Rotherham of the thirty-two matters he takes up in his Appendix. This Appendix is valuable and with most of it we are in harmony, but one point we cannot overlook—the absurdly bigoted translation of *βαπτίζειν* by "immerse" which he attempts to defend on the ground that *he* is convinced that such is its meaning and that the Trinitarian Bible Society have translated it by *טָבַל*, which means *to dip*. He is perfectly consistent in his translation, too, "John the Immerser came—proclaiming an immersion;" "Jesus came "and was immersed into the Jordan;" "arising, was immersed;" "Jesus . . . was tarrying . . . and immersing;" "our immersion into his death;" "the immersion wherewith I am to be immersed(!);" "one faith, one immersion;" "immersions of cups;" "diversified immersions(!)." Worst of all, "but ye in Holy Spirit shall be immersed(!)." The bigotry of a man who sets at naught all the scholarship of those who differ and who represent about 98 per cent. of Christendom, so that he insists on translating in a sectarian sense the word which has come down in all branches of the Church for nineteen centuries as the name of one of the Christian ordinances! The sectarian bigotry is so unblushing that it scarcely stirs our indignation. The translation is evidently a denominational version so far. We were sure of this when we read the commendatory notices in the prospectus before opening the book. They were mostly from Baptist periodicals. The rest of us ought to get out a version for the large majority of Christendom, with "John the Sprinkler;" "our sprinkling unto his death," &c.!

The evidence is irrefutable that the mode of baptism was by sprinkling, and we are convinced; but if we were making a version into Chinese or Metabele we should certainly respect the prejudices of our fellow-men who do not so believe. We always thought this denomination was very arrogant in holding a monopoly of the ordinance given to the Church by our Lord, in their very name; and now we have some relief, they are Northern Immersers, Southern Immersers, Free-Will Immersers, Hardshell Immersers! This is as it should be. Possibly they will allow now that the rest of us *baptize*,

while they *immerse*. The Arminianism of Mr. Weekes is certainly less conspicuous and pretentious than the Immersionism of Mr. Rotherham.

Columbia, S. C.

D. J. BRIMM.

LINDSAY'S RECENT ADVANCES IN THEISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

RECENT ADVANCES IN THEISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. *By James Lindsay, M. A., B. D., B. Sc., F. R. S. E., &c.* Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1897. Pp. 547. Price, \$5.00.

This is an able and comprehensive treatise upon a theme of perennial interest, alike to philosophy and theology. The author is a parish minister in Scotland, who is known by several other valuable works. His *Progressiveness of Modern Christian Thought*, and *Significance of the Old Testament for Modern Theology*, as well as his *Essays, Literary and Philosophical*, have secured for him considerable credit as a thinker of ability and as a writer of force.

The profound problems discussed in this large volume are those which emerge in connection with God, the Universe and Man. Theism is at once a doctrine of God, and a theory of the Universe, and of Man also.

The discussion is divided by our author into three great divisions. The first takes up "The Recent Philosophy of Natural Theology;" the second deals with "The Recent Philosophy of Theism (God);" and the third expounds The Recent "Theistic Philosophy of Religion (Man)." The Theistic principle, our author says, runs through these three tentative divisions of the subject, and they are closely related.

If we wished to be somewhat critical, fault might be found with this classification; for the first and second divisions really cover the same ground, and the first also includes not a little that belongs to the third. Theism may be defined as that doctrine of which affirms the existence and continued operation of an infinite personal being, and presents this affirmation as the only adequate solution of the problems of the universe and man. Theism is a doctrine of God; and, hence, it is a Natural Theology. It is also a theory of the universe and man; and, hence, it is a Theistic Cosmology. It further has to carefully consider the relations of God to the universe as both transcendent and immanent. It will be at once perceived that the deepest problems of philosophy and theology necessarily emerge from this study; and it is one of the hopeful signs of modern speculation that it is moving away from materialism, pantheism, and deism, to an all-embracing Theism. In the postulate which Theism makes, philosophy finds its profound principle of unity, science discovers its adequate hypothesis to explain all phenomena, and theology beholds its proper object of veneration, communion, and obedience. Such a doctrine also provides the solid divine philosophy upon which Revelation may securely rest. We rejoice, therefore, in every advance made in the study of Theism, and welcome the book before us as a helpful contribution in this fruitful field.

One thing which will strike the reader in the perusal of this volume, is the wide scope of the author's reading in this field, and the extent of the criti-

cisms and commendations of the various authors whose views he presents. No list of the authorities thus referred to is given in the volume, but a hurried count of the names in the excellent Index at the end of the treatise, shows over 320 such names. For the reader who wishes to pursue his reading further by consulting the authors quoted or referred to, it is a serious defect of the book that the references are seldom given in foot-notes. Sometimes the name of the author only, without reference to the treatise referred to, is given. Such references, given with care, would double the value of the book to the earnest student. For the ordinary reader, however, the loss will not be so great, because he seldom looks up such references, even when they are carefully given.

The first chapter is introductory, and it contains a fine sketch of the field to be traversed, and an enthusiastic commendation of the study to be pursued.

Then in the first main part, which deals with "The Philosophy of Natural Theology," there are three chapters. These deal with The Nature, The Origin, and the Permanence of Religion, respectively.

Touching the Nature of Religion, almost a score of erroneous or defective views are referred to and criticised, and the author's view is there stated in several different forms. He rightly locates religion not in any single faculty of man, such as intellect, will, or feeling, but in the spiritual nature or person of man. It is a power in man which gives color to all else in his experience and activity, and is the crowning exercise of all his powers. It is a reciprocal communion between God and man, which flows from the self-revelation of God to man, as it is met by a complete self-relation of man to God. By the union of these two factions in this way the content of religion is complete, and its Nature to be understood.

So in reference to the Origin of Religion, we have a wide scope of discussion in the statement and criticism of false or one-sided views. Mere naturalistic theories are rejected. In the last analysis, the origin of religion in the soul of men, is to be discovered in the fact that God reveals himself in that soul. This takes place, not in any Hegelian way, but by a process of self-revelation and self-reception, in harmony with the nature of religion above explained. The criticism of various writers upon this subject is able, though we would not commit ourselves to all of his views in detail.

From the views of our author in regard to the Nature and Origin of Religion, we most naturally expect that he would strongly maintain that Religion is a Permanent factor in the experience of the human race. He argues not only for the Permanence, but also for the Perfection of Religion; and he deals some hard blows to agnosticism and pessimism as he thus argues.

In the second part of the volume, in which the Philosophy of Theism is discussed, there are six long chapters. These discuss in order: The Being and Attributes of God, the Cosmological Proof of the Existence of God, The Advance in the Teleological Proof, The Ontological Argument, The Moral Argument, and the Personality of God.

No attempt can be made to follow our author's critical discussion, which at every point is able and instructive. We are gratified to find that he places the cosmological proof on its proper causal basis; that he argues in favor of

the fundamental principle of the ontological proof ; and that he holds that evolution, even if proved true, does not destroy, but only modifies, and enlarges the scope of the teleological proof. The moral argument is well presented ; and some of the radical errors of Kant, in holding by the moral proof and rejecting the other proofs, are effectively pointed out. The contents of the chapter on the Personality of God is valuable against pantheism, and the philosophy of the unconscious, as represented by Hartmann and others.

In the third part of the treatise, there are also six chapters, which consider in various aspects the Theistic Philosophy of Religion. These chapters have as their several themes : The Functions of Reason in Man, The Personality of Man, Human Freedom, The Reign of Law in Man, Man's Redemptive Needs, and The Spiritual Nature, Affinities and Goal of Man.

He gives a high and noble place to Reason in Man, and shows how it is to be viewed in relation to the infinite reason of God. From the view of Reason in Man it is easy to pass on to maintain his Personality, which is necessary, not only on rational but also on moral grounds. Moreover, the Personality of God and of Man are related to each other closely. His discussion of Human Freedom is somewhat confused, and scarcely so satisfactory as much of his previous expositions is. He strongly asserts Freedom ; and, in a sense, contingency ; and seems not to perceive the fact that an event may be certain (not necessary), and yet its cause, or the agency by which it is brought about, may be entirely free in action. His zeal against Determinism of a mechanical sort, has led him to an opposite extreme, in our judgment. The Reign of Law in Man is an interesting study, and if many of the things truly brought out in this chapter were applied to the contents of the preceding chapter, his views of Human Freedom would have been somewhat modified. The chapter on Man's Redemptive Needs is a very suggestive one. Here not only the Need of Redemption is brought out, but the philosophical basis of mediation is unfolded, and made evident. The fact that mere subjective change in the moral state of the sinner is not all that is needed, is made plain ; and the need of an objective ground of redemption is emphasized. This, on the whole, is a satisfactory chapter, only the nature of sin as moral evil, perhaps, scarcely receives its due weight, in even a philosophical way. The last chapter deals in an able way with the Spiritual Nature, Affinities, and Goal of Man. Here the perdurability of spirit, and its consequent immortality are argued for in an effective way. The natural basis of immortality has prominence given to it, and the view already taken of man's rational and spiritual personality fully justifies the high ground taken for natural immortality.

We close by commending this book to those whose tastes are favorable to hard reading and close reasoning. It is no easy work to go carefully through a book like this, but the exercise strengthens the mental powers. To read what does not call these powers into vigorous exercise may be of little value ; but one strong book carefully read is both a tonic and a gymnastic.

The book is beautifully gotten up, the paper, type and binding are almost perfect. But the price is high, and yet we shall not say that it is not worth the money.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

VANCE'S PREDESTINATION.

PREDESTINATION. A Sermon. *By Rev. James I. Vance, D. D.* Pp. 32.
Paper. 5 cents. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

This sermon, by the popular pastor of the First Church, Nashville, Tenn., has been issued with the imprimatur of the Presbyterian Committee of Publication. There is some difficulty in determining why the author felt himself called to preach, much less to publish, the sermon. No thorough Calvinist can possibly accept it as a statement of his creed, nor will the Arminian hardly be willing to do so, coming from the source it does. The only ones who can derive any benefit from it, will be that class who believe in anything that is called Predestination. They do not understand the doctrine, do not profess to understand it, do not propose to try to understand it, but they believe it, and they mean to keep on believing it. This class will probably profess themselves very much edified by reading this sermon. We commend it most heartily to them, and to them alone.

All hope of clearness is destroyed by the fact, that there is no definition of predestination given, while the word is frequently used in different senses. In one place it evidently covers *all of the decrees* of God :

“God has a will, a plan, a purpose about the world. He has always had as much. When he started out to make a world, there was a definite plan in the mind of the Creator. Nothing was left to chance or fate ; everything was a matter of prearrangement.”

In another place it appears to mean simply *election*. Speaking of the condition which predestination meets, the author says :

“The condition is the human race, dead in trespasses and in sins. God’s will infringes upon a soul spiritually dead, lost. It will not help the present discussion to inquire into the cause of this, &c.”

In another place it clearly means a *plan* of redemption. “What is the goal of Predestination?” The answer is : A kingdom, the restoration of the fallen, all of the steps of grace ; the gospel call, justification, adoption, and sanctification. From this statement it might be supposed that Predestination had been treated logically, 1st, as to its general meaning ; 2d, specifically, as equivalent to election ; and 3d, as embracing the application of redemption. Such, however, is not the case. The whole structure of the sermon makes this an impossibility. Predestination with our author simply means predestination. The loose way in which the whole subject is handled is best illustrated by his position that all Churches hold to this doctrine.

“Predestination is likewise in the creeds of all Christian Churches. It is there either explicitly or implied, either by direct statement or by necessary inference. There is no exception. . . . Other Churches state the doctrine more mildly. They endeavor to mellow it, limit its sweep, reduce it to the measurements of human thought, but they must recognize its presence. The difference between the denominations with regard to predestination is not that one Church accepts it and another denies it. The difference is in the place assigned to the doctrine.”

The objections that are dealt with under the terms “caricature and apol-

ogy" are of the kind that hardly need refutation or even comment, while the real difficulties with which the doctrine is beset, and upon which the body of the Church needs light, are left untouched. Was it just to appoint one man as the legal representative of a numerous constituency, without their consent ; and then, upon his sinning, to impute the guilt of his sin to each one of them, without their having any opportunity to repudiate his conduct ? Was it wise or good in God to do this, when he foreknew that the representative appointed by himself would certainly sin ? Was it merciful in God only to elect some of our fallen race to eternal life, and to provide an atonement for them alone, when that same atonement is sufficient for all ? Such are some of the difficulties, that if answered well, would have been of service to the Church.

The *ground* of Predestination is made to be the *love* of God.

"God's decrees are not the manifestation primarily of power, wisdom, expediency, or foreknowledge, *but of eternal and unchangeable love*. . . . Perhaps the strongest, clearest statement of Predestination is that contained in the latter part of the eighth chapter of Romans, beginning with, 'Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called.' Lying side by side with this, in the same part of the same chapter, is the Bible's strongest, sublimest statement of divine, inseparable love : 'I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, &c.' "

If it were meant that God was good in all of his decrees, or that love was the motive that led to the election of some men, and angels to eternal life, there would be none to object. But this is not what is meant. If we have rightly fathomed the purpose of the author, this sermon was prepared for the purpose of showing that Predestination in all of its manifestations, springs from *love*. His text is, "The will of the Lord be done," and the Lord's will is the expression of his love. Justice nowhere appears, all reference to it is studiously avoided. It is love, love, love, nothing but love ; no justice, no righteousness, no holiness, except as they emanate from love. Was it love that decreed the permission of the first sin ? Was it love that decreed the eternal punishment of the wicked ? Was it love that destroyed the beloved city, and scattered the chosen people ? Does love say, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay ?" The answer to such questions is amazing. It is in substance, God could not help man's sinning without making him an automaton. When he had sinned God provided a plan of escape for him. This plan is offered for his acceptance or rejection. The human will is clothed with ability to choose or not choose this plan. If any are lost, therefore, it is because God is not able to prevent it. Here are some of his statements :

"Individuals may reject God's plan, but they can not thwart his purposes." "The objection looses its last vestige of plausibility when we confront the gospel call, which clothes the human will with ability to accept, if it chooses to do so, the gracious provisions of the gospel and enter into life." "God's glory is his goodness, his grace ; and if he can be glorified by the redemption of one soul, much more by all."

But what of Predestination ! Could Bishop A., or Presiding Elder B., or Circuit Rider C. possibly ask for any thing more ? Calvinism has been betrayed and wounded, in the house of its friends.

From the positions taken in this sermon universal restoration follows as a logical consequence. The author says :

"God's decrees are not the manifestation primarily of power, wisdom, expediency, or foreknowledge, *but of eternal and unchangeable love.*" "Remember this, that God's decrees are God's love in thought and action." "But God is a Father, his people are his children, and worship is adoration of God's goodness and love."

This quotation relates not to a class, but to all of God's creatures.

"God is not glorified by the damnation of his creatures. 'It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish.' (Mt. 18:14.) Besides, if God can be glorified by the salvation of a part, why not by the salvation of all? How comes it that God's glory is so easily satisfied? God's glory is his goodness, his grace ; and if he can be glorified by the redemption of one soul, much more by all."

"Predestination has for its goal the restoration of the fallen and the outcast. This is precisely the lesson taught in the the famous passage in Jeremiah about the clay and the potter. (Jer. 18, 2-6.) The meaning has often been horribly distorted from its plain and evident intention. It has been made to teach that God fashions some lives for an everlasting heaven, and others for an endless hell ; and he does this because we are the clay and he is our potter. Nothing could be further from the meaning of Jeremiah. The potter finds the clay 'marred,' useless, but instead of casting it away, he touches it with the alchemy of his art, fashions it with the skill of his genius, until under his deft care the 'marred' clay becomes a vessel shaped for use and invested with beauty. So God, the divine potter, deals with human clay. He finds us 'marred,' sinful, but instead of casting us away, he touches us with the alchemy of his holy love and fashions us with the skill of his grace, until under his patient, considerate care, the 'marred' clay once more becomes a vessel mete for the Master's use, and invested with imperishable beauty and worth."

"God has a will, a plan, a purpose about the world. He has always had as much." "God's plan will certainly be carried out sooner or later. Time is no factor with God, because he is without beginning or end ; 'a thousand years in his sight are but as yesterday when it is past and as a watch in the night.' Delays are not defeats with God." "From first to last it is every where and always a predestination to *privileges*. The decrees do not impoverish but enrich, do not damn but save."

It appears from these quotations taken from different parts of the sermon that all decrees spring from love, that they are all fulfilled by love, that they look to the salvation of the lost, that they never damn but always save, that God cannot be glorified by the damnation of any, but is by the salvation of all, that time is no object with him, and that his will and purpose must surely be accomplished. If this is not universal restoration, what is it? If any doubt remains as to what is here implied, the interpretation which is given of Jer. 18, 2-6, would remove it. The author does not venture on interpretation of Scripture very much, except as a sort of illustration, but here he deals formally with the passage. The meaning which he gives it is, that *all* of the marred clay is to be made into vessels of beauty. As this clay is made to represent us in our sinful estate, the fashioning of it into vessels of imperishable beauty means that no one of us shall be cast away. We cannot forbear the regret that Paul could not have seen this interpretation before he committed himself to that horrible position, that out of the marred clay,

the potter, in his justice and wisdom, might make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor. Such is the bright hope set before our race,—the Universalist that could desire more would certainly be hard to please.

We pass over a number of other serious errors in this sermon without comment. It has throughout the unpleasant odor of "New Theology," and the nauseous taste of "Advanced Thought." It is all so bad, that the only proper disposition to make of it would be to recommit the whole case, with instructions to review and correct.

G. A. BLACKBURN.

Columbia, S. C.

WEST'S DANIEL'S GREAT PROPHECY.

DANIEL'S GREAT PROPHECY ; THE EASTERN QUESTION ; THE KINGDOM.

By Rev. Nathaniel West, D. D. Large 12mo. Pp. 306. New York :
The Hope of Israel Movement.

This is no ordinary book : in massive strength and comprehensive exegesis of Scripture it is equal to the learned work of Dr. Pusey on Daniel, or the profound treatise of Prof. Auberlen on Daniel and the Revelation.

Dr. West is no ordinary man : his bold thinking ; his love of truth for its own sake ; his extensive and accurate scholarship ; his abounding labor by pen and tongue in behalf of the integrity of the Scriptures, place him in the foremost rank of the great Biblical students and scholars of the century.

In reviewing this book, the best service I can render the readers of THE QUARTERLY will be to let Dr. West state his views in his own words.

Nothing could be finer than his *Description of Daniel* :

"A young man eighteen years of age, a captive at the Court of Babylon, and hostage for the good behavior of the vassal king of Judah ; a youth of royal blood and a holy celibate for the kingdom's sake. Before he reached his majority he reproduced and interpreted the monarch's dream, and because of his piety, learning, genius, and fear of God, grew to become the prime-minister and master of the magi in the realms of Babylon and Persia. By the banks of the Euphrates, Ulai and Tigris he talked with angels and received visions from God. A hundred years he lived contemporary with the kings of Assyria, Babylon, Media, Persia, Greece and Rome, and the last four kings of Judah. He personally knew Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joshua the High Priest and Zerubbabel, Prince of the House of David. In Babylon and Shushan he met the royal magnates of the heathen world. He was contemporary with the Greek sages, Anaximander, Xenophanes, Parmenides, and Pythagoras. He studied 'Moses and the prophets,' and like Joseph and Moses could decipher Egyptian obelisks and read Assyrian and Babylonian texts with greater ease than can any of our modern archæologists. He loved Jerusalem, the temple of the Holy Land. The woes of his nation touched his heart, and the desolation of Zion melted his eyes to tears. Although by his own influence the edict of Cyrus was procured for the release of the captives, yet as an exile he chose to remain at the Court of Babylon in order the more to promote their interests. He pursued his mission, trusting in a faithful God. In his person, he was fair of countenance, well favored, the admiration of Ashpenaz, Melzar and Arioch, the object of their tender regard. In his demeanor, he was courteous, dignified, deferential, reverent and respectful. In his character, abstemious, serious, devout, courageous, unblemished in his private life, and incorruptible in public office, a pattern of righteousness, holiness, wisdom, prayer and faith—full of the fear of God—a favorite with all. In

his attainments, he was skilled in all learning, 'five times better than all the magicians and astrologers' that served in the king's realm, the envy of the satraps, who sought to destroy him. What angels thought of him we know. Gabriel could address him as a man full of holy desires, 'a man greatly beloved.' What the prophets of his time thought of him we know. Ezekiel could speak of him as worthy to stand beside Noah and Job because of his righteousness. The Queen-mother of Belshazzar could call him 'a man of excellent spirit, and knowledge and understanding,' full of 'the spirit of the holy Gods.' "

His statement of the historical and supernatural character of the Book is conclusive; and crushing to the "destructive critics," who place it in the times of the Maccabees.

"The canonicity and inspiration of the book of Daniel are established by testimonies more numerous and varied than can be claimed for any other sacred writing. They come from the pens of inspired prophets and historians, and from the whole body of Jewish literature subsequent to the close of the Old Testament prediction. Chaldæan, Persian, Greek and Roman authors have confirmed its statements. Centuries have verified its prophecies. The lips of Christ, Peter, Paul, John and the evangelists, have borne witness to its truth. The entire New Testament is effulgent with its eschatology. The early Church teachers, with rare devotion, applied themselves to search diligently and understand its contents, and held it aloft as a shining proof of the Christian faith. Schoolmen and reformers studied it with deepest interest. Jews, Christians and Mohammedans, Catholics and Protestants alike, have vied with each other to explore its mysteries. From B. C. 534 to A. D. 1898, through 2,400 years, more than ten thousand volumes have been written as a tribute to its worth and world-wide significance, and, in our generation, the monuments of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Armenia and Egypt have united to do it honor."

But the most significant portion of Dr. West's treatise is his exposition of the *Time of Impact of the Stone* on the feet and toes of the Metallic Image or Colossus seen in dream by the great king Nebuchadnezzar. Does this refer to the First or Second Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ? Does the Impact date from the Incarnation or the Return of Christ? Are the Ten Toes Christianized or are Civil Governments destroyed?

"And our thesis is this, that the Fifth Kingdom to rise on the ruins of all the rest is the Kingdom of Christ in immediate and universal victory, and which (1) never yet has so arisen, (2) never can, and (3) never will so arise, till the Second Coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, to put down all Gentile politics and power, and introduce his universal reign of righteousness and peace."

"The question of the *time point* of the 'impact' is vital. The prophet nowhere teaches that this 'impact' occurs at the juncture of the knees with the thighs of the statue, where the Roman empire first comes into view, in contact with the Greek, anterior to the birth of Christ. Moreover, the first advent is not symbolized anywhere in the statue. We meet it nowhere till we reach chapter ix. The stone's impact does not occur at the first advent."

"It is not the beginning of the fourth empire under Augustus we have here, but its *end*, and in the *last* days of the ten toes or separate kingdoms into which it is then divided. Such division did not exist in the days of Augustus, nor of Tiberius, nor of Diocletian, nor of Constantine, nor even in the days of Theodosius when the final division east and west was made. The tenfold division of the empire into separate and independent kingdoms follows the work of the Goths, Vandals, Huns and Hunli, in the sixth and

seventh centuries, just prior to the emergence of Mohammed, and the mediæval and modern kingdoms as now existing, are not the last arrangements of the toes. The stone could neither strike the toes before they were formed, nor, having struck them and turned them to 'chaff,' allow them to survive, like England, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, Turkey and the rest. 'No place is found for them.' The work of the stone is not smooth, gentle, evangelical and peaceful rubbing, but perpendicular fracture, pulverization, judicial grinding, atomization, an attending wind of judgment blowing the chaff, dust and powder of all Gentile politics so far out of sight as never to be seen any more. Clearly, therefore, by the words, '*in the days of those kings,*' is not meant '*in the days of those four empires,*' as Jerome would have it, nor '*in the days of one of those four,*' as his perplexed commentators would term it, but in the *last days of the fourth*, divided into ten separate, contemporaneous and independent kingdoms."

No interpretation of Scripture Symbolism can compare with the colossal absurdity that teaches that the "STONE IMPACT" on the "TEN TOES," and their complete pulverization and annihilation, is the First Advent of our Lord and the Christianization of the Nations: *the Stone smites on the feet, and breaks them in pieces; they become as chaff; the wind carries them away; and no place is found for them.* The wild vagaries of Cocceius and his followers are tame and commonplace when seen by the side of this grotesque and gigantic specimen of "*misfit*" and misinterpretation of Biblical Symbolism. If our ministers will read over carefully five times the Dream and its Interpretation in Dan. ii., they will find that the "STONE" has no function of "*Christianizing the Nations.*"

The Great Messianic Prophecy. Dan. ix.

Dr. West is not satisfied with either the King James or the Canterbury translation, and gives his own, which is omitted here for want of space—his interpretation is as follows :

"The 'Seventy Sevens' or 'Weeks' selected from the whole course of time as weeks relating entirely to Jewish affairs, are 'Weeks' of years, each seventh part being literally one year. As seven days constitute a week, so seven years constitute the prophetic week. All the weeks are of equal chronological measurement, each week consisting of seven literal years, or 2,520 literal days. The sum is, therefore, 490 years. These weeks are distributed into three divisions of 7-62-1, that is, into 49-434-7, years respectively, and, excepting Babylon, span the whole height of the Colossus in ch. ii., and the lives of the Four Beasts in ch. vii., *i. e.*, from B. C. 536 to the Second Coming of Christ. They cover the whole subsequent period of Israel's national prostration under the Gentiles."

"Two intervals come in between them, one unseen and undefined between the third and fourth weeks, the other stated as between the sixty-ninth and seventieth weeks. They are, therefore, not to be counted *unbrokenly.*"

The Prince of the twenty-seventh verse is not the Messiah Prince, but the Anti-Christ—and the seventieth week closes the Times of the Gentiles, and is the Week of the Little Horn, the Prince who comes on the wings of abomination.

I have endeavored to give the reader some idea of Dr. West's style and strength, but the book is packed so full of strong meat, that no review of a few pages can do it justice. Those who get it and read it will thank me for these lines.

A. W. PITZER.

Washington, D. C.

BARRETT'S STORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

THE STORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. From the Apostles to the Present.

Revised and enlarged from lectures delivered before Baylor University Summer Bible School, 1897. *By Robert N. Barrett, Th. D.* * * * Waxahachie, Tex. 1898. Author's Private Edition. 8vo. Pp. ii., 72. Paper, 25 cents; 50 per cent. discount in lots of ten or more.

The author should have informed the public in his title that this book is prepared with special reference to Baptist missions and propaganda, inasmuch as he endeavors continually to leave the impression that immersionists have been the main factor in world-evangelization, and usually gives the Baptist statistics, even where other denominations have done much more. The work is about as good a sketch as could be given in the space occupied, and is not without interest, even though so brief. The sketch of early missions prior to the present epoch is the most valuable part. The volume appears to us as rather too condensed for those who have not a considerable missionary library at hand. For those that have such a library a briefer syllabus with references would be of more service as a basis for lectures, or guide for investigation.

We would suggest that a 12mo. or 16mo. form, with limp or flexible cloth binding, would be more useful and attractive. If the author should get out another edition, we would recommend more careful proof-reading, as we noticed in a rapid perusal twenty-eight typographical and grammatical errors, besides those that the author calls attention to. Of even greater importance are several little errors that the author has allowed to blemish his work: as that Joseph used a hired stable; that the Nestorian shaft in China belongs to the *sixth* century, instead of the *eighth*, its date being 781; that the Chinese emperor is now reading the *English Bible*; that the Bible Societies furnish the Brazilians with *Spanish Bibles*; that Tibet is still closed to missionaries; that "Jerry McAll" has conducted such a successful work in Paris and other French cities, getting Jerry McAuley of New York and Robert Whitaker McAll of Paris amusingly mixed up; the classing of Jamaica along with Cuba and Porto Rico, as Spanish dependencies.

He says, p. 28: "Christ did not institute a national Church, but independent Churches." We suspect the author betrays his denominational proclivities in this statement. If the plural word refers to provincial Churches as the capital would indicate, we can accept; if it means independent *churches*, it is unwarranted. As a matter of fact, Christ only speaks of "my Church," and "the Church."

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

NAVE'S TOPICAL BIBLE.

THE TOPICAL BIBLE. A Digest of the Holy Scriptures. *By Captain Orville J. Nave, D. D., LL. D.* Cloth. 8vo. Pp. 1,615. \$5.00. New York: The International Bible Agency.

This is a work containing more than twenty thousand topics and sub-topics, and one hundred thousand references to the Scriptures, embracing all doc-

trines of Biblical religion, and all phases of ancient society, history, law, politics, and other secular subjects; archæology, the arts, sciences, philosophy, ethics, and economics; principles of government, equity, and right personal conduct; biography, personal incident, and illustrated facts; geography, the history of nations, states, and cities, and a multitude of common subjects, illustrative of ancient religion, governments, manners, fashions, customs, and ideas.

From time to time men have undertaken to set thus in order the "things written," and the result of these efforts have been most helpful to Bible students. But no one of these has been exhaustively complete. About one hundred years ago Mr. Matthew Talbot, of England, classified the Scriptures; and since then the Analyses published in America have followed with some modification of arrangement Mr. Talbot's classification. These, however, have been more the classification of verses, while The Topical Bible "brings together in cyclopedic form and, under familiar headings, all that the Bible contains on particular subjects." Dr. Hitchcock's Analysis of the Bible has deservedly held its place as one of the best for the past twenty-five years, but Dr. Nave has improved upon that by the construction of a work much more comprehensive, and based upon more scientific principles.

This is not a new Bible, but the old familiar Authorized Version rearranged topically in alphabetical order. Nor is it a work in support of some sectarian dogma. The author has cited passages which are variously interpreted by different religious schools or accepted authorities under the subjects they are claimed to support, without reference to his own personal views.

The method pursued in preparing the Digest was, first, to analyze topically each verse of the Bible, each series of verses, and each chapter and series of chapters; and, second, to group under suitable headings all the Scriptures related to the subjects found in the analysis. The first verse of Genesis may serve to illustrate: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." "In the beginning." Some authorities interpret this phrase as meaning the beginning of time: therefore, the author noted, "Time, Beginning of, Gen. 1:1." Other authorities interpret it as referring to the beginning of creation: therefore, the author noted, "Creation, Beginning of, Gen. 1:1." "God created." Note, "God, Creator, Gen. 1:1." "Created the heaven." Note, "Heaven, Creation of, Gen. 1:1." "Created the heaven and the earth." Note, "Earth, Creation of, Gen. 1:1." "This process," the author says, "was faithfully adhered to throughout the work."

So this is not only a Digest, but an Analysis also. All the matter of Scripture is analyzed without regard to verse and chapter divisions, except for convenience in reference. For illustration of the fullness of the analysis, take Romans 5:1, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This verse is cited under nine different headings, viz: Justification, Faith, Peace, Salvation by Faith, Jesus the Saviour, Atonement, Mediation, Propitiation, and Reconciliation. Again, to illustrate the thoroughness of the topical study, let us take one example: Under the subject, "Affliction," over 1,400 passages are quoted, filling twenty-eight double column pages. Then there are over 2,000 more under cross-

references, making altogether nearly 3,500 passages quoted and cited on this one topic. Furthermore, many verses are cited as often as thirty times.

That which makes the work still more complete is the division of the most important topics into Sub-topics, which are printed in an alphabetical list at the head of the grand topic, and followed by references to the pages on which the passages may be found.

There is still in addition to these divisions a copious, elaborate system of Cross-References to all related and antithetical topics, which enables a student to study a subject in all its bearings and ramifications.

A complete textual Index closes the work. This seems to be everything required. It refers to the pages and columns in which each verse of the Bible is quoted or cited in the entire work.

Dr. Nave has done his work well, and has placed all Bible students under lasting obligations to him. We have no hesitation in expressing the belief that all other Digests and Analyses of the Bible must give place to The Topical Bible.

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

DICKSON'S TRUTH THAT SAVES.

THE TRUTH THAT SAVES AND HOW TO PRESENT IT. *By Rev. J. A. R. Dickson, B. D., Ph. D.* New York : American Tract Society. Pp. 138. Price, 50 cents.

Here is an attractive little book, with a noble purpose, a chaste and perspicuous style, and loyal to the truth from lid to lid. The writer is happy in the use of illustrations, and rich in the employment of apt quotations. He handles the Bible reverently but dexterously, and as one reads, he finds his heart warming to the theme of the book.

Dr. Dickson's purpose is to focus attention on that truth in God's Word which saves, and which is to form the preacher's message in his effort to win souls. He deals with his subjects under these eight heads ; "The Desire for Fruit ;" "Different Kinds of Truths in the Word ;" "The Truth that Saves ;" "Substitutes for the Gospel ;" "Preparation for the Reception of Saving Truth ;" "The Truth made Effectual to Salvation ;" "How to Present the Gospel ;" and "The Joy of Preaching the Truth that Saves."

He analyzes the truth that saves into three elements as it deals with Christ's death, burial, and resurrection.

"There is a soothing opiate," he says, "that many take to-day to give ease from the troublesome pain which comes of seeing no fruit ; it is dispensed in this form : 'Duty is ours, results are God's.' That is true, but it evidently carries a very limited sense in the word 'duty,' if it leaves out all concern for the success of the Word in the soul of the hearer. . . . Truth may be preached, but not the truth that saves ; and that being the case, conversions will be few and far between."

In treating of the substitutes for the Gospel, Dr. Dickson makes very clear the important point that faith does not create fact, but accepts and rests upon it as it is established by God's word. He compares a winsome and attractive invitation that lacks Gospel truth, to fishing with a bare hook, and shows

very tellingly how many preachers preach powerfully and eloquently, without ringing a single Gospel bell.

"It is not the offer, nor the invitation, nor anything springing out of the Gospel, that is the power of God unto salvation—but the Gospel itself—'Christ died, the Just for the unjust.'"

A very searching portion of the book is that in which he deals with the tendency of the modern pulpit to pass over or tone down the teachings of Scripture on eternal punishment.

"No marvel that to-day we hear of so few broken hearts. The truth of God is not presented in its fulness. It is emasculated. It is nerveless. It no longer clutches the conscience and shakes the soul with the terror of the Lord."

On p. 82 there is a fine passage, in which an intellectual apprehension of truth in the abstract is distinguished from the faith which embraces the same truth incarnate in the person of Christ.

The book is sound and orthodox, but it is something better than this. It is alive and throbs throughout with the inspired Word. It is timely, and will bear a careful, studious reading. If its message were better heeded by the pulpit, there would be less need of bemoaning the small number of conversions and the slow growth of the Church.

To the preacher or Christian worker who has gone daft on "church methods," and who is ever trying to furbish the ecclesiastical machine, I would commend the earnest, evangelical message of Dr. Dickson's book. What the preacher must handle, as "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," is the inspired Word rather than the church machine; "the truth that saves" rather than "church methods."

JAMES I. VANCE.

Nashville, Tenn.

CHISOLM'S GOSPEL IN GOLD ; OR THE GRACE OF GIVING.

THE GOSPEL IN GOLD ; or the Grace of Giving. *By Rev. James J. Chisolm, D. D.* Richmond, Va. : Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 18mo. Paper, 5 cents. Pp. 60.

The more we study the subject of Christian giving, the deeper is our conviction that there is no doctrine that contains so much of the precious gold of the Gospel, and we have read no work in which this thought is so clearly and forcibly presented in so small a compass as in this. The thoughtful and studious author has for many years been delving in this mine, and here condenses the results of his studies in a few pages, as the banker reduces his paper currency to gold. It is a little treasury of thought, and will prove helpful to those who have not time to read larger treatises.

The meaning, the method, the motives, the measure, and the reward of Giving are briefly but forcibly presented. He clearly shows that Giving, according to the Scripture rule and measure, is the highest act of worship, as "the test of our honesty, the tribute of our loyalty, the token of our gratitude ;" the crucial test of Christian character, as "the manifestation of our sonship, and the measure of our love ;" and secures the richest rewards, as

"it enhances our temporal prosperity, ennobles the character and conduct of our earthly calling, and enriches the soul with the wealth of heaven."

We "are not redeemed by such a contemptible thing as gold," but many are not redeemed without it. It is the chief instrumentality in the outward extension of the kingdom of Christ, and of its internal development.

Charleston, S. C.

G. R. BRACKETT.

KENNEDY'S PUBLICATION.

PUBLICATION. *By Rev. M. S. Kennedy.* Richmond, Va. : Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Pp. 16. Price, 2 cents.

This is a sermon from the text, "Give attendance to reading." It was preached for the purpose of arousing interest, in the congregation of the author, in the cause of Publication. The treatment of the subject is admirable, and wherever it is read the contributions to this important work will be increased. There is only one point in it open to criticism. The policy of the Committee, in devoting every cent contributed, and all of the profits from the business department, to the distribution of Christian literature, is commended. The wisdom of this is questionable. No one questions that such work is wise and profitable, and every one regrets that more of it can not be done ; but what our Church most needs at present is a literature of her own, one that will give her prestige and influence in the nation and in the world. There is sufficient scholarship and literary talent in our Church to produce such a literature, yet most of the books that we ourselves read are the products of some other Church. The chief reason of this lies in our publication system. If one now writes a book, there is no possibility of getting it before the public unless the publisher is secured against loss. Few of our ministers are able to give this security, so he must himself hawk his wares before the public, begging for subscriptions to justify the publication of the work. This is humiliating, and few, even for the good of the Church, are willing to do it. The remedy is for the Committee of Publication to publish whatever would be worthy of preservation, whether it were a financial success or not. The benefits that would accrue would more than repay the Church for its expenditure. It would furnish the Church with a philosophical, theological, historical and devotional literature that would correctly represent our principles, conceptions, purposes and hopes ; one that would increase the respect of the Church at large for the ability and scholarship of our ministry, and at the same time increase our influence and promote our usefulness. It would also have the effect of producing scholars, and of cultivating literary talents that now lie dormant. The policy that fails to recognize this is indeed shortsighted, and the result is that the Southern Church which has scholars, theologians and orators that could make her name famous throughout the world occupies a place that is almost provincial. The few whose writings have been published have done us honor, some of them have shown extraordinary genius, but their writings do not constitute a literature, the line is too thin to command attention.

GEO. A. BLACKBURN.

Columbia, S. C.

IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHINESE PHILOSOPHY. An Exposition of the Main Characteristic Features of Chinese Thought. *By Dr. Paul Carus.* Chicago : The Open Court Publishing Company. 1898. 8vo. Pp. 64. Paper, 25 cents.

Reprint of an article in *The Open Court* for January, 1896, with a useful Index. Interesting to students of Sinology, of Comparative Religion, and Comparative Philosophy, and to prospective missionaries—very useful to these last. It requires close study to follow and appreciate. After reading through one will reaffirm the statements of the author in his Introductory remarks, viz : "It (Chinese Philosophy) is a rare mixture of deep thought and vain speculations, of valuable ideas and useless subtleties. It shows us a noble beginning and a lame progress ; a grand start and a dreary stagnation ; a promising seed-time and a poor harvest."

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, UNDER THE RULES OF EVIDENCE GOVERNING COURTS OF JUSTICE. *By J. P. Hobson.* Second Edition. Richmond, Va. : Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 16mo. Pp. 131.

Quite an able Tractate. The argument is conducted in a novel manner, and so successfully that it will be read with appreciation by every one that is interested in this controversy with the immersionists. We would especially recommend it to those in our Church who, under the influence of the English versions and of Dr. Broadus' great name, probably think that maybe, after all, the Baptists are right.

"TELL THEM," or The Life Story of a Medical Missionary. *By George D. Dowkontt, M. D.* Illustrated. New York : Office of *The Medical Missionary Record.* 1898. 12mo. Pp. 256. Cloth, 60 cents ; Limp, 30 cents.

Really an autobiographical sketch of the man who inaugurated Medical Missions in America, interspersed with many interesting incidents that go to show how God has sustained him in his work of faith. The faith element is quite as remarkable, so far as exhibited, as in the case of George Müller. The term "Medical Missions" is used in a wider sense than usual, so as to include work among the destitute and degraded masses of our large cities. That is the kind of medical missionary Dr. Dowkontt is, and has been from the beginning. But he has trained in connection with his work above a hundred men and women, who are serving as medical missionaries in foreign lands under the various Boards and Committees. It is a glorious work for Christ, whether at home or abroad, and the volume now presented shows how much may be done for the salvation of the soul while a skillful and consecrated physician or surgeon is ministering to the suffering body. It will

repay perusal. It enlarges one's view and warms his spiritual man and helps him to deeper consecration and greater faith.

THE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY IN THE ANCIENT WORLD. A Study in the History of Modern Development. *By R. M. Wenley, Sc. D. (Edin.), D. Phil., (Glas.), Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan, some time Honorary President of the Glasgow University Theological Society.* New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898. 16mo. Pp. 194. 75 cents.

The problem which the learned author sets before himself in this work is, What were the essential features in the development of man's religious, moral, and social needs throughout the ancient classical and Hebrew civilizations that ultimately ended in a spiritual impotence curable by Christianity alone? To the solution of this he brings, in the compass of a work unusually compact and terse, a great array of facts and a careful study of great philosophical movements. Special attention is paid to Socrates and the Greek Self-criticism, as well as to the mission of the Jews, and the general preparation of the world, as elements in the opening of the way for the appearing of Christ in the world. The little volume belongs to the collection of the Church of Scotland called the "Guild Series."

BIBLE COURSE. Outline and Notes. *By Rev. F. H. Gaines, D. D.* II. From the Kingdom to End of Old Testament. Atlanta : The Franklin Printing and Publishing Company. 1898. 8vo. Pp. 118.

This volume completes the author's Outlines of his Bible Course. Like the two volumes which have preceded it in publication, it is made up of Notes and Outlines. He divides the history covered into periods determined by the accession of Saul, the disruption of the kingdom, the fall of Samaria, the Babylonian exile, and the restoration. The subdivisions, analyses of historical books, and studies of the leading characters are marked by great thoughtfulness and painstaking care. The author's chief work is found in the arrangement and analysis. On leading events and characters he usually quotes, with discriminating taste and care, such well known writers as Blaikie, Geikie, Stanley, and others, and uses largely the compilations of Dr. Glentworth Butler. The analyses of the prophets are excellent. The literary questions connected with certain epoch, as the days of Josiah, for instance, are not considered very fully. Their discussion would not have been germane to the author's purpose. Like all Notes and Outlines, this volume admirably sets forth the author's method of teaching, and it is a fine one, but in this form will not be found so well adapted to general use as it will prove when fully elaborated. An expansion of it would make a valuable addition to the literature on the subject.

TWO PARABLES. ^{*} *By Charles R. Brown, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, Oakland, California.* Chicago, New York, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898. 12mo. Pp. 250. \$1.25.

A series of ten striking and evangelical sermons, four of them upon the

Parable of the Good Samaritan, and six of them upon the Parable of the Prodigal Son. The preacher's style and method of presenting his thought, as well as what he says, may be usefully studied. The sermons will amply repay reading.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES H. SPURGEON. Compiled from his Diary, Letters, and Records, by his Wife and his Private Secretary. Vol. I., 1834-1854. 4to. Pp. 373. To be completed in four volumes, for \$10.00. New York, Chicago, and Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898.

A finer volume, as to its mechanical features, has seldom been produced. Broad pages, printed in large, clear type, on heavy paper, handsome illustrations, and substantial binding, furnish a worthy setting for the account of such a life as Spurgeon's. It deals with the first twenty years of the great preacher's life, from his birth to his entrance upon his metropolitan pastorate. The story is told by himself, and his diary, and other records, are characterized by the same sweet simplicity and genuineness which marked his public career. As it was in this early period of his life that he laid the foundations, in doctrine and principle, for the work of his maturer and more widely known life, this volume will possess special interest to students of his career in their analyses of the secret of his power and success. It lets the reader into the inner sanctuary of his heart and mind, at a period which was formative and critical.

IN KINGS' HOUSES. *By Mrs. Caroline Ripley Dorr.* Boston : L. C. Page. 1898.

"Behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses."

A touching little romance of "ye olden time," telling how Robin Sandys, "grandson to Dame Dorothy Sandys," for six years head nurse to the Lady Anne Stuart, became Sir Robert, Lord Valdegrave, and won the "little lady." The basis is historical, most of the events grouping around the pathetic career of William, the fifth Duke of Gloucester, "Heir to the Crown of England, but never the Prince of Wales." The characters are natural and the plot well sustained throughout. As years pass, the pen of Mrs. Dorr loses none of its power.

The musical rhythm of "The Guest" still echoes in her writings of to-day, and her sense of the fitness of things is as keen as it ever was. She cannot fail to charm the boys and girls with this story of those who dwelt In Kings' Houses. We most heartily recommend the book, with a single criticism. Says the author : "Who shall say that the wider sympathies, the broader outlook that came to Robin through this experience, were not worth all the pain through which they were won? In after years he looked back to the loitering journey with Father John as to some blessed pilgrimage." However holy Father John may have been as an individual, he is not a fair type of the priest of the seventeenth century, and the broad-mindedness accruing from intercourse with him is a mistaken one. We cannot too zealously be-

ware of the pernicious doctrine that a man's *creed* is nothing and his *life* everything. "As a man thinketh, so is he."

Elsewhere in Mrs. Dorr's writings we find her soaring to the realm of the Universal Fatherhood of God. Take, for example, her poem, "Somewhere :"

"How can I cease to pray for thee? Somewhere
In God's great universe thou art to-day.
Can he not reach thee with his tender care?
Can he not hear me when for thee I pray?"

"What matters it to him who holds within
The hollow of his hand all worlds, all space,
That thou art done with earthly pain and sin?
Somewhere within his ken thou hast a place.

"Somewhere thou livest and hast need of him ;
Somewhere thy soul sees higher heights to climb ;
And somewhere still there may be valleys dim
That thou must pass to reach the hills sublime."

We believe that "the souls of believers do immediately pass into glory," and do not interpret 1 Peter iii:19 as indicating a second term of probation to those who are suffering the just penalty of the law. To believers there are no "dim valleys" to be passed after the valley of the shadow of death. In either case our prayers for the dead are useless, and on examination what appears to be a sweet sentiment degenerates into mere universalism. With the exceptions of these occasional lapses Mrs. Dorr's writings are good, healthy, moral reading for our youth.

ALASKA, ITS NEGLECTED PAST, ITS BRILLIANT FUTURE. *By Bushrod Washington James.* 12mo. Pp. 444. 1898. Philadelphia: The Sunshine Publishing Company.

A thoroughly delightful work, portions of which have appeared from time to time under the nom de plume of Bushrod. The author gives us an extended trip through this our land of the midnight sun, vividly painting its beauties as well as its neglected opportunities. It is a masterly appeal to the members of our Legislature, lest, through neglect, we lose one of our most promising possessions. Particularly interesting is his discussion and representations of the totem poles, the family crest of the Alaskans. The slaughter of our seals, the encouraging mission work, and the preparations for a journey to the Klondyke are most ably discussed. There are thirty-four fine illustrations.

THE BEST OF BROWNING. *By Rev. Jas. Mudge, D. D.* New York: Eaton & Mains. 12mo. Pp. 252. \$1.50. 1898.

A book for Mr. A who likes Browning and for Mr. B who dislikes him. Comparatively few have time or inclination to explore all the turbid depths that Browning has sounded, yet would be pleased with the gems. Here we have them. Dr. Mudge has carefully selected the best of Browning, comprising many complete poems with extracts from the more lengthy ones, and

presented them in a charming style. He gives us a biography which in itself explains many of the poet's eccentricities, and, in addition, many criticisms from his friends and foes, impartial criticism, too, freely admitting his faults while extolling his real merit. "How to Read Browning," and "The Benefits of Browning Study," are interesting chapters. This is a book which ministers will find interesting and probably helpful.

AMONG THE FORCES. *By Bishop Henry W. Warren, LL. D.* New York : Eaton & Mains. Pp. 197. Price, \$1.00.

This little volume is a series of illustrated short chapters on the wonderful power exerted by the forces of nature, written in an easy, simple style and adapted to our intelligent youth. It seeks to divert attention from fairyland and stories of genii and sprites, to the greater wonders that lie in the realities around us, as seen in the application of the powers of nature to the service of man. The actual and present workings of God are vastly beyond all the dreams of Arabian imagination. The volume includes interesting sketches of the Matterhorn, the Grand Canon of Colorado, and the Yellowstone Geysers. It concludes with two chapters previously published on "Spiritual Dynamics" and "When This World Is Not."

CHRIST AND THE CRITICS. *By "Gerome."* Cincinnati : Curts & Jennings. New York : Eaton & Mains. 1898. Pp. 85. Price, 50 cents.

The purpose and scope of this booklet will be best presented by quoting entire the preface from the pen of its author. It is brief—

"A glance at these pages will show that no attempt has been made to solve any philological, geographical, historical, theological, or other question of Higher Criticism. None of the supposed inaccuracies, discrepancies, or contradictions pointed out by radical critics have been touched. I did not design to do so. Holding all these matters for the time being in abeyance, I have sought the answer to one question only, and that was, not what the Old Testament books said as to their authorship, not what the apostles and evangelists said, not what the voices of the ages have said, but what did Christ say? All other questions, except the authorship of the Pentateuch, remain as they are. But the settlement of this one question will enable earnest students to approach difficulties with less fear. The final chapter is added for the simple purpose of showing that the conclusions reached are not inimical to the noble results of modern scholarship."

The tone of the book is dispassionate, its style clear, and its argumentation for the most part cogent. The conclusion to which the author is led by his examination of the "testimony of our Lord" is that Christ is unequivocally committed to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. As a popular presentation of an important phase of a large subject, this little book, despite certain unnecessary concessions, will fill a useful place.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE CRITICS. *By John Milton Williams, D. D.* Chicago : Charles H. Kerr & Co. 1898. Pp. 95.

This book with all its defects, and they are not insignificant, has some things to commend it. Its author writes out of conviction, and hence not

only with vigor, but frequently with force also. Had he been content wholly to pass by some things, and give his entire strength to fewer points, the results would have been more satisfactory. But he has attempted too much, and does not always show sufficient insight into the real nature and merits of the positions which he assails. It is only fair to add that, while he puts some things well, in other cases the author does not represent the real conservative position, and that in other cases he does not by any means represent the real strength of the conservative position. We have no doubt that Dr. Williams is himself a virtuous man, but his theory of virtue is, we regret to say, most vicious. It is the well but not favorably known "New England theory." The proof-reading of the book was very bad.

THE HOLY LAND, IN GEOGRAPHY AND IN HISTORY. *By Townsend Mac Coun, A. M., Member of the American Historical Association, Fellow of the American Geographical Society, etc.* Vol. I., Geography. Illustrated by fifty-three maps. Pp. 96. Vol. II., History. Illustrated by one hundred and one maps. Pp. 136. New York : Townsend Mac Coun. 1898.

In this work the author seeks to popularize the subjects dealt with, first by clear, practical treatment, and then by brevity and compactness. They are dainty little books, too dainty, we fear, for general use in their present form, except by the most delicate hands of young ladies in our adult Sunday-school classes. The maps are marvels of clearness for their size, which is almost diminutive. For average Bible students there is too much of modern Palestine and its unfamiliar and difficult names. We do not think the volumes will displace Smith or Thompson, or even those more old fashioned and less pretentious works of Osborne and Barrows.

AFFUSION, THE ONLY SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM. *By Rev. J. W. Tyler, M. A.* Pp. 39. 5 cents. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

This tractate takes its place with the many others of its kind on the mode of Baptism. Its contention is for Affusion as the Scriptural mode. The discussion is concise and clear. Mr. Tyler himself seems to have been an immersionist once, but now undertakes "to show that there is no immersion in the Bible." We think his proposition is sufficiently proven. He considers the Use or Meaning of Baptism, cites Individual Instances, infers the mode from similarity in Purification, notices two prophecies concerning, and closes with answers to Objections to Affusion as the mode. This tract may be found useful in pastoral work where there are cavils and questionings upon this subject.

JOHN G. PATON, MISSIONARY TO THE NEW HEBRIDES. An Autobiography. *Edited by his Brother.* Cloth. 16mo. Pp. 99. Price, 50 cents. New York : Fleming H. Revell Co.

The title of this book carries with it a sufficient commendation. Vols. I.

and II. of this *Autobiography* have become a Missionary Classic, which has not only been read in America, Great Britain and the Colonies, but which has been translated, in whole or in part, into many modern languages. Probably no book of this century has been blessed in a greater degree to the honor and praise of God than the History of Dr. Paton's remarkable life. The public from the very first hailed it with an uncommon welcome, and God in many ways signally owned and blessed it. This volume tells the story of Mr. Paton's life during the twelve years that have elapsed since Part First and Part Second were completed—1886-1897. It is a graphic, simple, unctuous, inspiring, faith-strengthening narrative. The Editor says of it what he did of the first two volumes, "I publish it because Something tells me there is a blessing in it." And, indeed, "there is a blessing in it."

THE STORY OF JOHN WESLEY. *By Marianne Kirlow.* Told to Boys and Girls. Pp. 168. 75 cents. New York: Eaton & Mains.

The life of this great man is here briefly and simply told. We recommend it particularly to those in search of good literature for the Sabbath School library. For, besides containing the chief events in the life of this great man, it also has the "sweet old story" ingeniously woven in, and which may take hold of the hearts of our boys and girls for whom the book is written.

DID THE PARDON COME TOO LATE? *By Maud B. Booth.* Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 48. Price, 30 cents.

This little story of a wanderer from the fold is pathetically told, and the power of God's free grace and the efficacy of Christ's blood as manifested in the heart of "Frank," one of the convicts of Sing Sing, is well portrayed, and every Christian must rejoice to be assured again that even the vilest may return, and that Christ came to save even to the uttermost.

Mrs. Booth is no doubt doing good in this prison work, but like many others in this present day she takes pains to let the world know it. This feature of the book we do not admire.

X. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

JULY—AUGUST—SEPTEMBER.

American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.

- ELDER, A. M., Sc. D., Wm. Ideas from Nature. Talks with Students.
FAUNCE, D. D., E. F. A Young Man's Difficulties with his Bible. Cloth, \$1.00.
JOHNSON, E. H. and AYERS, E. E. Surcum Corda. A Book of Praise. 8vo.
Pp. 654. \$1.50.

CLARKE, Wm. Newton. Mystery in Religion. Pp. 40. 10 cents.

D. Appleton & Co., New York.

JAUVIER, Catherine (Translator). The Terror. A Romance of the French Revolution. \$1.50.

TAYLOR, D. D., Ph. D., A. R. The Study of the Child. The International Education Series.

BALDWIN, J. M. The Story of the Mind. Cloth, 40 cents.

A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

PATON, B. A., Rev. James. The Story of John G. Paton Told for Young Folks. \$1.00.

MOULE, D. D., H. C. G. Colossian Studies. Pp. 318. \$1.75.

Henry Artemeus, Philadelphia.

SHUGERT, Fanny Alricks. The Day Breaketh. A Tale of Jerusalem and Rome in the Days of Christ. 16mo. Pp. 291.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.

STRETTON, Hesba. Alone in London. Pp. 123. 15 cents.

TORREY, R. A. Our Bible. Pp. 132. 15 cents.

Callaghan & Co., Chicago.

DESMOND, H. J. The Church and the Law. Pp. 133. 75 cents.

The Christian Literature Co.

DARMESTELER, James. The Zend-Avesta. Sacred Books of the East. Cloth, \$3.00.

Christian Publishing Co., St. Louis.

FAIRHURST, Alfred. Organic Evolution Considered. \$1.50.

The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

BARRINGTON, A. H. Anti-Christian Cults. Spiritualism, Theosophy, Christian Science. Pp. 170. 50 cents.

The Robert Clarke Company, Cincinnati.

GOSS, Rev. C. F. The Philopolist, or City Lover. 25 cents.

T. Y. Crowell & Co., New York.

BARNES, Irene H. Behind the Pardah. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

TRINE, Ralph Waldo. In Tune With the Infinite. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25.

TOLSTOI, Count Leof. What is Art? Translated by Aylmer Maude. Pp. 234.
\$1.00.

WARD, Mrs. Humphrey. New Forms of Education. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 39.
35 cents.

Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing Co., Nashville.

FOSTER, Robt. V. Systematic Theology. Pp. 868. \$3.00.

Curts & Jennings, Cincinnati.

- THOMPSON, D. D. John Wesley as a Social Reformer.
 HUNTINGTON, Rev. D. W. C. Sin and Holiness. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 288.
 \$1.20.
 HAWKINS, Mrs. Mary Anderson. Philip Barton's Secret. Cloth. 12mo.
 Pp. 228. 85 cents.
 BOWNE, Borden F. The Christian Revelation. 18mo. Pp. 107. Cloth,
 50 cents.
 HALSTEAD, Wm. Riley. Christ in the Industries. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 179.
 75 cents.

The Defense Publishing Co., New York.

- The Trial for Life ; or, Our Pastor's Defense. Pp. 508. \$1.50.
Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

- DRIVER, D. D., Rev. S. R. The Polychrome Bible. The Book of Leviticus.
 4to. Pp. 106.
 CONDER, C. R. The Hittites and Their Language. Pp. 312. \$2.50.
 THOMPSON, John. Through China with a Camera. Pp. 284. \$5.00.
 STEEVENS, G. W. Egypt in 1898. Pp. 283. \$1.50.
 MACLAREN, Ian, and Others. In Answer to Prayer. Pp. 24. 75 cents.
 ROBERTSON, D. D., Alexander. The Bible of St. Mark. Crown, 8vo. Pp. 376.

E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.

- HEPWORTH, Geo. H. Through Armenia on Horseback. Pp. 355. \$2.00.
Eaton & Mains, New York.
 WARREN, L. L. D., Henry W. Among the Forces. Pp. 197. \$1.00.
Eyre & Spottiswoode, London.
 SINKER, D. D., Robert. Hezekiah and His Age. Pp. 184. \$1.50.
Fortune & Scott, New York.
 WASHINGTON, Booker T. Black Belt Diamonds. Pp. 115. \$1.00.
Ginn & Co., Boston.

- SPRAGUE, Ph. D., H. B. Milton's Paradise Lost, I., II., and Lycidas. 45
 cents.
 JASTROW, Morris. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Pp. 780. \$3.25.
Harper & Bros., New York.
 GREEN, S. P. McL. The Moral Imbeciles. Pp. 237. \$1.25.
 GAULLEMIER, Henry. The Paternal State in France and Germany. Pp. 225.
 \$1.25.

Herbert H. Hawes, Bluefield, W. Va.

- HAWES, Rev. H. H. Bible Church Studies. 8vo. Cloth. Pp. 398.
E. H. Herrick & Co., New York.
 HORTON, D. D., Rev. R. F. Women of the Old Testament. Studies in Wo-
 manhood. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.00.
 PULLAN, M. A., Leighton. The History of Early Christianity. Cloth. 12mo.
 \$1.25.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., New York.

- BATES, Arlo. The Puritans. Pp. 423. \$1.50.
The Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia.
 DEMLITZ, Lewis N. Jewish Services in Synagogue and Home. Pp. 487.
Orange Judd Co., Springfield, Mass.
 TALMAGE, D. D., Rev. T. DeWitt. From Manger to Throne. A New Life
 of Jesus Christ, and a History of Palestine and Its People. 50 cents.
Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago.
 WILLIAMS, John M. The Old Testament and the Critics. Pp. 95.

Wilbur B. Ketcham, New York.

- SMITH, Hannah Whitall. Christ Enough. 15 cents.
 HAVERGAL, Frances Ridley. Wonderful Gifts. 15 cents.
 ELIOT, E. S. Thou Remainest. 15 cents.
 DRUMMOND, Henry. Joy, Rest and Faith. 15 cents.
 STALKER, D. D., James. For All and For Each. 15 cents.
 FARRAR, D. D., F. W. True Manhood. 15 cents.
 MACLAREN, Ian. Home Making. 15 cents.

Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

- HARNACK, Dr. Adolp. History of Dogma. Translated by Neil Buchanan.
 Vol. IV. Pp. 353.

Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

- ABBOTT, B. D., D. Litt., T. K. Do This in Remembrance of Me: Should it
 be, "Offer This?" Pp. 53.
 GUTCH, B. D., Rev. Charles. Sermons. Pp. 304.
 LONG, Andrew. The Making of Religion. Pp. 235. \$4.00.
 SUTHERLAND, Alexander. The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct.
 2 vols. Pp. 336. \$4.00 per vol.

The Lutheran Publishing Society, Philadelphia.

- Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministe-
 rium, from 1748-1821. Pp. 619. \$3.50.
 SCHUTTE, Walter E. Her Place Assigned. A Book for Older Sunday School
 Scholars. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.
 STUMP, Rev. Adam. The Secret of the Canon. 12mo. \$1.25.
 HAY, D. D., Chas. E. Luther, the Reformer. 32mo. Pp. 201. 40 cents.

The Macmillan Co., New York.

- WACE, D. D., Henry. The Sacrifice of Christ, Its Vital Reality and Efficacy.
 18mo. Pp. 93.
 WELDON, Rev. J. E. C. The Hope of Immortality. \$1.50.
 ADENEY, W. F. The New Testament Story Retold for Young People.
 BENNETT, W. H. The Old Testament Story Retold for Young People.
 MOULTON, Ph. D., Richard G. The Modern Reader's Bible Edited with In-
 troduction and Notes. St. Luke and St. Paul. Two volumes.
 18mo. Pp. 461.
 MOULTON, M. A., Richard G. The Modern Reader's Bible. The Gospel,
 Epistles and Revelation of St. John. 50 cents.
 SADLER, Rev. F. M. The Acts of the Apostles, with Notes Critical and
 Practical. Pp. 522. \$1.50.
 ROUNDELL. Letters to His Son on Religion. Pp. 165. \$1.25.
 VAN DYKE, Henry. The Gospel for an Age of Doubt. Pp. 329. \$1.25.
 SADLER, Rev. M. F. The Gospel according to St. John. \$1.50.

Marlier, Callanan & Co., Boston.

- O'NEIL, J. L. Jerome Savonarola. Pp. 232. \$1.00.
 HOGAN, Rev. J. B. Clerical Studies. Pp. 499. \$2.00.

Mennonite Publishing Co., Elkhart, Ind.

- LAMBERT, George. India; The Horror Stricken Empire. 8vo. Pp. 480.
The Mershorn Co., New York.

- AZHDERIAN, Autranig. The Turks and the Land of Haig; or Turkey and
 Armenia. Descriptive, Historical and Picturesque.

John Murphy & Co., Baltimore.

- WOODS, Rev. P. Guide to True Religion. Pp. 301.

Ogden Bros. & Co., Knoxville, Tenn.

- JOHNSON, A. S. Letter to a Young Methodist Preacher. Pp. 235. 50 cents.
 JOHNSON, A. S. The Life of Trust. Pp. 301. 50 cents.

The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.

- HUC, M. Travels in Tartary, Thibet and China. Vol. I. and II. Illustrated. Pp. 668. \$2.00.
- HUTCHINSON, Woods. The Gospel According to Darwin. Pp. 241. \$1.50.
- CORNILL, Carl H. History of the People of Israel. Pp. 325. \$1.50.
H. H. Otis & Sons, Buffalo.
- SHEARD, Rev. Chas. Civil Law in the Ecclesiastical World. Pp. 76. 50 cents.
L. C. Page & Co., Boston.
- MAUGHAM, Wm. Somerset. The Making of a Saint. 12mo. Cloth. Pp. 351.
The Pilgrim Press.
- AYABE, M. A., B. D., Jenichiro. A Japanese Robinson Crusoe. 12mo. Pp. 219.
James Pott & Co., New York.
- BAYLES, Ph. D., G. James. Civil Church Law in a Series of State Digests for Churches of All Denominations. \$1.00.
Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.
- CHISOLM, D. D., Rev. J. J. The Gospel in Gold; or, The Grace of Giving. Pp. 60. 5 cents.
- KENNEDY, Rev. M. S. Publication. Pp. 16. 2 cents.
- DICKSON, S. O'H. The Story of Marthy. Pp. 269. \$1.25.
- TYLER, M. A., Rev. J. W. Affusion, the Only Scriptural Baptism. 18mo. Pp. 39.
G. P. Pulman's Sons, New York.
- ANDREWS, Samuel J. Christianity and Anti-Christianity in Their Final Conflict. Pp. 356. \$2.00.
- ADDIS, W. E. The Documents of the Hexateuch. Vol. II. Pp. 405. \$4.00.
- JACOBS, Henry Eyster. Martin Luther the Hero of the Reformation. 12mo. Pp. 454.
- SOMBART, Werner. Socialism. Pp. 199. \$1.25.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Jewish Religious Life After the Exile. Pp. 265. \$1.50.
Reformed Church Board of Publication, New York.
- SCHIEFELIN, Samuel B. After Death and Other Mysteries. 16mo. Pp. 118. 25 cents.
Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.
- BEATON, Rev. David. Selfhood and Service. Christian Personality and its Relation to Wealth and Social Redemption. \$1.00.
- BROWN, Chas. R. Two Parables. 12mo. Pp. 250. \$1.25.
- CARY, Otis. The Man Who Feared God for Naught. A Rhythmical Version of the Book of Job. 50 cents.
- COWAN, Rev. Henry. Landmarks of Church History. 40 cents.
- EXCELL, Rev. J. S. The Biblical Illustrator. Pp. 787. \$2.00.
- MACGREGOR, Rev. G. H. C. Praying in the Holy Ghost. 50 cents.
- PARK, David. Missionary Methods for Missionary Committees. 18mo. Pp. 76. 25 cents.
- POLWIN, Prof. L. S. Here and There in the Greek New Testament.
- WARNE, F. G. George Muller, the Modern Apostle of Faith. 75 cents.
- ROBERTSON, D. D., Rev. James. Our Lord's Teaching. 40 cents.
- WHYTE, D. D., Alexander. Bible Character. Gideon to Absalom. 12mo. Pp. 245. \$1.25.
- PATON, John G. Autobiography. Vol. III. Pp. 99. 50 cents.
- MORGAN, Rev. G. C. God's Methods With Man. Pp. 188. \$1.00.
- SPEER, Rev. R. E., and others. Select Northfield Sermons. Pp. 128. 30 cts.
- MEYER, F. B. Meet for the Master's Use. Pp. 121. 30 cents.
- CLARK, Rev. F. E. Fellow-Travellers. Pp. 288. \$1.25.
- JACKSON, B. A., Rev. George. The Ten Commandments. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00.

- TORREY, R. A. What the Bible Teaches. A Thorough and Comprehensive Study of All the Bible Has to Say Concerning the Great Doctrines of Which it Treats. Large 8vo. Cloth. Pp. 539. \$2.50.
- CONLEY, D. D., Rev. John Wesley. Divine Healing and Doctors. 16mo. Pp. 36.
- GIFFORD, Rev. Daniel L. Every-Day Life in Korea. 12mo. Cloth. Pp. 229.
- SPURGEON, C. H. All of Grace. Cloth. 12mo. 40 cents.
- MOORE, Joanna P. Kind and True. 25 cents.
- MOORE, Joanna P. For Mother. 25 cents.
- SPEER, Robert E. Missions and Politics in Asia. Cloth. \$1.00.
- WHITE, Wilbert W. Thirty Studies in the Revelation of Jesus Christ to John. Cloth. Long 18mo. 35 cents.
- MORGAN, Rev. G. Campbell. God's Methods with Man in Time: Past, Present, and Future. 12mo. Pp. 188. \$1.00.
- DIXON, D. D., Rev. A. C. Lights and Shadows of American Life. 12mo. Pp. 197. \$1.00.
- CLARKE, Annie. Light Amid the Shadows. Pp. 143. 50 cents.
Review and Herald Publishing Co., Chicago.
- SMITH, Uriah. Looking Unto Jesus. Pp. 288. \$1.00.
H. W. Rokker Co., Springfield, Mo.
- THAYER, Rev. E. W. The Bloody Sacrifice. 8vo. Pp. 179.
Scriptural Tract Repository, Boston.
- HASTINGS, H. L. Ancient Heathenism and Modern Spiritualism. 5 cents.
G. W. Schroeder, New York.
- SCHROEDER, G. W. History of the Swedish Baptists. Pp. 316.
Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- CARLYLE. Frederick the Great. Centenary edition. Vol. V. \$1.25.
——— The Ancient Faith in Modern Light. A Series of Essays. Cloth. 8vo. Pp. 416. \$4.50.
- ABBOTT, B. D., D. Litt., Rev. T. K. Ephesians and Colossians. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. Cloth. 12mo. \$2.50.
- CRANE, Elizabeth G. Berquin. A Drama in Five Acts. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 111. \$1.00.
- KNYPER, D. D., Abraham. Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology. \$4.00.
- STOPFER, Edmond. The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. \$1.25.
- ALEXANDER, Archibald. Theories of the Will. Pp. 421. \$2.00.
- TRUMBULL, H. Clay. Memories of a War Chaplain. Cloth. \$2.00.
Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York.
- TOLSTOI, Leo N. The Christian Teaching. Pp. 210. \$1.00.
The Student Volunteer Movement, New York.
- The Student Missionary Appeal. Addresses at the Third International Convention. 8vo. Pp. 563. \$1.50.
E. B. Treat & Co., New York.
- SMALL, B. D., Rev. Chas. H. Corner-Stones of Faith; or The Origin and Characteristics of the Christian Denominations of the United States. 8vo. Pp. 469. \$2.00.
The Union Press, Philadelphia.
- BATTEN, S. J. The New Citizenship. Christian Character in Its Biblical Ideals. 12mo. Pp. 306. Cloth. 90 cents.
- WRIGHT, Julia MacNair. Toward the Glory Gate. 12mo. Pp. 240. Cloth. \$1.00.
- STILES, B. D., Wm. Curtis. "Excuse Me!" The Pleas That Ruin You. A Study in the Perversities of Unbelief. 50 cents.
- GREEN, E. Everett. Battledown Boys; or, An Enemy Overcome. 75 cents.
- SPURGEON, C. H. Cheer for Daily Life. 12mo. Pp. 120. 50 cents.
- SPURGEON, C. H. Counsel for Christian Workers. 12mo. Pp. 123. 50 cents.

SPURGEON, C. H. Advice for Seekers. 12mo. Pp. 134. 50 cents.

WOOD, D. D., Charles. Friends and Foes of Youth. Pp. 132. 50 cents.

United Society of Christian Endeavor, Boston.

CUYLER, Theodore R. Well-Built. Plain Talks to Young People. Pp. 53. 25 cents.

CHAPMAN, D. D., J. W., and Others. Answered. Remarkable Instances of Answered Prayers. Pp. 53. 25 cents.

DICKINSON, D. D., C. A. The Indwelling God. Pp. 66. 25 cents.

FULLER, Thomas. Quaint Thoughts. Pp. 43. 25 cents.

James H. West, Boston.

DU BUY, Jean. The Teaching of Jesus. Cloth, 50 cents.

Western Tract Society, Cincinnati.

————— The Chapel Hymnal. Prepared by the Presbyterian Board of Publication. 60 cents.

Thomas Whittaker, New York.

HORTON, D. D., K. F. The Conquered World and Other Papers. 18mo. Pp. 128.

HUNTINGTON, Wm. R. The Spiritual House. Pp. 70. 25 cents.

W. A. Wilde & Co., Boston.

HODGE, Mrs. Aspinwall. The Palm Branch. 35 cents.

John Wilson & Sons, Cambridge, Mass.

————— Inasmuch. A Story of the West. Written for the Woman's Home Missionary Union of Nebraska. Pp. 87.

Winona Publishing Co., Chicago.

FRADENBURGH, Ph. D., D. D., J. N. Ancient Religions. 12mo. Pp. 464.

STARR, Frederick. Some First Steps in Human Progress. 12mo. Pp. 305

J. C. Winston & Co., Philadelphia.

THOMAS, Dr. R. H. Penelpe; or Among the Quakers. Pp. 366. \$1.25.

E. & J. B. Young & Co., New York.

TOMKINS, Henry George. Abraham and His Age. \$2.50.