

JANUARY, 1899.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

CONTENTS.

No. 1.

- I. PRESBYTERIAN BULWARKS OF LIBERTY AND LAW. Herrick Johnson.
- II. PERIOD OF ISRAELITISH SOJOURN IN EGYPT. W. W. Moore.
- III. DISCOVERY OF THE KINGS. Parke P. Flourney.
- IV. DID CHRIST PREACH TO SPIRITS IN HADES? Wm. W. Harsha.
- V. JONATHAN EDWARDS. Henry Collin Minton.
- VI. THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA. John W. Primrose.
- VII. THE CREDULITY OF OUR AGE. R. C. Reed.
- VIII. THE COVENANTER IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY. W. F. Junkin.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR. - - - 75 CENTS A COPY.
IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly :

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted
an Association composed of the following Ministers :

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.	C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.
W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.	W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.
D. J. BRIMM, D. D.	B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.
JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.	ROBERT PRICE, D. D.
WM. C. CLARK, D. D.	J. B. SHEARER, D. D.
J. N. CRAIG, D. D.	SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.
A. B. CURRY, D. D.	R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.
C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D.	C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.
T. W. HOOPER, D. D.	ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D.;
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D.; S. C. BYRD, A. M.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. :

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and settlement of account to date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES
I. THE PRESBYTERIAN BULWARKS OF LIBERTY AND LAW. By PROF. HERRICK JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.	23
II. THE PERIOD OF THE ISRAELITISH SOJOURN IN EGYPT IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH. By PROF. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.	243
III. THE DISCOVERY OF THE KINGS. By REV. PARKE P. FLOURNOY, D. D.	454
IV. DID CHRIST PREACH TO DISEMBODED SPIRITS IN HADES? By PROF. WM. W. HARSHA, D. D., LL. D.	557
V. PRESIDENT JONATHAN EDWARDS. By REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D. D.	694
VI. THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA. By REV. JOHN W. PRIMROSE, D. D.	959
VII. THE CREDULITY OF OUR AGE. By PROF. R. C. REED, D. D.	11026
VIII. THE COVENANTER IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY. By REV. WILLIAM F. JUNKIN, D. D., LL. D.	12746
IX. EDITORIAL.	14763
X. NOTES: THE SKULL HILL; HAS GOLGOTHA BEEN DISCOVERED? By REV. E. W. McCORKLE.	16471
MINISTERIAL RESTLESSNESS. By REV. T. D. WITHERSPOON, D. D.	17071
XI. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. By GEO. A. BLACKBURN, S. M. SMITH, ROBT. PRICE, JAS. A. QUARLES, D. J. BRIMM, T. R. ENGLISH.	
XII. BOOK NOTICES.	

9/22/30
Budget fund
\$4.00

X
Per
P9284
v. 13

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 47—JANUARY, 1899.

I. THE PRESBYTERIAN BULWARKS OF LIBERTY AND LAW.

It is a striking and memorable coincidence that while in the City of Philadelphia the Presbyterian Synod of New York and Philadelphia, in 1787, was discussing and amending the report of Witherspoon and his associates, and seeking the best possible embodiment of Presbyterianism as an organized, representative and constitutional government, the Constitutional Convention was also at the same time, in that same city, debating and determining the best form of government for the new Nation. Led by Witherspoon, whose blood still tingled with the thrill of the hour when he signed the Declaration of Independence, the Synod took the Confession of Faith in hand, and without any scrupulosities of reverence for it as a venerable symbol, and in absolute indifference to possibilities of patch-work, stripped it of every vestige of Erastianism, and ordered a thousand copies of the Plan as thus amended, printed for distribution among the Presbyteries, "for their consideration, and the consideration of the churches under their care." In the next Synod, 1788, after further amendment and full discussion, the whole Plan was finally adopted as "The Constitu-

tion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

Thus the government of the Presbyterian Church was made consistent in its entire and absolute separation of Church and State. The completed work became a bulwark of Christian liberty, and it stands to-day four square to all the winds of Cæsarism and the Papacy.

But these Presbyterian Fathers did more than this. They made a luminous and comprehensive statement of "the general principles" by which they had been governed in the formation of the plan. These principles are basilar and structural—they enter vitally into our government and discipline. They are at once its foundation and its vindication. For the clearness and comprehensiveness of this declaration of principles, which constitutes the first chapter of our Form of Government, for its balance and poise, for its grasp of fundamentals, for its truths whose very statement when once understood, makes them seem almost axiomatic, for its safe-guarding of sacred rights, for its just limitations put about liberty to keep liberty from license, and for its equally just limitations put about power to keep power from tyranny—for all this, and also for the lofty spiritual tone and the calm judicial temper pervading it, I know nothing to match it, of its kind and within the same compass, in all literature. It has been too much hidden under a bushel. In a ministry of forty years, I have never once heard it publicly referred to. In the histories I have consulted, it is passed by with the barest mention. It is my desire, in this article, to make it as a city set on a hill, that it may give light to those who are yet in darkness as to Presbyterian Government and Discipline, and that it may more widely do what its authors hoped it would when they gave it to the world, viz.: "Prevent those rash misconceptions and uncandid reflections which usually proceed from an imperfect view of any subject."

These Fathers of American Presbyterianism were “unanimously of opinion :”

First. “That 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.”

This supreme assertion of freedom of conscience is taken from the bosom of the Confession of Faith, where it had been placed by the Westminster divines when they wrought out the doctrinal standards in the famous Assembly of 1643. Our American Presbyterian Fathers copied it from the Confession, and lifted it to the foremost place in the Form of Government, where it leads the brilliant galaxy of principles for which many have died, and millions more have been willing to die. It is our immortal Presbyterian Declaration of Independence. It matches and surpasses Thomas Jefferson’s world-famous manifesto, “That all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” Let me repeat this first principle of Presbyterian Government: “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.” To this the Fathers added in this same first section the following irresistible sequitur: “Therefore, they consider the rights of private judgment in all matters that respect religion as universal and inalienable. They do not even wish to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power further than may be necessary for protection and security, and at the same time be equal and common to all others,”

True to this declaration they swept everything out of the Confession that looked at all like union of Church and State. And they made clean work of it. Not a vestige of the union of Christ and Cæsar was left. No King but

Christ. No vicar of Christ, usurping lordship. A conscience free from all commandments of men that are not commandments of God. The right of private judgment in matters of religion inalienable. Nay, more—no alliance with the State whatsoever—no aid to any religious constitution by the civil power save in the protection of rights common to all. That is to say, no public money for sectarian use.

These are the ringing words by which the Presbyterian Church irrevocably commits herself to the crown rights of her Lord and King. The principle is held by other evangelical faiths. But it has been given a rare historic setting by Presbyterians; notably when the Free Church of Scotland, in 1843, left her earthly all rather than bow to the behest of civil magistracy, and her four hundred ministers turned their backs upon manses and glebes and benefices, surrendered an annual income of at least a half million dollars and boldly walked forth to be God's freemen. And notably again, when the American Presbyterian Church placed this principle first and chief of all in the charter of her God-given rights—set it as the crown jewel in her diadem of Christian loyalty and liberty.

I need hardly say to you that there are portents of a coming time when we and other faiths of God's free hosts, may be obliged to stand for this principle as with faces of steel and consciences incarnate, against a wily, grasping, ecclesiasticism, whose history is black with the record of her usurpation of powers that belong to our Lord and King alone.

I pass now to a consideration of the second principle affirmed by the Fathers in the first chapter of our Form of Government.

They are unanimously of opinion :

Second. That, in perfect consistency with the above principle of common right, every Christian church, or union

or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualification of its ministers and members.

This statement seems almost axiomatic. It is the common law of organization. Safe-guarded interests are impossible without it. The bride of Christ must keep her robe unsoiled. She has a God-given stewardship. Shall anybody be admitted to her communion? Shall she put her imprimatur on every veriest tramp that claims to be commissioned of heaven to preach the Gospel? How could she keep her peace, or care for truth which Christ has committed to her, if she flung her gates and her pulpits wide open, and let the whole motley world in to her communion and her ambassadorship, without condition and without limitation! If terms of church and ministerial fellowship are to be made at all, who shall make them and determine their nature and spirit, if not the Church herself, in the light and under the law of that Word which Christ has given her. It is true that in the exercise of this right, any particular church, or association of churches, may err, "in making the terms of communion either too lax or too narrow." But even in this case, said these Presbyterian Fathers, "they do not infringe upon the liberty or rights of others, but only make an improper use of their own."

Now what are the terms of communion imposed by the Presbyterian Church? Looking into the New Testament record of the early Church, she found only one condition of church membership, viz: belief in the Lord Jesus Christ as a Saviour; and that, and that only, she has placed at the door of her communion. She demands no assent to an extended creed. She presses no questions about a system of doctrine. She seeks to know simply whether the applicant for admission to her fold is a Christian—a loving, obedient disciple of Jesus Christ. If he be that, he is welcome to all the privileges of her Church membership. Any true child of God,

of whatever name or creed, may come knocking at the door of the Presbyterian Church and asking, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" and the swift answer shall be, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." He may have imperfect views of Christ, he may stumble at the Trinity, he may have doubts about the mode of baptism, he may be an Arminian as to the decree, or a Pelagian as to the human will, or a Lutheran as to the Lord's Supper, or a Sabellian, a Swedenborgian, a Congregationalist, a Prelatist; no matter. Has he the spirit of Christ, and does he believe there is none other name given under heaven among men whereby he can be saved? Then the Presbyterian Church says his place is within Christ's visible fold; and without a question as to his orthodoxy in any other regard, she opens wide her doors to welcome him. And her ground and warrant for this is, that, according to the Scriptures, there should be no conditions of church membership, which are not conditions of salvation. Surely the Church should receive to her fold anybody that she has reason to believe Christ would receive to his. What possible right have we to make it harder to get into the Church than it is to get into heaven?

This is no new, no individual opinion—outside judgment to the contrary notwithstanding. It is the historic position of the American Presbyterian Church. In the Adopting act of 1729, more than one hundred and fifty years ago, when the question of subscription to the doctrinal standards was up for settlement, while the Synod claimed the right, and avowed the necessity, of demanding of the ministers an assent to all the essential and necessary articles of the Confession of Faith, it made this distinct avowal concerning all applicants for admission to church membership; viz: "We are willing to admit to fellowship in sacred ordinances all such as we have ground to believe Christ will at last admit to the Kingdom of Heaven."

Thus we build no wall about our communion that Christ has not built. Our banner is inscribed with "Whosoever believeth, let him come." We bar out no Christian because of his intellectual doctrinal conviction. Instead, therefore, of our being bigoted and narrow, as is often charged, binding a rigid creed on the brow of every believer as a condition of church membership, there is scarcely so broad and free a communion in all the ranks of evangelical Christendom.

But still further did our Presbyterian Fathers lay down the principles of church government.

They are unanimously of opinion :

Third. "That our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible church, which is his body, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, but also to exercise discipline for the preservation both of truth and duty."

They agree with the Westminster divines of a century and a half before them that, "The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate."

On the ground of antecedent probability they would reach this conclusion. The government of God's Church would seem to be too vital a thing, of too vast concern, and covering too many interests to be left to the varying caprice and prejudice of even regenerated Christian men. Christ came to establish a kingdom. But a kingdom implies government. And a government without a form of government is impossible. Christ surely did not set up a kingdom, only to leave it with no regulative principles and no officers of rule, without order and without law. This would be to leave it a mob.

But these men were not content to rest so important a matter on the mere warrant of antecedent probability. So

they searched the New Testament Scriptures to ascertain the kind of government Christ left his Church. They found clear record of the following facts: that there were authorized rulers in the early Church; that these rulers were elders; that elders and bishops were identical, the titles being used interchangeably; and that there was a plurality of these elders or bishops in a church. And they came with overwhelming and unanimous conviction to the conclusion, that the government of the New Testament Church was a government by elders.

The record is unmistakeable. He that runs may read. The persons we meet oftenest in the inspired account of early church organization and activity are the elders. They come into view everywhere. There were elders in the church at Jerusalem (Acts 15:11); elders in the church at Ephesus (Acts 20:1); elders in the Church of the Dispersion (I. Peter 5:1); Paul and Barnabas, on returning from their first missionary tour "appointed elders in every church" (Acts 14:21). Titus in Crete "appointed elders in every city." What were the duties of these elders? Just what they are now in the Presbyterian Church. They were rulers—officers of government. Paul in his letter to Timothy charged that the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor (1 Timothy 5:17). In his letter to the church at Rome, while speaking of different gifts in the Church, he says—"He that ruleth," let him rule "with diligence" (Rom. 12:8). In his letter to the Thessalonian Church, he speaks of those that were "set over them in the Lord" (Thes. 5:12). In his talk with the elders of the church at Ephesus, he says, "Take heed to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops" (Acts 20:28). In the letter to the Hebrews, Christians are bidden to "remember" and "obey" and "submit to" those in the church who "had the rule over them" (Heb. 13:7-17). But ruling was not all. They were to "watch in behalf of souls" (Heb. 7:17). They

were to "speak the Word of God" (Heb. 7:17). Paul bids the elders of Ephesus "feed the church of God" (Acts 20-28). Peter exhorts the elders to "tend the flock of God, exercising the office of bishop." James tells the Christians of the Dispersion, "Is any sick among you, let him send for the elders of the church." And Paul in his letter to Timothy commends especially those of the elders who "labor in the Word and in teaching."

This is the New Testament doctrine of the eldership. These following things lie on the very surface of Scripture, viz: There was a plurality of elders in every church, even in the small mission churches; these elders all ruled; they were officers of government; they watched over the flock of God; they exercised the functions of a Bishop; and some of them, at least, not only ruled, but preached the Gospel, "labored in the word and in teaching." Surely our Presbyterian Fathers had a right to say, "The Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of church officers." And for naming these officers "elders" they had a "thus saith the Lord."

But still further, in laying down the fundamental principles of church government, these Presbyterian Fathers are unanimously of opinion:

Fourth. "That truth is in order to goodness; and the great touchstone of truth, its tendency to promote holiness; according to our Saviour's rule, 'by their fruits ye shall know them.' And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are. On the contrary, they are persuaded that there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty. Otherwise it would be of no consequence either to discover truth, or to embrace it."

This admirable principle never had better expression.

The Church of God is put in trust of God's truth. But what profit is it that we keep his truth, if it is of no consequence what a man's opinions are, and there be no inseparable connection between faith and life. Paul's terrific arraignment of men was that they had "exchanged the truth of God for a lie." The consequence of that exchange was, that they became "vain in their reasonings" and "their senseless heart was darkened." Of course all truth is not in order to goodness. The truth of the Copernican theory of the universe, or of the circulation of the blood, or of the correlation and conservation of force, or of a problem in mathematics, may be accepted or denied without making a man the better or the worse. But this is not the kind of truth these men of God were talking about when they were laying down the fundamental principles of church government. They meant the truth of revelation, the truth of God's Word, the truth that vitally touches life, and harnesses itself to the human will, and goes down into character. It was with this clear limitation, they said, "Truth is in order to goodness, and the great touchstone of truth, its tendency to promote holiness."

The principle needs no proof. Its statement is its demonstration. Under the conviction of this principle, they are unanimously of opinion :

Fifth. That "it is necessary to make effectual provision that all who are admitted as teachers be sound in the faith."

Here we see a marked and important difference between terms of admission to the Church and terms of admission to office in the Church. Ready as our Presbyterian fathers were to receive into church membership any and all whom they had reason to believe Christ would admit to heaven, they nevertheless thought it necessary to make effectual provision that the officers of the Church, to whom is entrusted the teaching and preaching of the Word, be sound in the faith. The reason for this necessity is not far to seek.

The Presbyterian Church stands for a certain system of doctrine and a certain form of government. She believes God's word teaches that system of doctrine and authorizes the government; she believes that these are nearer the mind of God as revealed in the word, than are the systems of doctrine and governmental forms of other evangelical faiths, and she believes the differences are so important, and affect Christian character and church efficiency so vitally, as not only to justify her separate and continued existence as a branch of the Church of Christ, but also to bring her to the maintenance of her faith with a mighty constraint of conscience.

This is her reason for being the only ground of her separate existence. If she has nothing distinctive in faith and government which she thinks her Lord has put her in trust of she is guilty of schism, of dividing Christ's body without cause, and she ought not to maintain her separate organization, no, not for an hour.

But her martyrs have not died for nothing. She has not fought with the wild beasts of tyranny and intolerance, and yet had no stay and courage from her great truths. She has not grown oaks without congenial soil. She has gone through two and a half centuries thinking in her heart of hearts she saw in Holy Scripture some doctrines of sin and grace and some principles of government that needed to be embodied in a system, if all God's truth were to be told and used in making Christ's kingdom come. So she wrought out her Confession of Faith and her Form of Government and published them to the world. Who shall question her right to do this? Nay, who shall challenge her duty to do it. And conceding her right and her duty to confess her faith, who shall challenge her right to guard and keep it? And by what better way can she keep it than by "making effectual provision that all who are admitted as teachers be sound in that faith"?

Clearly wolves must not be given the liberty of the flocks of God. Pulpits must not be open to false teachers, privily bringing in sects of perdition, denying even the Lord that bought them. This goes without saying. But more goes with it, that needs to be said and said with emphasis. When men come to the Presbyterian Church seeking the solemn sanction of ordination to her offices, or of admission to her ministry, she surely has a right to know their attitude towards her doctrine and government. Her doctrine is embodied in her published Confession of Faith.

So, one of the questions to be asked of all men before they can be enrolled as office bearers in the Presbyterian Church and accredited as her duly authorized official teachers and preachers, is this:

“Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures?”

The Confession of Faith is the doctrine of the Word of God as interpreted by the Presbyterian Church. She has embodied it in a system. She believes this system is taught in the Holy Scriptures. She asks for no *ipsissima verba* subscription. Many specific detailed statements might be doubted, or denied, without affecting the integrity of the system. But three historic phases of belief are unchallengeably included in this Presbyterian Confession of Faith. First, the evangelical system, common to all evangelical churches of whatsoever name and embracing the doctrines essential to salvation. The extremest advocate of liberty of subscription would not for one moment contend that any true church of Jesus Christ could demand less than this. Neither the Presbyterian Church, nor any other Christian church, could ordain to her ministry an atheist or an infidel, without denying the Lord that bought her.

But the system of doctrine in the Presbyterian Confession, embraces also the Protestant system, as opposed to

the Roman Catholic. And neither here can there be any doubt as to the right of the Presbyterian Church or any other Protestant Church, to demand as a condition of entering her ministry, an acceptance and adoption of the Protestant system, as contained in her Confession of Faith. Not without treachery to the Head of the Church could she ordain one who leaned to altars and crucifixes and the worship of the Virgin, and the real Presence, and the infallibility of the sovereign Pontiff.

But still another system of doctrine is in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith. It is commonly known as the Reformed or Calvinistic System. This system, first of all, exalts God, places Him on his eternal throne, in active, undivided, unconditioned sovereignty. It humbles man as a sinner and smites him with a sense of spiritual impotence. But it glorifies him in Christ as a believer, to which glory it declares him chosen of God in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, and effectually called in the fullness of time, and the eternal realization of which has been made forever sure to him, so that once in Christ, he is always in Christ, and can never perish.

It is this system, as well as the common evangelical system and the common Protestant system, Presbyterianism has embodied in her Confession of Faith; and it is this, as well as the other two, which she, in her exercise of government, demands assent to, and adoption of, before any one can enter her ministry. Has she a right to place this condition at the door of entrance to her official stewardship of the mysteries of God?

We might better ask—Has she a right to do otherwise? Can she do otherwise without betraying her trust? This Calvinistic system of doctrine is her peculiar testimony. This, and her form of government, are the justification of her existence. To witness to this strong doctrine of God and sin and salvation she was especially set. She *believes*

that the system in all its essential and necessary parts, is in Holy Scripture, a sacred and important part of the trust of truth God has committed to his Church. Belief in it has helped her make two and a half centuries of no mean history. In this soil of doctrine and in this air of liberty she has grown her oaks. It is no wonder she loves and keeps her faith.

Suppose now an applicant appears for admission to her ministry, who is manifestly a true believer, accepting the Scriptures as the Word of God, and bowing in joyful obedience to Jesus Christ as his Saviour and Lord. He is asked the usual question: "Do you receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures?"

He answers, I receive and adopt the Confession as containing the evangelical and the Protestant system of doctrine, but I cannot adopt its Calvinistic system, for I do not find it in the Scriptures.

Clearly this is no case of a man challenging the crown rights of Christ. Instead, he joyfully crowns him Lord of all. This is no case of a false teacher, bringing in damnable heresies and denying the Lord that bought him. He will preach no word that will drown men in destruction and perdition. For he believes with his whole heart in all the doctrines of the Gospel essential to salvation. But he does not believe in the Calvinistic system of theology. In other words, he is not a Presbyterian. For the Presbyterian Church does believe in the Calvinistic system. It has the indorsement of her scholarship, her conscience and her heart, as God's own truth to which she owes much of her iron nerve and rootedness, and which has led her, in the strength of her high thought of God, "to prefer rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence." Yet she is to receive this man, though he does not and will not receive the truth she holds as her peculiar her-

itage. She is to enroll him in her ministerial ranks, and he is henceforth to preach in her pulpits, be installed over her churches, minister at her altars and feed her flocks. In God's name, she cannot do this inconsistent thing. It would be a label that told a lie; a house divided against itself; a suicide by self-contradiction.

But in thus taking care that her faith be kept, she is doing neither the one nor the other of two things with which she is often charged in this matter of safe-guarding her ministry. She thereby imposes no faith on other men's consciences. She simply stands for her own Confession. And she thereby casts no reflection on the applicant she declines to receive. She simply recognizes the fact, as our Presbyterian Fathers declare in this same section of fundamental principles, that "there are truths and forms with respect to which men of good characters and principles may differ." Thus she blends a broad Christian charity with tenacious doctrinal conviction. She knows that a great proportion of Christendom, endowed with learning, and rich with men of keen intellects and consecrated hearts, whose reverent study of God's Word, and whose enthusiastic devotion to Christ it would be folly to question, do not find the Calvinistic system in the Word of God, and do not believe it *is* the Word of God. In other words, perhaps the majority of those who love Christ, obey his will, fight his battles and hope for heaven only through his cross, do not believe as we do, who stand for Presbyterian government and Presbyterian doctrine. This should make us, not less inflexibly loyal to our faith, but charitable in judgment, and not swift to deny that those whose walk with God we dare not question, yet who do not look out of our theological eyes, may have as much of heaven's light on their Bibles as falls on ours.

But I must pass to speak of another principle set in this first chapter of our Form of Government by the Presbyterian Fathers. They are unanimously of opinion :

Sixth. "That though the character, qualifications and authority of Church officers are laid down in the Holy Scriptures—yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority, in any particular society, is in that society."

They thus declare for the right of suffrage, assert the autonomy of each individual church, and make the government of the church representative. And thus a cardinal feature of Presbyterian Church Government gets its complete expression, viz: A government under a written constitution and administered by elders as representatives of the people. It is neither autocracy nor democracy. It has neither hierarchy nor oligarchy. Its elders are taken from among the people, are chosen by the people, and they rule in the interests of the people. It is therefore, in the highest and best sense, a government "of the people, by the people and for the people."

Presbyterians believe that all power in the church is vested in the people. They hold that the people have right to a substantive part in the determination of all questions of doctrine, discipline, order and worship. Christ, the King and Head of his Church, has vested power of government in his Church. Who are his Church? Bishops? Prelates? Elders? No. The universal priesthood of believers—the whole body of believers in Christ Jesus. These are the Church. Hence, power vests in them. The Holy Spirit is the source of all power. And the Holy Spirit is given, not to the Apostles alone, not to their so-called successors alone, nor to any church officers alone, but to the entire Church. The Presbyterian Church, therefore, stands for election of officers by the people, and her suffrage is as wide as her communion. Whoever has a right to the Lord's table, man, woman or child, has a voice in the government of the church. Woman suffrage and minor suffrage, as well as manhood suffrage, are her usage and her law. Hence there is no government on earth, of

Church or State, more fully and completely representative.

Church power relates to three things : First, to matters of doctrine. The Church must interpret God's law and frame her creed as based on that law. Second, to matters of government. She must determine, in the light of God's Word, her own form of government. Third, to matters of worship. She must determine, subject to the written Word, the rules for the ordering of worship. Now if church power covers this wide field and all power vests in the people, then back to the people at last must come every question of doctrine and government and worship. So the Presbyterian Church believes. Every member of her communion votes. These votes elect the elders. These elders rule. We freely move in the grooves of law, for we make the grooves. If we do not like them, we need not break them. We can change them. The process is slow and long and guarded, as it ought to be. Changes in any constitution, but especially in the constitution of the Church of God, should not be made in a spasm. But they can be had, and by the people, if the people will.

I pass now to the seventh and last of the underlying principles framed by the Fathers and set in this marvelous first chapter of our Form of Government.

They are unanimously of opinion :

Seventh. That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or.....by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative ; that is to say, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners ; that no church judiciary ought to pretend to make laws, to bind the conscience, in virtue of their own authority ; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God."

Thus we are reminded that in the last resort the constitution of the Presbyterian Church is the inspired and infallible Word of God. The final question with every Presbyterian conscience is, What saith the Scriptures ? "Synods

and Councils may err," frankly say these men of God. Human standards, even as interpretations of Holy Scripture are fallible. The Presbyterian Church does not claim that she has any authoritative court of Christ, of which it can be said, "When it speaks, God speaks." We call the standards of doctrine and government and worship, the Constitution of our Church. And so they are, but only in a modified sense. They are the subordinate standards. The court of final appeal is the Word of God. "The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own glory, and man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or tradition of men."

We reach now the last section of this matchless chapter. It is the beautiful, magnificent and irresistible corollary from the seven preceding scriptural and rational principles.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are unanimously of the opinion:

Eighth. That if the preceding scriptural and rational principles be steadfastly adhered to, the vigor and strictness of its discipline will contribute to the glory and happiness of any church.

And here follows the closing sentence that should be written in letters of golden light over the door of every judiciary of our beloved Zion.

"Since ecclesiastical discipline must be purely moral or spiritual in its object, and not attended with any civil effects, it can derive no force whatever but from its own justice, the approbation of an impartial public, and the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church Universal."

Bare majorities would never have passed extreme measures in our church, the knife of discipline would never

have cut clean through the whole quivering body of our church, and the bitterness of strife would often have been drowned in a deluge of patience and good will, if the spirit breathed in these words had always dominated in our Presbyteries and Synods and General Assemblies.

And this does not mean a boneless, pulpy, flabby theology. Much less does it mean a peace purchased at the price of any truth of God. It means a spirit that can keep the balances amidst the profoundest agitation of great debate; that will at any cost hear the other side and all of it; that will believe the positive statements and frank disclaimers of a brother in Christ, rather than even its own fallible inferences; that has learned something from the old battles with which the bride of Christ has been torn and rent, the issues of those fierce strifes often having proved that they were mainly wars of words. Would to God that across our seven-jeweled crown of church government, placed here by the Fathers over the very threshold of our Palace of Law—would that across this seven-jeweled crown of government might be set in immortal brilliants to be known and read of all the Presbyterian host, this ever memorable truth: "Ecclesiastical discipline can derive no force whatever but from its own justice, the approbation of an impartial public, and the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church Universal."

I have thus passed in review the seven great principles that enter vitally into the structure of Presbyterian polity. I have called them the seven jewels in our crown of government. They might well be named our seven great bulwarks—bulwarks alike of liberty and of law.

With these we face the foe, and in the name of the omnipotent Jehovah, fling down our challenge to the world, the flesh and the devil. We blaze their names upon our battle-scarred banner, and joyfully bear them aloft before our bannered host: Christ's lordship of conscience; wide open communion; heaven ordained officers, with parity of

rule ; inseparableness of truth and duty ; guardianship of truth ; universal suffrage ; and Holy Scriptures the last appeal. These are indeed bulwarks of liberty and bulwarks of law.

How they stand for liberty. They declare for the inalienable right of private judgment and enthrone the conscience as free from the doctrines and commandments of men, and to be bound by no man-made laws that are not also the laws of God. They swing wide open the door of church communion ; and, like heaven's door, whosoever believeth may go in thereat. They unchurch no Christian. They shut no one out of God's banqueting house who loves Jesus Christ. They put a ballot in every hand that takes the bread and wine of communion ; and the ballot may be cast by man, woman or child, in the fear of God for the government of the church.

But this large liberty is no license. See how these bulwarks stand for law. They declare for officers of rule and instruction authorized by Christ, the King, "for the preservation both of truth and duty," to preach his word, administer his sacraments, and shield his flock.

They brand as pernicious and absurd the opinion that degrades truth to a level with falsehood, by making it of no consequence what a man's opinions are.

And giving truth its regnant, transcendent place in God's Kingdom, they safe-guard truth by providing that all teachers of truth shall be sound in the faith.

And above all, they enthrone Christ, not only as Lord of the conscience, but King of his Church and Lord of all, upon whose shoulder government is, whose name is the mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, of the increase of whose government and peace there shall be no end, King of kings and Lord of lords, who is far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, Prophet, Priest and King,

Saviour and Head of His Church, containing in himself by way of eminency all the offices of his Church. How could there be lawless license under such acknowledged Kingship, with Word of God as infallible rule, and officers of Christ bound by ordination vows to keep and guard the published faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in Holy Scripture?

Law and liberty, therefore, hold their balanced and coordinate place in the government of our Church. We have "superiority without tyranny," "parity without confusion," "subjection without slavery." We voice the unity of the Church in our graded assemblies of elders, but neither in Session nor Presbytery, nor Synod nor General Assembly, does any officer come to pre-eminence of power or jurisdiction.

Such a Church must needs have stood for civil, as well as religious, liberty. Who that reads can doubt it? History is ablaze with the record of Presbyterian fidelities in the battles against oppression.

Her Kingship of Christ and liberty of conscience and election by the people, commit the Presbyterian Church to civil liberty as naturally and inevitably as the sun commits the day to light and cheer.

So, too, is she fore-pledged to education by the very logic of her systems both of government and doctrine. By the law of Christ her King, power rests in the people. Popular election of church officers, necessitates intelligence. A blind ballot is a deadly weapon. A sufficient number of them means possible revolution any hour in Church or State. Hence Presbyterians have always been, by preference and conviction, patrons of the school. Students flocked to Geneva and Calvin. Bancroft says, "Calvin was the father of popular education and the inventor of the system of free schools."

If now, under these principles, we have ever been intolerant, or hedged God's free communion about with extend-

ed and rigid creed, or betrayed truth by laxity in ordination, or usurped powers vested of Christ in the people, or substituted our fallible Confession for God's infallible Word, or disciplined where the discipline got no force, either from its own justice, or from the approbation of an impartial public, or from the countenance and blessing of the great Head of the Church, it is because we have been false to our far flung battle cry.

If, drunk with power, we loose
 Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe—
 Such boasting as the Gentiles use,
 Or lesser breeds without the Law—
 Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
 Lest we forget, lest we forget.

But surely the times are not quite ripe, simply for Gospel lullabies. We still are confronted with illusion and mendacity. Men are still preaching doctrines of devils. Intolerance no longer builds bonfires to burn dissent; but it lurks still in high places, wearing sheep's clothing.

The battle is not over. We shall long be in need of intellects that can "pierce to the roots where truth and lies part company." We shall still have abundant service for men of the Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego sort; men who can walk into the fire, and though their flesh quiver, their hearts will not; men who, though they are crushed down will rise again; whom, though they may be splintered and torn, no power on earth can bend or melt—stalwart, strong oaks. And the centuries show that there is a soil and an atmosphere congenial to this fixed conviction and deathless courage. It is the soil of Presbyterian doctrine, and the atmosphere of freedom that sweeps through all our structure of Presbyterian government, where liberty and law lock hands, and ever walk together in a goodly and godly fellowship.

In our loyalty to these historic and heaven-honored symbols of Presbyterian doctrine and government, let us praise God and shame the devil. They are red with the blood of

martyrdom. They chronicle multiplied victories of conscience. In all their essentials they are truths of God.

“Shame to stand in God’s creation
And doubt Truth’s sufficiency.”

Let us be swift to recognize the bannered hosts of other faiths who make Christ King and crown Him Lord of all. Let us give them cheer as they fight and pray, and let us thank God for their victories ; but with a dear and deathless regard, let us stand by the beloved old Church whose name we wear, and whose doctrine and government we have solemnly before God and man accepted and adopted, and let us give to her through all the years our prayers and tears and toils.

HERRICK JOHNSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

II. THE PERIOD OF THE ISRAELITISH SOJOURN IN EGYPT, IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH.

The period extending from the call of Abraham to the death of Moses, which the Biblical writers invariably describe as the genetic period of Hebrew history, and to which they refer nearly all the great formative ideas and institutions of the Hebrew race, is the very period which the negative critics pronounce to be practically a blank so far as Israel's literature and religion are concerned. According to them, Abraham was not a historical person at all, but only "a free creation of unconscious art;" he and his immediate descendants never dwelt in Canaan, as the book of Genesis says they did; the children of Israel never resided in the land of Egypt, as the book of Exodus says they did, never crossed the Red Sea, nor went to Mt. Sinai; the Divine presence and voice there are pure inventions; the Tabernacle is a pure fiction; the three codes of the Pentateuch (the Covenant Code, the Deuteronomic Code, and the Priest Code), so far from being three sets of laws promulgated at different times by Moses within the last forty years of his life, really represent three great stages in the evolution of Israelitish religion, which were separated by wide intervals of time, the Covenant Code belonging, say, to the tenth century, B. C., the Deuteronomic Code to the seventh and the Priest Code to the fifth, and which were successively palmed off upon the people as the work of Moses by different parties in the State. Indeed, there was no Hebrew literature in the time of Moses nor for several centuries after his time. Thus, as Duhm says, "The Mosaic period is wiped out with one stroke; yes, even Moses himself is no more historical than Merlin or King Arthur." In short,

the books of the Pentateuch, as well as those which follow them in the Old Testament Canon, are so largely fabricated of pure romance, uncertain tradition, and partisan distortion, as to deprive them of any claim to be considered trustworthy histories.

This new theory of the early history of Israel differs from the Biblical or traditional theory at almost every point, but the most pronounced and significant differences, and those which strike every reader most forcibly, are—first, the tendency of the latter to bring the beginnings of Hebrew history, literature and religion down to much later dates than those to which they are assigned by the former; and, secondly, the tendency of the latter to eliminate from that history, literature and religion the supernatural element to which the former attaches supreme importance.

In regard to the first of these differences, it is evident that the crucial period, a full knowledge of which would settle the question between these rival theories, is the era comprising the migrations of the patriarchs and the alleged sojourn and exodus of Israel. If we knew even the general character of this period, we should know, at least, which of the two theories was the more probable, the one regarding it as the most fruitful period of Israel's history, the other regarding it as the most barren. When we inquire as to the sources of such a knowledge of that era, of course the Books of Scripture occur to us first. But this is the very period concerning which the modern theory says the Books of Scripture give us no reliable accounts, the Pentateuch being composed not of documents which are even approximately contemporary with the alleged events, which were not only much later themselves, but which were also worked up by still later writers into a largely fictitious account of that early period, so that these books really represent the views and reflect the times, not of the patriarchs and Moses, but of these late writers. Scholars have endeavored to meet these views, and, as it

seems to me, with marked success, by arguing the trustworthiness of the sources of early Hebrew history from the internal evidence, showing that the Pentateuch, as it stands, is a unit, consistent with itself and with the rest of Scripture; whereas the rearrangement of the books necessitated by the new theory of the history brings them into perpetual, glaring contradiction of themselves and one another, and also of those portions of Scripture the authenticity of which has never been disputed. Still, both theories appeal for support to the Old Testament Scriptures, though one takes the testimony of the Pentateuchal books as they stand, while the other rearranges them to suit itself. If now there were some other source from which we might derive a knowledge of the period in question, the testimony of this extra-Biblical witness, especially if demonstrably disinterested, would be of immense value in helping us to decide between the claims of these two contending theories. We have just such a witness in the science of Oriental Archæology. Its testimony may not be so full and explicit in regard to the details of the Biblical History in this particular period as we could wish; in fact, its confirmations of the specific statements of Scripture in matters of geographical detail and historical references, while not without value, as we shall see, are by no means so numerous and striking for this period as for some of the later periods; but its testimony to the general character of the age to which the Biblical theory refers the beginnings of Hebrew history, and to its literary attainments and political conditions, is clear, and, as I shall endeavor to show, decisive as to the claims of the two theories above described.

But, before proceeding to the consideration of that testimony, it is important to note two facts already established by archæology, both of which raise a powerful presumption in favor of the traditional theory of the early Hebrew history:

(1) It has established the trustworthiness of that portion of the Biblical history which extends from the time of the disruption to the time of the return from the Babylonian exile. This it has done by means of monuments and documents contemporary with the events described. These have supplied a multitude of undeniable facts by which to test the Biblical descriptions. Extending as they do over hundreds of years and having numerous points of contact with this profane history, nothing would be easier than to convict them of error if they were false. No other religious records ever exposed themselves to refutation at so many points. But, so far is this from being the case, their truthfulness has been vindicated all along the line. For a period of about three hundred years, extending from the days of Ahab and Elijah to the time of Cyrus the Great, the Biblical and the cuneiform records run side by side, supplementing, explaining and confirming one another in the most remarkable manner. There is, of course, a general difference between the two accounts in the point of view, and there are occasional contradictions in matters of detail, but it is universally conceded that, as Schrader says, "the historical narrative of the Bible is, as a whole, confirmed."

Further, not only are the main facts of the history thus attested, back to the very beginning of the two kingdoms, when, in the fifth year of Rehoboam, Shishak invaded the land, but the Babylonian and Egyptian background of the patriarchal history, as given in Genesis, has also been vindicated by archæology as a true picture of that remote period.*

In view of these confirmations of the Biblical records covering the times of the patriarchs and the kings, it is certainly not unreasonable to suppose that the records for the intervening period, from the descent into Egypt to the division of the kingdom, are also trustworthy.

* Prof. J. D. Davis, *Bib. World*, June, 1896, p. 499.

(2) The other fact referred to as raising a presumption in favor of the traditional theory is the demonstration by archæology of the great antiquity of the art of writing and of historical records.

The result has been to cast out of court finally one of the main assumptions of the earlier skeptical criticism, viz., that the art of writing was so rudimentary in the age of Moses as to make it incredible that he could have written the Pentateuch. Another result has been to make it impossible for criticism to begin as it formerly did with the assumption that the Biblical history was not credible. Indeed, this archæological evidence has changed the whole situation, has shown that trust, and not distrust, is the justifiable attitude towards the Old Testament, in short, has raised a strong presumption in favor of the traditional view.

This tendency of the modern theory to bring down the beginnings of Hebrew history, literature and religion to late periods is really determined by a theory of natural evolution. This brings us to the second of the two main differences between the traditional theory of the early Hebrew history and the modern, viz., the tendency of the latter to eliminate from the history that supernatural element to which the former attaches supreme importance. We cannot undertake to discuss this here. We content ourselves with pointing out that an enormous presumption in favor of the traditional theory is created (1) by the unique character and influence of the religion of Israel, which absolutely forbids its classification with other religions as a merely natural manifestation of the religious faculty of man, and (2) by these great prophecies of the Old Testament which are antipodal to the peculiar character of the nation from which they sprang, and which, on any conceivable view of the dates of the books, must have been uttered long before the occurrence of the events in which they were fulfilled.

Let us now turn to one of the earliest of these ostensible prophecies, evincing supernatural knowledge of future

events, the statement of Jehovah to Abraham (Gen. 15:13-16): "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them and they shall afflict them—four hundred years;* and also that nation whom they shall serve I will judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance.....And in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorite is not yet full."

This prophecy fixes the exode from Egypt as the first great goal of Hebrew history. All the traditions of the people after that exode look back to it as the turning point of their national and ecclesiastical life. Now, if we could show by contemporary extra-Biblical records not only that the period from Abraham to Moses was such a period in point of civilization and literary attainments as the Biblical theory implies, but also that there was such an adjustment of the nations as to promote and secure the fulfillment of that prophecy, it would go far towards proving both the trustworthiness of the Hebrew records and the Divine direction of all the interplay of the contemporary nations.

In order to the fulfillment of God's prediction to Abraham concerning the settlement and sojourn of his descendants in Egypt, and their subsequent oppression and exodus, it was absolutely necessary that there should be very different political adjustments at the different stages of that history. What these adjustments were, we are now beginning to see more clearly than ever before. The first of these which we propose to consider briefly is the Hyksos domination of Egypt in its effect upon the fortunes of the Hebrews.

More than two thousand years before Christ, great hordes of Asiatic people, of obscure origin, but who, if not themselves Mesopotamians and Syrians, were at least very friendly to Palestinians, made an irresistible irruption into

* The Masoretic text shows that the "four hundred years" refers not to the period of the affliction but to the length of the sojourn.

the valley of the Nile. At first they ravaged the country with a rude and bloody hand, destroying the temples, slaughtering the priests and playing havoc in general with the splendid civilization of Egypt. But gradually the conquerors succumbed to the influence of Egyptian culture, restored and beautified the cities and temples, and became themselves the patrons of learning and art. Indeed, their assimilation to the subject population was so complete that, except for the one matter of religion, these new Pharaohs were scarcely distinguishable from the old. The rule of these mysterious Asiatic strangers, known to us as Hyksos or Shepherd Princes, lasted, according to Manetho, five hundred and eleven years, the center of their power being Zoan in the Delta, where they were in close proximity to their Asiatic kindred, and were also removed from the unmixed Egyptian population farther South. These native Egyptians while compelled to submit to the Hyksos domination, and notwithstanding the adoption by the conquerors of their own manners and customs, never forgot that the Hyksos were foreigners, and, as we shall see at another time, after centuries of subjection, they finally threw off this Asiatic yoke and drove the alien dynasty out of the country.

But it was while the Hyksos power was at its height that the immigration of the Hebrews took place. That curious bit of history, recorded in Numbers 13:22, to the effect that Hebron in Southern Palestine "was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt" (which was the Hyksos capital), suggests the probability that the Egyptian relations of the patriarchs were connected in some way with the larger movements of Asiatic nomads towards the Delta. However this may be as to Abraham, it is certain that the immigration of Israel in the time of Joseph took place under the rule of the Hyksos, or Shepherd Princes. And at no other time would Israel and his shepherd sons have been accorded the kind of treatment which the book of Genesis says they received at the hands of the Pharaoh, as distinguished from his

Egyptian subjects. "Throughout the whole episode of the life of Joseph," says M. Naville, "an attentive perusal of the Biblical narrative reveals a sort of separation between the king and his subjects, between the race of the conquerors, favorable to the foreign emigrants, and the home-born population." Thus, while every shepherd was an abomination to the native Egyptians, the pastoral vocation of the Israelites seems to have been almost a passport to the favor of the Asiatic Pharaoh. Not to press the statement of Gen. 45:16 that, when Pharaoh heard of the arrival of Joseph's brethren, "it pleased Pharaoh well and his servants," nor to insist that his offer of wagons to bring down their families and property, and the urgency of his invitation to them to establish themselves in his land—not to insist that these were significant of a desire on his part to have another strong Asiatic clan to settle in Egypt and strengthen his hands against his native Egyptian subjects, as may possibly be indicated by the statement of Stephen (Acts 7:13) that "at the second time Joseph was made known to his brethren: and Joseph's race became manifest unto Pharaoh"—not to insist, I say, upon these points, it is clear from other statements of the Scriptural narrative that the conditions just at that time were precisely those which were best fitted to secure the fulfillment of the prophecy to Abraham (Gen. 15:13-16) concerning the settlement and sojourn of his seed in a land not theirs and their subsequent relations to the dominant race. Thus, when Judah, as forerunner, announced the arrival, on the frontier, of the great Israelitish caravan, and Joseph went up to meet Jacob, he told his brethren carefully that he and they alike should in their prospective interviews with Pharaoh emphasize the fact that they were Palestinian shepherds and thus secure their allotment to the land of Goshen. "I will go up and tell Pharaoh, and will say unto him, My brethren and my father's house which were in the land of Canaan are come unto me, and the men are shepherds, for they have been keepers

of cattle; and they have brought their flocks, and their herds, and all that they have. And it shall come to pass when Pharaoh shall call you and shall say, What is your occupation? that ye shall say, 'Thy servants have been keepers of cattle from our youth even until now, both we and our fathers;' that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen; for (he adds) every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians" (Gen. 46:31-34). By "Egyptians" here Joseph meant the native race of Egypt, as distinguished from the Hyksos and their people, just as it is twice explicitly noted in the preceding narratives that Potiphar, to whom he had been sold, was an "Egyptian." To speak of a man in Egypt as an "Egyptian" would have been superfluous under ordinary circumstances; but it was perfectly natural at a time when the sovereign and the people of his race were foreign conquerors. These "Egyptians" were still in the majority in Upper Egypt, though subject to the Hyksos domination. The fact, then, that every shepherd was an abomination to the "Egyptians" would prevent Joseph's shepherd brethren from being sent up the country and thus cut off entirely from communication with the land which had been promised to their fathers and to which they knew they should eventually return, and would lead to their being settled in Goshen, that frontier province in the eastern Delta, in which they could most easily maintain some sort of intercourse with the land of their inheritance and their hopes and from which they could most easily march when God's hour should strike.

The Pharaoh acquiesced in the arrangement promptly and cordially. These shepherds were evidently no abomination to him. And so it came to pass that in "the best of the land," i. e., the best for herdsmen, the great pastoral clans of Israel were established, and there they lived and labored and multiplied for four hundred and thirty years.

We have now seen how the Hyksos conquest prepared the way for the first step towards the fulfilment of God's

prediction to Abraham, viz., the settlement of his descendants in an alien land. Let us next inquire whether by other political adjustments the way was prepared for the fulfilment of the second part of the prediction, viz., the enslavement and oppression of Israel, and for the third part, viz., their deliverance from bondage and their conquest of Canaan.

In the next place, then, this third point was kept steadily before their view as the great goal of their tribal history. Though settled in Goshen under the royal favor, and enjoying for a time great prosperity and increasing power, they were not allowed to forget the land of their fathers, nor to lose sight of the fact that they should ultimately return thither. The remembrance of these things was indispensable to the development under their changed conditions of a saving *esprit de corps* and the preservation of their individuality and solidarity as a nation amid the mixed races of the Delta. There are various indications in the Bible and also in the monuments, of this fact, that their settlement in Goshen did not involve any abrupt severance of their relations to that other land around which clustered all the promises of God to their race, but that on the contrary, they had perfectly free intercourse with it for some fifty years and at least occasional communication with it after that. When Jacob died his body was taken up to Hebron for burial. The way into Palestine was then open. Not so, however, at the burial of Joseph some sixty years later, for he was buried in Egypt, not at Hebron. Evidently the road to Hebron was no longer open. The explanation is that in the meantime the native Pharaohs in the South had thrown off the yoke of the Hyksos and expelled the Asiatic strangers from the Delta. The retreating Hyksos established themselves for a time in Palestine. With their downfall, of course, the special influence of Joseph at court came to an end, and in his dying words to his people, "God will surely remember you and bring you up out of this land unto

the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," and "Ye shall carry up my bones from hence," he seems to recognize in their changed relations to the crown a sort of foreshadowing of that eclipse predicted to Abraham when his seed should be enslaved and afflicted in a land not theirs. That, however, was still far in the future. Following in the wake of the Egyptian conquest of Asia, which followed the expulsion of the Hyksos, the grandchildren and great-grand-children of Joseph laid claim to their patrimonial estates in Palestine and even occupied and fortified them (2 Chron. 7:20-24). In all these ways, then, Divine Providence kept the eyes of the Israelites turned towards Canaan.

But not only was Israel thus continuously prepared for the land, so to speak, and kept in an expectant attitude towards it, but the land was also prepared for Israel. And in this, likewise, the hand of God is manifest. As it was God's purpose to preserve a somewhat close connection between Israel and Canaan during the Egyptian sojourn, and as an Egyptian Canaan could eventually be more easily occupied than a Babylonian Canaan by a people who had been prepared for the task by an Egyptian sojourn, it was necessary, from the point of view of Israel's fortunes, that Egypt should now succeed Babylonia in the domination of the land of promise, yet so as that neither great antagonist should retain permanent possession of it and that it should be reserved and ripened for final occupancy by the Hebrews. Accordingly we find, first of all, as already intimated, that shortly after the expulsion of the Hyksos from the Delta, the old relations between Egypt and Asia were exactly reversed. For centuries the Asiatics had been supreme in Egypt. Now the Egyptians overrun Asia and lay the boundary of their empire on the banks of the Euphrates. Canaan, of course, became an Egyptian province. In the meantime there had grown up in Mesopotamia the powerful kingdom of Mitanni, which for two centuries

stood like a solid barrier between Egypt on the West and Babylonia on the East, and which thus contributed her part to the providential balancing of the nations which was designed to prepare Palestine for the easy invasion of the Hebrews. It was during this first century of Egyptian occupation of Canaan, too, that a new enemy, emerging from its mountain home in the North, began to press Southward into Syria—a people who were destined to play the leading role there in a century or so, and to open the way still more effectually for the Hebrew occupation of Palestine, viz., the Hittites. It seems probable that it was in order to strengthen himself against these already formidable foes that Thotmes IV. (c. 1440 B. C.) married the daughter of the King of Mitanni. This was “the beginning of those intermarriages with the princes of Asia which led to the Asiatized court and religion of Amenophis IV., and finally to the overthrow of the 18th Dynasty.” Our knowledge of these facts is derived chiefly from the cuneiform tablets discovered at Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt, in 1887. The matter contained in these tablets is equal in bulk to about half of the Pentateuch, and consists of diplomatic messages, business letters concerning affairs of international interest, friendly communications between allied kings, and reports as to the condition of subject states. These brick epistles from Mesopotamia and Syria, antedating but a century or two the occupation of Canaan by the children of Israel, have, therefore, turned a brilliant search-light upon this important period of ancient history. The largest group of tablets is the one containing the letters from the Egyptian viceroys in Syria and Palestine. They belong almost entirely to the time of Amenophis IV., or Khuenaten, “the heretic king,” who undertook to substitute for the old state religion the sole worship of the sun’s rays, and they show conclusively that his exclusive devotion to this religious reformation not only weakened his government at home, but had even more disastrous effects abroad. Egypt’s hold

upon the subject provinces at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea, which had already been relaxed by the compromising policy of Amenophis III., was now loosened still further so that her suzerainty became hardly more than nominal. Not only were the outposts neglected, but even the most important garrison towns were left without reinforcements and supplies; that, too, at a time when the Hittites and Amorites were making inroads in the North and a people called the Habiri were equally aggressive in the South. We can not dwell upon the significance of the fact thus demonstrated that the Babylonian language was the medium of international communication even between Egypt and her Syrian dependencies, implying as it does that the Babylonians had once, and for a long time, occupied the whole of Southwestern Asia, as the Bible declares, and some of the critics have denied; nor upon the still more remarkable fact that the cuneiform script was in general use not only for the writing of this diplomatic tongue but for the Palestinian vernacular as well, a fact implying large auxiliary attainments in many regions of intellectual activity; nor upon the demonstration afforded by these tablets of the falsity of the assumption still prevalent among the negative critics that the Hebrews of the Exodus were a barbarous people, unacquainted with the useful arts, and incapable of the skilled workmanship in textile fabrics, metals and precious stones, ascribed to them in the Pentateuch; nor upon their demonstration that there was free intercourse between these ancient peoples—letters, messengers and merchants passing constantly from Mesopotamia through Palestine to Egypt and *vice versa*—so that the migration of Abraham from Babylonia to Canaan, the journeys of Jacob to Padan-Aram and Egypt, the selling of Joseph to traders bound for the valley of the Nile, and the finding by Achan of the goodly Babylonish garment and the wedge of gold among the spoils of Jericho, are all in strict accord with the conditions of the times. We content ourselves at

present with emphasizing the one fact that the letters from Syria to the Pharaohs show us that the ill-starred reformation of Amenophis IV., which produced so much confusion and strife at home, was the cause of no less disorganization and weakness in the provinces. Thus "the heretic king" became unwittingly God's instrument (Is. 45:15) for paving the way for the Israelitish occupation of Canaan. Egypt's hold upon her Syrian dependencies was loosened, and, indeed, all but shaken off; the Hittites and Amorites were successfully disputing her supremacy in the North and the Habiri in the South; the native princes, despairing of any effectual help from the royal visionary who was completely absorbed in his hopeless attempt to reform the national religion, were allying themselves with the invaders, and yet not so as to constitute with them a new and strong single government. Therefore, when Joshua began his campaigns for the conquest of Palestine, he found, not a compact nation, subject to one powerful sceptre, and ready to offer effectual resistance to his invasion, but a large number of small states, governed by petty kings, who were constantly fighting with one another. The conditions described in the Scriptures are the very conditions to the existence of which the tablets testify. These conditions were not improved, but only aggravated, by the later Hittite and Egyptian regimes, and also by the irruption of barbarians from the North just before the Israelitish conquest.

Very soon after Khuenaten's death the reaction set in against his Semitic religious innovation, his more than half Semitic court and his multitude of Semitic governors and officials. The final stage of this reaction, the final triumph of the national cause, is marked by the rise of the 19th Dynasty, and it is in the founder of that Dynasty as one of his immediate successors that we must find that "new king" who "rose up over Egypt," who "knew not Joseph," and who subjected the teeming Semitic population of Goshen to the rigorous

repressive measures described in the first chapter of the Book of Exodus, lest in case of war they should join the invaders and fight against the Egyptians. "Unquestionably God's providence is the enginery of his purpose." The time predicted for Israel's sojourn in Egypt was approaching its close, if the divine promise concerning their departure at the end of that period was to be fulfilled. A reversal of the policy of royal toleration and favor towards Semitic subjects was now necessary, else they would never have left their comfortable berth in Goshen. Accordingly, "as an eagle that stirreth up her 'nest' (Deut. 32:11), making the sharp sticks protrude, and by excess of discomfort forcing her fledglings out of it when the time has come for them to learn to use their own wings, so God now permits the Pharaoh to render life in Goshen intolerable to the chosen people, in order that they may be compelled to go forth to that larger life to which they were appointed.

It was the previous conquest of the Delta by the Hyksos kindred of the race to which Abraham belonged that secured him his ready welcome to Egypt. It was the favor of these same Shepherd Princes which secured for the shepherd sons of Jacob a similar welcome in the time of Joseph, and brought about their settlement, not in upper Egypt where the native Egyptians lived, to whom every shepherd was an abomination, and where they would have been cut off entirely from communication with the land of their destiny, but in the border land of Goshen, where their intercourse with Palestine could be kept up more or less continuously, and whence they could most easily march when the time should come for their return.

It was the downfall of the Hyksos which caused the eclipse of Joseph's influence at court which seems to be foreshadowed in his dying words. It was the expulsion of the Hyksos which caused the confusion beyond the border and blocked the road to Hebron, so that Joseph's body could not be taken thither for burial. These changed rela-

tions, however, did not necessarily involve any actual hostilities against the peaceful shepherds of Goshen. They were probably left undisturbed by the victorious native Pharaohs. Some of them even seem to have followed in the wake of the Asiatic conquests of the 18th Dynasty and to have asserted successfully their claim to their patrimonial estates in Palestine. Moreover, paradoxical as it may appear, it was the Asiatic conquests of the 18th Dynasty which led to a more complete Asiatizing of the Egyptian court and religion than that which had been caused even by the hated Hyksos. For it was in consequence of these Asiatic campaigns that these successive Pharaohs, Thotmes IV, Amenophis III, and Amenophis IV, married Mesopotamian princesses, and it was through their influence, supplemented it may be by some surviving influence of the powerful house of Joseph and his wife Asenath, the one a monotheist, the other a sun-worshipper and daughter of a Heliopolitan priest—it was through the influence of these monotheistic Mesopotamian wives and mothers of the Pharaohs that the sole worship of the sun's rays became the court religion, and that, in a generation or so, the old stock of the Egyptian aristocracy and hierarchy found themselves once more under the rule of a dynasty of Asiatic extraction and alien faith. It was the ill-starred attempt of "the heretic king" to force this faith upon his unwilling subjects and to break down the Theban hierarchy of Amen, that lost Egypt her Palestinian provinces and led to the downfall of the 18th Dynasty.

The "new king" who rose up over Egypt, who knew not Joseph, and who perhaps began the oppression of Israel, was probably Rameses I, the founder of the anti-Semitic 19th Dynasty. The Pharaoh for whom Israel built the store-cities and who carried the oppression of the subject race to the utmost pitch of severity, was almost certainly Rameses II. That this mighty builder, who covered the Nile valley with his monuments, was the special oppressor

of Israel nearly all Egyptologists have for some time believed. The most recent confirmation was the discovery of Pithom itself in 1883. The inscriptions found on the spot show that the city was built by Rameses II.

The three most prominent features of the history of the dynasty to which he belonged are, first, the shifting of the centre of gravity of the empire from Upper Egypt to the Delta; secondly, the re-establishment for a short time of the Egyptian suzerainty over Palestine, and thirdly, the protracted but indecisive conflict with that new foe in the North of Syria, the Hittites, who had already in the time of the 18th Dynasty emerged from their mountain home and contributed somewhat to the downfall of the Egyptian power in Palestine. All these points bear directly upon our contention that Divine Providence was shaping the political movements of the time to one end, viz.: the exodus of the Israelites and their settlement in Canaan. The wars between the Hittites and the Egyptians prepared the way for the Israelitish conquest negatively by balancing the two great powers of the time so that neither of them could take permanent possession of the whole country. They prepared the way positively also by aggravating the conditions of confusion and weakness, which, as the Amarna tablets show, had resulted from the decline of Egyptian supremacy in Palestine at and after the time of Khuenaten. "The Canaanitish princes stood between two opposing forces and suffered accordingly. When the Israelites arrived, after the death of the great Egyptian monarch, they found an exhausted population, little able to withstand their attack." As to the other special feature of the 19th Dynasty, it was only natural that a king who waged twenty years of war against the Hittites of Northern Syria and re-established his rule over Canaan, should have made the Delta rather than the remote Theban region the centre of gravity of his empire. Accordingly we find that Rameses II. did establish a third capital in "the field of Zoan." He restored and

even surpassed the ancient splendors of two cities, especially, in this district, viz.: Tanis and Bubastis. Our results then for this period are (1) the culmination of the reaction against the Semitic policy of the later kings of the 18th Dynasty; (2) the shifting of the centre of gravity of the empire from the Thebaid to the Delta and the establishment of the court on the very border of Goshen, making it perfectly practicable for Moses to have had that kind of ready communication with the Pharaoh which has seemed to some a reason for suspecting the historicity of Exodus; (3) the unparalleled development of architectural enterprises and public works of every kind, involving a vast increase in the use of forced labor and in the oppression of the subject populations by the state, a policy which could not fail to have the effect of weaning the Israelites from Egypt, loosening their hold upon the land of Goshen, and making them ready for the final step contemplated in the divine prediction to Abraham, viz.: their departure from Egypt and their return to Canaan; (4) the identification of Rameses II. as the Pharaoh of the Oppression by the actual discovery of Pithom, one of the stone fortresses built for him by the Israelites on the eastern frontier of Goshen; (5) the re-establishment for a time of the Egyptian suzerainty over Canaan; (6) the checking of the Egyptian advance northwards by the Hittites and of the Hittite advance southwards by the Egyptians, so that neither of these great powers was able to take permanent possession of the country to the final exclusion of Israel; and (7) the further weakening of the Canaanitish cities alike by these wars and by the Egyptian occupation, so that they were unable to make a united and effectual resistance of the shortly subsequent Israelitish invasion. In view of such adjustments as these, both in Egypt and in Canaan, preparing the people for the land and the land for the people, making it impossible for Israel to remain longer in Goshen, and at the same time making it possible for them to conquer Canaan, it does not

seem to us too much to say that these arrangements were divinely ordered to bring about the fulfilment of a prophecy in regard to a people in whose movements, as we now know, the spiritual destiny of the world was involved. Indeed, we may boldly affirm, both in view of the facts just now adduced as to the beginnings of Israel's history, and in view of what Israel has since been to the world, that this theory of a supernatural Providence (if I may be allowed such an expression) working out a divine plan is the only theory which explains either that history or this influence.

It was my purpose to mention also the opportunity for the actual exodus of Israel created by the confusion and weakness in Egypt caused by the Libyan invasion in the time of Merneptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, but I pass that by.

We have thus endeavored to show that the real question involved in the difference between the Traditional Theory and the Modern is the historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament, with which its inspiration stands or falls; that the two most characteristic and ominous features of the Modern Theory are, first, its tendency to bring down the beginnings of Hebrew history, literature and religion to comparatively late dates; and, secondly, its tendency to minimize, if not eliminate, the supernatural; and that both of these tendencies (or assumptions) are discredited by the assured results of Oriental archæology, the first directly, the second inferentially. These results have enabled us to place the history of the Hebrews in its proper relations to the history of the world at large, so that, instead of the old isolation of Scripture, we now have a manifold interturning of the sacred history with the general "web of human memorial." When we place the history of the decisive period from Abraham to Moses in the setting afforded by these extra-Biblical records, though the materials are less abundant than for the period of the monarchy, they are sufficient to show that the Traditional Theory of the history fits environment thus revealed and the Modern Theory does not.

Not only are the assumptions of the latter as to the illiteracy and rudeness of the pre-Mosaic and Mosaic periods and the consequent non-contemporaneousness of the Pentateuchal history with the events which it professes to record, and as a further consequence the untrustworthiness of these writings as history—not only are these assumptions discredited, but the statements and implications of the narrative as to the character of the age and the course of events are positively confirmed.

As the other main difference between the two contending theories, the difference, namely, in their treatment of the supernatural element of the history, we have directed attention to one of the earliest of the passages of Scripture, as claiming a supernatural knowledge of future events, the one (in Gen. xv., 13:16) which professes to have outlined the fortunes of the descendants of Abraham for a period of several centuries. Following the history down, we have seen that this prophecy and the historical adjustments which secured its fulfilment fit one another like lock and key, though those adjustments extend over a period of 500 years and involve the movements of various great nations. These facts seem to us to vindicate the explicit statements of Scripture to the effect that God does direct the movements of the nations so as to accomplish through them his purposes towards Israel and the world (Amos 9:7, Isa. 7:18-20, *et al.*) and to raise a very strong presumption against the whole anti-supernatural attitude of the Modern Theory of the early Hebrew history, as represented by its real masters and exponents.

In view, then, of the testimony of these extra-Biblical witnesses from the hoary past to the veracity of these documents of our religion, "We may turn to them with increased confidence and faith; confidence in the historical picture they set before our eyes, and faith in the divine message which they were commissioned to deliver."

W. W. MOORE.

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

III. THE DISCOVERY OF THE KINGS.

It is well known that the announcement was made two or three years ago that the names of Amraphel, Chedorlaomer, Arioch and Tidal had been found on Babylonian tablets. The importance of such a discovery, if real, it is difficult to exaggerate. It would be a very plain proof that those critics who had announced that the accounts of Abraham's times in Genesis were legendary and not historical, must be mistaken; for, in the discovery of their names on the tablets, these supposedly mythical figures of the time would be seen emerging from the cloudland of legend and taking their places on the now clearly-lighted stage of history.

It is not strange, then, that the reality of the discovery should have been hotly disputed, and that the claim that the names in Genesis 14:1 had been found on the tablets, should have elicited angry denial and sarcastic criticism. There seems to have been much of this sort of comment in England, and *The Expository Times*, reprinted in this country, takes up the strain.

The lecture of Mr. Theophilus Pinches, of the British Museum, before the Victoria Institute, January 20th, 1896, announcing the probable discovery of these four names on Babylonian tablets, was published in the *Journal of Transactions* of that society for 1897, and *The Expository Times*, endorsing a critique of *The Church Times*, speaks of the lecture as follows :

“Mr. Pinches practically surrenders the whole case, for he says, ‘I now come to what many will probably regard as the most interesting part of my lecture, namely, the tablets which seem to refer to Arioch, Tidal and Chedorlaomer. At the word ‘seem’ you find a reference to a note at the foot of the page. The note is this, ‘At this stage I

purposely say 'seem to refer,' and I wish it to be noticed that I have never spoken of these names without a note of interrogation, though this was probably an excess of caution.' But he continues and says: 'With such imperfect texts as these, dogmatising is impossible, and the author disclaims any such intention. It is quite indifferent to him whether it [KU-KU-KU-KU-MAL, E-RI-E-A-KU, and TU-UD-KHUL-A]* be Chedorlaomer, Arioch and Tidal respectively—they may be entirely different personages, but if they are not what they seem to be, it is a remarkable historical coincidence, and deserves recognition as such.' 'That,' says *The Church Times*, 'is not the way men talk when they have made 'an important discovery.' And it adds: 'After this its advocates can do no less than give their dead tablet a decent and honorable burial.'"—*Expository Times for June, 1898*.

The writer of this editorial stops quoting Mr. Pinches' foot-note just at the point to serve his evident, though, perhaps, unconscious, purpose to discredit the evidence adduced later on, and to make it appear that the lecturer "practically surrenders the whole case." This will be plain when the reader is told that the rest of the foot-note reads:

"My audience will be able to judge whether three names so similar to those in the 14th chapter of Genesis are or are not those of the personages mentioned in that chapter. I do not ask them, however, to express an opinion as to the magnitude or strangeness of the coincidence if they should decide that the names given by the tablets are *not* those of Arioch and his allies. The other Assyriologists are now adopting the views regarding these names held by Prof. Sayce, Prof. Hommel and myself."

This, while modest, as becomes true scientific investiga-

*Instead of this, the cuneiform characters occur here in the lecture. *The Exp. Times* thus transcribes the inscription with an evident design.

tion, making no dogmatic deliverance before the evidence is in, is surely not a "surrender of the whole case," either practical or theoretical.

One does not like to charge the editor of so very scholarly a periodical as *The Expository Times* with garbling and intentional *suppressio veri*, and prefers what seems the only alternative supposition—that such is his devotion to an adopted theory, that he is absolutely blind to all facts that militate against it. There is a great deal of our poor, common, human nature even in specialists of the most remarkable attainments.

Whatever may be the explanation, when one has before him the complete lecture, with the facsimiles of the tablets, the lecturer's transcription of the words on them in ordinary letters, his translation of them, and his notes upon them, his impression is precisely the opposite of that which he would gain from the extracts in *The Expository Times*.

The lecturer's view of the matter may be seen quite clearly, whatever disclaimers he may make of an intention to dogmatize, from such words as these :

"It is in the highest degree unlikely that tablets containing the names of Tidal and others, closely resembling Arioch and Chedorlaomer, the last designated "King of Elam" and "the Elamite," should not, after all, refer to these personages."

The credit of discovering the name of Amraphel, King of Ellasar, under the form of Hammurabi, who seems to be King of Babylonia (Shinar)*, is given to Prof. Schraeder and the celebrated "Father Scheil," who deciphered it in Babylonian tablets in the Museum of Constantinople. In one of the letters of Hammurabi (or Amraphel), the name of Chedorlaomer also occurs. (There are three of these

* "I may add that the texts discovered by Mr. Pinches seem to be oracles addressed to the Babylonian King Khammurabi."—*Prof. A. H. Sayce*.

letters.) A note from Prof. Sayce, written from Assuan, Egypt, suggests the propriety of the title "King of Nations," given to Tidal in Genesis. The word in the tablet (Umman-manda) which he translates "nomad hordes," he says, corresponds exactly with the Hebrew, *goyyim*, "nations." Prof. Hummel, in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, makes the same suggestion.

We should never forget, in a discussion like this, the power of the imagination to mislead. We see men, beasts, ships, etc., in the shifting clouds of the sky or among the embers on the hearth; and Mr. Pinches is right in refraining from an unqualified assertion that he has certainly made the discovery of the names of the kings who, almost forty centuries ago, invaded Palestine. It would have been better if some other Assyriologists had shown an equal degree of caution, and it is well for us to suspend our judgment till the evidence is quite clear. There are some things, however, which concur to aid us in coming to a conclusion, if not of absolute certainty, yet of a very high degree of probability, in this matter. Let us notice some of these.

(a) The improbability of such an invasion, at this time, has been asserted by Wellhausen to amount to a certainty that it *did* not, because it *could* not, occur, and he has spoken in the most scornful terms of the historical character of the account in Genesis 14, asserting that "all these incidents are sheer impossibilities." The monuments, however, show us that Sargon, long before the days of Abraham, invaded the land of the Amorites and extended his conquests to the Mediterranean Sea. Besides, the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, discovered ten years ago, written in the cuneiform character, show that Babylonish influence in this region had by no means ceased in the age of Abraham. The account of such an invasion, then, instead of bearing the stamp of improbability, is seen to be *antecedently quite*

probable."*

(b) Another thing which has impressed me is one which does not seem to have been dwelt on, by those who have discussed the matter, as much as it deserves: This is the similarity of these names on the tablets to those in our Hebrew Bible, leaving out of view the vowel points. We should remember that we are not to try to see whether they correspond to the names as they appear in our English Bible. Every beginner in the study of the Hebrew Bible must be struck with the somewhat shadowy resemblance between many of the names in the Hebrew and in our English Bible. In some cases they have undergone a transformation altogether unaccountable.

The names which we are to compare with those on the tablets are not Chedorlaomer, Tidal, Arioch and Amraphel, but the names which were in the Hebrew text of Genesis 14:1, as it was originally written. We know that it was written without the vowel points of the present Hebrew text as generally printed for ease and convenience in reading. The vowel points were put in by the Masorites when the knowledge of the Hebrew language was declining. These scholars supplied the vowel points that the Scriptures might be more easily read.† The pronunciation of their day was doubtless as far from that of Moses as is our pronunciation of English from that of Chaucer, so far as vowel sounds are concerned, and it is entirely improbable

* Kudur-Mabug, the father of Arioch, is found from the tablets to have borne the title, *Prince of Palestine*.

† A second inscription discovered at Ur (W. A. I. i. 2. No. 3) runs as follows:

To the God Uru-Ki (Moon-god of Ur) his king, has Kudur-Mabug, the prince of Martu (i. e. the countries of the West, Palestine) built the temple for the preservation of his life and the life of Iri-Aku, his son, the king of Larsa." *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, (Hommel) p. 167.

"The title, 'Prince of Martu,' therefore, necessarily implies that Kudur-Mabug had extended his military operations as far as Palestine." *Ibid.* p. 170.

† The vowel points did not exist in Jerome's day, and even then he could not read with certainty many Hebrew words.

that they attached to this consonantal writing the very vowels which their forefathers of twenty-five centuries before their time had used. When we make the comparison, then, it is not the likeness or unlikeness between the names on the tablets and those in our English Bible, or even those in our Hebrew Bible with the Masoretic pointing, but those in the unvocalized Hebrew text, that we are to decide upon. The four gutturals, though sometimes represented in the English forms of Hebrew names by vowels, come into the comparison, of course, as they belong to the text as originally written. With this made clear, we may begin the comparison, and may as well begin it with that name at which *The Expository Times* has poked most fun—Chedorlaomer. In the tablet which Mr. Pinches designates as "SP. III., 2. Reverse," * occurs the name Ku-dur-lag-mal. From the first Hammurabbi tablet of Father Scheil, what appears to be the same name has the final syllable "mar" instead of "mal."† Taking this last form, stripping it of its vowels to compare it with the unvocalized Hebrew name, we have on the tablet, K d r l g m r, and in the Hebrew, K d r l g m r. Most persons would agree that they are much alike. They are, in fact, as thus presented, *identical*. The English reader will naturally ask where the G comes from, as it does not appear in Chedorlaomer. The answer is that the last o in Chedorlaomer is the Hebrew *ayin*, a guttural which is sometimes represented by a vowel in English, and sometimes by the consonant G, as it is, for instance, in Gomorrah just below, where the G at the beginning is this same *ayin* which has been transcribed as o in Chedorlaomer.‡

* A facsimile of this tablet is shown in *The Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute for 1897*. (Vol. xxix.), p. 83.

† Liquids are liable to be interchanged, as we see from the fact that a very familiar Bible name is written sometimes Nebuchadnezzar and sometimes Nebuchadrezzar.

‡ Arabic scholars tell us that the *ayin* of that language, by the use of a diacritic mark, is made to do double duty, too—as a vowel and a consonant—as is the case, indeed, without the use of a diacritic mark, with our y.

It is true that the transcription of the Father Scheil tablet has a prolonged vowel and guttural sound along with the G, but I think any one who will ask an educated Jew to pronounce for him several words containing gutturals will be convinced that the sound of them, as coming from Semitic organs, is so peculiar that it would be quite natural to expect such differences in the transcription of a tablet which Hebrew writers transcribed into their own characters, using their peculiar gutturals to represent them. I think we may fairly say that here there is an exceedingly close resemblance, if not identity.

The most dissimilar name in our English text to that discovered in a tablet is Amraphel, King of Shinar. Yet, when we remember that Hammurabi begins with the letter H, which, in almost all languages, is a very uncertain quantity, witness the different pronunciation of the cultivated and uncultivated English people of words beginning with a vowel and those beginning with the letter H—and then remember that the Ph. in the final syllable in one case, and the B in the other are both labials and liable to be interchanged, the similarity is much closer than would at first appear. The consonants are the same with the exception of a final L* in the Bible name, and the double M in the tablet.

A-r-i-o-k—the Hebrew of Arioch† written without Masoretic points—is surely not unlike the A-r-i-a-k of the tablet treated in a similar way—Tidal, in the Hebrew (without points T-d-g-l), may be said to be identical with the Tudgula of the tablets so far as the consonants are con-

* This final L, however, instead of presenting difficulty, helps to make the identification more perfect, for Hommel draws attention to the fact that Ammi-rapal(tu) occurs as another form of the name Ammu-rabi or Ammi-rabi.

† Hommel (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 167), informs us that "an *ex voto* now preserved in the Louvre runs as follows :

' To the goddess Ishtar, the lady of the mountain . . . have Kudur-Mabug . . . and Riaku, his son, the exalted shepherd of Nippur, the guardian of Ur,' *King of Larsa*, etc."

sonants are concerned, and with these alone have we to deal. The G, in this name, too, is *ayin*, the guttural, which is sometimes a vowel and sometimes G, while less frequently, it has other values.

(c) To these considerations must be added the remarkable fact that these names are found, not only on separate tablets, but three of the four on the *same* tablet, while, in a different part of the world, *on another set of tablets*, the name of the fourth king occurs along with that of one of these three. On the tablet in the British Museum just named, Mr. Pinches feels quite sure that he finds the names of Tidal, Arioch and Chedorlaomer, while Father Scheil and Prof. Schraeder announce the discovery of a tablet in the Museum at Constantinople in which the names of Amraphel and Chedorlaomer occur. The kings are *together* in Genesis, and we find the names *together* on the tablets.

(d) Then, no small importance should be attached to the character of the witnesses, and the number of them, some in one place and some in another. Men like Hommel, Sayce, Schraeder, Scheil and Pinches, are not likely to be mistaken in such a case, and, of course, collusion and wilful deception (and that, without any conceivable motive,) are not to be thought of for a moment. They are witnesses of the highest character and competency; and they are independent witnesses.

(e) Another thing which makes it look probable that these persons named in the tablets are the four kings of Gen. 14:1 is that in the case of some of them at least they seem to be referred to in the tablets as occupying the same positions with those named in Genesis. Kudurlagmar, as already stated, is referred to as "the King of Elam" and "the Elamite." As to Eriaku, Mr. Pinches tells us that "Father Scheil seems to have found the true key to the situation," and concludes that he was King of Larsa.* The propriety of the designation "king of nations" applied to

Tidal, or Tudgula, in Genesis, is seen, if he is the same as the Tudgula of the tablets, since in them is mentioned the assembling by Kudur-Lagmar of the "Umman-manda" or "nomad hordes," and Professor Sayce remarks: "In Tidal, therefore, I see a king of the nomad hordes who adjoined Elam on the North."

Here are coincidences of a very remarkable kind, and it is hard to believe that they are accidental. A very plain illustration may help us to see this more clearly. Suppose one is looking for three or four friends in a great crowd. At a distance in the throng he thinks he sees the face of one of them, but it is so far away that he cannot be certain that it is the face of his friend that he sees, though the likeness is very striking. At this moment another face is seen just by the first, and it looks like that of another member of the party for which he is looking. By this, the probability that he was right in his first supposition is not doubled only, but made almost a certainty. Then he sees another face and it seems to be that of a third member of the company he was searching for. It would be exceedingly improbable that three faces should happen to appear like the three he was expecting to see, unless they were those of his friends. When a fourth face is seen like that of the last member of the group, he was looking for, moral certainty is arrived at. He knows that these are his four friends. If each of these persons wore some insignia of rank which he could see in the distance, the recognition would be still more prompt and certain, if that were possible.

Now, let us make an advance in our supposition. Suppose that the friends he is looking for are not a Mr. Jones, a Mr. Smith, a Mr. Brown and a Mr. Green, but Emperor William of Germany, Francis Joseph of Austria, The Czar of the Russias and King Humbert of Italy, and that not

*Hommel puts this beyond doubt. See foot note on page 48.

only he, but other intelligent observers from different points of view, feel pretty certain that yonder in the great crowd is not only the face of William, with his waxed mustaches, but his German retinue and his German standard with its black cross and black eagle, and near him are the three other potentates with their standards and retinues. The crowd might consist of many thousands yet when several competent observers of the highest character concur in saying that these four persons are William, Humbert, F. Joseph and Nicholas, we could not doubt (especially if we had learned that these four princes were traveling together) that these were they. No one in his senses could doubt it.

So we see through the medium of the tablets—wonderful retrospective glasses—old Amraphel, King of Shinar; Arioch, King of Ellasar; Chedorlaomer, King of Elam, and Tidal, King of Nations, marching at the head of their hosts, with banners flying, out of the East into Palestine, as in the Bible, and out of the dreamland of the cities* into reality. The myths of the critics have materialized and become the kings—bad ones—cruel and ambitious ones—of the Bible. In the view of some of the learned, this conduct is highly improper and entirely unpardonable on the part of Amraphel and his allies. Many were doubtless much displeased and not a little discouraged to see these old kings come marching down the centuries to spoil so many fine theories and do such violence to the cherished results of “scholarship.” This invasion of the four kings

* “They have all agreed (and when they are agreed it seems that their science has spoken its final word and registered an irreversible decree) that we have no information regarding the patriarchal history. Some years ago Canon Cheyne stated in the *Contemporary Review* that this was one thing on which criticism positively insisted..... Henceforth, he said, no teacher of youth was to speak as if he knew, nor was he to suffer his pupils to imagine that he knew anything whatever of Abraham or Isaac or Jacob.”—(*Modern Discoveries and the Bible.*—Urquhart.

has been almost as disagreeable to many at the end of the nineteenth century as was that one of some thirty-nine centuries ago to the fine kings in Palestine and poor Lot. They have spoiled a fine region, carried off many much-prized goods—fine-spun, showy and much-wanted. But if the critics are taken, too, and carried into captivity, how hopeless is their case! for alas! alas! (unless they are mistaken) there is no Abraham to lead Amorite princes to rescue them, but only a poor bloodless myth.

Bethesda, Md.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

[Since this excellent article was prepared for publication, Mr. L. W. King, also of the British Museum, has issued a volume on "The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi," in which he claims that Father Scheil misread the name Chedorlaomer and that Mr. Pinches is probably mistaken in his transliteration of Tidal. The testimony for Arioch and Amraphel apparently remains the same. This fact is mentioned as bringing the latest word of archæology on this question, and also to make the point that the scholars, even the best of them, disagree about the more difficult inscriptions. Hence, when some discovery is announced contradicting Scripture history, the ordinary reader should possess his soul in patience until the final word of the scientists has been spoken. That word has been in multiplied instances a corroboration of the Bible account.—ED.]

IV. DID CHRIST PREACH TO DISEMBODIED SPIRITS IN HADES ?

This question has practical significance in the light of certain recent developments in theology. If probation extends beyond the present life, and if certain classes of the unsaved, as it is now held, may have an opportunity after death, to repent of sin, believe in Christ, and so attain to heaven, then Christ may have visited the world of departed spirits, and proclaimed to them the gospel of salvation. We do not wonder, then, that the advocates of the hypothesis of future probation push into prominence and emphasize strongly the passage of Scripture which seems to them to teach this benign mission of Christ to the world of spirits. That passage is found in 1 Peter, 3, 18, 20, and, quoting from the accepted version, is as follows : "For Christ, also, hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water."

The question now is : Do those words teach that Christ, after his crucifixion and before his resurrection, entered the unseen world and preached the gospel of salvation to those who were destroyed in the Noachic deluge ?

Candor compels us to say that many very able, and, in the main, evangelical expositors, hold this view, among whom we find that eminent critical scholar, Dean Alford, who gives the following interpretation of the passage :

"I understand these words to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of de-

parted spirits, and did thus announce his work of redemption; preach salvation, in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned—whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimagined by us we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations as far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced; it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution; but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice; the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it—and as we cannot say to what other causes this *κηρυγμα* may have applied, so it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy.”

Before I proceed to give the opposite, and, as I conceive, the true view of this passage, attention is called to some of the difficulties presented by the interpretation of Dean Alford and his sympathizers.

1. There is here taken for granted that which has never been shown, and yet that which is absolutely essential to the hypothesis presented for our acceptance, viz., that there is in the future life “a place of detention” for souls in which the preaching of the gospel would be helpful to the unsaved. Alford says “it is not purgatory.” What is it, then? and where does God’s word assure us of any such place of detention?

The only passages of Scripture quoted by Alford in his long and labored exposition, and which, it is logical to conclude, are the only ones to which he could refer, are 2 Peter 2-4, “For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains

of darkness to be reserved unto judgment," and Jude 6, "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Strange proof this, surely, of the existence of a place of detention, which is not purgatory, in which disembodied human spirits may hear the gospel of salvation. If the contention were that the *κηρυγμα* was to the fallen angels and for their benefit, then the Scriptures cited by the learned Dean would be pertinent; as it is, they have absolutely no application.

The truth is, the Bible does not teach that there is any such intermediate abode for disembodied souls. The assumption that there is such a place is destitute of foundation. It falls and the hypothesis founded upon it falls with it. If the righteous dead, as the Scriptures teach, go to heaven at death, they need no further proclamation of the gospel, and if the impenitent dead go to hell, where they are reserved in torments for the more public proclamation and exhibition of their guilt and condemnation at the General Judgment, surely preaching can do them no good. The first thing, therefore, to be established, is that which cannot be established, viz., that a place exists in the unseen world where this preaching could be of any avail to disembodied spirits.

2. Another objection to this hypothesis is derived from Dean Alford's admission that these spirits to whom, according to the assumption, Christ preached in Hades, had had the offer of salvation, and had deliberately rejected it. They had been preached to in Noah's day and had turned a deaf ear to the calls of God. The Dean says that these were "the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them." This refusal, then, so far as we can judge, was made deliberately and against motives sufficient to lead them to repentance. For one hundred and twenty

years, as we may infer from the record, they heard the voice of the faithful messenger of heaven and yet they went on and died in their sins. These sinners, then, seem in no wise to be distinguished from other sinners, and, if it can not be shown that there is anything peculiar in their case, why should they, of all sinners, be selected as the objects of *post mortem* offers of mercy?

3. In the reason assigned for this anomalous transaction which is advanced by Alford, we find an assumption which, if true in this case, is true in every case, and which is so sweeping that it would justify the denial of all future punishment. It is this—"this transaction," says Alford, "throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice; the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it." "Seems," to whom, pray? Why, of course, to man. So to us, sitting in judgment on the divine administration, it appears that Christ performed a just and righteous act in granting to these antediluvian sinners another opportunity of repenting, believing and being saved. Apply now this logic in other directions. How about the sin of our first parents? Does it not seem to us that the dire consequences of that one act in the garden of Eden "are infinitely out of proportion to the lapse?" Certainly. Human reason will so judge. The error here lies in our attempt to measure the desert of sin. If one act of disobedience in the garden of Eden plunged the whole race into moral and spiritual ruin—"brought death into our world and all our woe," what can we affirm to be just and right in the punishment of the antediluvians, who rejected deliberately the offers of life made to them? If man is to judge, it is easy to pronounce all future punishment whether its duration be longer or shorter, "infinitely out of proportion" to human guilt. This, indeed, is just what the advocates of universal salvation assert, and this is that in their contention, which appeals most strongly to those who seek to evade

the teachings of Scripture. That cause must be weak, indeed, which is compelled to resort to such erroneous methods of reasoning.

4. But the most serious objection to the interpretation put by Dean Alford on this passage of Scripture is that it is out of harmony with the general teaching of the Word. It is a well known canon of interpretation that obscure passages are to be interpreted by the plain and unmistakable utterances of other Scripture. That Scripture, on the whole, teaches most emphatically that in this life man has his only opportunity of securing salvation must be admitted; that "Now is the accepted time and now the day of salvation" is its teaching cannot be denied; that men are to be judged for the deeds "done in the body," and that their eternal future condition is to be determined by their conduct in this life, is placed beyond peradventure by the Bible. Christ never gave a hint, nor did one of his apostles ever make an intimation to the contrary, unless this be one by Peter. An interpretation, then, so radically out of harmony with the whole tenor and spirit of the Word cannot be the true one. What, then, is the true interpretation?

Such eminent scholars as Augustine, Bede, Thomas Aquinas, Lyra, Hammond, Beza, Scaligar, Leighton, Gerhart, Hoffman, Poole, Henry, Scott, Doddridge, Shedd and others hold:

- 1st. That Christ did the preaching here spoken of.
- 2nd. That he preached to the antediluvian world.
- 3rd. That the preaching was done by the Holy Spirit speaking through Noah.
- 4th. That the preaching being ineffectual with the antediluvians their spirits are now in hell—the prison of despair.

Says Dr. Thomas Scott, in commenting on 1st Peter, 3-18, 20, "Christ as God and in reference to his future incarnation, had gone by his Spirit, inspiring his servant Noah to announce the approaching deluge and preach

repentance to that incorrigible generation who perished in their sins, and were in the prison house of hell, (that is the adults among them) when the Apostle wrote, being confined there until the judgment of the great day. For they had sometime been disobedient and unbelieving, even during the hundred and twenty years of God's long suffering after the deluge was predicted but before it was sent. At that time Noah was occupied in preparing the Ark, showing his faith by his works, and calling them to repent and seek mercy from God, but they unanimously and obstinately rejected his message and thus they were destroyed by the flood, whilst only eight persons had their lives preserved in the Ark, being delivered from the waters and carried above them; so that the floods which drowned all others without exception occurred in their deliverance. Various other interpretations have been given to this passage," adds Dr. Scott, "but none of them appears to me in the least degree satisfactory."

With this Pool, in his learned annotations on Scripture, is in substantial accord. Commenting on 1 Peter 3-19, "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison," he says: "By which also; by which Spirit mentioned in the end of the former verse, *i. e.*, by, or in his Divine nature, the same by which he was quickened. He, Christ. This denotes the person that went and preached as the former doth the nature in which, and so shows that what is here spoken of the person of Christ is to be understood of him according to his Divine nature. Went: or came, *viz.*: from heaven by an anthropopathy, by which figure God is often in Scripture said to go forth, Isaiah 26-21, to come down, Micah 1-3, and go down, Gen. 18-21, Exodus 3-8, which two latter places are best understood of the Second Person. This, therefore, here notes in Christ not a change of place but a special operation and testification of his presence. And preached, *viz.*: By Noah, inspired by him, that he might be a preacher of righteousness to

warn a wicked generation of approaching judgment and exhort them to repentance. Unto the spirits, souls of man departed, which are frequently called spirits. Eccles. 12-7; Acts 7-59; Hebrews 12-23; in prison, *i. e.*, in hell, so it is taken, Proverbs 27-20, compare with Matt. 5-15, Luke 12-58, where prison is mentioned as a type or representation of hell; and the Syriac renders the word by Sheol, which signifies sometimes the grave, and sometimes hell. See the like expression 2 Peter 2-4, 5, and Jude 6." These views touching this Scripture are sustained, 1st. By the conceded fact that Christ, as God, did speak through godly men by the Holy Spirit prior to his advent, "For 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." (2 Peter 1-21) And, "of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify." (1 Peter 1-10, 11.) This method of speaking, touching Christ's work through the Spirit in olden times, it will not escape notice, is a favorite one with Peter. Having twice referred to it in other places, is it not legitimate to conclude that he does so in the passage under consideration?

2nd. In his second Epistle Peter again alludes to the deluge and refers to Noah by name as a preacher of righteousness, "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment, and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." (2 Peter 2-4, 5.) Here then we have this same Apostle teaching that Christ by the Holy Spirit did preach to mankind through holy men of old and that Noah was one of these old time preachers of righteousness. This surely is in harmony with the inter-

pretation we put on his words in the passage under consideration.

3rd. An exegetical study of the words in this mooted passage will confirm the interpretation which we seek to establish. In the 18th verse it is said that Christ was put to death in the flesh and quickened, or brought to life, resurrected by the Spirit, *πνευματι*. The nineteenth verse continues without a break *εν ᾧ* "in which," the *ᾧ* evidently referring to *πνευματι*, the nearest suitable antecedent, that is, in which Spirit he went and preached to the spirits in prison, even the spirits which in the days of Noah had been disobedient while God in his long-suffering had waited upon them during the one hundred and twenty years in which the Ark was in the process of construction.

An important question arises here. Was Christ quickened by the Holy Spirit? Was the third person in the Trinity active in the Redeemer's resurrection? So says Paul in Rom. 8-11: "If the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." The Holy Spirit is that personality of the Godhead to whom is here ascribed the work of the resurrection of the body. He it was who was especially employed in the resurrection of the body of Christ, and he it was by whom Christ preached through Noah to the antediluvians who had been consigned, after their death, to the prison house of despair for their rejection of the offer of life.

It is a notable, indeed, an almost unaccountable, fact that Dean Alford makes no allusion to this decisive passage in the eighth of Romans, but dogmatically assumes that the *πνευμα* of the eighteenth verse under contemplation refers to the human spirit of our Lord. The R. V. takes this view also, though in Rom. 8-11 it recognizes the resurrecting agent to be the Holy Spirit. By placing the two passages side by side or by reading them in conjunc-

tion, we will see the force of what we seek to advance. Peter says "Christ hath once suffered for sins the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit." Paul says: "If the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." If in Romans 8-11 it is the Holy Spirit who exerts the resurrecting energy, as both the A. V. and the R. V. teach, why should Peter be made to declare that Christ was raised from the dead by his human spirit? If it was the Holy Spirit who was the Divine agent in Christ's resurrection then it was the Holy Spirit who preached to the antediluvians for the *εν* points directly to the *πνευματι* referred to in the verse immediately preceding.

Further. The fact that the expression *απειθησασι* is employed by the apostle, the *ποτε* qualifying the *απειθησασι*, proves beyond doubt that the preaching occurred at the same time with the disobedience and building; the disobedience occurring whilst the Ark was in process of construction, the preaching occurred at that time also, and not thousands of years afterward. On this point Dr. Shedd in his *Dogmatic Theology*, volume II, pp. 609, 610, Remarks.

"Augustine, Bede, Aquinas, Erasmus, Beza, Gerhart, Hottinger, Clericus, Leighton, Pearson, Secker, Hammond, Hoffman, and most of the Reformed theologians explain 1 Peter 3, 18-20 to mean that Christ preached by Noah to men who were "disobedient" in the days of Noah, and who for this cause were "spirits in prison" at the time of Peter's writing the particle *ποτε* qualifying *απειθησασι* shows that the disobedience (or disbelief) occurred when the Ark was a preparing." But the preaching must have been contemporaneous with the disobedience, or disbelief. What else was there to disobey or disbelieve? says Pier-son. (Creed, Art. II), "Christ was really before the flood,

for he preached to them that lived before it. This is evident from the words of St. Peter (1st Peter 3, 18-20). From which words it appeareth, first, that Christ preached by the same Spirit by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead; but that Spirit was not his (human) soul, but something of a greater power; secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient; thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, when the ark was preparing. The plain interpretation is to be acknowledged for the true, that Christ did preach unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that he was before it, for though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he had personally appeared on earth and actually preached to that world but by the ministry of a prophet, by the sending of Noah, "the eighth preacher of righteousness;" yet to do anything by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause as if he did it himself without any intervening instrument."

In further confirmation of the interpretation that we seek to enforce, Dr. Shedd proceeds to remark as follows:

"Another proof of the correctness of this interpretation is the fact that Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison" was πνευματι only, the total θεανθρωπος did not preach. The σαρξ or human nature of Christ had no part in the act. But Christ's personal and local preaching in Hades would require his whole divine-human person; as much so as his preaching in Galilee or Jerusalem.

The Formula Concordias (IX. 2) so understands and teaches, "*Credimus quod tota persona, deus et homo, post sepulturam, ad inferos descenderit, Satanam devicerit,*" etc. Christ's preaching through Noah, "a preacher of righteousness" (2 Peter 2-5), and therefore an "ambassador of Christ" (2 Cor. 5-20) might be done through his divinity alone. See Eph. 4:20-21; Acts 26-23; John 10-16; for

instances in which Christ's preaching by others is called his preaching. It is objected that the phrase, he "went and preached" (*πορευθεις εκηρυξεν*) in 1. Peter 3-19, would not apply to a preaching that was instrumental and spiritual. But the same use is found in Eph. 2-17. "Christ came and preached (*ελθων ευαγγελισατο*) to you which were afar off." The reference is to Christ's preaching to the Gentile world by his apostles. Christ in his own person did not preach to them that were "afar off," and he forbade his disciples to do so until the time appointed by the Father, Matt. 10-5; Acts 1:4. The objection that actually living men upon earth would not be called "spirits" is met by Rom. 13-1; 1 John 4, 1-3; and by the fact that at the time of Peter's writing the persons meant are disembodied spirits.

4. One other consideration may be presented as confirmatory of the above. The Bible among all intelligent readers is known to be self-interpreting, every separate teaching will be confirmed by every other kindred teaching. This, then, may be applied as a test touching all of our interpretations of specified passages. If the construction we place upon them is not confirmed by other Scriptures, that construction is to be suspected. It is needless to affirm that the Alfordian interpretation of this passage in 1 Peter is not sustained by any other portion of the divine Word. That it should not be, if correct, is incredible. That such an important event in Christ's work of redemption as his descent unto Hades to carry the gospel to souls imprisoned there presenting, as it does, such a marvelous manifestation of Divine solicitude in behalf of the lost, should receive but a single brief and incidental reference, and by one writer only, is impossible.

If an attempt should be made to support the unscriptural interpretation forced upon the language of the inspired Apostle by an appeal to the spurious clause in the so-called "Apostle's Creed," "He descended into Hades," it would be sufficient to reply that in its original form this

ancient symbol read, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead and buried; the third day he arose again from the dead." The creeds promulgated by the Councils of Nice (325) and Constantinople (381) also omit the "descensus," and it first appears "in the latter half of the fourth century in the Church of Aquiliea." Being introduced, there arose the necessity of discovering some Scripture to support it, hence the unauthorized interpretation of I Peter 3, 18-20. May we not see here, also, the origin of the Papal dogma touching a "*limbus patrum?*"

As an appropriate close to this paper, Dr. Philip Doddridge's paraphrase of the passage under discussion may be offered. He says: "I have already observed, says Peter, that if it be the will of God you should suffer, it is better it should be for doing well than for doing evil; and it is evidently so because thereby we are made conformable to Christ our Head and Leader, whom it cannot but be our glory and happiness to resemble. For he also once suffered for our sins, he who was so eminently and perfectly the just suffered for the unjust for our benefit, in our stead, that he might introduce us to God, and fix us in a state of acceptance and favorable intercourse with him, being indeed put to death in the flesh by those enemies whom God permitted for a time to triumph over him, but quickened by the Spirit of God which soon reanimated his body and raised it to an immortal life; even that Spirit by the inspiration of which granted to his faithful servant, Noah, going forth, as it were, in that progress in which he employed him, he preached to those notorious sinners, who, for their disobedience, have since experienced the just severity of the Divine vengeance, and are now in the condition of separate spirits reserved, as it were, in prison, to the severe judgment of the Great Day. I speak of those who were long since disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited upon them in the days of the patriarch Noah during one hundred and twenty years while the

Ark was preparing, when few that is eight souls were saved by water."

WM. W. HARSHA.

Omaha.

V. PRESIDENT JONATHAN EDWARDS.

Jonathan Edwards, the elder, was born at Windsor, Connecticut, October 5, 1703. His father, Timothy Edwards, was pastor at Windsor almost 60 years and was a most godly and greatly beloved man. Jonathan was the only son among eleven children, and four of his sisters were older than himself. At a very early age he gave proof of the wonderful gifts with which he was endowed. He was reading Latin at six ; at twelve, he wrote a paper refuting materialism ; also, an elaborate account of the habits of the field-spider, based upon his own observations. Before he was thirteen he entered Yale College, then a struggling and homeless school at New Haven. While he was still a freshman he read John Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding," and he has left on record the great enjoyment thus afforded him. At the end of four years he was graduated with high honors, and after studying divinity two years, he was approbated to preach. He then came out West to preach in a small Presbyterian church in New York City, and though he was urged to remain as pastor, the new and crude conditions of the springing town did not attract him, and accordingly, he returned to Yale and his native New England. Here he held a tutorship till 1727, when he was invited to become associated with his distinguished grandfather, the Reverend Solomon Stoddard, the venerable pastor of the church of Northampton. He accepted this call and in this historic town, then one of the foremost communities in New England, he spent the most of his active life. That summer he married Sarah Pierrpont, the lovely daughter of an eminent minister in New Haven, whom he had loved since she was thirteen, and who was to him a most worthy and sympathetic companion throughout all his after life. For only two years after his coming to North-

ampton Dr. Stoddard continued in the pastorate and, upon his death, Mr. Edwards became the sole pastor. Here he remained for twenty-three years, and here was the scene of his most remarkable labors in connection with the "Great Awakening," a movement of inestimable importance in the history of American Christianity. Here for a score of years he was a tower of strength to his church, the town and that general region of New England. His marvelous preaching, for the discriminating historian has not hesitated to call him the greatest preacher of the age, made him not only the pride of his parish, but also a sort of oracle of wisdom and faith, consulted by great and small, from far and near.

His principles were puritanical and his ideas of policy and conduct were equally so. As a kind of reaction from the great seasons of spiritual activity and ingathering through which they had passed, there came a time of religious indifference among the Christian people of Northampton. The pure-minded pastor found occasion to denounce "frolics" in severest terms; he encountered a spirit of frivolity unseemly in the saints; and he was particularly annoyed to learn that an impure, obscene literature was being handed around among the young. Mr. Edwards consulted his deacons and they resolved forthwith to proceed against such evils in a way befitting their gravity. But human nature was the same among Puritan deacons as among their degenerate sons of later times; for when, after some preliminary inquisitions, it transpired that among the youthful offenders were some of the sons and daughters of these good deacons, their resolution suddenly halted and the earnest pastor, little daunted, found himself with a very broken support.

But this irritation was rather the occasion than the cause of the saddest incident in the life of this faithful man of God. Dr. Stoddard had held peculiar views of what should be required of a participant in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. His theory is commonly referred to now as that of

the "two-fold covenant." In a word, it required moral sincerity, decent deportment and an intellectual assent, in a general way, to the truth of the Christian religion. It did not contemplate a confession of personal Christian faith or experience. It seemed to regard this sacrament as a converting as well as an edifying ordinance and hence might with propriety be administered to certain of the unregenerate as well as to the saints in Christ. Mr. Edwards had had his doubts on this matter even before the death of his grandfather, but he modestly kept them in abeyance; in course of time, however, his views became more pronounced, the wonderful seasons of grace through which he had passed had sharpened in his mind the radical distinction between the converted and the unconverted, while his maturing years and his undivided responsibilities made it with him a matter of gravest conscientious concern whether he should longer keep silence. In 1744, he preached his sermons on *The Religious Affections* in which he strongly declared his dissent from the custom which they had been following. Unhappily, the congregation was not in any frame just then to follow his lead, particularly in a direction which might be construed as a reflection upon the memory of their late beloved pastor. For four years after these sermons no one was presented for admission to this sacrament. In 1748, to one who sought admission, Mr. Edwards declared what he should require. These terms were declined and the issue was then fairly on.

He asked of his church the privilege of discussing the subject in a series of sermons but his request was refused; rather, a storm of passion broke out and the angry cry was for his immediate dismissal. He did procure their consent to write a book on the Qualifications of Full Communion, but the people soon became impatient and would not wait. A Council was called and there was a preliminary wrangle as to the constituting of that body. Dr. Stoddard's views did not prevail generally throughout New England, but

they had a strong hold upon the churches and ministers in the immediate vicinage of Northampton. Accordingly, the people were afraid that if they went outside of the county—an entirely proper and regular thing to do—the Council would sustain Mr. Edwards. At last, the Council voted by a majority of one, that the pastor should go, and, afterward, the congregation ratified this decision by a vote of 200 against 20. He was dismissed June 22, 1750. He remained in Northampton some months, but a town meeting voted formally that he should not again be permitted to enter the pulpit. It is sad to see that great and good man, after twenty-three years of faithful service, with a large family dependent upon him, with no resources or means of support, coldly turned adrift upon the world; but it is far sadder to see the church that could do it. The best people in the congregation repented bitterly of their wrong afterward but it was too late. Nothing but the grace of God can account for the beautiful tenderness and forbearance which characterized Mr. Edwards' course through all this most trying experience. His Farewell Sermon is magnificent in its Christian dignity, eloquent in its judicious omissions and really sublime in its expression of unfeigned affection for all the people.

From Northampton, he went to Stockbridge to be a missionary among the Indians. It is not claimed that he was especially suited for this work but it is very significant that he chose it in preference to flattering invitations to Scotland or a Presbyterian pastorate in Virginia. Here among the red-skins of the wilderness, with the trees for his companions and his well-trained mind for his library, he did the best of his literary work. While his wife and daughters were doing needlework to be sold in Boston for their support, he was writing his Treatise on the Freedom of the Will, and some of his other works. His fame was soon assured and the missionary among the Indians was the only American whose name commanded high respect in the cir-

cles of European scholarship. In 1757, his son-in-law, President Aaron Burr, of Princeton College, died, and the wise directors turned to the metaphysician-missionary for his successor. At first he hesitated, saying that he prized the opportunities he enjoyed at Stockbridge for study and for some extensive literary work which he had in contemplation; and, moreover, he argued that he had an irritable temper which he feared might disqualify him for successful work among young men in the college. However, he finally accepted and came to Princeton, leaving his family at Stockbridge to come on later. He reached New Jersey in January, 1758, and as smallpox was epidemic, it was deemed a proper precaution that he should be vaccinated. It was done, and, the fever taking a bad turn, he died March 22, having been President of Princeton College just five weeks.

This brief sketch does scant justice to what was indeed a most remarkable and vastly influential career. Edwards' biography is intensely interesting and his writings are to be understood only in the light of his personal history. It is said that a great man is the flowering of his age and country; if this be so, is it not strange that the pioneer life of New England, in the first half of the eighteenth century, should produce the man whom Robert Hall has called "the greatest among the sons of men?" He was great, he had both the powers and the limitations of greatness. His intellectual capacities were prodigious. Thirteen hours a day was his regular allowance for work. As a pastor, he never made calls except upon the sick and when he was sent for. He barely took time from his books for his meals and his devotions. His exercise was horseback riding, of which he was very fond. Fortunately, Mrs. Edwards had a practical turn and she looked after the domestic needs, so that her distinguished husband scarcely knew how many cows he owned or whether the winter wood had yet been "laid in." He early formed the habit of writing out his thoughts, and many a time, when taking his ride, he would stop his horse

and jot down some momentary illumination which had flashed upon his active mind. This largely accounts for the thoroughness of his thinking and the clearness of his writings. We read that at his death he had 1,400 manuscripts on a vast variety of subjects.

The secret of his productive energy was his genius for concentration. He wrote his "Freedom of the Will" in four months and yet old Plato himself could not have denied it a place of honor among the noblest of his offspring. His treatise on the "Religious Affections" was first a series of sermons at Northampton, and yet Dr. Dwight said that if he had to choose one book beside the Bible to be saved from a universal deluge, it would be that book. Edwards was nothing if not a philosopher, and yet, like Coleridge, he was a theologian first and a philosopher afterward. A son of the manse, early taught in the Scriptures, he was both by temperament and training, a religious youth. And yet, it was not till his twentieth year—January 12, 1723—that he recorded his formal self-renunciation and the solemn dedication of himself to God. In his earliest years he was much troubled with doubts as to the divine sovereignty and it is indicative of a mystic vein that strongly marked his whole religious life, that those doubts should disappear, not, so much as the result of rational reflection as by a strange spiritual enlightenment. He always emphasized the testimony of experience as to the truth of his profoundest theological tenets. He regarded the wonderful life of the devoted David Brainerd as a distinct proof of the truth of Calvinism¹; and in his journal for 1723 we find this entry: "Wednesday, March 6, near sunset. Felt the doctrines of election, free grace, and of our not being able to do anything without the grace of God; and that holiness is entirely, throughout, the work of God's Spirit, with more pleasure than before."²

¹Volume I., p. 665. All references to Edwards' works in this paper are to the four-volume edition, based on the Worcester Edition, published by Robert Carter and Brothers, New York. ²Opera, I:9.

Edwards was a polemic rather than an apologete. However, he would doubtless have challenged this distinction, at least as it is usually drawn now; for with his penetrating insight he saw the consequences and implications of a doctrine as a part of the doctrine itself and his keen judgment spoke its verdict accordingly. Thus he scented Deism in Arminianism¹ and affirmed prevalent false doctrines of the human will to be "utterly inconsistent with conversion's being at all the effect of either the word or Spirit."²

The mainspring of his philosophical activity was his intense theological conviction. He was too evangelical to spend time in mere speculative theory-spinning and in all his writings we can trace the influence of that famous number eleven of the 70 resolutions which he recorded in early life for his guidance. It runs thus:

"Resolved, When I think of any theorem in divinity to be solved, immediately to do what I can towards solving it, if circumstances do not hinder."³

Edwards was too clear a thinker not to discover very soon that solving the theorems of divinity must throw him back upon the profoundest problems of philosophy.

Metaphysically, Edwards was a thorough idealist. Indeed, his extreme idealism was the fertile seed-thought which afterward sprouted into grave errors among those who claimed to be his followers. Authorities dispute whether he ever read the books of Bishop Berkeley, but they agree that his ideas were largely of the Berkeleyan type. Although he absorbed Locke while in college, his writings seem to have stimulated his thinking rather to have moulded it. Dr. Martineau says "to make room for the co-existence of finite and infinite causality has ever been the *crux philosophorum*; for no sooner is the infinite invoked than the finite flies."⁴ Early in his thinking Edwards seems to have arrived at what was to him a satisfactory

¹II:540.

²II:584.

³Op. I:4.

⁴Types of Ethical Theory, Vol. I., p. 159.

view of the relation between God and the outside² world; but long after we find him longing for a *rationale* of the relation between God and Mind. He regarded Providence as continuous creation. Objective permanent identity is in no way in the object itself; God has arbitrarily ordered that it should be regarded and treated as there. Such an idealism is often an alias for Pantheism, and it is too true that his teachings are not easily acquitted of pantheistic implications. He minimized second causes and carried the doctrine of immanence to the farthest extent of modern thought. He has very little to say about miracles and it is reasonable to infer that he did not care much for their evidential value; to him all nature was supernatural.

And, moreover, it is certainly as easy as it is common to say that this principle controlled his philosophy of mind also. His treatise on the Will is, as a piece of logic, absolutely unanswerable. First of all, man is an effect, and his resources, physical or psychical, cannot exceed the dowry with which he has been invested. Man, the agent, cannot have larger powers or possessions than, first somehow, were imparted to and so became the property of man the recipient. He asserts that "nothing can come to pass without a cause;" "and this dictate of common sense equally respects substances and modes or things and the manner and circumstances of things;" "but if things not in themselves necessary, may begin to be without a cause, all this arguing is vain."¹ He distinguishes between moral and natural necessity, making the former to refer to the necessary relation between strength of inclination and certain volitions and actions; making the latter to refer to the necessary relation between the force of natural causes—such as a wound causing pain or perceiving that parallel lines cannot cross—and their consequences upon our volitions and actions. Yet, after carefully drawing this distinction, he admits that the difference is not so much in the nature of the connection as in the things connected.²

¹Op. II:26, 27.

²Ibid, II:14.

This essay was no sooner given to the world than the hue and cry was raised that it was fatalism, pure and simple, and that cry has never since ceased to make itself heard. It may be said that the treatise bears evidence of the haste with which it was written, in its lack of a consistent terminology. He announces his purpose to use "will" as a synonym for the whole affectional nature, including, as Locke does, everything outside of the understanding, but he frequently departs from this usage and makes the will the specific faculty of self-determination. His use of "necessity" is confusing; he distinguishes between necessity and certainty, and yet some of his passages are acceptable only by inserting the latter word where he employs the former; indeed, he himself says in his appended remarks in a letter to a minister of the Church of Scotland: "Such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills, is more properly called certainty, than necessity; it being no other than the certain connection between the subject and predicate of the proposition which affirms their existence."¹

It should not be forgotten that this essay was written as a refutation of Arminianism. Its author regarded that in producing it he was not in the least departing from legitimate ministerial work; the devout Missionary was doing missionary work when he gave it to the world. He distinctly disclaimed all fatalistic imputations. His Calvinism may have been, as Dr. A. H. Strong thinks,² narrower than that of Augustine, or of Calvin himself, but, in any case, it was wide enough to furnish room for a persuasive and availing preaching of the Gospel to impenitent men. We find it in history that the idea of revivals is the gift of Puritan Calvinism in America, though it might be added that the abuses and excrescences of that idea are traceable to another source; it is simple fact that the great apostle of evangelism in early New England, the foremost figure in the deepest spiritual awakening the American church has

¹Ibid, II:185. ²Philosophy and Religion, pp. 114, 120.

ever known, was the writer of this same sternly philosophical essay; it is on record that the great Chalmers, the eminent preacher and teacher in Scotland and the fearless champion of civil and religious liberty everywhere, recommended this book to his pupils more strenuously than any other book of human composition, adding that it had helped him more than any other uninspired book he had ever read; and it is immensely significant that one of Edwards' biographers who is by no means in sympathy with his views, but rather charges that "his thought points directly to God as the author of evil"¹ is yet bound in simple truth to testify that this same so-called necessitarian in philosophy, when he entered his pulpit could show "a marvelous tenderness" in presenting his message, and that "he had the power of inspired exhortation and appeal."²

If there is a lurking *non sequitur* somewhere in the reasoning of the philosopher, certainly it did not affect the zeal of the preacher. It is always easy to detect a flaw in the design of the architect or to see a blemish in the work of the builder. It is easy to criticise "Edwards on the Will." But we are to remember that the theme is one of supreme difficulty and that the problem which it presents surpasses human grasp; and that, with all its alleged faults and flaws, this immortal production has somehow been able to hold a first place in the abundant and ever growing literature upon its theme, commanding the highest respect of all competent thinkers, whether or not they could accept the conclusions at which it arrives. No man is fit to speak on the question of the will who has not read Edwards with great care; as some one has said, there has been a good deal of "nibbling" at Edwards' argument, but "we suspect that the few who have taken hold in earnest, have in the end found pretty good reason to repent of their temerity."

President Edwards' essay on "The Nature of Virtue" is

¹Professor A. V. G. Allen's *Jonathan Edwards*, p. 288.

²*Ibid.*, p. 104.

one of his most influential and epoch-making works. It is characteristic of nearly all of the great Protestant confessions that they confine themselves, for the most part, to formal as over against real, conceptions of holiness and sin. Dr. Samuel Harris regards this as a defect in such a definition of sin, for example, as is given in the Westminster Catechism¹. A formal definition it certainly is, but it is perfectly competent to demur to the exception that herein is a defect. The law of God requires perfect conformity; non-conformity is sin. A broken sphere may be of wood or stone or iron; whatever it is of, it is not a perfect sphere. Sin may be essentially selfishness or unbelief or ignorance—whatever it is, it is non-conformity to the law. Here are indeed two distinct questions, both important and legitimate, but it is a great error to make the formal definition wait upon the real.

New England thought, however, has always had a penchant for philosophizing upon the real side of ethical theory and spiritual integrity and President Edwards gave a very distinct impetus to that tendency.

Fundamentally, he declared "there is no other true virtue but real holiness."² Grace is necessary to holiness and therefore all morality without grace is sin or vice. This searching theology gave characteristic tone to all his preaching.

Edwards made all sin to consist of self-love, and all holiness, on the other hand, to love of "Being." Since God is infinite and everything else is finite, love of Being becomes practically love to God; and, as we have seen, his metaphysical theory was right in the line of this rationalization of the Great Commandment which our Lord declared was the fulfilling of the whole law. This love is not the love of complacency but of benevolence. Happiness is the greatest good and benevolence—the purpose to promote

¹God, Creator and Lord of All, Vol. II, p. 201.

²Op. III, 101

happiness—is therefore the greatest virtue. Indeed, all virtue is reducible to this. In modern parlance, his system was an altruistic, or rather a universal, hedonism as against egotistic hedonism. Augustine was pressed by contemporary Manichean errors into a false notion of the real nature of sin and Edwards, in his abomination of self-seeking, was led into the same mistake. These two eminent instances should warn smaller men against staking too much upon their material definitions of sin. Although the homiletic instinct may lead the philosopher-preacher of Northampton into a theory of what sin is, the history of the Church will show that it is better and safer to treat it, in practically dealing with men, as a violation of the law of God, trusting the Revealed Word applied by the Gracious Spirit to the moral consciousness of men, to make known the rule to which their lives must conform.

The fallacy of Edwards' ethical theory has again and again been exposed. What he reduced all virtue to is good but it is not goodness. It may be good but it is not the good. Moral goodness is both simple and final. It can neither be analyzed into parts nor regarded only as a means to something higher than itself. Holiness is never a mere handmaid to happiness. The consummated kingdom of God is a paradise of eternal bliss but it is more ; and it is that because it is more. Love of Being is nonsense because "Being" is an abstraction and it is absurd to talk about loving an abstraction. We love beings, not beingness ; a being, not being. This idea of virtue has been very influential in the thinking of New England but it is fundamentally inadequate. We must admire the spirit of Edwards which led him to make the essence of evil to be the absorbing devotion to self and the essence of good to be love for others. It is a great truth the poet gives us in his words,

"Love took up the harp of Life and smote on all the chords with might,
Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, passed in music out of sight."

But it is one thing to find something good and quite an-

other to find a definition comprehensive enough to cover all that is good. Edwards' theory has been modified and amended but the informing principle is lacking in comprehensiveness. The late Dr. Henry B. Smith put it in this form, "True Virtue is, love to all intelligent and sentient beings, according to their respective capacities for good, with chief and ultimate respect to the highest good, or holiness."¹ It is perfectly obvious that this statement subordinates, if it does not eliminate, the distinctive principle of President Edwards' doctrine.

That he did teach this utilitarian theory can not be successfully denied. In his sermon on "The True Christian's Life, a Journey towards Heaven," he says, "We ought above all things to desire a heavenly happiness; to go to heaven, and there be with God and dwell with Jesus Christ."² In another sermon, he says "Satan aimed at nothing else but to fool man out of his happiness, and make him his own slave and vassal."³ This resolving of love into benevolence, he applies even to a holy love to God. The impenitent man hates God and would annihilate him if it were in his power. On the other hand, the believer is in an attitude of mind to make God happy if he could; he ascribes praise to him—"Blessed be God"—in his "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England," he speaks of "a sweet rejoicing of soul at the thought of God's being infinitely and unchangeably happy."⁴ This theoretical conception of virtue had great influence upon Edwards' preaching as well as upon his philosophy. Professor Sidgwick thinks that "ethical interests are but slightly affected by our theory of the will." However that may be, with a thinker as logical as Edwards, and with a preacher whose every sermon was a theological deliverance, such a theory was bound to be in some measure controlling.

It is well known that Edwards' preaching was to a very

¹System of Christian Theology, p. 223.

³Ibid, IV, p. 158.

⁴Op. III:303.

²Op. IV, p. 573.

uncommon degree eschatological. He preached much upon the future life, and, as an incentive to turn to God, he impressed upon the impenitent the horrors of an endless torment. No preacher ever surpassed him in the pictorial vividness, the realistic power, and the merciless emphasis with which he set forth the terrors of the law and the sufferings of the lost. Though we are assured that neither Edwards nor Dante believed in a literal hell or heaven¹ yet it is hard to conceive how they could have made their descriptions more real if they had so believed.

One is so impressed with the fervid, evangelical earnestness of this great man, that one hesitates to pronounce this disproportionate feature of his preaching a blemish on his record; all the more, because the fashion of our time has gone to the other extreme. We fain would sing ourselves to sleep with the love-songs of the Gospel while the Justice of the Eternal Throne is too often smothered with qualifications or refined into harmless apologies. Nevertheless, that Edwards' strength became a weakness here, we can not doubt. The judgment of this age is that he did not with sufficient clearness set forth the rational aspects of these truths; that his pictures sometimes make God almost as a cruel Moloch and the impenitent soul the helpless victim of his avenging anger; that his penalties were too exclusively those of objective circumstance rather than of subjective state, also. The very names of his sermons indicate this, e. g., Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God; The Eternity of Hell Torments; and many others. He does not dwell upon the continuity of character, and the reasons inherent in a moral nature for believing in a fixedness of destiny. The calamities of the wicked are judicial, arbitrary and extraneous. This ought he to have done, but not to have left the other undone. He does not choose for his texts, "Whatsoever a man soweth," "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still," "The wages of

¹Dr. A. H. Strong's Religion and Philosophy, p. 514.

sin is death." We are speaking now not of the preacher's intention but of the reader's impression. We could wish that in these sermons he had said more in the line of the remark which occurs in his sermon on Joseph's Great Temptation and Gracious Deliverance, so exceptional as to be all the more noticeable—"Every sin naturally carries hell in it."¹ He does not see the side of truth which Milton saw when he wrote those burning words, "Which way I fly is hell ; myself am hell ;" or, again,

"The hell within him, for within him hell
He brings, and round about him, nor from hell
One step no more than from himself can fly
By change of place."

In his sermon on The Fearfulness Which Will Hereafter Surprise Sinners in Zion, Represented and Improved, one sentence may be selected as showing the crude way in which difference in character is shown to make itself manifest in the future state :

"On these accounts, whenever we see the day of judgment, as every one of us shall see it, we shall easily distinguish between the sinners in Zion and other sinners, by their shriller cries, their louder, more bitter and dolorous shrieks, the greater amazement of their countenances, and the more dismal shaking of their limbs and contortions of their bodies."²

From this infernal realism we turn away with a shudder, to consider what connection it had with his theory of holiness. Though it is a subtle bond, there is a bond, psychological if not logical, which connects this preaching with his doctrine of happiness as the *summum bonum*. It may be true, love of being is essential virtue ; but, then, idealists for all that, we are. Dr. Henry B. Smith has given in a word the solution we are seeking, "The happiness theories must all ultimately run into the self-love theories The general good is only the sum of self-love."³ Heaven is happiness and hell is misery. It may have been the time and place—the Zeit-geist—that led the kind and gentle

¹Op. iv:588. ²Ibid. iv:497.

³System of Christian Tehology, p. 214.

Edwards to try to scare men into heaven and not to coax them in. He who regarded happiness as the greatest good would induce men to be eternally happy by making them realize how infinitely otherwise they should be unless they repented of their sins and turned to God. He would not bribe men, nor goad them nor drive them. He was not forgetful of other truths and of other phases of the truth, but he seems to have underestimated their homiletical, their persuasive value. His mind gravitated to the penalties of wickedness as the most effective weapon in the hand of the preacher with which to fight sin, and indeed to conquer the sinner. And so, whether we account for it by the spirit of his age or by the psychological characteristics of the preacher, we see Edwards, the philosopher, teaching that self-love is sin, and Edwards, the evangelist, urging men, by the quenchless burnings of an eternal hell, to take heed lest they fail not (as he presented it) so much of holiness as of happiness. Whatever may be thought of the consistency in this, there is a related point concerning which we may speak with freer confidence. In his sermon on *The End of the Wicked Contemplated by the Righteous*; or, *The Torments of the Wicked in Hell, No Occasion of Grief to the Saints in Heaven*, he discusses the old objection that the saved in heaven must be grieved to know of the miseries of their loved ones who are lost. His reply is awful and unique. Now, we are to love all men, for "we know not but that God loves them." Then, however, the saints in glory will know that God never loved them that are lost, and as saints are to be wholly conformed to God, "it will be no way becoming in the saints to love them." Indeed, in another sermon we read, "The view of the misery of the damned will double the ardor of the love and gratitude of the saints in heaven."² And yet, if we turn to the author's *Nature of Virtue*, we are told that love of

²Op. iv., p. 276.

being is the very essence of holiness. Can it be that his final test of virtue fails in the sacred affections and activities of heaven itself? As if seeing the patent contradiction, he says later in the same sermon, that "the different circumstances of our nature now from what will be hereafter make that a virtue now which will be no virtue then."

Such a logical *faux pas* is almost incredible of Jonathan Edwards. The reader may locate the flaw for himself. Judged by his ethical theory, his sermon—or rather that point of it—is false; judged by his sermon, his theory will not hold; there is no metaphysical necessity to conclude that either is correct. One thing is sure, and it is this: No theory of the Nature of Virtue can stand as rational and sound and true which is not applicable to all moral beings, in all worlds, *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Moreover, his doctrine of Virtue led him into a very doubtful theodicy as well. He inclines to the belief that, all things considered, it is best that there should be moral evil in the world. He shows, as against the Arminians, that it is as bad to permit sin as it is to purpose to permit it; he also argues that it is possible that the thing itself may be evil and yet that it is good that that thing should come to pass. But he goes farther and says, "God, in permitting sin, has respect to the great good that he will make it an occasion of;" "Sin, the greatest evil, is made an occasion of the greatest good;" God's grace could not be shown "if there were no sin to be pardoned." These repeated expressions, while having much truth in them, show that his conception of moral evil was that of a present condition, contributing to an ultimate higher good, which, without sin, could never have been realized. This has the single merit of consistency with an expediency doctrine of holiness, but it magically transforms moral evil into moral good, inasmuch as, benevolently or malevolently, it contributes to a good end, which is impossible without it.

With this view sin becomes at least a *felix culpa*, and

evil is "good in the making." Here again, his philosophy and his preaching do not clearly harmonize, for if sin contemplates a final consummated good as its reason to be, then it is hard to see the place for the eternal sin and the eternal hell which President Edwards so forcibly preached. It is the same old problem; the idealism of Edwards no more than that of Royce has solved it. If God immediately creates all that is, then certainly the only way to acquit God of being the author of sin is to deny that, in the long run, sin is sin—it is only a "seeming;" and that is what, in effect, Jonathan Edwards did.

Professor Allen, in his life of Edwards, points out the distinction between Divine Sovereignty and the moral government of God, and he leaves the impression that he emphasized the former rather than the latter. It would be very unfair to let such an impression go unchallenged; he held devoutly to both, for there is not necessarily any such contradiction between them as Allen makes out¹; and yet it must be said that there are not a few passages in Edwards' writings which give a show of reason for such a charge. His thought exalted the divine will rather than the divine reason. But he does not leave the careful student of his works in ignorance of his unfailing belief that that will is always regulated and directed by infinite goodness and wisdom. His language was not guarded, however. He says the whole course of nature is "an arbitrary constitution;" that is good philosophy and science has no testimony to the contrary, but when that is said it is not all said. He says, "God could have converted the world instead of drowning it;" we submit that the implications of this statement justify a more qualified dogmatism in shaping it. In his sermon on God's Sovereignty, he affirms that God could have saved those who commit the sin against the Holy Ghost without going contrary to any of his attributes; only it has

¹P. 79.

pleased him for wise reasons to declare that that sin shall never be forgiven. We are accustomed to think of that sin as unpardonable because it involves, in the sinner, such a state of confirmed, wilful hostility to God, as must be removed before he can be forgiven. An outright pardon is an act of a governor only, and may disregard the vindication of some of the "attributes" of a judge who "will do right." After the best is said, it must be confessed that Edwards' sermons, particularly, often present the divine sovereignty in a raw and unattractive manner. The rationality of the divine purpose and policy is overlooked. There is no permanence or identity in things except as God arbitrarily orders that there shall be. There is this much basis for the charge that "he asserted God at the expense of humanity." Spinoza said that he was not an atheist so much as an "acosmist;" Edwards, in early life, wrote "The universe exists nowhere but in the divine mind." A pupil of Spinoza need not have said more.

This idea of the arbitrary sovereignty of God took its harshest and most rasping form in his sermons to the impenitent. The sermon on The Justice of God in the Damnation of Sinners is almost revolting because it seems to bring God down to a low anthropomorphic plain of human motive and method; in reading it, one is almost ready to exclaim, "Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?" When the Augustinian theology speaks of "the mere good pleasure" of God, it safeguards the divine purpose and act against whims and caprice by its primary conception of God, who, by his very nature, is infinitely rational and good and wise. Edwards took care to say this sometimes, but often he did not; he failed in this mostly in his sermons, and, accordingly, in his horrible descriptions of the pains which God will inflict upon the lost, it may with reason be said that his words dishonor God in that they give a defective and inadequate glimpse of the divine thought and mind.

Dr. Charles Hodge argued¹ that with two exceptions, Presi-

¹Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, Vol. 30, p. 585. (Oct. 1858).

dent Edwards was a loyal champion of the old Calvinism. This claim, however, is not universally conceded. Dr. George P. Fisher¹ says "He was the originator of that modified Calvinism which is termed "New England Theology." The writer in the *American Encyclopedia*² says "Edwards sums up the old theology of New England and is the fountain-head of the new." The exceptions which Dr. Hodge referred to are, theologically, "Stapfer's scheme of the mediate imputation of Adam's sin;" and, philosophically, an eccentric theory of the nature of virtue. The second we have considered at some length. As to the first, while he does explicitly accept the doctrine mentioned, it must be said that he is not consistent in doing so. On the one hand, a text-book in Calvinistic theology could find no better setting forth of the traditional doctrine of Justification than Edwards has given them; but certainly that doctrine fits in ill with Stapfer's view. On the other hand, Edwards held a theory of realism which identified Adam and his posterity so that his first act of sin was theirs, not representatively but actually, and this realism is not affected by the circumstance that he postulated it upon the "arbitrary establishment" of God; but it must be apparent that such a theory of identity eliminates all imputation, mediate or immediate. It is not unfair to infer that his metaphysics muddled his theology on this whole question, but it cannot be denied that his writings on Justification and Original Sin bear out the impression made by his works throughout that there is a federal relation between Adam and the race and that that relation and not simply the natural, is the ground of the racial calamities that have marked the course of mankind.

Edwards was a philosophical theologian, and his thought was so vast and many-sided that it is not strange that many different schools claim him as their patron. Historically and in point of ability, he was the father of New England

¹History of Christian Doctrine, p. 395.

²If we are not mistaken, the writer of the article was George Bancroft.

theology but not otherwise. As we have seen, his eccentric theory of Virtue was far-reaching in its consequences, but it is hard to conceive of a greater libel on history than is that of calling the pastor at Northampton the originator of what goes to-day by the name of "New England Theology." If this be true, then the doctrine of Transmutation of Species needs no other proof. But what is New England Theology? Is it Unitarianism or is it present-day Congregationalism? The evolutionist can trace both back to the theological progenitor of New England, but he can find little that was distinctly his, in either. The Grotian theory of the Atonement is a mark of it, but that was neither Calvinistic nor Edwardian. A large and representative element, speaking for itself, would decline to characterize the nondescript, heterogeneous, theological conglomeration known as the new theology as even *neo*-Calvinism, and most discerners of the times would thoroughly respect the judgment. Jonathan Edwards, the younger,¹ led departures that might with reason entitle him to the distinction awarded to his father; Emmons' Exercise Scheme bears the marks of the elder Edwards' immediate creationism, but it is an interesting fact that it is more like Herbert Spencer's conception of mind, or the soul, as being only a series of states.

The fact is, President Edwards' direct influence upon the so-called new theology was rather philosophical than theological. His idea of the nature of Virtue was influential upon his own thinking and upon that of his successors, but it did not impair his allegiance to that system of truth known as Calvinism, of which he was such a distinguished defender, and to which he always declared his most ardent and unqualified support.

Edwards was the father of Congregationalism in this country, but he lived a century and a half ago. History must judge whether the offspring has been loyal to its

¹The son is commonly spoken of as "Doctor;" the father, as "President."

father. It were well if it were as ready to stand for his faith as it is to claim the honor of his saintly name. We may well believe he would be more at home to-day in Princeton than among the Berkshire hills. After he had been expelled from his church at Northampton, he was invited to go over to Presbyterian Scotland, and these were among the words he wrote in reply: "You are pleased very kindly to ask me whether I could sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, and submit to the Presbyterian form of church government . . . as to my subscribing to the substance of the Westminster Confession, there would be no difficulty; and as to the Presbyterian government, I have long been perfectly out of conceit of our unsettled, independent, confused way of church government in this land; and the Presbyterian way has ever appeared to me most agreeable to the word of God and the reason and nature of things."¹

Edwards' thoughts were seed-thoughts and he cast them forth on virgin soil. He had a clear wide field before him. His mind was of that self-resourceful type that was perhaps at its best, remote from libraries and schools. Conventionalities might have hampered and harassed him. He was not the man for active administration. His gaze was turned within rather than without. He might have suited the Princeton of his day better than that of ours. He would have begrudged from his books and pen the time required for eyeing naughty students and nursing sick rich men for their last will and testament. Standing as he did at the very "fountain-head" of American intellectual life, his profound and genuine piety went far to atone for the merely philosophical idiosyncracies of his system and left a deep and permanent influence for good upon the succeeding generations. He is even yet the most convenient and most telling illustration of a man who combined, in a remarkable

¹Dwight's Life of President Edwards, p. 412.

manner, profound intellectuality and profound spirituality. If his philosophy was too much like Spinoza's, it may be said of him, in the best sense, as was said of the Hebrew of Amsterdam, that he was a "God-intoxicated man." He had God in all his thoughts. For him, all things culminated in redemption; all cosmical processes found their interpretation in the work of the Son of Man. All his sufferings were propitiatory; the blood of his circumcision as well as of his crucifixion was shed to fulfil the law and to save his people. Lost men, saved by grace and ingrafted into the ever-living Redeemer, are in a far higher state than if they had never been lost; that is to say, redemption is far more than restoration.¹

No other man ever made a more careful study of the work of grace in the heart, for the pastor at Northampton was also the scientific investigator, noting and registering pathological symptoms and psychological data in the midst of the spiritual clinic for which he labored. And his conclusions are sound for all time. He lacked the first impulse of the fanatic. No pastor ever discriminated more sharply between "the warmth of sound health and the heat of a fever." His "Thoughts on the Revival in New England" are worthy the careful study of every pastor. He discouraged excessive emphasis on mere experience as a basis of assurance; he insisted that ordinary grace is more to be desired than supernatural gifts; he denounced morbid "exercises" and mystic "discoveries;" he made much of the difference between a willingness not to be damned and a being willing to accept Christ as a Saviour; he taught that a true Christian may not be able to state the time or place of his conversion; he put all possible emphasis upon the necessity of the fact "for a swine washed and a dove defiled have their nature still;" he rejected all testimonies that did not put honor upon the Word of God

¹It will be observed how this harmonizes with the idea that sin is a means to a good unattainable without sin.

and particularly upon the personal Christ; and in the end he came back to the Biblical test. By their fruits they shall be known. No preacher ever had less to say of himself and yet, again and again, we can see the gentleness and sympathy of the man. We can understand how he shed tears over his red-faced friends at Stockbridge when he left them to go to Princeton. That "Farewell Sermon" at Northampton is a marvel of self-control and many an aggrieved pastor, about to leave his church, would do well to read it from his pulpit instead of giving his "parting shot" as he retreats. The English language may be challenged to produce a sermon more exalted in tone, more beautiful in reverent thought and more delightfully edifying than is his most noble discourse on "The Excellency of Christ."

Edwards' limitations were largely those of his time; yet his insight was foresight and he anticipated many of the developments of subsequent thought. He was no mere mimetic tradition-worshiper, but said almost in the words of the late Professor Clifford that it is a sin to believe the truth on false or insufficient evidence. He combined immanence and transcendence and, strangely enough, seemed to put excessive emphasis upon each. His doctrine of continuous creation is precisely that of the Christian evolutionist to-day, however different may be the routes by which they approach it¹. It was Professor Huxley who had the temerity to say that he never learned to distinguish between causality and sequence and that his doctrine of the Will to-day is held only by agnostics². In his "Religious Affections" he distinctly forecasts the New Psychology—Professor Royce's psychology of the dissecting-room as against that of the arm-chair. He foresaw the mission of the religious newspaper and suggested to the magistrates the propriety of appointing an American fast-day. He did

¹Le Conte's *Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought*, p. 359.

²Encyc. Brit., Article Jonathan Edwards,

not trouble himself much with sociological problems and civic reforms. Professor Allen strains the truth to make him out a high-church-man, but in truth, the church and the town were in his time in many ways one. He was Christian statesman enough to foresee what has come to pass and it is interesting to read his words just now¹, with the West Indies on one side of us and Hawaii and the East Indies on the other, awaiting developments that may speedily and literally realize his vision :

“When those times come, then doubtless the Gospel, which is already brought over to America, shall have glorious success, and all the inhabitants of this new-discovered world shall become subjects of the Kingdom of Christ, as well as all the other ends of the earth; and in all probability, Providence has so ordered it, that the Mariner’s compass, which is an invention of later times, whereby men are enabled to sail over the widest ocean, when before they durst not venture far from land, should prove a preparation for what God intends to bring to pass in the glorious times of the church, viz.: the sending forth of the Gospel wherever any of the children of men dwell, how far soever off, and however separated by wide oceans from those parts of the world which are already Christianized”².

And yet, along with this prescience of genius, was a *naivete* which frequently provokes the reader’s smile. He never economized with the supernatural for as we have seen, everything was supernatural. It never occurred to him to doubt that the Pope was anti-Christ or that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. Human life was shortened in Moses’ time lest men should scorn immortality. As God is supposed to have created the world about the time of year of the Feast of Tabernacles, so in that glorious time God will create a new heaven and a new earth. It was a strange idea which he entertained that Satan led the first settlers over to America in order to frustrate the rapid spread of Christianity; “that they might be quite out of the reach of the Gospel, that here he might quietly possess them and reign over them as their god.”³

¹October, 1898.

²Op. Vol. I., p. 469.

³Op. Vol. I., pp. 322, 468.

For intellectual cogency and grasp Jonathan Edwards has had few equals. Sir James Macintosh speaks of him as "perhaps unmatched, certainly unsurpassed, among men." His arguments are ablaze with earnestness and as stern as steel. To read his essay on the Will is itself a course in logic. His controversial writings are dignified and courteous; he first points out the mark, and then he unerringly hits it. He uses scant rhetoric. His illustrations are few. He saves the force which other men would waste in words, to give greater intensity to his thought. If Martin Luther could say that the devil is a D. D., the mighty Edwards could say that he is orthodox in his faith; "he is no Deist, Socinian, Arian, Pelagian or Antinomian"¹. If he was as great in intellect as Augustine or Anselm, he was not less a mystic in the depth of his religious fervor and in the holy visions of his chastened faith.

The world will never see his like again—not that the race of giants died with him, but that the social and intellectual conditions which entered so largely into his making can never reappear. The lonely missionary to the Indians seems all the larger in his solitude. Human life was less complex, and so his individuality survives the better; he rises out of the past like some lofty mountain from the low level of a lonely plain. He had the spirit of a reformer, a hero, a martyr. He was an ordained knight-errant of eternal truth. He served God, not men. He held forth high standards because they were God's. He did

"Not give religious faith
To every voice which makes the heart a listener
To its own wish."

His quaint words describe his loyalty to his conscience and his Lord: "Practice is the proper evidence of Christian fortitude; the trial of a good soldier is not in his chimney corner but in the field of battle." Accordingly we are not surprised when the great Chalmers says, "I have long

¹Ibid. IV., 457.

esteemed him as the greatest of theologians, combining in a degree that is quite unexampled, the profoundly intellectual with the devoutly spiritual and sacred, and realizing in his own person a most rare yet most beautiful harmony between the simplicity of the Christian pastor on the one hand and on the other, all the strength and prowess of a giant in philosophy."

Times have changed and we thank God for that. We would not recall those days if we could. This mighty man of God had his weakness and his limitations and no one can see them larger than did he. But this Elijah the Tishbite, this John the Baptist, of the wilderness of New England, clothed in the camel's hair of his rustic age and eating the locusts and wild honey of his honorable poverty—no fanatic, no time-server, no flatterer, no self-seeker—standing like some prophetic fore-runner at the threshold of the breaking era of a New World and preaching in no soft words "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish," might well return to these velvety, luxury-loving times and call us back to the changeless claims and eternal truths of God; for we may be well assured of this, that with all our boasting greatness, in all that makes a great thinker, a great preacher, a great, good, godly man, either in brain or in heart, there hath not arisen among us a greater than Jonathan Edwards, the Elder.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

San Francisco.

VI. THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA.

The Presbyteries have now under consideration an overture, originating with the Presbytery of East Hanover, submitted to them by the Assembly of 1898. The overture reads as follows: "The Presbytery of East Hanover begs the Assembly to take steps to have the baptismal formula, found in chap. ix., sec. 6, of Directory of Worship, restored to its original form—"I baptize thee in the name," instead of 'into the name,' etc., that this formula may be in harmony with all other parts of our Standards in which the sentence occurs. The Presbytery begs the Assembly to propose to the Presbyteries that they consent to this change." To this request the Assembly consented.

The proposed change has elicited very little discussion. Some few Presbyteries have appointed committees to examine and report at the spring session. So far as known to the writer the overture has been discussed in only three of our religious periodicals, and in these very meagerly. Two of the six correspondents advocated the retention of the present form; a third preferred unto to either in or into; a fourth, the restoration of in; a fifth—a member of East Hanover Presbytery—objected also to the present formula as the work of "sciolists;" and the sixth, whose judgment approved of into, thought it expedient to change back to the old familiar word. As though it were a matter of small importance, the Church seems to have given the matter but little thought. The views of one of the brethren above referred to appeared more fully in the QUARTERLY of June, 1894. He then said: "The inspiration for the change from in to into appears to have been drawn from the Revised Version of the New Testament." We think it far more likely that it was due to the growing conviction of scholars that the inspired writers did not use prepositions loosely

and interchangeably; and to the great light thrown upon the subject of baptism by that eminent 'sciolist,' James W. Dale, D. D.

When Dale's first volume, *Classic Baptism*, appeared, the Baptist press denounced him for a 'sciolist.' Said one: "The author of the book shows himself to be an ignoramus." Said another: "It is too late in the day for an upstart with his pedantry," etc. But soon from all quarters of the world where the English language is spoken and from editors, professors and eminent scholars of all denominations, save immersionists, praises and thanks came pouring in. By the adoption of Dale's views in the change of 'formula to into, the little Southern Church put itself in the very front rank. To retreat now is to renounce the advantage of a wealth of learning which elucidates the meaning and spirituality of real baptism. In giving up the Scriptural formula we surrender the key that unlocks many hard texts, and the sword which has won many victories.

The attention of the reader is invited, first, to a collation of all the passages in which the word baptize is followed by a preposition and the word 'name.' To this list we add all other passages in which 'baptize' is followed by the preposition—*εἰς*. It is followed also by the preposition—*ἐν*, but this always indicates the agency by which the baptism is effected—with water, with the Spirit, with fire, by the cloud and by the sea. The synopsis gives the Greek preposition with the renderings of the Authorized and Revised Versions.

It is not pertinent to this inquiry to examine the usage of *ἐν* and *εἰς* with other verbs. We know that the primary meaning of *εἰς* is into; but we know also that after verbs of motion, unless the *εἰς* be reduplicated with the verb, that to is the equivalent of *εἰς*. An illustration of this we have in John 20:4, 6. John outran Peter and *ἦλθε πρῶτος εἰς* the sepulchre, yet went he not in; Simon Peter following *εἰςἦλθεν* the sepulchre. The versions are correct. John

went not in though he came first to the tomb, but Peter went into it.

The following table gives a complete list of all the passages concerned:

Text.	Greek.	A.Ver.	R.Ver.	Complement.
Acts 10:48..	ἐν	.. in	.. in	..Name of the Lord.
Acts 2:38...	ἐπι	.. “	.. “	..Name of Jesus Christ.
Mat. 28:19..	εἰς	.. “	.. into	..Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
Acts 8:16..	“	.. “	.. “	..Name of the Lord Jesus.
Acts 19:5..	“	.. “	.. “	..Name of the Lord Jesus.
I Cor. 1:13..	“	.. “	.. “	.. Name of Paul.
I Cor. 1:15..	“	.. “	.. “	.. Name, mine own.
Rom. 6:3...	“	.. into	.. “	..Jesus Christ.
Rom. 6:3...	“	.. “	.. “	..His death.
Rom. :4....	“	.. “	.. “	..Death.
I Cor. 12:13.	“	.. “	.. “	..One body.
Gal. 3:27...	“	.. “	.. “	..Christ.
Acts 19:3 ..	“	..unto..	“	..What?
Acts 19:3 ..	“	.. “	.. “	..John's baptism.
Mat. 3:11..	“	.. “	..unto..	..Repentance.
Mark 1:4...	“	.. for	.. “	..Remissions of sins.
Luke 2:3...	“	.. “	.. “	..Remission of sins.
I Cor. 10:2..	“	..unto..	“	..Moses.

Observe that in every citation except the first two the Greek preposition is εἰς; and that εἰς is rendered by the Revisors by into and unto—never once by in. A glance at the table shows this. The rendering in the case of Acts 10:48 is correct. The preposition is not εἰς but ἐν—ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, and means “by the authority.” It was necessary that Peter have express authority for so unwonted a step as the baptism of Gentiles as such. That authority was given him in vision on the tanner's roof. He is solicitous that his brethren should clearly understand that it was at the bidding of the Lord that he granted baptism to Cornelius. And so he did not command them to be bap-

tized εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, into the name of the Lord, but he commanded them, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι—in the name of the Lord, to be baptized.

There is a wide difference between εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. Says Dale in *Christic Baptism*, page 449, "The prevalent translation of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'in the name,' and its common understanding, 'by the authority of,' has scarcely an advocate among scholars." And again, on page 407, "It is a mistake to suppose that the Greek εἰς τὸ ὄνομα corresponds with the English 'in the name.' The Greek form ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι corresponds both in form and in force with the English phrase. These two Greek forms are not equivalent and must not be confounded. When Peter commanded the lame man 'in the name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) of Jesus Christ to rise up and walk,' the Greek phrase and the English are in entire correspondence. So when Peter (Acts 10:48) commanded Cornelius and friends 'in the name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) of the Lord, to be baptized, there is the same correspondence; 'in the name' being dependent on 'command,' and not on 'baptize.' The phrases baptize εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, 'into the name,' expressing the ideal element into which the baptized object passes and baptize ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, 'in the name,' declaring the authority by which the baptism is administered, are fundamentally diverse in conception and must be so exhibited in the translation. Again: "Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι are never substituted in sacred or classic literature, as synonyms." Such being the inherent difference between these two forms, we have seen there was abundant reason why Peter should command baptism by special authority. "There was no occasion in all Peter's ministry when he more needed to be invested with divine authority, than when the door of the Christian Church was to be opened to the Gentile world."

The only objection which can be urged against this interpretation is the order of the words. To this Dale replies: "The order of sequence does not necessarily de-

termine the grammatical or logical order." This he illustrates by reference to Scriptures. He continues: "It may be further answered: Cyril of Jerusalem quotes this passage giving another order, thus: 'Peter commanded them (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* I. X. *βαπτισθῆναι*) in the name of Jesus Christ to be baptized. It is highly probable that this was the order and the phraseology of the text used by Cyril, as it is also that of the Codex Sinaiticus. Objection from the order is therefore not only annulled, but whatever of weight belongs to it is thrown heavily on the other side."—*Christian Baptism*, p. 205.

Stier, also, says: "'Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα cannot simply be equivalent to *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* which only occurs in Acts 10:48, where *ἐν* is for *εἰς*, or teaches that these Gentiles were baptized in the full and plenary authority and will of Christ."

This first, then, on our list, should be stricken out, being not dependent on the verb—baptize.

And what shall be said of the second and only remaining exception: Acts 2:38? The proposition here is neither *εἰς* nor *ἐν*, but *ἐπι*. The argument of one of the brethren referred to at the beginning of this article as advocating a change is curious. "As by no possibility can *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι* be translated into the name, neither should *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* be so rendered." By no possibility can *εἰς* be permitted its primary meaning, because, forsooth, *ἐπι* has not that meaning! Neither can *ἐπι* by any possibility be rendered in. The translators have ample authority for rendering *εἰς* by into, but none whatever for rendering *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι*, in the name. Prof. Harrison (*Greek Prepositions*) gives 'on,' 'upon' as the primary meaning of *ἐπι*, with six figurative meanings growing out of it.

Here, let me observe, that some may shrink from the formula, 'baptize into Christ,' because it seems to afford some countenance to the theory of immersion. But the fear is needless for there is not a single instance in the Bible of baptism (*εἰς*) into water. What shall we say of Mark

1:9: Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in (*εἰς*) Jordan. It may seem to some that our list of instances wherein 'baptize' is followed by the preposition *εἰς* is incomplete through the omission of this text. But here as in Acts 10:48 *εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην* is not dependent on the verb 'baptize,' but on the verb *ἦλθεν*, thus: Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to the Jordan and was baptized by John. *Εἰς* after the verb of motion, means to, just as it did in the case of John who came first to (*εἰς*) the sepulchre but went not in. And as in the case of Acts 10:48 verbal juxtaposition does not determine grammatical and logical order. Jesus came to the Jordan and was baptized by John.

To return to Acts 2-38. To baptize on the name of Jesus, is indeed a most singular expression. Nowhere else does it occur. To believe on the name of Jesus is not uncommon. Dale supposes an ellipsis of a participle—'believing,' and translates: Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, (believing) upon the name of Jesus Christ, into (*εἰς*) the remission of sins. This is plausible, very; but there is another consideration which, we think, converts plausibility into assurance. A glance at the table of texts calls attention to the fact that while the R. V. almost uniformly translates *εἰς* by into, in four instances it is rendered unto. We are reminded of John who preached that repentance baptized into a state of pardon—the baptism of repentance *εἰς* the remission of sins. The abandonment of into in these passages for unto, and the 'for' of the A. V. squint at baptismal regeneration. Indeed, the Campbellites, notably, and others use them to prove that water baptism effects regeneration. John, however, taught that repentance baptized into the remission of sins. Of this baptism Paul said (Acts 19:4): 'John verily baptized with' (there is no 'with' in the Greek) 'the baptism of repentance' (i. e., symbolized it with water) 'saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come

after him; that is, on Christ Jesus." What more natural and proper, then, that the first distinctively Christian preaching should conjoin these two—repentance into remission and faith on Jesus who had finished his work. Repent and be baptized, every one of you (believing) on the name of Jesus Christ, into the remission of sins. Believing on Jesus, repentance still baptizes into pardon. This is the evangelical doctrine; water baptism in the name of Jesus for or into remission, is not.

The passage as it stands in the list above should then be stricken off, but replaced thus: Acts 2:38 *ei's* A. V. for R. V. into remission of sins. The result is that we have seventeen instances in which the word baptize is followed by *ei's* invariably, and the ideal element into which one is baptized. Why should not into be the invariable English equivalent. Again I quote Dale: "The essential of any baptism is made known in the clearest and most exhaustive manner when the receptive element (that into which the baptized object really or verbally passes) is declared. Thus when I am told that a living man is baptized into water, I know he is put in a condition which . . . issues of necessity in the destruction of life by suffocation. If the baptism is into fire, I know, by like reasoning, that the issue is the destruction of life by burning. So, if into insensibility, the issue declared is a condition of complete unconsciousness; or, if into impurity, a condition of complete pollution. There is neither change of principle nor obscurity of thought induced by a person being introduced as the receptive element. Who would stumble at the statement, 'I have dipped into Aristotle,' or . . . 'he is imbued with Plato,' or 'immersed in Shakspeare.' As the names of Aristotle, Plato, and Shakspeare are so intimately associated with certain distinctive conceptions that the names alone are suggestive and representative of them, so the name of the Lord Jesus is indissolubly and solely connected with the sacrificial atonement for sin, and it is, there-

fore, a difference in form and not in thought when sinners are said to be baptized 'into the remission of sins,' or 'into the name of the Lord Jesus,' from whom the remission of sins alone proceeds." The Scriptures give us no definition of baptism except by the word or words which are complementary of the idea of the verb. Abandon into and no one knows what baptism is.

The correspondent who disapproves both in and into, and advocates unto, remarks: "That Baptists should insist that nothing will do but 'baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' is not singular but why Presbyterians should clamor for it is not so readily understood." He is just as much opposed to into. He writes: "The R. V. uniformly substitutes 'into the name' except in one notable case ('No. 4'), where they could not face the music; which plainly reveals the fact that 'into the name' is as faulty and inadequate as 'in the name.' But what do the advocates of 'into' mean? What idea do they wish to express, or what hidden sense do they wish to insinuate, by the phrase, 'baptize into the name of the Lord Jesus,' or 'into the name of Paul,' or 'baptized into Christ?' One naturally suspects some latent mystical sense in the words, or some mysterious communication of sacramental grace."

"One naturally suspects some latent mystical sense in the words." Most assuredly there is a mystical sense, not latent but palpable, in the words. Baptism into Christ, or into the name of Christ, which is the same thing, denotes that which our theologians recognize as the "mystic union." It is no more difficult of comprehension than the language of our Catechism, which defines baptism as an "engrafting into Christ." "In Christ" is a pivotal phrase which is very dear to the Christian, for to be in Christ is to be a Christian. Paul refers to his 'brethren which were in Christ before him. If one be in Christ he is a new creature—and not otherwise. He is made the righteousness of God in Christ.

He is a saint, because sanctified in Christ. He is complete in Christ. By nature we are not in Christ, but in Adam. By some means we must be put into Christ. If not we are unsaved. It seems to us a strange question: "What do the advocates of 'into' mean? What do they mean to express?" By some means we who are not in Christ must be put into Christ, and the Scriptures say that only baptism does it. It is not "hard to explain satisfactorily what baptism into Christ means in English." Union and fellowship with Christ by baptism into Christ is a fundamental Biblical truth. "My Latinity is not first-class, but I strongly suspect," continues the writer, "that Paul himself, with all his scholarship and inspiration, when preaching in Rome, could not have said the thing in Latin." Apropos to this, suffer a quotation from Prof. Schaff (*Revision of New Testament*, p. xxxi.)—"Matt. 28:19, 'baptizing in the name,' is an error of translation. . . . This error arises from the translation of the Vulgate 'in nomine.' Tertullian had it correctly, 'in nomen.'

"Or, one naturally suspects," said this correspondent, "some mysterious communication of sacramental grace." Another also speaks of baptism into Christ—into the family of God—as a vicious formula. "Is it not dangerous?" he exclaimed. "Is not this the *opus operatum*?" It certainly teaches baptismal regeneration." Does it? The Confession of Faith, Ch. 27, Sec. 2, reads thus: "There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."

A question is pertinent just here. Is water baptism the sign or the thing signified? Is it real baptism or a symbol? If a symbol, it symbolizes something; and being divinely appointed, that something must be the truth. It symbolizes regeneration or real baptism with the Spirit whereby we are baptized into Christ. Being in Christ the soul is

purified, and water, a detergent, is aptly appointed to symbolize cleansing from sin. To say that the rite of baptism symbolizes regeneration, and to say that it communicates sacramental grace, are two very different things. As a symbol it must symbolize something and that something is regeneration with the spirit, baptism into Christ, consequent purification in him.

On the other hand, if the rite symbolize nothing and is itself the only baptism, what does baptism into or for the remission of sins mean? The baptism is completed with the action—whether that be immersion in water or sprinkling with water. For and unto can mean only that the intent or effect of this completed action is the remission of sins. These prepositions teach baptismal regeneration. But baptism into Christ, into remission of sins, into Christ's death, are not baptisms at all until the subject is really in Christ, in a state of pardon, in partnership with Christ in his death. Oneness with Christ is baptism, and not the result of baptism. The nature of the baptism is determined by the words complementary to βαπτίζειν εἰς. Water cannot baptize into Christ, but it can and does symbolize real baptism with the Spirit. What is real baptism? Baptism into Christ—union with him and consequent fellowship in all that he achieved as Saviour. The baptism of the New Testament is not for or unto remission; it is remission because it is into Christ. Strike out into, and baptism is robbed of Scriptural definition. There remains nothing for us to choose between save the Baptist rite of immersion in water and the Scriptural rite of baptism with water. And, when the water rite is administered, are we not teaching the *'opus operatum'* when we say that it—the finished ordinance—is unto Christ's death—unto remission? On the other hand, the putting into Christ is baptism, of which the rite is only a symbol. Furthermore, baptism by Jesus with the Spirit is wholly ignored. As to the phrases, baptism in the Spirit, in his death, in Christ, in remission, they are obviously mean-

ingless. Baptism 'in the name' can mean nothing but 'by the authority of' and can refer only to the water rite; but 'in the name' is certainly an incorrect rendering of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*. Any English preposition but into blots from the Bible the fundamental doctrine of Spiritual baptism. *Εἰς* it always is in the Greek; into it always should be in the English.

The defender of unto as the invariable rendering of *εἰς* after 'baptize' asks: "Why did not the R. V. put it 'baptized into Moses?'" We would indeed like very much to know. Our brother overlooked the fact that the R. V. made this mistake not once only, but four times. His answer is not satisfactory to us. He says, "For once, the form of the passage, as well as the idea, shut them up to the simple, natural and everywhere translatable idea and both of them put it, as it would have been well to put it everywhere else that *εἰς* occurs in such connection, 'baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.'"

"The simple, natural and everywhere translatable idea"—'baptism unto remission' we have already considered as teaching the unscriptural idea of pardon by rite, or baptismal regeneration. We object also, to the rendering, 'in the cloud and in the sea.' The Israelites were not in either. The preposition is the same used by John who baptized with water. Sometimes John's baptism with water is expressed by the instrumental dative without a preposition, thus confirming authoritatively the rendering that water is not the receptive element but the agency, by which the baptism was effected. And so here, the Israelites were baptized with or by the sea and cloud—into Moses.

This passage—I Cor. 10.2—is thus commented upon by Hodge: "Baptized unto Moses, i. e., in reference to Moses, so as by baptism to be made his disciples." Baptism *εἰς*—into—Christ means something far more than being made his disciple. "Unto Christ," regards baptism as a completed work resulting in Christian Discipleship; "into

Christ," does not mark the effect of baptism but is definitive of the baptism.

In Acts 19:3, Paul does not ask "unto what," but "into what were ye baptized?" It is essential (not to the symbolic rite, but to real baptism) that it be into somewhat. The reply was into—John's baptism effected by repentance into remission and symbolized with water. Had these disciples believed that baptism *ei's* meant baptism in, and had they as immersionists been taught that the only baptism was in water, they would have been astonished that an Apostle could ask such question. With surprise they would have explained: "Into what? Why, into water, of course!"

Before returning to consider "baptism into Moses" let us apply the prepositions 'unto' and 'in' to the case of Paul, I Cor. 1:13, 15. Here again Hodge renders *ei's* by "unto," i. e., in reference to Paul. . . . "By baptism we are brought into the number of the disciples and followers of his unto" (!) "whose name, or in reference to whom we are baptized." Paul thanks God that he had baptized only a few in Corinth, "as thus all pretext that he was making disciples to himself was taken away."

It is obvious that the two questions of verse 13 are by this interpretation rendered utterly incongruous and meaningless, thus: Was Paul crucified for you? Were ye by baptism made my followers? Some of the Corinthian church were of Paul—followers of his; and some, who mistakenly identified Peter with the Judaizers, were of Cephas. But Paul is far from intimating that the phrase—baptise *ei's* himself—meant to make a disciple to himself; and *ei's* *Χριστόν*—to make a disciple to Christ. He assumes it as well known that baptism into a person is the establishment of such union with that person as ensures partnership with him in all the benefits he has to share. And so he condemned their factions. Christ he says is not divided, and therefore they should not be divided. All are one in him.

Except as a helper of their faith in Jesus, Paul could profit them nothing. Was Paul crucified for them? Their baptism was not into Paul. He could not share with them the benefits of an atoning sacrifice. They were baptized into Christ and into his death.

Baptism, then, into Christ is not mere discipleship to Christ effected by the water rite, but fellowship with him in all the glorious award of his obedience unto death.

A legitimate inference from verse 15: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but, etc.—lest any should say that I baptized into mine own name"—is, that the ritual baptism with water symbolizes this vital union with the person into whom one is baptised. The very formula—"into Christ"—should be used which teaches the nature of real baptism. This usage is Scriptural and Confessional.

Before leaving this, it may be remarked that the rendering, in the name, i. e. by the authority of, is equally impossible. Paul had apostolic authority, and in the exercise of that authority he *did* baptize Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas.

We return now to baptism into Moses. This differs from baptism into Christ, just as the servant differs from Christ the Lord. Completeness of influence is in both cases indicated by the verb and preposition. Says Dale: "In the phrases baptized into sleep, into insensibility, into repentance, into remission of sins, into Moses, into Paul, into Christ, 'baptized into' is common to them all, and has precisely the same force in all. The differentials are sleep, insensibility, repentance, remission of sin, Moses, Paul and Christ."

The Israelites, by the cloud and by the sea, as not by all the plagues, were at last delivered from Egyptian bondage, and brought into fellowship with Moses in all the benefits which his commission designed for the children of Israel. The meaning is easily comprehended if once we know what is meant by baptism into Christ.

The change from into to in we must regard as most deplorable. To recapitulate:

1. The Greek preposition is invariably *εἰς*.
2. The Revised Version never renders it by in after "baptize."
3. *Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* never in classic nor Hellenistic Greek means 'in the name,' i. e. by authority of.
4. 'Baptism into Christ' and 'into the name of Christ' are one and the same thing. As a writer in the last QUARTERLY expresses this universally admitted fact: "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." But baptism in Christ is meaningless and therefore 'baptism in the name of Christ,' being its exact equivalent, is meaningless.
5. The Authorized Version's "for remission," and the Revised Version's "unto remission," squint at baptismal regeneration, and are used as proof texts by the Campbellites.
6. Abandon into and we rob the Bible of its own interpretation of baptism, and render any interpretation conjectural.
7. Not only so, but we erase from its pages all reference to real baptism, leaving only the water rite.
8. If it be said that we still have left us 'baptism with the Spirit,' my answer is: Yes, this is true, but we have no means of knowing what it is if it be not into Christ. The country is full of enthusiasts and errorists who tell us of power, fire, holiness, etc., but baptism into Christ seems utterly forgotten. The abandonment of the Scriptural formula will tend still further to obscure the truth.
9. Only into affords a rational and Scriptural sense in all the seventeen instances. Real baptism is always into Christ, into the Trinity, into repentance, into remission, into Christ's death, into one body. There was a baptism into

Moses, a typical Saviour from a typical bondage ; there could be no baptism into Paul as Saviour.

Unto. In no case does "unto" avail itself of the complement to define baptism. In every case baptism is the rite. Its significance is not uniform. In some instances, baptism unto, i. e., in reference to, may mean that baptism is a means of avowing discipleship. Baptism unto remission is heterodox. Baptism unto repentance, however, is disavowed by Campbellites even. Baptism unto death, and unto Christ's death, and unto one body are meaningless.

In. Baptism "in" the name is a mistranslation. Baptism in repentance, in Christ, in one body, in death, are inane and unintelligible expressions. In what were ye baptized is ludicrous. The same general remark is true of "in"—that it does not help define the baptism, and leaves nothing but water baptism to be defined. Should Paul appeal to us: Know ye not that so many as were baptized in Christ were baptized in his death, we should have to plead ignorance.

We cannot concur with the esteemed brother who wrote: "As the formula needs explanation in either case, it were best to change it back to the old familiar word." On the contrary, it were better to let it stay as it is, since when properly explained, it elucidates the truth, than to change to the old familiar word, which, however explained, can only obscure the truth.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

Greenville, Miss.

VII. THE CREDULITY OF OUR AGE.

This age which we claim as ours is not characterized by an excess of modesty. It is perfectly willing to admit its merits, and readily yields to the conviction that it will suffer nothing in comparison with any age that has preceded it. Earlier ages," suggests Mr. Froude, "however energetic in action, were retrospective in their sentiments. The contrast between a degenerate present and a glorious past was the theme alike of poets, moralists and statesmen. We now know better, or imagine we know better, what the past really was. We draw comparisons, but rather to encourage hope than to indulge despondency. In every department of life—in its business and its pleasures, in its beliefs and in its theories, in its material developments, and in its spiritual convictions—we thank God that we are not like our fathers. And while we admit their merits, making allowances for their disadvantages, we do not blind ourselves in mistaken modesty to our immeasurable superiority." These reflections of Mr. Froude would seem to be just. The marvelous development of industrial art has changed almost immeasurably the conditions of life, and has thrown a witching spell over our civilization. The rush and roar, the glare and glitter, the bounding pulsation of all life under these changed conditions very naturally lead us to think how dull and stupid and non-progressive the days of our fathers, and then the transition is easy to the fathers themselves. The Pullman car differs vastly from the stage. It is almost inevitable that we should assume that there is a corresponding difference between the occupants of the two. Those who rode in lumbering stage coaches and went to bed by the light of a tallow dip, of necessity must have been old fogies. We certainly know more than they, and knowing more, we believe less.

This, then, can not be a credulous age. The things which in other ages were not made known to the sons of men have been revealed to us. Says William Dean Howells, "We no longer believe in supernatural things, in ghosts and haunted houses, and the like. All that is dying out." He no doubt means by "we" all who are worth counting, "we, the people of this enlightened nineteenth century." It is now two hundred and six years since the twenty witches were hanged in Salem, Mass., since Cotton Mather, minister of Boston, in high repute for wisdom, wrote a treatise in which he expressed his "great thankfulness that so many witches had met their just doom," since the same treatise received the approbation of the President of Harvard College. It is one hundred and eighty-two years since Mrs. Hicks and her daughter, aged nine years, were hanged at Huntingdon, England, "for selling their souls to the devil; tormenting and destroying their neighbors by making them vomit pins; raising a storm so that a ship was almost lost at sea, by pulling off her stockings and making a lather soap." The age of credulity lies behind us. It is not to be supposed that our Secretary of the Navy carries a rabbit-foot to ward off accident and disease, after the manner of the illustrious Samuel Pepys, "Secretary to the admiralty in the reigns of Charles II and James II. Hear that worthy as he moralizes at the end of the year 1664: "I bless God I never have been in so good plight as to my health in so very cold weather as this is, nor indeed in any hot weather, these ten years as I am at this day and have been these four or five months. But I am at a great loss to know whether it be my hare's foote, or taking every morning of a pill of turpentine, or my having left off the wearing of a gown." It is more to the point to mention that Charles II, the sovereign of that same illustrious Samuel Pepys, touched nearly a hundred thousand persons in twelve years to cure them of scrofula. We have retained the name "King's Evil," but it serves merely as a landmark to

show how far we have traveled from the times of that ignorance. In 1806 the State of New York, according to the statement of an eminent medical author, purchased for one thousand dollars a preventive of hydrophobia. "The ingredients in this medicine were an ounce of the jawbone of a dog burned and pulverized, the false tongue of a newly foaled colt dried and pulverized, and one scruple of verdigrise, raised from the surface of old copper by lying in moist earth—the coppers of George I or II being preferred as the most pure." According to Boswell, Dr. Johnson did not believe in the Cock Lane ghost, but he was sufficiently credulous on the subject of ghosts in general to sit up a good part of the night watching for the aforesaid notorious Cock Lane ghost. Nor was he alone in his vigil—"many gentlemen eminent for their rank and character" kept him company.

Surely we have outgrown such silly beliefs. It would seem the very acme of hardihood to attempt to prove that credulity is a characteristic of this age. It has thrown the light of knowledge into the deep abysses of mystery and shown that they are empty. Whatever does not prove its existence in some palpable manner is not to be made an object of belief. If our intellectual leaders cannot avoid credulity any other way, they take refuge in agnosticism. When they reach the bounds of positive knowledge, they say they have reached the limit of mental activity. They admit the realm of the unknowable, but they teach us that the only rational attitude of mind in respect to it is one of perfect vacuity. The spirit of our leaders is iconoclastic. Reverence for the past has ceased to be a virtue, and is rebuked as bondage to tradition. They are proposing to lead the race into larger liberty, and free them ultimately from all inherited faiths.

The question we raise is, have they as yet led this generation into the larger liberty—are they meeting with any phenomenal measure of success in their efforts to lead them

to this goal? It is not our purpose to dogmatize. We claim no such familiarity with the mental history of the race as would justify us in dogmatism. But there are certain aspects of our age that the self-constituted representative of the highest culture may overlook. It is possible that our leaders are not altogether acquainted with the number and character of their followers. Our missionaries among the heathen are sometimes surprised to find that a disciple who has been under instruction for years is still clinging to the fragments of his old superstition. It may be that this age which enjoys so much light from such exalted sources is still carrying along with it into the dawning of a new century superstition as gross, credulity as silly as any that disfigures the age behind us. Let us note a few facts.

1. About the year 1830, in Seneca county, New York, a poor, illiterate, visionary young man professed to find a book containing a new revelation from heaven. The story he told was that an angel had appeared to him and made the astounding disclosure that the American Indians were a remnant of the lost tribes of Israel, and that by command of God they had deposited a volume, embracing their national history, and "the fulness of the Gospel of Christ as it was given to his people on this land," on a hillside near the town of Palmyra. The young man went to the place designated, and removing the surface of the ground, found a stone box in which was the book written on gold plates in "Reformed Egyptian" characters. The reason why it was not written in Hebrew, according to the testimony of the angel, was the want of space. The young man was enabled to translate these gold plates by means of a huge pair of spectacles, the ancient Urim and Thummin, which he found in the same stone box. Thus was produced the Book of Mormon. Surely no age of the world has given birth to a grosser fraud. But no sooner did Joseph Smith, Jr., begin to preach than he began to make disciples. In a

few weeks he organized a church of thirty members ; in two years he had gathered disciples to the number of two thousand, and in twenty years his following had increased to two hundred thousand. Such was its spread, notwithstanding the most diligent and varied efforts to stop it. There is little doubt that the Book of Mormon was a manuscript written to beguile the hours of a chronic invalidism by Rev. Solomon Spaulding, a Presbyterian preacher. The manuscript was stealthily copied by Sidney Rigdon. Many persons in the regions where the imposture was launched were familiar with the manuscript, and when the first Mormon propagandists began to preach, these persons recognized and proclaimed the fraud. Spaulding had died in the meantime, but his widow was appealed to, and she produced the original manuscript. But the strange delusion had taken hold. Smith and Rigdon, with brazen face and scurrilous tongues, denied everything, and kept in line the dupes they had gained. Then violence was tried. A mob broke into the homes of Smith and Rigdon, dragged them from their beds, tore their clothing from them, lacerated their bodies, tarred and feathered them, and left them almost dead. They were driven from State to State. As their numbers and strength increased, the strength of the opposition increased, until by and by it amounted to war. Finally Joseph Smith and his brother were treacherously assassinated. But the cause had grown strong enough to live on and flourish without them. Apostates did all they could to destroy public confidence in the character of the leaders. Among these apostates was Sidney Rigdon, who had ranked next to Joseph Smith, and had been equally influential in the beginning of the movement. He drew up a paper in which he declared that many of the chief men, calling them by name, had "united with a gang of counterfeiters, thieves, liars and black-legs of the deepest dye, to cheat, deceive and defraud." But nothing could check the ever-increasing tide of success. Missionaries, filled with

an enthusiasm that no opposition could foil, no hardships retard, went forth into all lands. They carried neither purse nor scrip, but with the sublime audacity of a faith that never wavered, threw themselves helplessly on a generous and guileless world. Results justified their course. At the Mormon conferences held throughout the British Isles in June, 1850, the number of Mormons in England and Scotland was reported at 27,863. In fourteen years preceding 1851, more than 50,000 were baptized in England, of whom nearly 17,000 had emigrated from her shores to Zion. To-day they number 300,000, control the State of Utah, form a considerable percentage of the population of Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona and Nevada, while they have large colonies in Old Mexico. Missions are maintained in Europe, Asia, Australia and the Islands of the Pacific. It is not working in the dark, not confining its efforts to the ignorant, not stealthily winning its way by concealing its grosser features. It is growing in the full light of our civilization, thrusting itself into positions of prominence, claiming recognition in our halls of national legislation, and staking its future, with bold confidence and with good reason, on the limitless credulity of nineteenth century humanity.

2. In 1847, in a little village in Wayne county, New York, two sprightly little girls, aged seven and five, discovered that they could make a peculiar sound by a slight, and even imperceptible, movement of the big toe. The sound was like that of a short, sharp rap on the floor. They deceived and bewildered their simple-minded mother. She became frightened, thought the house was haunted, and began to question the rappings on the supposition that they were made by invisible spirits. The children were spry enough to keep up and enhance the deception. The mother called in her neighbors, and by persistent questioning extorted a tale of murder. The guilty parties were vaguely hinted at. The news spread rapidly and produced

great excitement. An elder married sister of the little girls, Mrs. Fish, got possession of their secret. She drilled the young spiritualists, and had them to teach her how to crack her toe joints. Under her skillful manipulations, the excitement continued to grow. In the course of two years sufficient interest had been worked up to justify a public exhibition. She carried the girls to Rochester, hired the largest hall in the city, and there and then entered on a career of imposture that scarcely has a parallel. Soon spiritual seances became the "fad." All classes of society were drawn to witness the inexplicable manifestations. Men whose names were world-famous, Horace Greely, Bancroft, Fennimore Cooper, Bryant, N. P. Willis, Theodore Parker, William M. Thackeray, James Freeman Clarke, Thos. M. Foote, and Bayard Taylor, strong minded women, such as Alice Cary and Harriet Beecher Stowe lent their presence, and showed the deepest interest. Physicians were selected to investigate and report. Among these, Austin Flint, the most distinguished medical authority in the metropolis, with two others, visited the mediums at their hotel by appointment, and closely scrutinized their persons while the rappings were heard. They came near solving the mystery, and in their report assured the public that it was capable of a natural explanation. But by this time multitudes had become converts to spiritualism. The infatuation spread, mediums multiplied, and to-day the spiritualists count a million and a half in the United States and Canada. This colossal structure is built on a fraud so simple that it was at first practiced merely in the spirit of mischief by two playful little girls, Maggie and Katie Fox. As they grew toward womanhood, they were very beautiful, and also attractive in manners. Two eminent men took a deep personal interest in them. Horace Greely educated Katie, and Elisha Kent Kane, the famous arctic explorer, married Margaret. These men were not duped by them and tried to reclaim them from their false lives.

Their efforts seemed in vain, but after the death of their benefactors, the women did repent. In the most public and earnest manner they tried to undo the mischief they had wrought. On the 21st of October, 1888, Mrs. Margaret Fox Kane appeared at the Academy of Music in New York City, and in the presence of a large audience made a humiliating confession, and a complete expose. She said, "That I have been chiefly instrumental in perpetrating the fraud of spiritualism upon a too confiding public, most of you know. The greatest sorrow of my life has been that this is true, and though it has come late in my day, I am now prepared to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth—so help me God. I am here to-night as one of the founders of spiritualism, to denounce it as an absolute falsehood from beginning to end, as the flimsiest of superstitions, the most wicked blasphemy known to the world." She then proceeded to demonstrate the method by which the whole tissue of lies had been woven and palmed off on the public. The New York World on the following morning concluded a detailed account of the occasion with the following reflection: "Only the most hopelessly prejudiced and bigoted fanatics of spiritualism could withstand the irresistible force of this commonplace explanation and exhibition of how 'spirit-rappings' are produced. The demonstration was perfect and complete, and if 'spirit-rappings' find any credence in this community hereafter, it would seem a wise precaution on the part of the authorities to begin the enlargement of the State's insane asylums without delay." That was ten years ago, and the flourishing condition of spiritualism in that same community, as well as in the country at large, is a striking illustration of how little power the clearest and most palpable truth has over minds that have consented to believe a lie.

Be it noted in the case of Spiritualism, as in that of Mormonism, it is not depending for growth on stealthy meth-

ods ; it is not shunning contact with enlightenment. It boldly challenges the attention of all classes, and counts on flourishing in the future as it has flourished in the past, by successfully practicing on the limitless credulity of 19th century humanity.

3. In 1875, Helena P. Blavatsky, "a messenger of the adepts," appeared in New York, and started the theosophic movement. She had a brilliant fancy and had steeped her mind in the dreamy mysticism of Buddhistic philosophy. She gave forth with dazzling effect her bewildering speculations, colored with the wierd tints of the far distant Orient. She made her appeal to minds of the highest and broadest culture, and claimed to be the apostle of all that was truest and best in all religions, and to offer for her teachings a philosophic and scientific basis that would satisfy souls that had outgrown all other systems of belief. She met a ready response and very soon formed a Theosophic Society including men of some literary pretentions. She returned to India, and being a spiritualistic medium, made herself famous. She received communications in a mysterious way from the mountains of Thibet, where it is supposed the development of occultism through long centuries has reached its highest and purest stage. Her fame grew. The learned world of Europe concerned itself about her, and sent out agents to make a close study of her manifestations. Suspicious disclosures were made by enemies who had been in Madame Blavatsky's confidence. Investigation proved that she was the author of the letters which had been received from Thibet. Later on, in a fit of despondency, she confessed to one of her disciples, and petulantly exclaimed : "What is one to do when, in order to rule men, it is necessary to deceive them ; when they will not accept even the doctrine of Isis Unveiled without the sanction of miracle ; when their very stupidity invites trickery, for almost invariably the more simple, the more silly, and the more gross the phenomenon, the more likely

it is to succeed." This is valuable testimony from an expert in the art of deception. Such a confession one might have thought would have proven a death-blow to Theosophy, but not so. It has become firmly planted, and finds fertile soil in those who affect to be worshippers of Intellect. "It claims to be not a matter of faith, but of science—occult science, to be sure, but the most certain of all science. To accept the nonsense of the Mahatmas is not faith, it is belief on evidence. By one of those startling contradictions of the human mind, so often seen, this system, which has nothing but assumption and boundless assertion to rest upon; which starts off into space, marshals the spheres, takes possession of eternity as the arena of its operations—this system finds many followers among those who have been emptied of all faith, and into whom a seven-fold credulity has entered and taken full possession." It has had but twenty-three years in which to grow. To what dimensions has it come? "Starting with a membership of fifteen persons in 1875, it has spread all over the globe, until now it has hundreds of branches scattered through all the civilized and even the semi-civilized countries, and counts its members by thousands. Beyond its organization in importance, however, is the wonderful influence of theosophic teachings in coloring the literature, thought, ethics, and even scientific progress and religious expression of the world. The size of the society gives but a very imperfect idea of the extent of its work." Thus wrote William Q. Judge, who was President of the Theosophical Society in America from its founding in 1875 till death in 1896. A statement prepared since that time tells us that the American Society has 175 branches, located in most of the principal cities, and in many smaller towns. There are several great divisions of the Theosophical Society throughout the world, in Europe, Asia, Africa and Australia. If it be asked, "On what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he has grown so great?" the answer is

found in the catalogue of the Theosophic Publishing Society in Duke street, London. A sample of its publications are as follows, viz: "Astrology, Animal Magnetism, Astral Light, Alchemy, Mind-reading, Mind-cure, Myths of the Middle Ages, Phallicism, Chaldean Magic, Demonology, Witchcraft, Dream Mysteries, the Elixir of Life, Geomancy, Ghost Stories, Hypnotism, Sorcery, Mesmerism, Yoga Philosophy, Rosicrucianism, Faith Healing, the Cabala, Monism, Hindu Pantheism, the Science of Breath, White and Black Magic, Posthumous Humanity, Swedenborg the Buddhist, Reincarnation, Gipsy Fortune-telling, Secret Doctrine, Sacred Mysteries of the Mayas, The World as Will by Schopenhauer, Somnambulism, Zodiacal Physiognomy, Hallucination, Mysticism." What a gallimaufry is this! Enough to give one a nightmare to read it over in the solemn silence of the night. Of all the uncanny things that the frightened fancy of man has conjured up, only one has been omitted, and that is Hoodooism. An African Hoodoo doctor would doubtless take high rank among the theosophists.

4. A poor woman, who had need of money, borrowed a small sum from a Jewish usurer, giving him in pledge all she had best in clothes and linen. The feast of Easter approaching, she entreated him to lend her, at least for that great day, what she had pawned him. "I am willing to do so," said he, "and I will even release you from the whole sum I lent you, if you promise to bring me the Host you will receive in communion." The desire of having her clothes again, and not being obliged to repay the sum borrowed, proved a temptation the unhappy woman could not resist. She promised to bring him the host, and kept her promise. On the morrow, she went to her parish church, and after receiving the Host into her mouth, she hastened to take it out again, wrapped it in a handkerchief and brought it to the wretched Jew to whom she had promised it. It was for the purpose of gratifying his hatred against

our Lord that this man wanted to have a Host ; he treated it with the greatest indignity, and Jesus Christ constantly showed him how sensible he was to the outrages offered him. The Jew first put the Host on the table, and struck it repeatedly with a penknife ; blood immediately flowed from it in abundance, which caused the man's wife and children to shudder with horror. He nailed it to a wall and brutally struck it ; then he pierced it with a lance, to renew, if possible, the frightful torments of our Lord's Passion. The Host shed blood anew, as though to prove to the execrable wretch that it was not merely material bread. He threw it into the fire, and it was seen flying here and there without receiving any injury. The infernal rage that animated the Jew led him to throw it into a pot of boiling water ; the water took the color of blood, and the Host then appeared visibly under the form of Christ crucified. This sight so terrified the deicide that he went to hide himself in a dark corner of the house. But it was not long before his crime was discovered, and the discovery came about this wise : One of the children, seeing the people going to church, cried out simply : "Do not go to church any more to seek your God ; don't you know my father killed him ?" A woman hearing what the child said, entered the house under the pretext of asking for some fire, and she saw the Host, which was still under the form of Jesus on the cross ; but it soon resumed its former shape, and came to repose in the little vessel which the woman had in her hand. All amazed, she carried her treasure religiously to the Church of St. Jean-en-Greve.

"Seeing is believing," says the old adage. If, therefore, any one is incredulous, let him go to Paris and visit the Church of St. Jean-en-Greve, where the miraculous Host is preserved. The history just related "is most authentic," says the writer from whose book it is taken. The book was written about twenty-five years ago, and has gone through successive editions, the copy quoted from having

been published in 1888. It is properly summoned, therefore, to bear witness to the kind of literature demanded by our age. The author is one of the most prolific and popular writers in the Roman Catholic Church. The extract quoted is only a sample of the good things with which the book is filled. It was submitted to the censorship of an approved theologian, and on his report, it received the *imprimatur* of the most reverend, the Archbishop of New York. The "eminent clergyman" who discharged the delicate and responsible duty of censor speaks of the book and its author in almost hysterical adulation. "I have found the matter solid, well digested and instructive, the style simple, earnest and full of unction. The volume has nothing of the cold and dry system that makes religion among us so often a thing of duty more than of love. Deep thoughts in plain words, doctrinal sublimities in language so simple that a child, without effort, may understand. In it we find, together with all the motives that tend to draw our souls toward Jesus, our perpetual victim at mass, a glowing record of miracles, revelations and wondrous graces obtained through faith in, and love of our dear Lord in his own divine sacrifice. It is refreshing indeed to find in our cold, utilitarian age and country, a work issued from the press so full of Catholic life, and so glowing with the fire of Catholic love. To all men and women, to young and old, I would say: Spare yourself some unnecessary article of dress and buy this book. Every single page of it is worth the price of the volume. I wish it were in my power to place a copy of your work in the hands of every Catholic who can read the English language; and I hope it will be translated into all modern tongues, and come to the knowledge of every human soul on earth. May the angels carry it to the hands, minds and hearts of all." This extended quotation, which is but a small part of the eminent censor's commendation, is for the purpose of putting it beyond question that Michael Muller's book on the "Holy

Sacrifice of the Mass," miracles and all, is the kind of devotional literature most eagerly devoured by the Catholics, not of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but of the nineteenth, not of benighted Mexico and South America, but of the United States and Canada. Archbishop Hughes, of New York, wrote his commendation in the following language: "Dear Father Muller: I take great pleasure in adding my commendation to the many others which have already been given of your excellent book on the Holy Mass. I sincerely hope that it will have the widely extended circulation which it so well deserves." The Catholic press of the country were prompt and fervent in giving the book the benefit of their endorsement.

After finding such distinguished, and numerous and enthusiastic vouchers for the book, it may interest the reader to have another extract: "A holy man was one day at mass, which was being said by a priest who was rather worldly. What was his surprise, at the moment of communion, to see a charming child, surrounded by luminous rays, reposing on the paten in place of the species of bread! He was more astonished afterwards, for he said that when the priest went to take communion, the child turned away his head, struggling with his hands and feet, as if to prevent the priest from receiving him into his mouth. The same saint had several other times the same vision, which gave him much thought. One day this priest was conversing with him and confessed that as often as he received the body of our Lord at Mass he had great trouble in taking it, and knew not how that could come. The servant of God was very glad of this confidence; he took occasion to tell the priest what he had himself seen, and advised him to make a thorough examination of his conscience, a good confession and change his life. Touched by this kind admonition, and the warning he had received, the priest applied himself to become more edifying. Some time after, the holy man who had warned him, when again

assisting at Mass, perceived the same child between the hands of the priest, at the time of Holy Communion, but saw him enter now into his mouth and his heart joyfully and eagerly, which proved the sincerity of his conversion."

Shall we doubt the sincerity of the endorsement given to these stories by the high dignitaries and the learned ecclesiastics of the Romish church? Shall we suppose that their object is merely to palm off these pious legends on the ignorant with the hope of stimulating their faith and devotion? The answer is that these stories are no greater tax on credulity than the dogma of the Mass itself. When one has developed his capacity for believing until he can receive as true the doctrine that "Jesus Christ, soul, body and divinity is not only whole and entire in each consecrated wafer, but whole and entire in each particle of the wafer, so that millions of Christs are daily offered on Catholic altars," he can certainly have no trouble with anything else. Furthermore, these stories of "Father" Mullens', so full of Catholic life, and so glowing with the fire of Catholic love, are exactly in keeping with other means used for the nourishment of Catholic piety. It is only seven years since a threadbare and faded fragment of cloth was exhibited by authority of the Pope at the city of Treves, in Germany, and more than a million devout pilgrims went to look on it, taught by the Catholic church that they saw in it a part of the seamless garment worn by Christ, and for which the soldiers gambled under the Cross. It is not so long since a bone was placed on exhibition in one of the churches in New York City, and multitudes, almost without number, flocked to see it, believing it to be, as the Catholic authorities had taught them, a bone from the arm of the Virgin Mary's mother.

We have arranged these facts illustrative of the credulity of our age in climactic order. The crude fabrication of the illiterate founder of Mormonism demanded for their success a fair measure of credulity; the childish tricks of the Fox

sisters, the founders of spiritualism, demanded a larger measure; the fantastic and incoherent vaporings of Madame Blavatsky demanded a yet larger measure; but it was reserved for Rome to demonstrate the very utmost measure to which human credulity can go. Mormonism, spiritualism, theosophy are all young in the cause, novices in the art of deception. They do well considering, but to Rome belongs the steady progress of ages. Her incommensurable system of imposture has been built up by slow and gradual methods. Her mighty superstructure of falsehood has been paved by the patient work of successive generations. It has now reached dimensions beyond which the mendacious ingenuity of man can hardly carry it. There must be a limit to lying devices, if no limit to human credulity.

It had been our purpose to suggest some further illustrations of our topic from the various quackeries connected with the healing art, but enough has been adduced to make good our contention. At any rate we shall rest the case here. Carlyle says that the latter half of last century was "the very age of impostors, cut-purses, swindlers, enthusiasts, ambiguous persons; quacks simple, quacks compound; crack-brained, or with deceit prepense; quacks and quackeries of all colors and kinds. As if Bedlam had broken loose; as if rather the everlasting pit had opened itself and from its still blacker bosom had issued madness and all manner of hopeless misbirths to masquerade and chatter there." Carlyle introduces this statement to account for the brilliant success of the prince of impostors, Count Cagliostro. If the sage of Chelsea could see the far more extensive and permanent success of far more bungling cheats than Cagliostro, he would have to ransack his rugged vocabulary for still harsher words in which to characterize the latter half of this present century. From accounts given us of Count Cagliostro, it is not a serious reflection on an age that he stirred a temporary and superficial excitement. Says an elegant writer, "there was not a

fine lady in Paris who would not sup with the shade of Lucretius in the apartments of Cagliostro. There was not a military officer who would not discuss the art with Alexander, Hannibal or Cæsar; or an advocate or counselor who would not argue legal points with the ghost of Cicero. These were spiritual manifestations," adds our author, "worth paying for, and all our degenerate mediums would have to hide their diminished heads in the presence of Cagliostro."

Can we assent to Mr. Howell's *dictum*? "We no longer believe in supernatural things, in ghosts and haunted houses, and the like. All that is dying out." Is it not probable that he and his ilk would be surprised to know how small the coterie included in his somewhat pompous "we?" They have discovered a little, thin current settling their way, and they think it is the gulf-stream, but it is not. The aphorism of Burke is still true: "The credulity of dupes is as inexhaustible as the invention of knaves." It only remains to add that both dupes and knaves are as numerous now as they ever were in the past.

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

VIII. THE COVENANTER IN EARLY AMERICAN HISTORY.

It was not an accident that made John Cabot the discoverer of the Continent of North America rather than Christopher Columbus. He, whom "the winds and the sea obey," had decreed that the first ship to touch the solid shores of this continent should be one that bore at its mast-head the flag of what was soon to become Protestant England, rather than that of Roman Catholic Spain. He saw from the very beginning the end, which we discover only in the accomplished fact. That end was, that the colonization of North America should be a Protestant colonization.

Spain, then among the first, if not the very foremost nation in Europe, had determined that America should be another Roman Catholic Empire, the adjective being descriptive not of imperial glory, but rather of ecclesiastical control—in short, the equivalent of Papal. God's purpose was different. Hence Cabot and not Columbus. As the just and natural sequel of this first historic fact we have to-day American freedom, and the more than forty Commonwealths united under the Stars and Stripes, the symbol and pledge, the world 'round, of civil and religious liberty. For it is but to repeat the veriest commonplace of recent modern history, to say that America, with her republican institutions is the legitimate outcome of the Reformation. Given Luther, Washington was a necessity. If the oft-repeated proverb that, by his scholarly editing of the Greek New Testament, "Erasmus laid the egg, which Luther hatched," it is no undue stretching the figure to add, that from the brood thus originated sprang, as one of its most illustrious descendants, the Chanticleer that at Yorktown sounded out the clarion of victorious independence. In

1754, David Hume wrote in regard to these early discoverers of the New World: "Speculative reasoners during that age raised many objections to the planting of these remote regions, and foretold, that after draining their mother country of inhabitants, they would soon shake off her yoke and erect an independent government in America. But time," he goes on to remark, "has shown that the views entertained by those who encouraged such generous undertakings were more just and solid." But how much more "just and solid," now that we have advanced a century and a half beyond Hume, does the judgment appear of those "speculative reasoners," who prophesied a century and a half before he wrote! Hume lacked the spiritual insight to perceive the mighty working of those moral forces, which the reformation of Luther had unloosed. The defender of the Stuarts could not understand the principles that controlled the men who would mould a "government of the people, by the people and for the people."

But to say, that America is the outgrowth of the Reformation of the sixteenth century is to tell one-half the truth. That was a broad channel of far-reaching influence. But its deepest, mightiest current was that which flowed past the schools of Geneva. John Calvin—not a man, but the principles and truths of which his name is a compendious description—was the real founder of republican, free institutions in America. To present in full the historic demonstration of this statement would be to rewrite the history of Western Europe during its two most eventful centuries, the 17th and the 18th. It would require the telling afresh of that most thrilling story of modern times, the struggle of the Netherlands for the rights of man, a declaration of rights indelibly traced in the blood of heroes, both princely and peasant, than which none ever written was more sublimely glorious. It would march in review before us the armies of a Conde and a Gustavus; would open our ears to the

dying testimonies of countless martyrs; would repeat the trials and triumphs of generation after generation of Puritans, who being dead will yet continue to tell to coming ages the wonderful works of God. We should need to listen to the echoes of the teachings of Knox, as they come to us from Scottish glens, mingled with the tramp of the dragonades. Londonderry and the Boyne would have to tell again in our ears the story of their almost superhuman fortitude and valor. To glance even most superficially at this magnificent panorama—a pageant whose brilliant glories might well dazzle the eyes of angels—is, of course, far beyond the ability of the present writer and the patience of his readers. We can stay only to present the testimony—capable of very large increase—of a few of the leading historians who have written the wonderful story.

Hallam (Vol. 3: p. 427) tells us: "It was a struggle of the Scotch for the liberty of their Church, which was the means of preserving the liberties of England." And none in our day need to be reminded of the close and causal connection between English and American ideas of freedom. Macaulay (*England*, Vol 1: p. 73), speaking of the same era, makes the statement: "To this step" (forcing the "service book" upon Scotland) "our country owes its liberty." Lecky, tracing the influence of the Covenanters, declares: "The Kirk was by its very constitution republican," and, in the same line, Froude points out the fact, that "their" (the Kirk's) "religion taught them the equality of man." "It is," says Buckle (*Civilization*, Vol. 1: 811) "an interesting fact, that the doctrines, which in England are called Calvinistic, have been always connected with a democratic spirit. In the republics of Switzerland, North America and of Holland, Calvinism was always the popular creed. In the sharp retribution which followed the death of Elizabeth, the Puritans and Independents, by whom the punishment was inflicted, were, with scarcely an exception,

Calvinists." Again he says (Vol. 2: p. 185): "It was the Presbyterian clergy, who in their pulpits, their Presbyteries and their General Assemblies encouraged that democratic and insubordinate spirit, which eventually produced the happiest results by keeping alive the spirit of liberty." Referring to a little later period, Charles Hodge (*Hist. Pur. Ch.*, Vol. 1: p. 59), speaking of the early inhabitants of America, says: "The English Puritans were all rigid Calvinists, and many of them Presbyterians. The Dutch were Calvinists and Presbyterians. A moiety of the Germans were of the same class. All the French Protestants were Calvinists and Presbyterians, and so, of course, were the Scotch and Scotch-Irish." Cotton Mather informs us: "That a gentleman in New England having published a book, in which he attempted to prove, that Christ bore not our sins by God's imputation, and therefore, also, did not bear the curse of the law for them, the General Court of Massachusetts (the then supreme civil authority) afraid lest the Church of God abroad should suspect that New England allowed such exorbitant aberrations, ordered an answer to be prepared, in which it is stated, that the Lord Jesus Christ, as God-man and mediator, according to the will of God and of his own voluntary consent, fully obeyed the law, doing the command in the way of works and suffering the essential punishment of the curse in the way of satisfaction unto Divine Justice; and that they, who deny these, do take away both the matter and form of our justification, which is the very life of our souls." And Dr. Lyman Beecher writes (quoting Hodge, Vol. 1: p. 6): "Our Puritan fathers adhered to the doctrine of original sin as consisting in the imputation of Adam's sin and in a hereditary depravity." "The rigid Puritans," Mr. Bancroft affirms, "proved in America the supporters of religious freedom." And William Reed of Pennsylvania remarks: "The debt of gratitude, which Independent America owes to the dissenting clergy can never be paid." Froude gives to the

Covenanters the credit of having won independence for America and goes so far as to suggest that even Bunker Hill was borrowed from Ireland. Motley says: "Holland, England and America owe their liberties to Calvinists." And Ranke affirms, that "Calvin was the true founder of the American government."

But, weighty as are these authorities, there is still a more potent argument. The principles which inhere in that system of associated truths called Calvinism, contain at once the germ and the norm of freedom, both religious and civil. They have become, because they could not help but become, the greatest educating forces for the masses of men that the world has ever known. Their substance and their logical relations necessitate thinking, deep and strong thinking. They demand investigation into those questions which are essentially and everlastingly human. They display the logical consistency of the parts as a confirmation of their several and joint truthfulness. And let it be borne in mind, that logic is not arbitrary, but necessary. Logic is simply the scientific arrangement of the laws of thinking, not that of the philosopher alone, but of the universal mind of man. The humblest intellect, therefore, that accepts the teachings of this system, is thereby lifted into the sphere of the premise and the syllogism, though he may never have heard the names, and be wholly ignorant of their meaning. Awakened thought, quickened intellect, the outreach for larger knowledge; these, which are the very fountains of education, must ever be profoundly stirred in the mind of him who has learned the fundamentals of the Calvinistic system, viz.: God supremely sovereign and man lost, sinful, spiritually dead and helpless. It was, therefore, no freak of destiny, but the most natural development of principles, that Geneva should become the originator of public schools. Bancroft says: "The public school system was derived from Geneva, the work of John Calvin; introduced by Luther into Germany, by John Knox

into Scotland, and so became the property of the English-speaking nations." No wonder, as a recent writer relates, that "during the 18th century Covenanter ministers established twenty-eight colleges in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee." And even a more pregnant fact than this appears in the early annals of the American colonies, viz. : Wherever men of this faith were settled, the church and school-house were planted side by side from Massachusetts on the North to the Carolinas on the South, and as far inland as the country was settled.

Now, everybody knows that thinking is dangerous to despotism. Deliver populations from stolid ignorance, and you rouse the sleeping giant. Another element in the genesis of freedom is that profound reverence for God and his authority, that deep conviction, that he and he only is to be feared and obeyed, which lie at its very core. This conviction is deeply rooted in the vigorous system of Calvinism. This supreme reverence for God and allegiance to his authority beget a spirit of resistance to all unjust authority and to all unrighteous law. Hence the men who hold these views are instinctively the foes of anarchy on the one hand and tyranny on the other. To them civil liberty is liberty regulated by righteous law. Moreover, just in so far as God is exalted, the distinctions of lofty and lowly among men disappear. Hence the doctrine of sin, as taught in this system, is the mightiest of all levellers. God alone is great. And so the sturdy believer in total depravity—by which he means the curse of sin as it taints his entire nature—the totality of his being—body, mind and soul—gives little value to the factitious distinctions that prevail among men. In the presence of God monarch and subject stand on the same level. Both are sinners undone and helpless before their Divine Judge and King. Besides, as the pride of earthly distinction is humbled by this Scriptural doctrine of sin, so the lowliest position on earth

is lifted to the loftiest honor by the Pauline doctrines of the election of grace, and the atonement through the blood of the crucified Redeemer. He, whom the Eternal has chosen before the foundation of the world to be a child of God, and who has been delivered from the bondage and curse of sin by the death of the Son of God, has attained an elevation before which all earthly honors are as nothing. "His name, though it may not appear in the register of heralds, is recorded in the Book of Life." How easy—indeed, how necessary—to the believer in this system of truth, the inference, that men in their essential nature are all equal. This first principle of our great Declaration is no discovery of Thomas Jefferson or the men who with him signed that immortal document. The Waldenses and the Covenanters had felt its inspiration and rejoiced in its hope many generations before it appeared in the Westminster Confession or the Magna Charta of American freedom.

In addition to these germinal principles of Calvinism, there was also a law of their operation, which largely contributed to the establishment of liberty in America. That norm was the representative element in popular government. The Calvinistic system has sometimes been found conjoined with Independency in church polity; and the representative principle has occasionally united itself with Arminianism in doctrine. But both associations are abnormal. The logical connection is that of Calvinistic doctrine with Presbyterianism, or representative government. This combination of the principles of freedom with their normal associate in government, when transferred to the civil sphere, gave to America representative republicanism.

Thus the voices of history are confirmed by the outworking of well-known principles. And in the mouth of these two witnesses the fact is firmly established, that America's free institutions are the result of the Covenant theology in its development under representative methods

of government. The main channel through which these mighty moving forces found their way into the New World was the Covenanter colonization. It is often and truthfully described as the Scotch and Scotch-Irish influence. It was a grand and, I believe, the most controlling of all the forces, that wrought to the production of our American freedom and our representative constitutional government. Far be it from the purpose of this paper to withhold from other influences, which contributed to this grand result, one iota of the due recognition and honor which belong to them. All praise to Puritan and Pilgrim father! All honor to the sturdy Dutch and the knightly, unconquerable, incorruptible Huguenot, and the courtly Cavalier. That goodly vessel, our Ship of State, required the thought of many generations and the united energy of many strong and brave workers to lay her keel and build her frame. What this paper contends for is that "the knarled and crooked knees," as by many they are regarded, shall not be omitted when we recount

"What timbers, sound and strong,
To our vessel shall belong."

This element among American formative influences has failed of due recognition hitherto. In confirmation we cite the fact that the recent New York Methodist Conference, in reporting resolutions for adoption in regard to our war with Spain, entirely omits, in its statement of the original founders of our Republic, the name of this chief actor. "God," they say, "lifted his hand and the Huguenots, the Hollanders, the Puritans and the Cavaliers came to the New World and laid the foundations of the Republic." This omission is due mainly to two reasons. First, because the Covenanter was not among the earliest colonists. He came in after other factors had begun their work. But second also and chiefly, because in writing our early history he has had little share. And so much depends, as we all know, on who tells the story. Up to this time the Puritan and

Pilgrim have been foremost in this particular. This Calvinistic Scotch-Irish contribution to the production and formation of American institutions will bring the Covenanter before us as Immigrant, as Pioneer, as Soldier, and as Statesman.

The immigrant Covenanter, who came to America from Scotland and North Ireland, had won his name that day in 1638, when in old Grey Friar's church-yard at Edinboro he placed his signature to the revived Solemn League and Covenant. That was a mighty oath, by which he bound his soul: "We promise and swear by the great name of the Lord our God to continue in the profession and obedience of the said religion: and that we shall defend the same and resist all those contrary errors and corruptions, according to our vocation and to the utmost of that power, which God has put in our hands, all the days of our life." Well and faithfully has that covenant been kept these two hundred and fifty years. And kept it will be by the men who hold this faith, until the day of doom.

Under the tyranny of Mary Tudor and the Stuarts, persecution was inevitable to men of such a spirit. That tale of suffering is written in martyr blood and deeds of heroic devotion. It is so familiar, however, that no word of it needs here to be respoken. One of its results—a most signal illustration of the wrath of man bringing praise to God—was the large emigration of the men of Ulster and the Pentland Hills, and indeed from all Scotland, to the New World. The magnitude of that emigration has never been duly estimated. Recent research has developed the fact that it was larger by far than has ordinarily been supposed. During the seventy-eight years preceding the Toleration Act for Ireland, passed in 1782, so great and continuous was the exodus to America, that Froude says that "ships enough could not be procured to transport the emigrants." A careful and sagacious writer (Hodge, *History Pres. Ch.*, p. 60) has estimated that "one half the

population of this country would now be Presbyterian, had all the descendants of their co-religionists of the early day adhered to their faith." "According to Cotton Mather four thousand Presbyterians came to New England before 1640. At a later period one hundred families from Ireland settled Londonderry in New Hampshire, and to this settlement large accessions were made from Ireland; and from it streams of population went out to Maine. In 1729 a church was organized in Boston, composed of Scotch and Irish. Other emigrants settled at Pelham and Palmer." (Holmes, Vol. II., p. 99.) In 1718 three hundred and nineteen North of Ireland men petitioned the Governor of Massachusetts for a settlement in that State. And it is worthy of special note that only thirteen of these were unable to write legibly their own names. This is a most remarkable evidence of the prevalence of education among them. It was a rare occurrence, at that day, that ninety-six per cent of a group of emigrants could write their own names. Theodore Roosevelt, in his very interesting book, "The Winning of the West," (Vol. I., p. 180,) tells us that "in examining numerous original drafts of petitions and the like, signed by hundreds of the original settlers of Tennessee and Kentucky, I have been struck by the small proportion—not much over three per cent at the outside—of men, who made their mark, instead of signing their names." But the Scotch-Irish were few in New England as compared with their numbers in the more Southern colonies. Holmes mentions the arrival of four hundred and five emigrants from Scotland at New York in 1737 (*Annals*, Vol. II., p. 143.). The north side of Orange county, Smith states (*History*, p. 218), was inhabited by Scotch, Irish and English Presbyterians. And he mentions a settlement of Scotch in Albany county, New York. In the second volume of his history (p. 412) Bancroft asks: "Is it strange that Scottish Presbyterians of virtue, education and courage, blending a love of popular liberty with religious enthusiasm, hurried

to east New Jersey in such numbers as to give to the rising commonwealth a character which a century and a half has not effaced?" Brooks and rivulets with "curious, clear water," were as plenty as in the dear, native Scotland. It was a "gallant plentiful country," where the humblest laborer might soon turn farmer for himself. This was in 1682.

But by far the largest immigration of Covenanters was to Pennsylvania. In 1727 six ships loaded with families from Ulster landed in Philadelphia in one week. And during the whole of the eighteenth century the arrival of two or three ships a day was not uncommon. The population of this State in 1701 was twenty thousand. In 1749 it had risen to two hundred and fifty thousand, chiefly from this immigration. "But the Covenanters who landed in Philadelphia were not the only ones that came to the colonies. They landed at other points as well—at New York, Newcastle, Baltimore, Wilmington, Charleston and Savannah." "The larger part were in the South—perhaps two-thirds. They, therefore, constituted nearly one-half of the entire population of the Southern colonies. In North and South Carolina their control was almost supreme, as it has been ever since. Ramsay, the historian of South Carolina, states that Ireland—that is, the Scotch-Irish settlements—contributed most to the population of that State." (Covenanter, Cavalier and Puritan, p. 97.) The same is true in regard to North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky and Tennessee. "This immigration commenced about 1700 and continued until the Revolution. The conclusion may safely be reached that prior to 1776 five hundred thousand of the Covenanter race had settled in the colonies." (Covenanter, Cavalier and Puritan, p. 44.) At the period of the Revolution all the colonies together had a population of two millions, seven hundred and fifty thousand (McMaster's Estimate, Vol. I., p. 7), or, in the stirring words of Patrick Henry, "three millions of people, armed in the holy cause

of liberty." Of these the Covenanters or Scotch-Irish were decidedly the most numerous class, numbering over nine hundred thousand (Scotch-Irish Seeds in America, p. 276.)

From this glance at the constituents of the population of the colonies in the Western World, we reach the conclusion that at the close of the eighteenth century the Covenanter Immigrant had established his home and was exerting his influence more widely in America than any other people.

No chapter in American history possesses greater fascination than that which records the adventures of the early settlers of the country. These pioneers—"advance guards of civilization"—encountered untold difficulties and displayed unsurpassed courage and fortitude. They had to overcome, in the aboriginal Indians, foes more savage and intrepid than any that a European race has ever contended against in its prosecution of conquest and civilization. For more than two centuries the Iroquois stubbornly held their own against the invaders. And they were only one among many tribes. And as we read the history of this conquest of America by Europe, a remarkable contrast develops between the colonization of North America and that of Central and South America. In the latter, the conquering peoples became in time assimilated to the conquered. Their bloods were intermingled. The lines of cleavage between the races in large masses of the populations were practically obliterated. This was not the case in the Anglo-Saxon development of North America. We say Anglo-Saxon, for the French and Spanish, though early discoverers, were soon eliminated from the problem. The sturdy Briton never lost his race instinct. He refused to mingle his blood with that of an inferior people. This lesson of our country's founders has evidently been forgotten by some, who in recent times have proposed miscegenation as the solution of the "negro problem" in the United States.

Recreant to the noble nature of their forefathers, they know but little of the real color of Anglo-Saxon blood.

Among these pioneers in North American colonization none did sturdier service than the Covenanter. As settler and frontiersman his field of operation was broader than that of any other class. This arose from two sources. First, he was not among the earlier colonists. His immigration found the Atlantic seaboard pre-occupied. From necessity he was driven inland. And in the second place, by reason of the superior number of immigrants, his channel of settlement was broader, and after its tide set in, it was so rapid and continuous that it required larger territory for its spread. Hence we find the steady movement of Scotch-Irish population from Central and Western Pennsylvania through the Cumberland and Virginia valleys and Southward into North Carolina and Tennessee. These steady streams were met by men of the same race, who spread westward from the Carolina coasts, through North and South Carolina. And these two contingents combining, swept over Kentucky and into the vast region north of the Ohio River, then coming to be known as the Northwest Territory. From New England, it is true, there have gone out through all the west large contributions of population and far-reaching influences. But these did not begin until after the Revolution. Nor had the Cavalier, the Dutch and the Huguenot, except in rare and individual instances, left their centres of growth in the ports and on the plantations of the seaboard.

Thus the latter half of the eighteenth century witnessed, along the headwaters of the Susquehanna, the James, the Potomac, the Roanoke, the Holston, the Cumberland, the Ohio and their tributaries, the heroic achievements of vast numbers of men and women, whose integrity and fortitude, backed by their rifles and their axes and their looms, made the winning of the West so grand a chapter in our American history. And these achievements were mainly those of Scotch-Irishmen. Discussing this development, Mr.

Theodore Roosevelt, in his brilliant work (Vol. 3 1, p. 37) makes clear the fact that "the Scotch-Irish were much the most important element in all the West." The description that Daniel Boone gave of himself may truthfully be applied to the sturdy race of which he was an illustrious and typical representative—"an instrument ordained of God to settle the wilderness." Roosevelt styles them "those splendid pioneers of our people." "Those warlike borderers, who thronged across the Alleghanies, the reckless and restless hunters, the hard, dogged, frontier farmers, by dint of grim tenacity, overcame and displaced Indians, French and Spaniards alike; exactly as fourteen hundred years before, Saxon and Angle had overcome and displaced the Cymric and Gaelic Celts. They were led by no commander. Spurred ever onward by the fierce desires of their eager hearts, they made in the wilderness homes for their children, and by so doing wrought out the destinies of a Continental nation. The fathers followed Boone or fought at King's Mountain; the sons marched with Jackson to overcome the Creeks and beat back the British; the grandsons died at the Alamo or charged to victory at San Jacinto. They were doing their share of the work, which culminated in the marvelous growth of the United States." (*Winning of the West*, p. 27.) These backwoodsmen were Americans by birth and parentage and of mixed race. But the dominant strain in their blood was that of the Presbyterian Irish; that stern and virile people, whose preachers taught the creed of Knox and Calvin. "That these Irish Presbyterians were a bold and hardy race is proved by their at once pushing past the settled regions and plunging into the wilderness, as the leaders of the white advance. They were the first and last set of immigrants to do this. All others have merely followed their predecessors." "They were fitted to be Americans from the very start. They were kinsfolk of the Covenanters. The creed of the backwoodsman, if he had any creed at all, was Presbyterianism." The

preparation that fitted this hardy race for their great mission was an inheritance. They were their fathers' children. And grandly did they illustrate the proverb, "blood will tell." The Covenanter courage of the bare hillsides and narrow glens of Scotland, and the patient energy which transferred the bogs of Ulster into the very Paradise of the Emerald Isle, repeated their story in the wilds of America. This pioneer life furnishes a record fascinating beyond the most thrilling romance. The clearing and its log cabin, the stockaded village, the hunter's camp, the Indian massacre, the hard-fought battle with tomahawk and rifle, the increasing community with its gradually developing civic life—all these, with their thousand perils and exploits, make the pioneer a very hero to our imagination. We learn to know the sources of our country's greatness. Indeed, to follow the trail of the American pioneer is to read the preface to the story of the Revolution and to uncover the foundations of the Republic.

The Imigrant and the Pioneer had, however, done only preparatory work. The sword of the Soldier and the pen of the Statesman had yet much to accomplish, before the cap of liberty should grace the brow of America. And the call for the service was promptly answered by the display of their courage and their political acumen. Each colony of the original thirteen brought its contribution. It was the union of brothers for the protection of the home. And in this co-operative work the Covenanter did his full share. This share, by reason of his relatively superior numbers in the gross population and of the influence of his liberty-loving principles, was decidedly the most forceful. A line or two must suffice to show the sources of this opinion.

Indian warfare—the battle of the great Kanawha, Lord Dunmore's war, with many others—and the conflicts with the French had made ready the stalwart warriors of the Revolutionary struggle. "Lord Dunmore's war, waged by

Americans for the good of America, was the opening act of the drama, whereof the closing scene was played at Yorktown." (*The Winning of the West*,) p. 244.) "It made possible the two-fold purpose of the Revolutionary War; wherein, on the one hand, the Americans won, by conquest and colonization, new lands for their children, and, on the other, wrought out their national independence of the British King." "It is a fact beyond question, that most of the early successes in America were immediately owing to the vigorous exertions and prowess of the Irish immigrants," (Campbell's *Puritan*, Vol 2: p. 491.) Ramsay, who resided in South Carolina during the Revolution and was a member of the Continental Congress, bears testimony in his history that "the Irish (i. e. Scotch-Irish) in America were almost to a man on the side of independence." Douglas Campbell concurs in this judgment. "In the colonial wars the Covenanter section furnished most of the soldiers of Virginia" and "in Pennsylvania they stood up as a unit for independence." "They furnished to the Continental army a majority of the troops from that State."

But perhaps the largest contribution—certainly a very large one—which the Covenanter soldier made to the successes of the American arms in the Revolutionary struggle, was in his constant fighting with the Indians along the western borders. "Official records show, that it was as much the policy of the British ministry to destroy the settlements west of the Alleghanies and the Blue Ridge, as it was to overcome the army of Washington." (*Covenanter, Cavalier and Puritan*.) But, thanks to these sturdy frontier soldiers—almost wholly of the Covenanter stock—at the close of the war *not one* of those settlements had been lost. And when, in the great conflict for freedom, did the tide turn fully and finally in favor of the American arms? We have the authority of Thomas Jefferson for the statement, that the victory at the battle of King's Mountain "was the joyful announcement of that turn in the tide of success, that

terminated the Revolutionary war with the seal of our independence." The heroes of that brilliant victory were Lewis and Campbell and Sevier and Robertson, with their associates of the frontier—men to whom fear was a stranger and whose valor was the expression of deep-seated principle. "In the hour and five minutes, during which that terrible battle raged, two hundred and twenty of the enemy had closed their eyes in death; one hundred and eighty were wounded and six hundred were taken prisoners. Every man of the enemy was either killed, wounded or captured." It was a victory signal too in its consequences. At that time Cornwallis was on a triumphant march through North Carolina to Virginia. Charleston and Savannah had fallen. Lincoln had lost his entire army. Gates had been defeated at Camden. All Georgia and South Carolina had yielded to the British arms. Universal gloom spread throughout the colonies. In the midst of this darkness came the triumph of King's Mountain. It was the rift in the black cloud. It was the breaking of the morning.

Prof. Fiske, in his work on *American Political Ideas*, (p. 125) makes the "unqualified statement," that "the victory of Wolfe at Quebec marks the greatest turning point as yet discernible in all modern history." In close connection with this statement he further declares that "the conquest of the North American continent by men of English race was unquestionably the most prodigious event in the political annals of mankind."

Accepting the general truth of these broad assertions, we find in them full confirmation of the position taken in the opening sentences of this paper, viz: that the discovery of this continent by Cabot was providentially in the line of its Protestant colonization. For "the power of self-government," which Prof. Fiske regards as England's greatest gift to America, was incontestably the result of that Protestantism which she possessed both before and

especially after the Reformation. Cabot opened the door for Protestant possession, and Wolfe made sure the unhindered progress of Protestant principles, and America became the home of Protestant Christianity.

When, therefore, the "critical period" of our American development had been reached—that period lying between the close of the Revolutionary War and the adoption of the Federal Constitution—these great historical events found their explanation and their opportunity. A fair field was opened for the working of the principles of freedom. How should they be set in action? It was a question hard to answer. Diversity of interests—now that the dangers of war, which had hitherto held them together, were removed—threatened the colonies with separation and disaster. But the God who had provided a Cabot for discovery and a Wolfe for victory, had ready for our needs a Washington as a leader, a Jefferson, a Hamilton, a Rutledge, a Madison, an Adams, and many besides, as framers of our free institutions. We cherish with pride the record of their masterful achievements. They set up a government for the United States of America. They framed a Constitution for its organic law which England's greatest statesman of this century, "The Grand Old Man," described as "the most wonderful work ever struck, at a given time, by the brain and purpose of man."

These builders of our State represented no single section or race. And what were the several contributions which individuals or classes made to the political fabric, it would be impossible to tell. It is, however, only just to say, that the Scotch-Irish elements in the American population at this critical period were prominently active in these governmental achievements. A strong love of freedom and a rational understanding of its essential nature were inheritances from their stalwart, liberty-loving ancestry. Their deepest convictions pointed to law as the rule of duty and to obedience to regulated authority as a necessary con-

dition of political freedom. The early settlements of these people showed how readily their principles took form in systems of government. "The first men on the continent to establish a free and independent community were the Watauga Association in what is now East Tennessee. The Watauga settlers outlined in advance the nation's work. They successfully solved the difficult problem of self-government!" (*Winning of the West*, Vol. I, p. 193).

It was men of the same blood who, in 1773, "held in the county of Worcester, Massachusetts, where, half a century before, fifty Covenanter families had settled, the first public meeting in the colonies which set forth the precise essential principles of the Declaration of Independence. And in the year 1775, thirteen months before the great Declaration was proclaimed at Philadelphia, Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, had rendered her name forever immortal by her clear statement of the principles of liberty and the bold resolve, "we do hereby declare ourselves a free and independent people." And as we read the memoirs of the Federal Constitutional Convention we recognize Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, John Rutledge and James Wilson as the leaders in its great achievements. "Three of these were of Covenanter blood, and the fourth learned his political lessons at the feet of John Wither- spoon." The public men of that day and a little later were, in full proportion, from this same stock. Of the fifty-five signers of the Declaration of Independence, more than one-fourth belonged to this class. Thirty-nine general officers in the Continental army were Scotch-Irishmen. Ten of these were major generals. Very many of the early governors of the colonies and a large proportion of the members of the Legislatures, especially in the Central and Southern States, belonged to the Covenanter race. In cabinet and council, not less than in the clearing and in the battlefield, the men of Scotch-Irish blood were found at the front. As Immigrant and Pioneer, and as Soldier and

Statesman he served his country well, manifesting by noble actions the strong principles of his Covenanter blood and creed.

But instructive and important as it is at times to trace back the streams of our national life to the several fountains out of which they have flowed, it is yet a far richer pleasure to watch these streams as they lose themselves in the broad, deep river of our country's citizenship. The distinctions of the past are gone. There are no longer Covenanters or Cavaliers, Puritans, Dutchmen or Huguenots. All are Americans.

W. F. JUNKIN.

Montclair, N. J.

EDITORIAL.

It is deemed fitting that some explanation should be made of the late appearance of this number of the QUARTERLY. The transfer of management was made late in December and the new publication office had to secure suitable supplies, which could not be done, as in the case of Greek and Hebrew type, without considerable delay. The delay, however, secured to our readers such admirable articles as those by Herrick Johnson, W. W. Moore and R. C. Reed. Other articles had been secured by the former editor, Rev. S. C. Byrd, some of which are published in this number and some reserved for the April number which may be expected the first of that month.

We take this opportunity to thank our contemporaries North and South for their kind words. We hope to fulfil their predictions of success. A Review of the character of the QUARTERLY has necessarily a limited circulation, among the more scholarly of our ministers and people. It is moreover entirely dependent upon its subscription list for the necessary expenses of publication. But its value to the Southern Church can hardly be estimated in stimulating special study along the lines of theological and philosophical literature as well as in the value to others of the results of such studies as are published and preserved in our own Review.

The editor asks that subscriptions be promptly paid, and pledges his best efforts to render THE QUARTERLY well worth the subscription price.

It is perhaps not amiss to state clearly the position of the editor. He is responsible for the management of THE QUARTERLY, editorially and financially. All communications should be addressed to him, and correspondents will please note that the publication office is at Charlotte,

North Carolina. Associated with the editor are Dr. Stricker and Dr. Summey, who have had charge of THE QUARTERLY from the beginning. Dr. Beatty has consented to serve in place of the lamented Dr. Barnett, and Rev. S. C. Byrd has agreed to remain with THE QUARTERLY as associate editor. Thus the four theological schools of the Church and four sections of the South are represented.

1898. RECORD AND REVIEW.

(Hereafter this department will be devoted to a review of the religious events of the preceding quarter.)

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN.

The year 1898 will be remembered as one in which a large number of noble and useful servants of Christ were called to the higher service of Heaven. On January 4, Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., died at his home in Texas and the mortal remains were borne to the cemetery at Hampden-Sidney, Dr. Moses Hoge officiating at the funeral services. Born March 5, 1820; student at Hampden-Sidney College, the University of Virginia, and Union Seminary; pastor of Tinkling Spring Church; Professor at Union Seminary, first of History and then of Theology; Chaplain in the Confederate Army; Chief-of-staff to General T. J. Jackson; Co-pastor of College Church; Moderator of the General Assembly of 1870; Professor of Philosophy in the University of Texas and Teacher in the Theological School at Austin; he was great in all the varied activities of his useful life. The books which he has given to the world can only partially represent the man as he was, the greatest scholar of the Southern Church, and perhaps the first theologian of his generation.

Rev. John L. Girardeau was to Columbia Seminary what Dr. Dabney had been to Union. He was born on James Island, St. Andrew's Parish, South Carolina, on November 14, 1825. Graduating at the College of Charleston with high honor and later at Columbia Seminary, he began his

pastoral work at Wilton Church and then went to Charleston where he engaged in work among the negroes, a cause in which he was always profoundly interested. He also was a chaplain in the Confederate service, then became pastor of Zion Presbyterian Church, Charleston, and in 1876 was elected Professor of Theology in Columbia Seminary. His active labors ceased in 1895 and God called him home in midsummer of this year, 1898. He was a man of intense conviction, of deep spirituality, of simple, humble piety, and one of the most gifted pulpit orators the South has produced.

Rev. T. D. Witherspoon, D. D., was a man who combined profound and accurate scholarship with energetic and practical work for the Master. At the time of his death, November 3, he was Professor in Louisville Seminary, Chairman of Synodical Missions for Kentucky, and during the summer he had been personally conducting the evangelistic work in the mountains.

Early in the year, January 14, Rev. E. A. Ramsey, D. D., rested from earthly labors. He graduated at Davidson College and Union Seminary, and at the time of his death was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Memphis. He was an earnest, evangelical preacher and a man of great vigor of body and mind. He was useful in his day and generation.

Rev. E. H. Barnett, D. D., was a preacher of no mean attainments but his pastoral work in its thoroughness and far-reaching influence was the despair of his brethren of the ministry. With pulpit gifts that kept his large church well filled the year round, he was untiring in his visitation of his people and in the effectiveness of his pastoral work. He was greatly beloved. His death occurred on the 20th of September. He was one of the first editors of the QUARTERLY.

Rev. J. M. Rawlings, D. D., passed away on the 1st of February. A soldier at sixteen; graduating after the war

at the University of Virginia and Union Seminary; pastor of the Second Church, Lynchburg; Chaplain at the University of Virginia; Pastor of the church at Spartanburg, S. C.; Chancellor of the University at Clarksville, Tenn.; he had only begun his career of usefulness and promise when he was stricken with paralysis, from which he never recovered. He was editor of the North Carolina Presbyterian for a year and was constantly preaching as opportunity offered. He was on his way to an appointment on the last day of his life and kept it with his Master in Heaven.

Rev. J. N. Saunders, D. D., was another gifted and influential minister, and so was Rev. D. O. Davies, D. D.

Other true and faithful sons whom the Church has mourned during the past year are Rev. W. C. Vardell, Rev. W. P. Allison, Rev. James Knox, Rev. T. B. Ewing, Rev. J. J. Read, Rev. J. C. Conoly, Rev. J. T. Hendrick, D. D., Rev. F. McMurray, Rev. J. V. Barks, Rev. T. E. Smith, Rev. James R. Crews, Rev. Robert Morgan, Rev. John C. Dinwiddie, Rev. J. D. Thomas, Rev. Rufus W. Shive, Rev. R. A. Bowman, Rev. Wm. H. Matthews, Rev. J. K. P. Newton, Rev. T. Smith Simrall, Rev. W. E. Keller, Rev. T. S. Johnson, Rev. C. E. Chichester.

THE HOUSTON CASE.

The prominence of Rev. M. H. Houston, D. D., in the Church, his unquestioned ability, his deep spirituality, and especially the services he had rendered as Missionary, Secretary of Foreign Missions and Missionary again, made his case a celebrated one, and while his trial before Louisville Presbytery occurred on December 23, 1897, there was some correspondence between him and his Presbytery during the past year and much discussion of the several aspects of the case. The Presbytery after some remonstrance with Dr. Houston finally cited him to trial for views and practices at variance with the Presbyterian Standards, and passed sentence of admonition against industriously spread-

ing his opinions. Thereupon Dr. Houston read a letter to the Presbytery in which he said: "I now give back to the Presbytery of Louisville all rights and privileges that I received by my ordination as a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and I take my place as a private member of the Church."

This action was almost universally regarded as a wise and peaceful issue of the case. Dr. Houston was supposed to have requested a dismissal from the ministry according to Chapter 12, Section 3, of the Book of Church Order. In fact we have his authority for saying that he would have been more than glad if the Presbytery could have taken that view of his letter. But the Presbytery on April 15 adopted a report saying that it did not seem admissible to consider Dr. Houston's letter a request to be divested of his office, though it resolved to communicate with Dr. Houston its readiness to consider such request from him. Dr. Houston did not answer a letter from the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery, so in September another was written to which Dr. Houston replied:

DEAR BROTHER:—I have received to-day your letter of the 13th inst., with the enclosed "Presbyterial Report of Louisville Presbytery." As you state in your letter that you desire to be assured that this enclosure has reached me, I very cheerfully send you this acknowledgment as a matter of Christian courtesy. A former copy of the Presbyterial Report which you sent me was not acknowledged by me for the reason that on December 23, 1897, I gave back to the Presbytery of Louisville all rights and privileges that I had received by my ordination as a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and took my place as a private member of the Church.

With cordial wishes for the welfare of yourself and all your associates in the Presbytery of Louisville, I am,

Fraternally yours,

M. H. HOUSTON.

Upon the receipt of this letter the Presbytery

Resolved, That the Presbytery does hereby institute process against Rev. M. H. Houston, D. D., and cite him to appear before this Presbytery at its approaching spring session to be held at Anchorage, Ky., on Tuesday, April —, 1899, to answer to the charge of contumacy.

And the Presbytery does hereby appoint Rev. J. S. Lyons, D. D., Rev.

C. R. Hemphill, D. D., and Rev. D. M. Sweets to prepare the indictment and to prosecute the case, with instructions to present the indictment to Presbytery at an adjourned meeting to be held at Carlisle, Ky., during the sessions of Synod.

This action of the Presbytery was the occasion of a good deal of criticism and at a subsequent meeting of the Presbytery it was reconsidered and a substitute adopted which "defined the status of Rev. M. H. Houston to be that of a minister upon its roll, whose ordination now is in full force and upon whom rests an admonition in regard to certain particulars of teaching and practice."

It is evident from the history of this case that our Book needs amendment in this particular. Dr. Houston could not conscientiously say that he did not believe himself called to the ministry or that he had proved unacceptable to the Church. The Presbytery could not consider his statement a request in the form prescribed by the Book. There should certainly be some provision made for those who desire to leave the ministry on account of divergence from the Standards. Such an amendment as this might suit the case.

After the words, "if he has satisfactory evidence of his inability to serve the Church with acceptance," add, "or if he believes his views of doctrine or of government to be at variance with the standards of the Presbyterian Church."

The history of the Assembly was given in the last number of THE QUARTERLY.

NORTHERN PRESBYTERIAN.

The last number of THE QUARTERLY containing an account of the Assembly at Winona, gave a resume of the work of the Northern Church, the McGiffert case, the change in the administration of the Home Mission Board and the Westminster Assembly celebration.

The Church has lost two great men in the death of Dr. John Hall, pastor of Fifth Avenue Church, and of Dr. Samuel A. Mutchmore, editor of the *Presbyterian*.

REFORMED CHURCH.

JUNE.—The General Synod of this church met at Asbury Park, June 1st. There were 175 delegates. Rev. Edward Benton Cox, D. D., L.L.D, was elected President. An interesting report was made of the researches made by Dr. E. T. Corwin among the archives of the Netherlands. The publication of these papers, which is promised in a few years, will be of exceeding interest to the whole Protestant world. A memorial was read to the Synod from seventeen members of the Church—mostly theological students—desiring to be sent to the foreign field. After a long but most friendly contest Prof. J. H. Gillespie, Professor of Greek in Hope College, was elected Professor of Exegesis in New Brunswick Seminary, in place of Prof. James H. Riggs.

ASSOCIATE REFORMED.

The Synod of the Associate Reformed Church met in Chester, S. C., Nov. 10, and Rev. J. C. Galloway was elected Moderator. The work of the Synod is in a prosperous condition, and the meeting was harmonious and helpful to the cause of Christ. This noble body of Calvinists is so close to our own in all matters of faith and doctrine, that the separation of the two on common Southern soil has always been a matter of regret to our Church. Accordingly overtures of union, if that could be possible without the sacrifice of principle, were adopted by the last Assembly and Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D. D., of Rock Hill, S. C., one of the members of the committee appointed by the Assembly, addressed the Synod on the proposition of Organic Union, on behalf of the committee and the Assembly.

His address was a model of taste and skill, as well as a manifestation of the sincere esteem and affection in which we hold our A. R. P. brethren.

His main points were the holding of the same faith and order by the two Churches, the fact that both were Southern Churches, that our ideas on the spirituality of the

Church were identical, that union would prevent hurtful rivalries and enable us to husband our resources better. Finally that the question about the songs of praise showed a difference more real than apparent. Dr. Galloway responded with great courtesy, expressing his Synod's admiration for our Church, but stating that it was a three-fold principle of the Associate Reformed Church to read the Word, preach the Word and sing the Word.

The Committee appointed to take official action courteously declined to accept the overture. So ends the matter for the present, at least.

We would offer the remark, however, that our Church believes in singing the Word in exactly the same sense that the A. R. P. Church believes in preaching the Word. The sermons of its ministers are not paraphrases of Scripture, but human and uninspired expositions of Scripture. Doubtless the protest of the A. R. P. Church on the question of Scriptural singing has had its effect in excluding from the hymnology of the Church much of the trash and rubbish that are called hymns. But we have no doubt that the Committee on our new Hymn Book could easily prefix an appropriate Scripture text, often one of the Psalms, to the hymns they will select, and that the hymns will all be sermons in song on Scripture texts. So we can meet them on their own platform of preaching the Word, singing the Word and reading the Word.

The United Presbyterian Church also made an overture on Organic Union which seems to have met with a more favorable consideration.

We have often wondered whether our brethren of these two Churches would permit a paraphrase of what scholars consider the earliest Christian hymn.

If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him

If we suffer, we shall also reign with him:

If we deny him he also will deny us:

If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful.

He cannot deny himself.

If Paul had been an Associate Reformed Presbyterian (we believe he was a Presbyterian of some kind) he would have condemned the singing of that hymn because it was not a paraphrase. But since he has set the seal of inspiration upon it, what are we going to do about it?

EPISCOPAL.

JANUARY.—The election of Archdeacon Brown, of Cleveland, O., as bishop-coadjutor of Arkansas, stirred up considerable feeling. It was charged by an opposing minority that the election was “compassed by trickery, fraud and violence;” that Dr. Brown was elected on account of his wealth, and after intimidating those who were supported by mission funds. It is said that the Church was left divided paralyzed and almost helpless and hopeless.

JUNE.—Forty-six students graduated from the General Theological Seminary of New York.

JULY.—There has been a crisis in the Anglican Church of Toronto. In the contest between High and Low Church in 1879 Rev. Arthur Sweatman was elected Bishop as a compromise candidate. But he soon showed his partiality for the High Church Party and alienated those of Low Church tendencies. Besides which his administration of official duties has been so lax as to be almost scandalous. At the Annual Synod of the Diocese his administration was criticised so severely that the Bishop determined to resign. But the most influential men of both parties induced him to reconsider his resolve, after paying him for the arrearages due on his salary and passing a vote of confidence.

One of the Low Church ministers was severely censured for officiating at the marriage of a divorced person, and it was decided that no Diocesan property should be rented for liquor-selling purposes.

The Triennial Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church met in Washington, D. C., in October, and adjourned after a three week's session, to meet in San Fran-

cisco in 1901. It was in many respects a notable assembly.

1. For its catholicity. There seems to have been a reaction from the exclusive claims that have been so common with its smaller ecclesiastics. Perhaps the effect of the Lambeth Articles has been good upon the Church that sent them forth. Logic will have its way at last and it must have dawned upon the supporters of these articles looking to the union of Christendom, that other Christians were far ahead of them in manifesting that spirit of unity that must come before any visible bond. It is with great pleasure that we publish these words from the opening sermon by Bishop Tuttle: "What a blessed lengthening out of the cords of the Church it is when our minds grasp and our hearts take in the truth, that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ and are baptized in the name of the blessed Trinity are members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, no matter by what of earth's shibboleths they call themselves, and are partakers of his grace and full sharers in his bequeathed estate and brothers of ourselves." And the pastoral letter read at the close of the Convention declared one of the needs of the Church to be "more catholicity of evangelism and less ecclesiastical self-sufficiency."

2. Its conservatism. This is no new characteristic. But it was refreshing to see the unanimity with which the Convention refused to change the honorable and descriptive name of their Church—Protestant Episcopal. "Known in law as the Protestant Episcopal Church" could not stand. "That made the Church instead of our mother, our mother-in-law," said one of the delegates. The church at Jamestown, Va., whither the Convention journeyed on a pilgrimage, was the first Protestant church built in America.

There was nothing done as to the proposed change in the matter of the law of divorce. There are two parties in the Church on this question, some holding to the words of the prayer-book that marriage is "till death us do part,"

others accepting the words of Christ that in divorce for the only just cause the innocent party may marry again. In these days of loose ideas on this whole subject of divorce, the Protestant Episcopal Church is doing much for the cause of righteousness. There should be no "forbidding to marry," however, where Christ has allowed it. We fear that our own Church weakened its testimony against the evils of divorce by admitting desertion as an adequate cause for separation—carrying with it the right of remarriage by the innocent party. A good many Presbyterian ministers will consult their own consciences in that particular before performing the marriage ceremony.

3. The tendency to representative government. This was shown in the persistence with which the standing committees held to their privilege of taking part in the election of bishops. And again in the article looking to the erection of an appellate court—at which some Presbyterians, familiar with the working of their own system, will smile complacently.

When the Lambeth Articles, looking to the union of Christendom on the basis of the "Historic Episcopate" were first adopted, it was proposed to allow congregations who did not wish to use the prayer-book to come into the Episcopal Church. The proposal was almost unanimously defeated. On a second trial the bishops rebuked the plan as disloyal to the Church. At this convention the following compromise was adopted: "Provision may be made by canon for the temporary use of other forms and directories of worship by congregations not already in union with this Church, who are willing to accept the spiritual oversight of the bishop of the diocese." That is a great concession. But as to its practical value, an Episcopal clergyman in Virginia is responsible for the following illustration: "A public hall was once crowded to the doors, which were shut fast to keep out the surging crowd outside. When it became necessary to open the doors there

was great trepidation lest the building should suddenly become unmanageably full. But when the doors were cautiously opened it was found that there was nobody there." Does anyone happen to think of a few congregations who are unwilling to use the prayer-book, but who are "willing to accept the spiritual oversight of the bishop of the diocese."

At the celebration at Jamestown, much was made of the fact that a House of Burgesses was elected there by Episcopalians, the beginning of representative government in America. But there was already a Parliament in England, contending for the rights of the people against Bishop and Throne. And when the Parliament won the victory of civil and religious liberty under Cromwell, Episcopal Virginia remained true to the Throne, and its name of "Old Dominion" is an historic protest against the claims that the Episcopal Church was on the side of the liberty and independence of the Colony. The Protestant Episcopal Church of America ought not to disturb itself so much about that Revolutionary history, because it is not the Church which favored royalist and ecclesiastical tyranny, but is a later organization.

One resolution that has a semi-humorous side was that appointing a commission to enquire into the orders of the Reformed Episcopal Church. That marks an advance certainly over the year 1867 when Rev. S. H. Tyng was tried for preaching in a Methodist Church, or over the year 1868 when Rev. J. P. Hubbard was tried for exchanging pulpits with a Baptist minister, or even over the year 1873 when Bishop George D. Cummins officiated in some joint communion services in New York City, for which he was so mercilessly assailed by his brethren that he withdrew from the Protestant Episcopal Church, and, with eight clergymen and twenty laymen, organized the Reformed Episcopal Church, one of whose published tenets is the rejection, as contrary to the Word of God, of the doctrine

that "the Church of Christ exists in only one order or form of ecclesiastical polity." But the reader will remember that Bishop Cummins was a duly consecrated Bishop. He had that mysterious something that had been handed down through the long line of the Historic Episcopate from the Apostles themselves. Could he lose it? If so, might not some one in the line have lost it before and the validity of all orders be thereby imperilled? If not, could he not run off with it and confer it upon some one else? So there is a commission now to enquire into the validity of the orders that were conferred by Bishop Cummins. We hope they will be found valid and that some day the two churches will get together on the broad platform of the Reformed organization. Such a protest was never made in vain, as the quotation from Bishop Tuttle's sermon shows.

One thing that added strength to the Convention was the fact that it was national. In avoiding the causes of division on the questions arising out of the Civil War the Episcopal Church showed itself far wiser than the Presbyterian, the Methodist or the Baptist Churches.

METHODIST.

JANUARY.—The two commissions appointed by the Northern and Southern Methodist Churches met in Washington and adopted the paper drawn up by the Southern representation looking to a federation of the Churches. The paper adopted recommends to the general conferences a common catechism, hymn-book and order of worship, joint regulation of the Epworth League and expedients for co-operation in church work at home and abroad.

FEBRUARY.—The seventy-ninth annual report of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North, shows 190 foreign missionaries, 646 ordained preachers and 169,500 members in foreign fields. Total receipts for the year, \$1,693,621.

JUNE.—The Southern Methodist General Conference met in Baltimore on May 5 and continued in session until May 23. The session was characterized by a spirit of concession and was harmonious throughout. Dr. J. M. Buckley seemed to voice the sentiments of a majority of the Conference when he said that Organic Union as an end was far inferior in importance to genuine Christian unity. Plans were made for raising \$1,500,00 during the closing years of the century to be applied to the equipment and endowment of colleges. Bishop Morrison and Bishop Candler were the two elected to this office during the Conference. In spite of some discord, especially in the matter of perfectionism, the Southern Methodist Church begins another quadrennium under favorable auspices.

BAPTIST.

The Southern Baptist Convention met at Norfolk in May and with the exception of the Whitsett controversy had a harmonious and profitable session. The work of the Church is going forward in all directions. The Convention, representing the brains and property of the denomination, stood by Dr. Whitsett. But after the Convention there was so much contention in the association and so many threats against the Seminary, of which Dr. Whitsett was the honored President, that he tendered his resignation to the Board of Trustees, thus sacrificing himself for the peace of his Church. It is a peace dearly bought. Dr. Whitsett was scholar enough to know the history of English Baptists and to know that immersion was not at first practiced by them. He was man enough to tell the truth about these facts. It does not touch the theory that immersion is the Scriptural mode of baptism, though it does make it a little awkward for close-unionists that the modern founders of their denomination were not even baptized. But so much the worse for the facts and these discoveries. It is an episode very similar to the case of Galileo and the Romish Church.

Dr. Whitsitt, however, has more backbone than Galileo, and there is no hint of a recantation from him. Meanwhile the earth continues to revolve around the sun and the fact remains that the early English and American Baptists did not practise immersion.

APRIL 20.—The famous Metropolitan Tabernacle in London, known as Spurgeon's Tabernacle, was destroyed by fire. Pastor's College, on the next block, was saved. The cost of the Tabernacle—\$175,000—was not quite covered by insurance. Rev. Thomas Spurgeon, the present pastor, made at once an earnest appeal for subscriptions for a new building.

LUTHERAN.

MARCH—The General Synod of the Lutheran Church appointed a Deaconess Board for the purpose of awakening a general interest in the office and work of deaconesses—founding training schools and supplying congregations with deaconesses.

The General Evangelical Synod of Prussia held its biennial session in Berlin, lasting over three weeks. The Synod represents the nine old Prussian Provinces and is neither distinctly Lutheran nor Reformed, but the King of Prussia is the *summus episcopus* and the Synod has no power of final legislation. The question of theological students and the German universities was the main one before the Synod. The Synod shortened the term at the universities and put an interval of two years between graduation there and ordination, one of which is to be spent as assistant to some pastor approved by the consistory. This puts the completion of the students' education in the hands of the conservative and evangelical pastors.

INTER-DENOMINATIONAL.

FEBRUARY.—The third convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions met at Cleveland, Ohio. The movement has for its field 1,000 institutions

of higher learning in the United States and Canada. It has an enrollment of 4,000 members, and 1,100 of these have gone to the foreign field.

MARCH.—D. L. Moody closed an eight-days' evangelistic meeting in New York City in the Grand Central Palace. The meeting was continuous—from ten o'clock in the morning to eleven at night—and Mr. Moody was assisted by many co-workers. Thousands listened daily to the telling of the old, old story.

Rev. Alexander McLean, D. D., General Secretary of the American Bible Society, died this month. He was a familiar figure at the various assemblies of the Churches, and his loss is a serious blow to the Society.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.

There is a remarkable movement going on among the priests of the French Catholic Church, in which separation from that Church and the preaching of the Gospel only are the distinctive features. These priests do not yet propose to identify themselves with the Protestant Church. There is also a most successful work being done among the Italian priests by the Waldensian Church.

FEBRUARY.—Hoffman's "Catholic Directory" just issued claims to be accurately compiled from official sources alone, and the statistics show 10,911 priests, 9,570 churches and missions and a Catholic population of 9,856,622 in America. This shows a decrease of 100 churches during the year and an increase of 260,195 members.

APRIL.—Cardinal Goschereau, Archbishop of Quebec, died in that city April 12.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL DISCOVERIES.

One of the interesting discoveries in archæology made this year is that of a marble block in the ruins of Corinth. The American School at Athens, under the direction of Prof. Roper P. Richardson, has been making excavations in

Corinth and this is the first important find. The stone contains a mutilated inscription with the letters remaining ΑΓΩΓΗΕΒΡ, the A and the P being slightly erased. Completing the inscription we have ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ, Synagogue of the Hebrews, and in all probability this is all that is left of the Synagogue of the Jews at Corinth, where Paul "reasoned every Sabbath and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks."

Careful study of the papyrus leaf on which were recorded the famous Logia has recovered a part of one more Saying. It reads: "Jesus said: Thou hearest with one ear," and the antithesis is confidently supplied, but the other ear hast thou closed.

NOTES.

THE SKULL HILL: HAS GOLGOTHA BEEN DISCOVERED?

One of the living questions, which meets you at the table, on the street, in the parlor, everywhere at Jerusalem to-day, is that of the scene of the crucifixion of our Lord. Not that the identification of the locality is a necessity—not that it is necessary in the interests of Protestantism to establish a site other than the present Holy Sepulchre—not that God has not, for some wise purpose concealed the exact spot; but this interest arises from other and entirely different considerations, viz: the investigation of facts and the satisfaction derived from their establishment, as far as this can be done. This question is approached with diffidence because it has been discussed for centuries by some of the most enlightened of mankind. To cast a shadow on the present location is to undermine venerable tradition, as well as to pour contempt on the devotion of the faithful who have hallowed it as a shrine for fifteen centuries.

The writer has no zeal as to any particular site. Nor does he lay claim to any detailed investigation of the subject. He merely presents the considerations as they have occurred to him, leaving the reader to draw his own conclusion. These observations though cursory were formed on the ground, and are based, it is hoped, on common sense.

THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

The settlement of the question as to the claims of the present church hinges on Tradition and Topography. An eminent modern excavator and authority observed to the writer that tradition was the main and perhaps the only buttress for this church, and he added that this advantage attached to it. It gave a certain plausibility as against any other place not thus supported. But when we remember how full the Holy Land is of unholy things, how easily traditions take root and upon what slender basis, they are established, we are on our guard at once. The appearances are all unfavorable to the claims of this church. One is impressed with the number and character of the "pious frauds" that have assembled in it. Foremost among them the miracles of "the invention" of the Sepulchre as well as the finding of the true cross. Added to these the Sacred Fire which Dean Stanley declares, "Considering the time, place and intention of the professed miracle, it is probably the most offensive imposition to be found in the Christian world." And when one is shown the hillock in the church on which, the tragedy of heaven and earth, was enacted, with its lamps and brass and silver he turns away convinced that the probabilities are against these precincts. Baedeker, than whom there is no more astute or correct secular authority, describes this eminence, and in so doing stamps it with improba-

bility. "The eminence is only fourteen and one half feet above the level of the church. The place for the cross is perched upon the apex of this rock. It is however not yet ascertained whether this eminence consists of natural rock; judging from the sub-stratum we should rather infer the contrary. Herr Conrad Schick, however, Recent Palestine Explorations, claims that it is living rock. Nor is any hill mentioned here until the time of the pilgrim of Bordeaux, after which there is a long silence on the subject. In the East apse is shown an opening faced with silver where the cross is said to have been inserted in the rock. The site of the crosses of the two thieves is shown in the corner of the altar place. Each five feet distant from the cross of Christ—doubtless much too near. They are first mentioned in the middle ages. About four and one-half feet from the cross of Christ is the famous cleft in the rock (Matt. 27, 51) now covered with a brass slide under which there is a grating of the same metal. When the slab is pushed aside a cleft about sixteen inches in depth is seen, the character of the rock being not easily distinguished." So much for the appearances.

1. As to the tradition. Eusebius writes that during the excavations in the reign of Constantine "contrary to all expectations" the Holy Sepulchre was discovered. The mother of Constantine prompted by divine vision undertook a journey to Jerusalem and she and Bishop Macarius by miracle discovered not only the Holy Sepulchre but the true cross also. They were guided in locating the site by the tradition that Hadrian had erected a temple to Venus on the spot of the crucifixion, to outrage the Jews. But as Dean Stanley, who is as learned as fair, well remarks, "It is hardly conceivable, that Hadrian could have had any motive, in his original purpose, when that motive was to insult the Jews, rather than the Christians, who, at that time were not only separate and distinct from the Jews but clearly so contemptible as to be beneath his notice." See Milman's History of Christianity, Vol. 1, p. 417, where this issue is squarely made. And further there is not a reference by Origen or Justin to the companion temple at Bethlehem, though erected by the same Emperor for the same purpose: though these writers speak of the cave at Bethlehem and both wrote within a hundred years of the time. This is the origin and basis of the tradition upon which the Holy Sepulchre rests its claim. But when we think of the convulsions through which the city passed through those first centuries, and how everything was turned under by the iron plow share of Roman desolation, and how not even "one stone was left on another," we can readily see how easily the site could have been lost. And if its discovery depends on the act of the heathen emperor erecting a shrine to insult the Jews how very difficult it is to base any argument on that incident to determine the site of the church for the Christians. Then these sites passed through further cataclasm, in which they have been covered, with the accumulated debris of the ages, as they were trampled over by Roman, Persian and Mohammedan warriors, in turn, so that the possibility of tracing any site even one founded upon such a tradition, is exceedingly remote, if not absolutely impossible.

2. As to the Topography. Very few authorities are bold enough to claim that the church is within the ancient wall. As this is a necessity according to the narrative, (Matt. 28, 11. Heb. 13, 12) its improbability has discredited this situation more than anything else. But we frankly admit that while everything seems to be against the locality topographically, yet it is difficult to decide the question as to the line of the ancient wall without further excavation. The case against it is well presented by Thomson who was a careful, minute and accurate observer. Thompson's Land and the Book p. 486, Vol. I. He declares that no practical engineer would select a line for the second wall which starting at the tower of Hippicus on the west and ending at the northwest corner of the temple area should leave the site of the Holy Sepulchre west or northwest of it. This carries the wall down into the hollow and makes such a sharp angle that the area would be cramped beyond all conception, and on this line it would be difficult to carry it north to the temple area. This would make the configuration of the city wall preposterous, and the only reason for running it thus, is to place the Holy Sepulchre outside of it. Moreover it would be ridiculous for purposes of defense—there being higher ground immediately north of this wall. And this would not have been countenanced in the day when the wall was the essential defence of the city. In order to exclude the Holy Sepulchre the second wall must have made a deep bend eastwards, and descended into the upper valley of the Cheesemongērs and then followed that valley northwards to the Damascus gate. This line appears so forced and unnatural, that it must fail of acceptance. The other line, on the contrary, for the wall, beyond all these points gives the city, a well defined area, and makes it strategically defensible. This is fatal to the claims of the present building, and as long as the topography is what it is, will suggest grave doubts in regard to it. And on these grounds almost all authorities, either view it with suspicion, or abandon it entirely. The argument of Dr. Robinson seems to make a final disposition of it, if anything else were necessary. See Biblical Researches by Dr. Edward Robinson. Now if the present site is discounted, both on traditional and topographical grounds, is there any other point that fulfills the required conditions? There is a spot beyond the present walls, and almost certainly beyond the ancient walls to which attention is turning more and more in recent years. Indeed, it is the only spot now much thought of, in this connection. Some authorities have located it on the brow of the Kidron others, as Fergusson, at the Mosque of Omar, but against all of these are serious objections, both on account of the precipitous character of the ground on the East, and the nearness of the old wall to the brow of the declivity. Even if there had been room, it could not have been visible—except from Scopus or the Mount of Olives. They have been for the most part abandoned. So that to-day the consensus of modern opinion follows the northern trend. The various writers, notably Germans, among them Kortens, first suggested doubts as to the genuineness of the claims of the Holy Sepulchre. But not

until the time of the famous Chinese Gordon was the locality, which is sometimes associated with his name, brought into prominence. After mapping the ground and making careful investigations, this Christian engineer, was forced to the conclusion that the Skull Hill north of the Damascus gate was the scene of this unique tragedy.

THE SKULL PLACE.

In the examination of the claims of this locality, the writer acknowledges that one difficulty lies in identifying this with the Skull Hill. To do this he does not rely on the real or fancied resemblance of the place to a skull, which has been noted by many and recognized by some, though the spot had never been pointed out to them. It may be well to say that the eminence is about sixty feet in height, that it is about one hundred paces north and east of the Damascus Gate, and just opposite the Cotton Grottoes, otherwise known as Ancient Quarries. With those quarries it must have been connected, before the escarpment was taken away, and the street run through at this point. Then probably the foot of the hill extended to the wall, from which it was easily accessible by a gate marked in the old maps as Herod's Gate. But why can it be said that this was the place of the skull? (Gulgoltha in the Aramaic.) Because it was the place of execution. Geikie, than whom there is no more reliable or erudite investigator, says the "place of stoning where Jewish criminals were put to death, lay at its foot." And as this was not far from the Tower of Antonia, the prison and the Roman quarter of the city, it would be naturally the execution ground for the Romans, because they could easily hurry the criminal to that point and the path would be wholly within the Roman quarter. And in those cruel days of a bloody power, little attention was paid to sepulture, therefore bones and skulls would be found lying around. Hence, and most naturally the name Skull Place. To confirm this, excavations have shown that the ancient graves at that point, are neither Jewish nor Mohammedan, while there are some modern Mohammedan places of burial. In the older ones, however, bones and bodies seem to have been thrown together, two or more in one grave, as the Romans often buried their criminals. This is never done by Jews or Mohammedans. On inquiring if there was any tradition of this as a criminal spot, a missionary residing there, for a long time, informed the writer that he had heard of it. And that the Jews were wont to pronounce a curse, as they passed by. Saying, "cursed be he who brought ruin on our city by claiming to be our king." While this is discredited as tradition, still it lends a certain plausibility to the above allegations. But the main contention is as to the fulfillment of other conditions, as to the "nighness," the roads, and especially the wall. It is remarkable how it meets these requirements.

1. "Nigh the city." This vicinity is so near as to be easily accessible from the Damascus Gate, or Herod's Gate, from the Roman Quarter, over the site of the quarry excavations, made probably since that time. Being a prominent point, it was visible from all the hills about, the walls and even the roofs, of the houses in the city.

2. Convenient to the roads. The narrative requires it to be near enough for the passers by to "wag their heads" at the Saviour," also it is said the procession met "Simon coming out of the country." Now no locality could come nearer these requirements. This skull hill is in the elbow formed by the Damascus and the Jericho roads. These roads as Thomson remarks, and as all travellers know, never change. Owing to the limestone formation of the country they run, just where they have always run. The old remains at the Damascus Gate, almost, establish the fact that this is an old gate, and that the road must have always entered the city at this point. And the same remark applies to the Jericho road ascending from the Kidron and hugging the north wall of the city. No place could have been more public. Here four ancient roads may be said to meet.

3. But the last link in this chain is the most difficult because of the lack of excavation data, viz: the line of the ancient wall. It is called the second wall, and is thought to have been erected by Agrippa near the time of the death of Christ. The decision of this question will be settled, if ever, by the location of that wall. Josephus says the wall was circling (Kukluomenon.) Dr. Frederick Bliss, to whom reference has already been made, in this communication, one of the most recent excavators and perhaps the best modern authority, informed the writer that three points in the old wall are fairly well established.

One at the Freres College, north and east of the Joppa Gate. A second at the Damascus Gate, with a third at a point east of the Holy Sepulchre. A line drawn through these points gives the "circling" wall of Josephus. This line is outside of the Holy Sepulchre and inside of the skull hill, and the point at the Damascus Gate as most northern and most important, is perhaps more clearly established, than either of the three, and this too by both ancient and modern excavations. The Damascus Gate is even now one of the most striking of the five entrances to the Holy City. If that is fixed the other two fit into it easily and naturally. Captain Warren, one of the most extensive and successful and perhaps the most reliable, after Robinson, of all the observers, seems to fix the wall at this point. In his work he writes, "This gate is at present built of two very different styles of masonry, the older portion of which is probably the same as portions of the sanctuary wall. While excavating on the east of the road, outside the gate, he found a flight of steps. North of those steps was found a very ancient wall running east and west. These stones are "draughted" and similar to those at the "Wailing Place" of the Jews, but appear not to be "in situ"—there being other stones in the wall of more recent date. Nearly opposite the gate, the wall suddenly stopped, and on digging round was found to be ten feet six inches in thickness, the north side being of a different style of masonry from the south, but of a similar age. The results of these explorations are important, adds Thomson, since they confirm the opinion that there was at that point a city wall and gateway at least as ancient as the time of Herod the Great. This point is re-

garded as fairly well established by all authorities—the other points depend on more recent excavations. But Dr. Bliss remarked to the writer that the remains east of the Holy Sepulchre pointed clearly to the ancient Roman period, and that the stones indicated the inside stones of an ancient wall. All of these points are most interesting and important, but owing to the fact, that they are chiefly of archæological interest, the ordinary traveller with a modern guide, feels no interest in them, and never sees them. But they seem to have a strong bearing on the location of the old wall. And the bearing is as strong on the location of the Skull Hill as the Golgotha.

THE SEPULCHRE.

This is a very important factor in the final solution of the question. Hence we see that Constantine pressed by this necessity resorted to the miracle of the "invention" of the sepulchre. The narrative reads (John 19, 41) "Now in the place where Christ was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." On the west slope of this skull place there is a garden, which bears an ancient aspect. A garden then being as now in the East more a place for fruits and flowers and shrubbery than vegetables. In this garden was a sepulchre. And this sepulchre, averred an eminent English missionary and scholar, who has studied and written much on this question, answers every requirement. And if that is the place of the crucifixion said he, this is the place of burial almost beyond the shadow of a doubt. Witness the following facts:

- (a) This sepulchre is a very ancient burial place.
- (b) It belongs to the Herodian period with its groove, side stones and antechamber.
- (c) It seems to have been a new tomb. "Wherein never man before was laid."
- (d) It is the tomb of a man of wealth.
- (e) It never was finished. One of the loculi, only, having been completed.
- (f) It seems not to have been used but once.
- (g) The symbols of the early church are found there clearly evidencing the fact that they regarded it with reverence and perhaps used it as a place of worship.
- (h) One stooping can peer in and see the place where the linen clothes lay, as did the disciple, who came running. (John 20, 5.) When the excavations were made for the foundations of the Church of St. Stephen near by, a remarkable find was made. Two ancient inscriptions were unearthed. One of them read, "To Nonus and Onesimus, two deacons of the Resurrection, and then follow these significant words. "Buried near my Lord." One of the residents of Jerusalem cognizant of these facts said the inscription had disappeared in a very mysterious manner. And it was thought because of the probable unfavorable influ-

ence such a discovery would exert in the decision of the question as against the present Holy Sepulchre. To say the least it is very remarkable in connection with the skull place, its near neighbor, and supports very strongly the contention that the Skull Hill was the scene of the crucifixion. The only objection advanced against this spot is that Christ was probably hurried to the scene, and if the route lay by the Damascus Gate, it would have been much too long, and would have taken the procession through the most crowded portion of the city. But this is not of force, when we remember that the Skull Hill, before the Quarry work was done there, was easily accessible from Herod's Gate, just in the rear of Antonia and the Roman quarter of the city. And the Damascus Gate is also reached by another and secluded path. Christ's being a notable execution must have taken place at the stated spot. And what other could have been more appropriate than this so near, resorted to by Jews and Gentiles alike.

I leave the reader to decide as to this question, viewing the place, its character and associations, its position with respect to roads, the city, its sepulchre and especially its position with regard to the ancient wall.

Clifton Forge, Va.

E. W. McCORKLE.

The following authorities have been consulted and bring us under obligation to them :

Thomson's Land and the Book.

Stanley's Sinai and Palestine.

The Fifth Gospel.—Ott.

Recent Palestine Explorations.

MINISTERIAL RESTLESSNESS.

In one of those inimitable creations of his genius with which Mr. Addison has enriched the pages of the *Spectator*, he recalls for us a reverie into which he was led by meditating upon Horace's famous satire on the discontent of mankind with their appointed lot. He imagines a proclamation to have been issued by Jupiter designating a spot in the centre of a great plain to which every one who has a burden that he thinks more grievous than that of others around him, may come and lay his grievance down, with the view of taking that of some other, less unfortunate than himself. The essayist looks on with increasing interest as the crowds press in from every side, each man adding his sorrowful contribution, until the pile in the centre of the plain has grown to a great "mountain of miseries."

A second order then comes from the father of the gods. Every man who has thrown his burden on the pile, is to select in its place that of some other, and having taken that up is to depart with it to his home. Mr. Addison describes with matchless vividness the appearance of a poor hunch-back, who, casting a look of relief at the humps that had so long disfigured him, selects a stone in the bladder, and with erect form and graceful carriage makes his way out through the crowd, whilst the

poor sufferer, to whom that stone in the bladder had given many nights of sleeplessness, and days of agony, is but too happy to take up in its stead the humps that the hunch-back has thrown down. In the blissful consciousness of relief from suffering, he is for the time being quite indifferent to the astonished look of his friends and lady admirers, as he passes them with the two great humps looking over his shoulders.

This mutual contentment does not however last long. It takes but a few sharp twinges of the calculus, to make the man who had so congratulated himself upon escaping bodily disfigurement realize that he has purchased pulchritude of form at too great a price, and that his former affliction was much more tolerable than the one he has chosen in exchange. On the other hand, the man who had purchased relief from the calculus by consenting to wear the hunches, under the constant humiliation which his sensitive nature experiences in the consciousness of his deformity, secretly rues his bargain, and berates himself for his mistake.

It is a happy experience with both these men, when Jupiter, moved to anger by the complaints that have increased rather than diminished under his beneficent provision for exchange, orders that every man shall take up again his original burden, that which has been wisely allotted to him, and to which his shoulders have become inured by the discipline of time.

No better service, perhaps, could be rendered to the Church by some man of means at the present time, than by issuing an edition in tract form of this essay of Mr. Addison, and placing a copy in the hands of every minister throughout the land. These are times of almost unprecedented restlessness in pastoral relations. A vacancy recently occurred in one of our churches of moderate prominence and size. The writer was invited by the Session to visit the church and confer with them as to the proper steps to secure a pastor. On his arrival he found that already more than forty names had been presented for the vacant pastorate, quite a number of them the names of pastors of much stronger churches—churches that the pastor who had just retired would have been only too glad to accept in exchange for the one these brethren were now seeking.

The case is exactly analogous to the one imagined by the critic of the *Spectator*. The grievance is a real one. It was no imaginary ill from which the victim of the calculus was suffering, no mere fanciful infirmity that wrought upon the sensitive nature of the hunch back. And so in these times of financial stringency, and of business depression, when salaries are sadly in arrears, when all benevolent causes languish, and when despite all the pastor's arduous and unremitting labors the church that he serves seems to be growing weaker rather than stronger, it does not require the magnifying glass of the airy-shaped gaily decked creature called Fancy, of whom Mr. Addison tells us, to make the burdens of the earnest and conscientious pastor seem heavy. We have no disposition to underestimate them, or to withhold our profound sym-

pathy from the men who are called upon to bear them. The pecuniary embarrassments of men whom the world expects to be more prompt than all other men in the payment of accounts; the unappreciated sacrifices of men who are wearing out their lives in incessant and unremitting toil for others; the intolerance of sound doctrine; the insubordination to all discipline; these things are enough to try the patience, depress the spirits, discourage the efforts of any but the most veritable Great-heart. Let us not wonder that men writhe and grow restless under the unhappy conditions in the midst of which they are called to labor.

The trouble is, however, that the brother who becomes restless, who is ready to resign, who eagerly covets another man's field, has not realized that these other men have difficulties and embarrassments as great as his own. Take for instance the matter of arrearage in salary. The church begins to fall behind; the deacons come to the pastor with the statement that the revenues are steadily declining; that the contributions are insufficient to meet the current expenses, that with their very best endeavors they will be compelled to leave him at the close of the year with a part of his salary unpaid. He has always been accustomed to look upon the prompt payment of salary as one of the best evidences of acceptability and usefulness in the pastorate. Now, that his salary falls into arrears, he begins to open his ear to a call from some other field. If he could only look over the Synod of which he is a member, or over the whole Church and see that more than half, in many cases largely more than half the ministers are in the same condition with himself, his ardor and enthusiasm for a change of field would greatly cool. If he could put himself for a little in the place of some brother, whose lot as compared with his own he has been disposed to envy, he would find himself like the man who exchanged his hunches for the stone in the bladder. He would find that this brother has trials in his work greater, if possible, than those he is seeking to flee.

In nothing is this more apparent than in the envy sometimes felt by the pastor of the country charge for the brother who has been called to a city pulpit. The salary of the country parson seems so insignificant by the side of that of the city pastor; his life seems so humdrum and monotonous as compared with the stirring, throbbing activities of a great city; his opportunities for making his mark in the world, and for acquiring influence and fame, seem relatively so small, that he wonders why the great Head of the Church has left him to walk those obscure paths and cultivate those stunted fields, whilst his more favored brother has "the candle of the Lord shining upon his head," "wastes his steps with butter" and has the rock to "pour him out rivers of oil."

But let this brother throw himself for a little time into the tumultuous torrent of the city pastor's life; let him see how, with the utmost economy the thousands of the salary melt away faster than the hundreds in the country manse; how, with the unceasing drain of calls, committees, public meetings, extra services, and the thousand and one interruptions, the day is wasted away, and long after the country pastor

at night has evened up his work and is in refreshing sleep, his brother of the city is toiling under the midnight lamp, and with the sweat upon his brow to be ready for the next service, whilst his hungry eyes look upon the covers of books, that have lain long upon his table waiting in vain for some break in the current of that river of which the poet has said :

"Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ænum."

The wisest course, and indeed the only true course is to recognize these trials as incident to the work to which as ministers we are called. "Even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister." "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Lord." If this article were written for one of our weekly newspapers, it might be an eminently fitting thing to upbraid the Church for allowing its faithful ministers to groan under privations, embarrassments, discouragements which it is in its power to obviate or remove. But the columns of the QUARTERLY have been purposely selected because it falls chiefly into the hands of ministers.

And in this kind of interlocutory meeting the writer would like to lift up his voice against this peripatetic spirit that is abroad amongst the ministry of the Church. It is doing incalculable injury to our ministers. This restlessness "grows by what it feeds on." Every change only enfeebles the power of patient endurance and aggravates the thirst for freedom from care ; whilst on the other hand a steady battling with adversity for Christ's sake brings out the highest elements of Christian manhood, and develops the maturest and richest fruits of Christian experience. This restlessness is doing incalculable damage to the churches. The congregation that has let a good pastor go, and then found difficulty in securing another, will be likely to make any reasonable sacrifice, rather than encounter vacancy again. But the congregation that, having set a good pastor adrift for want of a little sacrifice, finds a dozen or more men with the highest recommendations, eagerly knocking at its door, will be likely to become less liberal and more exacting, more self-indulgent and harder to please.

In every aspect in which we may view it, the demand of the times is that we shall make sacrifice, and if need be suffer, even though the churches we serve exact of us needless self-denial, and manifest no proper appreciation of the hardships which for Christ's sake, and for their sakes we undergo.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

[Perhaps the last article that he wrote for the press. It is a timely message to his brethren.—ED.]

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

A WORLD PILGRIMAGE, *By John Henry Barrows, Edited by Mary Elenora Barrows.* A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, pp. 479. Price \$2.00.

When one remembers that the early Christians refused to co-ordinate their religion with the religions of the world, and their God with the gods of the world, by placing an image of their Saviour in the Pantheon, thus declaring the onliness of their God and of his religion; and then remembers the part of Dr. Barrows in that absurd Babel at Chicago, called the Congress of Religions, in which Christ was co-ordinated with Buddha, Confucius and Mahomet, and his true and only Gospel with the jargon of their human creeds, the question will arise to an orthodox mind, whether anything that Dr. Barrows could write would repay for the time occupied in reading it. The title of this book, however, is tempting, and the book-maker has used his art to advantage, so that one cannot refrain from looking to see how it begins. This means that he will read the whole book, for it is exceedingly interesting and well written. The author has a most readable style; wit, eloquence, pathos, description, sympathetic delineation of men, and excellent criticism of literature, art and architecture will be found in this volume.

His description of Germany is especially good. Probably a clearer conception of the surroundings of German university life cannot be had anywhere. The reader sees the professor, the student, and the people among whom they live; the halls, streets and gardens arrange themselves in perfect order before his imagination; and he can almost feel himself thinking as a German student would think. The politics of the empire is treated in an equally happy way, and yet, hardly professedly treated at all, but the reader is made to understand the conditions under which the people live. The spirit of conservatism, the influence of the army, the customs of the people, and the training of the youth, are so portrayed that the naturalness of what often appears unnatural in German politics is made to appear. In treating of the habits of the people emphasis is laid upon those things that show the regulative principles that determine their life and character, so that one knows, not only what the Germans do, but in the general what they would do under any given circumstances.

In France the reader's attention is diverted from the things around him to one of the objects of this pilgrimage; the arrangement for the exposition of 1900 of another conference in which Christians and priests of Baal are to take sweet council together. There is a great deal of splendid description and excellent criticism in these chapters, but it is almost all forgotten in the discussions about this congress.

Old England is treated briefly and well. This is as it should be, for all Americans are acquainted with England, its people, and its ways.

The chapters on Italy and Greece are fascinating. Dr. Barrows is in his element here; he is among the masters of the world's painters, poets, sculptors and architects. And as one follows him, or rather goes with him, through Turin, Milan, Florence, Rome, Naples and Athens, he feels the power of the beautiful and the venerable to charm and elevate. It is true that art alone enervates, as is shown too clearly in the history of the Greek and Latin races, yet more of it in our Western civilization would be decidedly advantageous.

The reader will doubtless smile at the treatment of Constantinople and the Turkish Empire. The gentle author finds nothing to please, and everything to grate upon his sensibilities. Here is probably a specimen of the greatest possible severity of Dr. Barrows.

We are constantly reading of Palestine and Egypt. And every summer fresh tourists feel called upon to write up their trips, so that the average reader is more than familiar with everything in these countries. It is difficult, therefore, to write of travels here in an interesting way, and no less a genius than Mark Twain can keep one spell-bound with the incidents of a journey. The author seems to recognize this and has interspersed a sufficient amount of criticism through his narrative to keep it from being tiresome.

But if anyone has read rapidly for a few pages, when he approaches India he will be all attention again. This was the objective point of the pilgrimage, and the purpose of it was to deliver a series of lectures on Christianity, which, from Dr. Barrows, would of course be on comparative religions. India in general is well described, but in a number of instances the reader will feel that the picture leaves something to be desired, that it is not quite full enough. Here, however, is some of the finest description in the book. No one who reads his description of Benares, Darjeeling, and the Taj Mahal will ever forget them, especially the latter. This beautiful gem of architecture stands out before the mind in all of its exquisite loveliness, and at the same time the very inmost soul of the writer is seen just as clearly as the glistening dome or graceful towers of the famous mausoleum.

The remainder of the trip through Ceylon, by China, and on through Japan, is from the nature of the case less fascinating, although thoroughly interesting.

The religious impressions of the book are not so satisfactory. The description of the Chartre's Cathedral and of the Taj Mahal show very clearly that sentiment predominates in the make-up of the author. His sensitiveness to surrounding conditions is so great that his style of writing is affected by the country from which he writes. The impressions of Germany, of France, of Turkey or of India are reflected in the style of composition. Love and beauty are so much to him that law and righteousness are subordinated. We imagine that original sin, retributive justice and eternal punishment are subjects that call for no treatment at the hand of Dr. Barrows. Hence, in dealing with the heathen, instead

of emphasizing the great legal principle upon which alone a sinner can be justified, he is constantly looking for the points of good that can be discovered in their religions. Suppose the Buddhist does not kill flies, and opposes cruelty to animals. What of it? Suppose he had the Ten Commandments and the sermon on the Mount, and lived fairly up to their teachings. What of it? It is the living up to them by Jesus Christ that grounds our salvation, and not our living up to them. But Dr. Barrows seems to see that which is meritorious in commending to divine favor, in whatever is in itself good, beautiful, loving or venerable. For the same reason he commends the thin veneer of morality with which Catholicism has covered itself in Christian countries. A paragraph here will illustrate his whole theology: "It is impossible to summarize my fresh impressions of the city of the Cæsars and the Pontiffs. But I will refer to a few things which have moved us most deeply. In the superb Vatican library and museums, among three hundred churches and near them a half score Egyptian obelisks, inscribed with the name of some papal pontifex maximus, one feels that this is indeed the city of the popes. While there is much in the forms and ideas of the great Roman Church, with which I am not in harmony, while my heart sinks when I see the pilgrims climbing the Holy Staircase on their knees, and when I read the promises of indulgence and behold the acts of worship given to the Bambino, I feel as perhaps never before the wondrous charm and power and present revived vigor of Catholicism. One cannot see what beautiful and lofty conceptions have gone into so many of the statues and pictures and altars without realizing that a large part of revealed truth has here been embodied and portrayed, and that many find in it peace and strength. Still, I do not look to Italy, but to the Catholic Church as it exists in the United States, for the spirit, method and ideals which may yet bring this venerable communion into what seems to me completer harmony with modern science, modern liberty and modern aspirations." Sentimentalism abhors vileness and suffering; it therefore constantly endeavors to picture a condition free from these things. This condition must be both natural and universal. And its power to blind the mind to plain facts is marvelous. The reader will bear in mind that lofty and beautiful conceptions, however good in themselves, do not take the place of atoning blood and imputed righteousness.

Columbia, S. C.

GEO. A. BLACKBURN.

PAUL AND HIS FRIENDS: A SERIES OF REVIVAL SERMONS.

By Rev. Albert Louis Banks, D. D., Pastor of First M. E. Church, Cleveland, Ohio. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York. 12mo. Cloth, Gilt Top, Rough Edges, pp. viii., 347. \$1.50.

Dr. Banks is a prolific writer, author of seventeen volumes. Of these, nine consist of sermons, of which three volumes contain revival sermons constituting a series: Christ and His Friends, The Fisherman

and His Friends, Paul and His Friends. The last volume of this series is before us for criticism.

One is at a loss to account for the title unless it derives its significance from the fact that most of the texts prefixed to the discourses have some association with Paul; occurring generally in his epistles or in those parts of the Book of Acts which treat of his history.

The author tells us that the sermons were preached in the month of January, 1898, during a series of evangelistic meetings in the First M. E. Church of Cleveland, Ohio. The themes had been selected two years before and illustrations had been gathering all that time, but each sermon was finally outlined and dictated to a stenographer on the day of delivery.

It is probable that the two years' period referred to was employed exclusively in the gathering of illustrations; for there is nothing in any sermon in the volume suggestive of laborious preparation, nothing that might not have been on the part of a ready, practiced speaker, the product of the particular occasion, requiring a short while only of serious brooding in the seclusion of one's study. Indeed, the discourses are, strictly speaking, not sermons at all; they are simply *talks*, suggested by a Scripture text. As such, however, they were doubtless better suited to the purpose in hand than formal sermons would have been. For a series of revival services delivered night after night for weeks, they are admirable. They are all brief and to the point; expressed in easy, flowing, graceful style, fresh and vivid, practical and personal, abounding in apt illustrations and with a certain flavor of personal reminiscence now and again to add savour.

The freshness and the directness of these exhortations is very suggestive to preachers; the good common sense exhibited in the general character of the discourses is worthy of emulation; you can see from the way in which he dispenses with formality and technique and goes straight to the point aimed at, and the effect desired, that he "meant business" every time and that the business in hand is to persuade to an instant and unreserved acceptance of Christ as a personal Saviour from sin. This is the potent purpose of every sermon in the volume. The fundamental truths he assumes, he does not stop to prove them; a sufficient understanding of them on the part of his hearers he takes for granted, and hence he pauses not to expound or explain them; his sole purpose seems to apply the great facts of sin and redemption for the immediate moving of men. This course we judge to be wise in such services, and for the ends in view we consider his method admirable. Of course one must expect to find an occasional hint of the author's doctrinal point of view, from which a Calvinist will dissent.

S. M. SMITH.

JOHN WESLEY AS A SOCIAL REFORMER.

By D. D. Thompson. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings.

This is a small work of one hundred and eleven pages. It is not a history of John Wesley's life and labors as an evangelical preacher or the

organizer of a new denomination, but a discussion of his character as a social reformer, elevating the class of society in which he labored, removing social evils, and setting in operation influences which are still at work for good both in England and America.

Wesley's labors were among what are called the lower classes—those which were most likely to be affected by the anarchical and revolutionary spirit which at that time pervaded Europe and exploded in the French Revolution. Lecky is quoted to show that the Methodist movement contributed largely to save England from the fate of France. "Many causes conspired to save her (England), but among them a prominent place must, I believe, be given to the new and vehement religious enthusiasm which was at that very time passing through the middle and lower classes of the people, which had enlisted in its service a large proportion of the wilder and more impetuous reformers, and which recoiled with horror from the anti-Christian tenets that were associated with the revolution in France." To elevate morally and socially this class seemed to be the object of Wesley as much as to save their souls. And it is the testimony of candid and intelligent members of the Church of England that the man who did most to reform the social life of England in the last century was John Wesley. The minuteness with which, in his printed tracts, he gives directions to his converts as to their habits of life, social intercourse, diligence in business, personal cleanliness and abstinence from intoxicating drinks, would be amusing if it were not for their evident necessity, and the writer's profound seriousness.

Canon Farrar bears an eloquent testimony to the courage, zeal and efficiency of his labors in this direction. Wesley was an uncompromising enemy of slavery. He not only denounced the African slave trade and the horrors of the middle passage, but American slavery especially, which he characterized as the "vilest that ever saw the sun." In this he differed from his great cotemporary and co-laborer, Whitfield, at once more eloquent and more conservative, who expressed the opinion that the Bible did not condemn slavery, and indulged the hope that the settlement of the negroes in America might be the means of their becoming Christianized and saved. The author of this book thinks that Wesley's "Thoughts on Slavery" did more to bring about its abolition than any other book ever written, not excepting "Uncle Tom's Cabin," for which it prepared the way.

Clarksville, Tenn.

ROBT. PRICE.

THEORY OF THOUGHT AND KNOWLEDGE.

By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University.
New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1897.

METAPHYSICS.

By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University.
Revised Edition from New Plates. New York and London. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1898.

Philosophy, the science of ultimates or of principles, is divisible into

Epistemology, which considers the fact, origin, extent, and forms of human knowledge; and Ontology, which discusses the ultimates of being. The first book noted above is intended to discuss Epistemology, and the latter, Ontology. The *Theory of Thought and Knowledge* indicates by its title a dual subject. The Theory of Thought is Logic in the broad sense, and considers human thinking subjectively with its various forms and laws; the Theory of Knowledge is the objective side, discussing how far, if at all, human thinking attains a knowledge of objective reality. The topics treated under thought are the general nature and conditions of thought. How does the mind get objects, the categories, the notion, the judgment, inference, proof, deduction and induction, explanation, and some structural fallacies? Under Knowledge, philosophic skepticism, thought and thing, realism and idealism, apriorism and empiricism, knowledge and belief, and the formal and relative elements in thought.

The *Metaphysics* is divided into three parts: I. Ontology: 1, The Notion of Being; 2, The Nature of Things; 3, Change and Identity; 4, Causality; 5, The World-Ground. II. Cosmology: 1, Space; 2, Time; 3, Matter, Force and Motion; 4, Nature. III. Psychology: 1, The Soul; 2, Soul and Body; 3, Of Mental Mechanism; 4, Freedom and Necessity.

These volumes oppose sensationalism, empiricism, agnosticism, skepticism, natural realism, materialism, pantheism, atheism, nihilism, and evolutionism. This seems to locate the author, by the method of exclusion, as an apriori idealist and theist. Such seems to be his philosophy, theistic idealism; all reality is the projection of God's thought, which is free and works to secure a purpose.

The books are not didactic; they assume a knowledge by the reader of all the questions discussed; to specify, one must have studied Logic to understand the Theory of Thought. The treatment of the topics is critical; he is a worshipper at the shrine of Kant; but he does not apply his critical principles impartially or consistently. The tone is self-confident, haughty, not to say arrogant, supercilious. He has a pitying contempt for those who do not see as he does; they are like young puppies, whose eyes have not yet opened. He is specially contemptuous in his bearing towards the Scotch school of common sense. The style is too abstruse and abstract, and needs elucidation by illustration and example. They are stimulating volumes for an intelligent teacher of thoughtful students, and are good, solid ivory for our young preachers to cut their eye teeth on.

Lexington, Va.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

TWENTY-SIX YEARS OF MISSIONARY WORK IN CHINA. *By Grace Stott*, of the China Inland Mission. Preface by Hudson Taylor. Eight Illustrations. *Second Edition*. New York: American Tract Society. 1897. Cr. 800; pp. 366. \$1.75.

We consider this a delightful book. Mrs. Stott's style is chatty and

agreeable. You feel much of the time that she is carrying on an un-studied conversation with you, and yet she has her matter well in hand. But her aim is to instruct while she pleases, and in this book the thoughtful reader will find much instruction. First of all, he will be impressed with God's gracious dealings with those whom he has sent from home and kindred to serve him among the benighted and degraded; how even in afflictions his grace proves all sufficient. He will get a clear view of the true missionary spirit in the lives here set before us. He will see how much must be endured, and how cheerfully it can be suffered for the sake of Christ and the salvation of his elect. The missionary must witness by his suffering as well as by his proclamation of the truth. So it was with Paul and so with all his Order down to the present. He will, withal, get a clear conception of the fearful strain to which faithful soul-seekers in those lands are subjected.

In the next place he will have the opportunity to study the work of leading men from gross idolatry to the true religion, as it progresses from day to day and year to year. The methods of mission work, of training, of testing, of preserving what has been won, are exhibited. Sketches of a number of the converts are given, which we found quite interesting. If the professors in this enlightened land were subjected to what many of those professors had to endure, we fear that our 25,000,000 would soon be thinned to 12,000,000, or 15,000,000 at best.

In the third place, he will get a good idea of Chinese character, which Mrs. Stott sums up at the conclusion of her work as follows: "It is true that as a nation the people are dirty, treacherous, and in many instances cruel; but while they have these and other unlovely national characteristics, I can bear testimony to a warmth of devotion, fidelity and patient endurance not exceeded by any country, not even by our own beloved England."

Mrs Stott went out in 1870 to become the wife and co-worker of Mr. Stott, who had preceded her a couple of years, being one of the first volunteers of Hudson Taylor's China Inland Mission. They were located at Wenchow, which, ere long, became an open port, a place of 80,000 inhabitants. We pause here to make two remarks:

(1) As we remarked recently with reference to geographical names in Japan, it would seem at this late date that authorities ought to adopt some uniform spelling for Chinese names. Mrs. Stott, for instance, spells uniformly, "Wen-chow;" the Century Dictionary and Cyclopaedia, "Wan-chow;" the Encyclopedia of Missions, "Wen-chau." All of which is confusing, when carried through the whole long list. Knowing this confusion, we were in doubt a long time whether men meant Hankow or Hangchow, when we saw one of these names.

(2) We are surprised to find that Funk & Wagnall's Encyclopedia of Missions gives no credit to the C. I. M. work at Wen-chow, established and carried on by Mr. and Mrs. Stott and others for above a quarter of a century and with such great success. Their work was the first established there and the most successful, if converts are the measure of suc-

cess. But the Methodist Free Church is credited with the only work at that point.

Mr. Stott was a cripple with but one leg, but he did a wonderful work for seventeen years, when he succumbed to consumption. Mrs. Stott's labors subsequently can be characterized by no word except "apostolic," a real Priscilla, we imagine. Preaching, traveling, teaching, conducting a Bible Institute for her native helpers, advising, directing, examining, we do not wonder that her health gave way, and she had to return for rest, during which period of rest she has given us this book. We were greatly interested and pleased with the sketches of sermons preached before her by her students, for criticism. They would do credit to most of the students in our Theological Seminaries. By way of encouragement to mission work in China, she says, "perhaps no country has given larger results for the amount of labor bestowed than China."

There are twenty-five chapters in the work, which is chronological in arrangement, but with a sub-classification of topics in the separate chapters. The title of each chapter is a verse of Scripture, on which the chapter is a commentary, so to speak, and the reader will be interested in studying the appropriateness of the selections. Our verdict is that the author has been very successful. So the book has a homiletic value.

The volume is in excellent style, paper, type, and binding, gilt-top, with photo-engravings. There is more than the usual number of mistakes, typographical and literary. The continual and awkward omission of the narrative "that," is marked. These things should have been corrected in the second edition, by all means. A good map of the district worked would be a great addition to the book.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

THE MAKING AND THE UNMAKING OF THE PREACHER. Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University, 1898. *By William Jewett Tucker*, President of Dartmouth College. 16mo., Cloth, pp. 224. \$1.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Boston and New York. 1898.

In 1871, Mr. Henry W. Sage, of Brooklyn, New York, contributed \$10,000 to found a Lectureship on Preaching in the Divinity School at Yale College, New Haven, Conn. In honor of Dr. Lyman Beecher, it was styled the Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching.

For twenty-seven years, eminent preachers in this country and in Great Britain have delivered lectures in the course. It affords fine illustration of the fecundity of the theme and the versatility of the speakers.

It may be permissible to one somewhat familiar with the course from the beginning, to hazard the opinion that it has not proved a series of increasing value, a fact inevitable for two reasons: The field for choice of lecturers grows more restricted with every selection, and the subject becomes more exhausted with every presentation. When a preacher

like Henry Ward Beecher began the long series, breaking virgin ground in a field in which he had for long years been pre-eminent, the occasion and the man met in way and to a degree that no succeeding course could exactly duplicate. The result was that no lecturer that followed him has equaled the fulness and the richness of his course, running as it did through three successive years; it was exhaustive, able and brilliant. For some years the successive lecturers, Dr. John Hall, Dr. Wm. M. Taylor, Phillips Brooks, Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, and others, continued to discuss preaching from the homiletic point of view, but in each successive course, as the field became more and more thoroughly worked it became increasingly difficult to keep the beaten track without the paralysis of repetition, and so the range widened inevitably and by slow degrees until one is struck with the contrast presented by the "Cure of Souls" and "The Making and Unmaking of a Preacher," on the one hand, and the courses given by Beecher and Hall on the other.

As a reader lays down the latest volume in the course he cannot forbear wondering what turn the next lecturer *can* take, and yet each volume in the long, growing series sustains the interest and proves the perennial freshness of the theme.

As may be gathered from the title, the volume before us treats of the influences which make or mar the preacher, his helps and his hindrances. It is the work of an observant, thoughtful man, alive to present tendencies, alert in current issues; one who appreciates difficulties, but in the midst of them preserves a temperament cheerful and confident, his whole discussion, therefore, characterized by a hopefulness which is contagious and stimulating. Now and again there are indications of a very wide and cordial sympathy with the trend of the New Theology, the influence of which he gladly welcomes as substantial gain to the cause of preaching and material aid to the preacher.

The style is clear, forcible, at times even striking; there are not a few paragraphs which would lend themselves well to quotation, occasionally a sentence with the sparkle of an epigram.

The volume contains eight lectures:

- I. Preaching Under Modern Conditions.
- II. The Making of the Preacher by Education.
- III. The Unmaking Process.
- IV. The Preacher and His Art.
- V. What the Preacher Owes to the Truth.
- VI. What the Preacher Owes to Men.
- VII. The Pulpit and the Church.
- VIII. The Optimism of Christianity.

While there are some few things in the volume that the present writer naturally dissents from, yet there is much to commend and much that will prove interesting, instructive and helpful to thoughtful, discriminating readers.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C., Manse First Presbyterian Church.

RHETORICAL TEXT BOOKS.

THE PRACTICAL ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC ; WITH ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES. *By John F. Genung, Ph. D.* (Leipsic), Professor of Rhetoric in Amherst College. Boston : Guin & Company, Publishers. 1887.

ENGLISH VERSIFICATION FOR THE USE OF STUDENTS. *By Rev. James C. Parsons*, Principal of Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass. Leach, Shewell & Sanborn. Boston and New York.

A HANDBOOK OF POETICS FOR STUDENTS OF ENGLISH VERSE. *By Francis B. Gunemere, Ph. D.*, Head Master of the Swain Free School, New Bedford, and formerly Instructor in English in Harvard College. Boston : Guin & Company. 1885.

THE ESSENTIALS OF ARGUMENTATION. *By Elias J. MacEwan, M. A.* Boston, U. S. A. : D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers. 1898.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ARGUMENTATION. *By George Pierce Baker*, Assistant Professor in English in Harvard College. Boston, U. S. A., and London : Guin & Company, Publishers. 1895.

Various opinions have been held as to the true province of Rhetoric ; Quintillian making it the universal science, on the ground that the speaker might be called upon to treat any question and for success need every virtue. Whateley limited it to argumentative composition in prose. Some have treated it as a science ; others, as an art ; others, as both. Prof. Genung properly regards it as the art of composition, covering all kinds of discourse, prose or verse, written or spoken, and magnifying its practical character, insisting upon the need of adaptation in all composition to subject, occasion, writer, speaker, hearer and reader. His treatment is comprehensive, clear, judicious and specially serviceable for a text-book, making the treatise probably the best for the school room now published in this country. There is a comparison book of excellent examples for study.

There are some blemishes. The chief, perhaps, is the meager attention which he pays to poetics, making necessary a supplementary work for this branch of composition. He rightly divides the subject into style and invention, but does not accurately discriminate these in his definitions, though he does do so in the treatment of the two. Style is properly the Rhetoric of the elements of composition, giving suggestions as to the proper choice of words and construction of sentences and paragraphs ; invention is the Rhetoric of the entirities of composition, teaching how to compose narratives, descriptions, expositions, arguments and orations. In minor matters of detail, the grossest mistake is in the elaborate plan which he gives for the paragraph, sufficiently comprehensive as it is for the most exhaustive treatise upon the broadest subject.

As already stated, Genung's deficient treatment of poetics compels the use of some work covering this department of composition. No one is known to the writer which adequately meets this need ; Parson's *Eng-*

lish Versification and Gunemere's *Poetics* combined are satisfactory, as they supplement each other. True to title, Parsons limits himself to verse-making and to versess in English; giving a compact, clear and generally accurate treatment of the poets involved. Gunemere's work, as the title suggests, is broader; discussing poetry, its kinds, its style, including figures of speech, and its forms in meter. It is a mere handbook of 242 duodecimo pages, but comprehensive for such a small volume. His order of treatment should be reversed; beginning with the mechanics of meter, then discussing style, and, finally the soul of the subject, poetry itself with its radical kinds.

The advance of mind leads to specializing; the activity of the mind to-day is largely occupied with matters of belief. As a result of these two facts we are now having special treatises on argumentation, of which a couple are named above. Baker's is the earlier and comes from Harvard, grew out of the teaching there, and is designed, therefore, for such a class of students. It is not specially intended for lawyers, but for all who need to argue. It is valuable for its full discussion of plans, outlines, skeletons, or briefs as the book calls them, and for the excellent specimens given. It treats of persuasion as a part of argumentation, and discusses analysis, briefs, preparatory reading, evidence, the forensic, and persuasion, in the order here given. The work seems hastily prepared and is marred by many imperfections of detail. His examples from Story's defense of Judas and from Huxley on Evolution are of questionable propriety.

MacEwan's work is the outcome of teaching young farmers in an Agricultural College. This fact will indicate the character of the work as to simplicity and adaptedness to all classes. Surely every intelligent mind needs information and drilling as to correct reasoning. If the farmers of the country would read, imbibe and practice the principles found in this volume, they would not be the dupes of demagogues on important issues. The treatment is comprehensive, as will be seen from an outline. He divides the subject into three main heads: I. The Introduction; II. Discussion; 1. Plan; 2. Body of Arguments; 3. Evidence; 4. Classes of Arguments; 5. Sequence of Arguments; 6. Persuasion; III. The Conclusion. There is an Appendix, containing some of the best examples of Arguments in our language; Huxley's on Evolution being one.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

LIFE OF MRS. SARAH A. LANKFORD PALMER. *By Rev. John A. Roche, D. D.*, with an introduction by Rev. John P. Newman, D. D. LL. D. George Hughes & Co., New York. Pp. 286. \$1.50.

Beyond all question the subject of this memoir was an earnest and devoted servant of God, and if the object of the writer had been to glorify the grace of God as exhibited in her life, and to stimulate the zeal of others by her example, he might have found an abundance of

material in her long and active life. But such was not the aim of the writer. The book is intended to be a plea for the doctrine of entire and instantaneous sanctification, and was prepared at the request of Mrs. Palmer herself. In this work she is presented not only as an earnest advocate and exponent of this idea, but also as a shining example and illustration of it. Indeed the biography is only a minor and incidental feature of the work, and a very considerable part of the book is taken up with arguments, historical and exegetical, going to show that this teaching is in accord with the Word of God, the views of Wesley, and the experience of men.

It is one of the most striking peculiarities of the doctrine of entire sanctification, or perfectionism, that even its ablest advocates are unable apparently to state it in terms clear and unmistakable. Apparently there are no words in our language capable of setting it forth clearly, and the terms used are always qualified and limited to such an extent that the mind is lost in its attempt to locate itself. Take for example the following quotation from Wesley as a fair sample of the "guards" which must be thrown around the doctrine: "Certainly, in the proper sense, it is an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God. Yet this sanctification, at least in the lower degrees, does not include the power never to think a useless thought, nor ever speak a useless word. I, myself, believe that such a perfection is inconsistent with living in a corruptible body; for this makes it impossible always to think right. While we breathe we shall more or less mistake. If, therefore, Christian perfection implies this, we must not expect it till we die. Indeed my judgment is that, in this case particularly, to overdo is to undo, and that to set perfection too high—so high that no man that I ever heard of or read of attained—is a most effectual, because unsuspected, way of driving it out of the world. . . . Absolute or infallible perfection I never contended for. Sinless perfection I do not contend for, seeing it is not Scriptural." (P. 93.) Imperfection we know, and perfection we can comprehend, but when we are directed to something that comes between, and is neither the one nor the other, we find that the idea eludes our grasp. That the sharp line drawn between the so-called "perfection" and a lower state is an entirely arbitrary one, and may be shifted at will, may be clearly seen in the warning given by Wesley in the passage quoted above, that we must not set the standard of perfection *too high* lest we drive it out of the world. The idea seems to be to look around and see how high the most earnest souls have attained and then fix that as the standard, very much as Fahrenheit fixed the zero of his thermometer scale.

In the conclusion of the work the author argues that as one single case of conversion, like that of the Apostle Paul, is sufficient proof of the existence of such a thing as conversion, so "a single case of entire holiness, attended with the Scripture evidences of its reality," should satisfy the candid mind. We readily grant it, but where is that single case to be found? Certainly not in the subject of this memoir, as her

biographer thinks, for while she was eulogized after her death as one "wholly sanctified," the same writer candidly admits that she was not without her "faults," which, however, were only "minor defects." (P. 240.)

But according to the author, Mrs. Palmer was not the only instance of entire sanctification, but it is attributed to some who never claimed it for themselves, and would doubtless have repudiated such a claim in their behalf, such as Isaiah, Paul, Jonathan Edwards and his wife, Flavel, Cowper, Howe, Payson, etc.

The biographical portion of the book is interesting, but the argumentative portion of the work is neither striking nor original, and the author produces the impression that he is more anxious to show that the doctrine in question is in accord with the views of Wesley, than to show that it is the teaching of the Word of God.

T. R. ENGLISH.

Richmond, Va.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE BIBLICAL ILLUSTRATOR ; or, Anecdotes, Similes, Emblems, Illustrations, Expository, Scientific, Geographical, Historical and Homiletic, gathered from a wide range of Home and Foreign Literature, on the verses of the Bible. *By Joseph S. Exell, M. A.* Pp. viii, 454 ; SECOND PETER. Pp. x, 219. Royal 8vo. In one volume, \$2.00. New York, Chicago, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company, 1898. REVELATION. Pp. viii, 787. *The same publisher.*

The title of this series, of which we now have the volumes containing the Epistles of Peter, and the Revelation, describes the nature of the work so fully that it is needless to write of it more fully. The illustrations, expositions, similes, etc., are drawn from a large number of literary and homiletic sources, and represent the best thought of many of the best men. Each Epistle is preceded by an introduction, in which the questions pertaining to that subject are discussed, the position held by the authors quoted, and especially in the case of Second Peter, being the conservative. The authenticity of Second Peter is considered by Dr. Paton J. Gloag, who shows very clearly that this book is to be received without hesitation.

WHETHER WHITE OR BLACK, A MAN. *By Edith Smith Davis.* Illustrated by Bert Cassidy. Chicago, New York, Toronto : Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898. 12mo., pp. 199, 75cts.

A book which is scarcely worth a notice. It is pretentious and weak, and false to both nature and facts. It is a glorification of the negro character and capacity, and is a very poor effort to break down the social barriers which separate the white and black races. It is inferior in every respect to similar works, or to any of the literature upon the Negro problem. It is evidently written from the standpoint of some disappointed school-marm.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. *By Justin H. McCarthy, M. P., Author of "An Outline of Irish History," "England Under Gladstone," etc.*
In two volumes. Vol II. 12mo., pp. 700. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1898.

All readers of history, and especially those who read with such great delight the author's first volume, published about eight years ago, are to be congratulated upon the appearance of this volume, which completes the work. Its clear, captivating style, not less than the ability with which it studies and depicts the scenes of that most tragic period in French history, will attract and hold a multitude of readers. The volume sustains the interest excited by the first and makes of the whole work a classic in history which will stand alongside of Carlyl's and others, while it will be invested with a charm unequalled by any of them.

ALONE IN LONDON. *By Hester Streten.* Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. Pp. 123. 15 cents. 1898.

The Bible Colportage Association sends us another of Hesta Streten's pure, simple and gospel-spirited works. This is the story of an outcast waif in the streets of London protected by an over-ruling Providence. It is worth buying and reading.

OUR DAILY BREAD. *By F. Grather.* Cleveland, O.: Publishing House of the Reformed Church. Pp. 513. 12mo. 1898.

A series of devout meditations for each day in the year, translated chiefly from German, French and Latin texts, the list of authors ranging from the Reformation to the present. The work is a very good, though simple, aid to private devotion.

VIRGIL. Book VIII. *By John Tetlew, D. Sc.* Boston: Ginn & Co.

This is a small convenient hand-book, with maps, vocabulary and word-groups. The word-groups are a splendid feature, aiding materially in the recognition of the relationship of words through observation of their roots.

HASSAN, A FALLAH. A Romance of Palestine. *By Henry Gillman.* New York: Little, Brown & Co. 12mo. Pp. 597. \$1.50. 1898.

This is a graphic description of life among the Fallaheen or peasants of to-day. As a delineation it is interesting in the extreme, though filled with tiresome digressions. Mr. Gillman is well acquainted with his theme, having sojourned in Palestine upwards of fifty years. Wherefore, as an historical work it will be read with pleasure. However, a fly in the ointment irretrievably mars its excellence and minimises its value. While apparently not countenancing, the author plainly palliates vice, and extracts sympathy for it. Hence a repulsive vein of impurity pervades the whole book.

THE WORLD WELL LOST. *By Esther Robertson.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. Henziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

The Church of Rome is flooding literature with her subtle, ingenious pleas. Here is a characteristic one. It is the story of a young girl who had been taught to abhor the Roman Catholic Church, and especially the Convent. By a change of circumstances she is compelled to enter a Catholic hospital. She finds it so different, according to the story, from what she expected that she is completely won over, becomes a nun and considers it a high privilege to devote her life to the service of the Church. The book is a Roman Catholic work, full of Papist superstition and dangerous. In the present position of the heroine nun, as Mistress of the Novices, she is awaiting the call to come up higher to join the band of Soul Workers, a class who, while present in the body, are absent in the spirit working miracles, performing healings and doing other wonders, like the "Blessed Mary of Agreda, who converted a tribe of Indians in New Mexico while her body lay in a trance in her Convent in Spain."

THE PRODIGAL'S DAUGHTER, AND OTHER STORIES. *By Lelia Hardin Bugg.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 8vo. Pp. 255

Another work of the same character as the above, and which we equally condemn, in its matter. However, in its conception and execution, as (though without approval) his lord commended the unjust steward, we commend the authoress because she has written wisely for the interests of her Church.

THE CREW OF THE DOLPHIN. *By Hesta Stretton.* Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 15 Cents.

The author of *Jessica's First Prayer* needs no introduction. This is another of his delightful English stories, illustrating the watchful care of him who "holdeth the sea in the hollow of his hand." A good book for our Sabbath school libraries is this.

SONS OF ADVERSITY *By L. Cope Cornford.* Boston: L. C. Page & Co. Pp. 313. \$1.25.

The scene of this tale of love and adventure is laid in England and Holland and in the time of Elizabeth, petty intrigues with Spain forming the basis. The plot is well conceived, an unusual feature being the villainy of the hero's father. There may be those who will find it to their liking, but for us it savors too much of the dime novel. Kennedy's frontispiece illustration is a happy conception.

APRIL, 1899.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

CONTENTS.

No. 2.

- I. GENESIS OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY. F. R. Beattie.
- II. THE WOMAN QUESTION. P. D. Stephenson.
- III. EXPEDIENCY OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN. J. A. Quarles.
- IV. BODY, SOUL AND SPIRIT. W. S. Bean.
- V. THE DOCTRINAL ISSUES OF THE HOUSTON CASE. R. A. Lapsley.
- VI. RECOIL OF EVOLUTION'S ASSAULT ON TELEOLOGY. N. L. Anderson.
- VII. AN OLD ENEMY WITH TWO NEW FACES. W. P. McCorkle.
- VIII. SALVATION IS OF THE JEWS. Julius A. Walden.
- IX. THE POLEMICS OF INFANT BAPTISM. B. B. Warfield.
- X. NOTES.
- XI. EDITORIAL.
- XII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR. - - - 75 CENTS A COPY.
IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. McKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly :

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by
an Association composed of the following Ministers :

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.	C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.
W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.	W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.
D. J. BRIMM, D. D.	B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.
JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.	ROBERT PRICE, D. D.
WM. C. CLARK, D. D.	J. B. SHEARER, D. D.
J. N. CRAIG, D. D.	SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.
A. B. CURRY, D. D.	R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.
C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D.	C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.
T. W. HOOPER, D. D.	ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D. ;
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D. ; S, C. BYRD, A. M.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. :

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and settlement of account to date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES
I. GENESIS OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY By PROF. FRANCIS R. BEATTIE, D. D.....	189-205
II. THE WOMAN QUESTION. By REV. P. D. STEPHENSON.....	206-228
III. EXPEDIENCY OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN. By PROF. JAMES A. QUARLES, D. D.....	229-243
IV. BODY, SOUL AND SPIRIT. By REV. W. S. BEAN, D. D.....	244-252
V. THE DOCTRINAL ISSUES PRESENTED BY THE CASE OF DR. M. H. HOUSTON. By REV. R. A. LAPSLEY.....	253-267
VI. THE RECOIL OF EVOLUTION'S ASSAULT UPON TELEOLOGY. By REV. NEAL L. ANDERSON, A. M.....	268-280
VII. AN OLD ENEMY WITH TWO NEW FACES. By REV. W. P. McCORKLE.....	281-297
VIII. SALVATION IS OF THE JEWS. By REV. JULIUS W. WALDEN, D. D.	298-312
IX. THE POLEMICS OF INFANT BAPTISM. By PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D. D., LL.D	313-334
X. NOTES. (1). IS THE STANDARD DECLINING ? By REV. SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.....	335-338
(2). "IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN." By REV. WM. FROST BISHOP, D. D.....	339-344
XI. EDITORIAL. COMMENTS. RECORD AND REVIEW.....	345-362
XII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. By R. A. WEBB, T. R. ENGLISH, D. J. BRIMM, J. R. LAFFERTY, W. P. McCORKLE.....	363-380

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 48--APRIL, 1899.

I. GENESIS OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

For great events in either Church or State there are usually well defined periods of preparation. Such events do not arise suddenly, but come to pass in their fulness of time.

It is with them as with a mighty river. Its vast volume of rushing waters is the product of many smaller streams, and these in turn are made up of many lesser rivulets, which, gathering from distant mountains and flowing through fertile plains, combine to make the great river—the St. Lawrence, the Mississippi or the Amazon; the Rhine, the Danube or the Nile. To understand the river aright, we must trace its various converging streams to their respective sources, in the recesses of lofty mountains, in the depths of trackless forests, or amid the loneliness of distant lakes. Thus explorers have sought the sources of the Nile, the Mississippi and the Amazon, and in this way reliable geography is made.

So it is with the Providence of God, as it works out its great movements, alike in the life of nations and in the history of the Church. These movements can only be rightly understood by tracing the various streams of influence

which have led up to them, and which flowed forth in their great events, up to their distant sources and down their winding courses.

From this view-point we see how the Roman Empire of world-wide dominion, and the Greek language of universal diffusion, made ready a highway for the swift-winged Gospel to spread its blessings speedily over the civilized world. So, too, we see, later on, that the revival of learning, the unrest of men under the tyranny of the Romish hierarchy, and a deepening interest in the spiritual side of religion, flowed together to produce the resistless current of the Protestant Reformation.

With the Westminster Assembly, and its noble and enduring work, the same is true. Various things led up to the convening of this historic and memorable convention, and gave shape to the great task which it was raised up of God to perform. On the inner side the logic of events made the calling of this Assembly both natural and necessary. It met in its fulness of time also.

The theme which this article is to discuss leads to the study of these events, in their real significance, as they culminated, and were crowned in the Assembly at Westminster. We shall seek to trace the logic of Divine Providence, alike over Church and State, in the main events which led to the formation of the Assembly, and we shall take a brief glance at the Assembly itself as thus formed.

The events which combined to bring the Assembly into existence were partly civil or political, and partly religious or ecclesiastical. They lay, in part, in England, and, in part, in Scotland; while continental influences also came in. In only the briefest way can these events be traced out under two main heads, one treating of the political, and the other of the religious aspects of these events, though these were so merged into each other as to be really identical in many cases.

I. The political series of events leading to the calling

of the Assembly carries us back to the Reformation in England, about a century prior to the Assembly. The name of Henry VIII., who came to the English throne eight years before Luther sounded the first loud notes of the German Reformation in 1517, comes up here. About 1526 Henry's quarrel with the Pope began, in connection with the King's desire to divorce his wife of many years, Catherine, to marry Anne Boleyn. After some years of delay the King grew impatient; and, finally, renouncing the jurisdiction of the Pope altogether, he assumed to himself the Headship of the Church in England. A few years later the Pope, when he saw that all hope of submission on the part of Henry was gone, solemnly ex-communicated him from the Church, and went through the hollow form of deposing him from his throne.

Henry was succeeded by Edward VI., who came to the throne as a lad, and who favored the true Reformed faith in various ways. His brief reign of six years did not a little to settle matters in the realm, and one can scarcely help feeling that his reign was all too short.

Then came the dark and dreadful period of Mary—the bloody Mary—when the storm-tossed bark of the Protestant faith was in great danger of utter shipwreck. For a time the prospect was as gloomy as it could be, for it looked as if everything would be lost, that, under Edward, the people had gained for true religion in the realm. Hundreds fled from England to the continent, and a very great number—over 300—suffered martyrdom during less than five years. This was indeed a dark day for true religion in England, and Mary's short reign was as much too long as Edward's had been too short.

Then follows the long and brilliant reign of Elizabeth—from 1558 to 1603—a period of 45 years, when the Reformation in the modified form represented by the Anglican Church was virtually established, as it has continued down to the present time. The national power of England was

greatly increased, and Ireland was made an integral part of the Empire. This remarkable woman had no real sympathy with the Lutheran and Calvinistic phases of the Reformation, and she ever retained a measure of affection for the Romish Church, on the side of religion. At the same time, on the political side, she guarded most scrupulously her claim to be the head of the Church in England. It was towards the close of her reign that the Puritans began to make their views felt in the sphere of the State. Believing, as they did, in the necessity of a complete reformation in religion, they paved the way for those views of civil government, which culminated in Hampden, Cromwell and Pym, about the time of the Westminster Assembly. The civil contest was between the King and Parliament; and the religious struggle was between Bishop and Presbyter. Out of both the civil and the religious conflict came the Westminster Assembly a little later.

Then followed the Stuarts, a favored yet ill-fated royal house. James VI., of Scotland, came to the throne as James I., uniting by his accession the two kingdoms of England and Scotland. He reigned from 1604 to 1623, when he was succeeded by the misguided and unfortunate Charles, who amid constant turmoil of public affairs continued to reign and misrule till 1648, a period of 26 years, when he was put to death on the scaffold at the hands of the Parliament, and largely under the influence of Oliver Cromwell. It was during this distracting time that the Westminster Assembly convened. Throughout, the King was opposed to the Assembly and its work, for he evidently thought that it was too democratic, and too decidedly Presbyterian, to suit his views.

Politically, the utter folly of the Stuart line forced the Parliament to attempt to settle the religious disputes which prevailed on every hand. The notion of the divine right of kings was met by the assertion of the God-given rights of the people. The Cavalier and the Roundhead opposed each

other strenuously in the halls of legislation, and fought each other bitterly on the battlefield. In like manner, the advocates of Prelacy, and the adherents of Presbytery and Independency waged as bitter a controversy in matters ecclesiastical as was pursued on the field of military combat. Politically, therefore, there were interests of vital importance which called aloud for settlement in the realm, and which could never be really settled till they were settled right. With these, indirectly, the Assembly had not a little to do.

II. In the second place we pass to trace the religious lines of influence which produced the Westminster Assembly. These were perhaps more varied, and of deeper significance, than those which lay in the political sphere. In a very brief way can we now sketch some of these which come most obviously into view.

These influences had their source partly in England; and, in part, they flowed in from Scotland, and over from the continent. Indeed, Scotland, and Geneva, and Holland had a great deal to do with the influences and movements which culminated in the remarkable Westminster Assembly.

The Reformation movement in England is not only of thrilling interest, and full of painful romance, but it is exceedingly difficult to interpret it aright. So many factors enter into it, and such diverse claims are made on its behalf, that it is not easy to reach a well balanced conclusion in regard to its inner significance. *First*, there is a large personal element, represented by Henry VIII, and, afterwards, by other English sovereigns, especially by Elizabeth. Then, the effects of the writings of Luther, and other continental Reformers, began to appear in England as early as 1530. In like manner the vast influence of John Knox, directly on Scotland and indirectly on England, also enters into the problem. And, in the time of Edward VI, the hand of Melancthon was felt, through the Augsburg

Confession, as is evident from the Articles of Edward. But, perhaps the strongest single influence came from Zwingle and Calvin, for Calvin's Institutes was for a time the text-book in theology in the great English universities.

The tendency of the English sovereigns and aristocracy to Episcopacy was strong, and it did not take many decades for the gathering conflict to assume definite shape. The result was the Puritan conflict on English soil, which must ever be regarded as one of the most remarkable periods in the history of England. It was a time of transition and readjustment. In the state, the contest was between absolute monarchy and representative government; and in the church, it was between Episcopacy and Puritanism, in which both Independency and Presbyterianism are to be included from this point of view.

On the religious side, the way was further prepared in a very definite way for the Westminster Assembly by the preparation, before it met, of various creeds or doctrinal statements of religious truth. First of all, there were the creeds of the period of Henry VIII. The Ten Articles, in 1536, were the first; and they made but little modification of the Romish Creed, with the King put in the place of the Pope as the head of the Church. The Thirteen Articles of 1538 were more Protestant, but were never approved by Henry. Then came the Six Articles, in 1539, which marked a return to Romish doctrine, and they have been fittingly called "The Whip With Six Strings." The Articles of Edward in 1552 mark a distinct advance in the formation of a creed. They were forty-two in number, and they form the basis, and largely the materials, of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican churches everywhere. In the time of Elizabeth, the Eleven Articles were issued, but they were soon displaced by the Thirty-nine Articles of 1563.

The Lambeth Articles are also of much interest in relation to the Westminster Assembly and its work, for they

are distinctly Calvinistic throughout. Though these Articles never had ecclesiastical authority, they are of great historical importance. They appeared in 1595, and consists of Nine Articles. Elizabeth was not in sympathy with Calvinism, and hence she could not regard the Lambeth Articles with the least favor. Indeed, she bitterly opposed the introduction of these Articles, for she prosecuted the divines who drew them up, and ordered the recall of the Articles at once.

Of still deeper interest in this connection are the Articles of Ussher, known as the Irish Articles. They appeared in 1615, and were drawn up by Archbishop Ussher, of Dublin. They became the doctrinal symbols of the Irish Episcopal Church. They are 104 in number, and they constitute the chief basis of the Westminster Standards, in many respects, for no pre-existing creed did more to shape the materials of the Confession of Faith of Westminster than these Articles of Ussher, who was himself a member of the Assembly.

Another strong stream of influence flowed in from Scotland. Under Knox the Reformation in Scotland, in its origin and result, was very different from the reform movement in England. In Scotland it was first a religious movement, and then a political; in England it was primarily a political movement, and then became a religious reform. In the former case we have Presbyterianism, with virtual separation of Church and State; and in the latter Episcopacy, with union between Church and State.

The Scotch Confession dates from 1560, and was framed by Knox, it is said, in an incredibly short time. It consists of Twenty-five Articles, and sets forth the clear evangelical doctrines of the Christian faith. It definitely asserts the Headship of Christ over his Church, and for a long time it exerted a strong influence upon the Scottish Church. It is remarkable that the Scottish Church, after using this home-made Confession for over eighty years, should have

adopted the Westminster Confession, made in another place altogether. This clearly reveals how much concession the Church in Scotland was ready to make in order to have peace and uniformity in religion in the whole realm.

In close connection with the Scottish Confession, the Covenants are to be named. These are most solemn pledges to defend the Reformed Faith. The First Covenant was made in 1556 as a defense against Popery, and it was solemnly ratified at several places. Then follows the National Covenant, first in 1581, and again in 1638. It was drawn up by John Craig, was ratified by the Scottish Parliament, and even signed by Charles I., when his coronation took place in Scotland. Last of all these is the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643, the very year the Westminster Assembly was called to meet. It was aimed specially against Episcopacy, though it told also against Popery. Its great significance for us is that it really forms the connecting link between Scottish Presbyterianism and English Puritanism. It also brought near together the General Assembly and the Church in Scotland, and the Assembly at Westminster, and it associates the Scottish Parliament with the Long Parliament very closely in the great events in which they both had a part.

The survey of religious influences would not be complete did we not take notice of the Continental streams which mingled with those already noted, to produce the Westminster Assembly, and to prepare the way for its enduring work. We have seen that in Scotland the Reformation was more thorough than in England. The same is true of Geneva and Holland. There, too, the Reformation was quite complete, and from these centres strong influences were brought to bear upon the Reform movement in England, and that for years prior to the Westminster Assembly. It is well known that there was in Elizabeth's day a strong party in England, who wished for a more complete reform in religion than the Episcopacy

of that time represented. This party in her day, and afterwards in the time of James I., and Charles I., was in constant communication with the thorough-going Reformers on the Continent, as well as in Scotland. Hence, we see how intimately the Westminster Assembly, which grew out of the desire for thorough reform in religion in England, is related with the reform movements in Scotland, and on the Continent, as the ordinance calling the Assembly itself distinctly affirms, when it says that the Assembly to meet shall seek to bring the Church in England into "nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and the other Reformed Churches abroad."

Thus it came to pass that this memorable Assembly, whose 250th Anniversary has been celebrated, gathered up into itself the varied yet kindred streams which flowed from the pure springs which rose among the hills of Scotland, the mountains of Switzerland and the plains of Holland, and then in turn this Assembly, with its venerable symbols, has, in the Providence of God, become the unfailing reservoir from which has flowed numberless pure and life-giving streams, into lands far and near, to make glad the city of God, even to the very ends of the earth.

From this hurried sketch, the lines of political and religious influence which led up to the Westminster Assembly may in part be understood. The political line dates from Henry VIII, and runs on through Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, then into the Stuarts, who, with their fatal doctrine of the divine right of kings, did much to develop the political aspects of Puritanism, as an emphatic protest against despotism alike in Church and State. On the religious side the Westminster Assembly was the product of the partial reform which was effected in England, and which many earnest minds felt to be incomplete, and of the influences which flowed into England from Scotland, Geneva, and Holland, where the Reformation was thorough-going and complete. All these

influences combined to produce the strong religious factor in the rising Puritan movement, and to produce a state of conflict and confusion, which the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity could neither allay nor remove. Nay, rather, these forcible and unspiritual restraints aggravated the disease rather than healed it.

In addition, there were Creeds and Liturgies of various kinds in existence among the people, and the utmost confusion of belief and practice prevailed on every side. Each party was a law to itself, and no effective arbiter appeared on the scene to settle these disputes. The spheres and function of Church and State were not clearly understood, though the Puritans were moving in the right direction, and at times, perhaps, in danger of going too fast and too far. Thus political and religious chaos reigned, but the Spirit of God was moving upon the confusion, and at length that Spirit led to the formation of the Westminster Assembly, and guided its devout and learned members in their splendid work.

The immediate providential events leading to the Assembly were the Long Parliament, essentially Puritans, and the Scottish Parliament, thoroughly Presbyterian, on the political side; and on the religious side stand the Irish Articles, the Scottish Confession, and the writings of the Continental Reformers. In due time the Assembly was called, not by the King, but by the representatives of the people in the Long Parliament. It was convened to settle the disputes and differences in regard to religion in the realm, for the express purpose of bringing about a measure of uniformity in Doctrine, Government, Discipline and Worship. As the differences in government and worship were far greater than in doctrine, so it was with these that the Assembly was directed chiefly to deal, though before their work was done they covered the whole ground in the symbols they gave to the world.

III. In the third place, it may aid us in getting a clearer

view of the conditions which, as already described, led to this memorable Assembly, if we look for a little at the gathering itself, and note its general character, and briefly view its disputes and decisions.

As we have already seen, there was utter confusion in Church and State in the realm, for a generation prior to the Assembly, especially from 1620 to 1643, when that body met. There were several political parties, in particular the Royalist and the Parliamentary. Both of these stand in close relation to the Assembly; the former against it, the latter with it. Then there were a greater number of ecclesiastical parties. First, there were Anglicans, who were more in sympathy with Popery than with Reform. Secondly, there were Episcopalians, who were Erastian in their views, and who would place the Church under the State. Thirdly, there were more moderate Episcopalians, who were in sympathy with the true Reformed faith. Fourthly, there were the Independents, who were the heart of the Puritan party. Lastly, the Presbyterians, who held a somewhat middle place between the Independents and the moderate Episcopalians, and who, among themselves, exhibited two distinct types of Presbyterianism, the moderate and the *jure divino* types.

With the first and second religious parties King Charles was in secret sympathy, while the other three parties were generally ranked with the Parliament. Hence all these parties had intimate relations with the Assembly, either by way of antagonism or sympathy.

In the Assembly itself there were at least four well-defined parties. First, we have the consistent Episcopalians; secondly, the Erastians; thirdly, the Independents, and fourthly, the Presbyterians. These classes indicate the religious conditions of England at this time.

To harmonize these divergent views, so as, if possible, to secure uniformity in the religion of the realm, was the immense task set for the Assembly. It is evident to us, at

this later day, that this was well nigh an impossible task, and it was made all the more difficult, because the leaders of these various parties did not then see, as we now have learned it, the distinction between outward uniformity and inward unity, amid a measure of outward diversity. Another element of great difficulty in the way of the Assembly was the fact that the relations of Church and State were not clearly understood at that day by very many. The principle of a free Church in a free State was only beginning to dawn; and before the Assembly closed it had risen above the horizon, never to set again among a free people. We praise, rather than blame, the Assembly for its service here; for while it did not produce the uniformity which it was appointed to effect, it did for subsequent ages something far better, the advantage of which we, in this country, fully enjoy, and should ever highly value.

Soon after the Long Parliament met it addressed itself to the task which the disturbed condition of Church and State forced upon it. The temper of the Parliament was for the most part against the King and the bishops. The first bill convening the Assembly was passed in 1642, but it did not receive the royal assent. But next year, on June the 12th, Parliament took things into its own hands, and passed an ordinance calling an Assembly of learned and godly divines, and others, to meet at Westminster on July 1st, 1643. The purpose of the Assembly is stated to have been, "To effect a more perfect reformation of the Church of England in its Liturgy, Discipline and Government on the basis of the Word of God, and thus to bring it into nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and with the Reformed Churches on the continent."

The Assembly then summoned was to consist of 151 members. Thirty of these were laymen, 10 from the House of Lords, and 20 from the Commons. These were named first in the ordinance of Parliament, and among them were scholars and statesmen like Selden, Pym, Whitelocke, and

Vane. There were also to be 121 divines, chosen from different sections of the country, and representing the diverse religious views of the people. A large number of these were Presbyterians, a smaller number were Episcopalians, few of whom, owing to the King's edict, sat in the Assembly. A small company were Independents, but they were influential, and had the support of Cromwell and the Army.

The Assembly was thus brought into existence by the authority of the State, though the Parliament, as the representative of the people, instead of the crown, exercised this authority. It was not convened by ecclesiastical authority, for Parliament named the members and gave the Assembly its instructions. It was called "to consult and advise of such matters . . . as shall be proposed unto them by the Houses of Parliament, and to give advice to Parliament when . . . required." It will thus be seen that it was to act under Parliament, which body chose the officers of the Assembly, paid its expenses, directed its labors and passed on all its decisions and conclusions. Still it is only just to add, that when the Assembly was once constituted, it was not hampered by the Parliament, but was, for the most part, left free to the fullest debate upon all points raised. Hence, we find that the results of the Assembly show that men of great ability, wide learning and deep piety were in the Assembly. And it may properly be added that the Long Parliament itself was one of the most religious political bodies that ever met in any land or age. In spite of the efforts of King Charles to hinder the good work of the Assembly, it pursued its task from year to year, and with a patience and devotion worthy of all praise, and thus its members continued to serve the cause of truth and righteousness, as few men since Apostolic days have served it.

A glance at the Assembly, as it convenes, is all that we have time to take. Of the Episcopalians there were

to be seen four prelates and five doctors of divinity. Of the Erastians, Selden, Lightfoot and Coleman were chief. There were only five avowed Independents, though others were in sympathy with them. Goodwin and Nye were their leaders. The Presbyterians constituted the majority of the members, and they continued to take an active part in the debates, till the Assembly concluded its labors, thus giving a good example of the perseverance of the saints. Cartwright, Twisse, Travers, Gataker, Palmer and Reynolds were prominent in their ranks. And the Scottish commissioners, eight in number, must not be overlooked. They were not really members of the Assembly, for they were appointed by neither of the English or Scottish Parliament, but by the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, which was decidedly Presbyterian. They sat with the Assembly ; and, in proportion to their number, exerted a great influence upon its decisions. Henderson, Gillespie and Baillie are the three chief names of this company.

The debates were more upon matters of Government and Worship than upon points of Doctrine, for all were Calvinistic in doctrine. The debate between the Independents and the Presbyterians touching the form of government lasted about thirty days, and on other points there was much discussion. Touching the mode of baptism it was decided, by a vote of one, that immersion should not be recognized as valid baptism. But into further particulars concerning the Assembly proceedings we cannot now enter. Suffice it to say that the Assembly gave to the world "The Directory for Worship," "The Form of Church Government," "The Confession of Faith," and the two "Catechisms," Larger and Shorter. These are monuments more lasting than granite of the noble work the Assembly did.

In closing this article we make two or three reflections upon the Assembly and its work, and upon the men who composed it, and the value of the service they rendered.

First, the members of the Assembly were, as a body,

able, learned and devout men, who worked faithfully at the task given them to do. As to their ability and learning we have abundant testimony, and the work they did is sufficient evidence in itself of this. That they labored faithfully is shown by the long debates and thorough discussion of every disputed point. Nothing was passed upon till it was fully considered from every point of view. Probably no council of the Church ever did its work so thoroughly as this.

Secondly, they revered the Word of God. The ordinance appointing them directed that every point should be settled on the basis of the Word of God; and the history of their debates, together with the importance attached to the proof-texts from Scripture, show how carefully they carried out their commission. Every article, and each statement, was quarried out of the bed rock of Holy Scripture, and the debates in the Assembly were largely discussions of the texts adduced in support of the various propositions. Hence, we have a creed that is scriptural in the very highest degree. How vain are many of the objections to our creed when we consider this fact!

Thirdly, much importance was attached to the formation of the Catechisms. They were made after the Confession, to a large extent. The Larger was made first, and was intended chiefly for the office-bearers in the church. Then the Shorter was drawn up for the instruction of the young. It is the condensed essence of all that had gone before, and it stands absolutely unrivalled among the means of religious teaching for the young people. Our churches, our Sabbath schools and our homes should never forget this, or allow such an instrument of catechetical instruction to lie unused. It is a form of sound words into which the Spirit of God will shed light and meaning in after years.

Lastly, the earnest piety of the members of the Assembly, and the devotional spirit which marked their work should never be forgotten. Amid all their long debates and earnest discussion they never forgot their dependence

upon the Holy Spirit, and the light which comes down from above. They held solemn fast days once a month, and the services often lasted without a break for eight hours. Here is a brief sketch of such a service: "Dr. Twisse opened with a short prayer, Dr. Marshall prayed two hours most divinely, confessing the sins of the members of the Assembly in a wonderfully prudent and pathetic way. After this, Mr. Arrowsmith preached one hour. Then came a Psalm, after which Mr. Vines prayed near two hours. Then came a Psalm, and Mr. Henderson brought them to a short, sweet conference of the heart, and Dr. Twisse closed with a short prayer and blessing."

One little wonders that such devotion, coupled with such learning and patience, made the Assembly so remarkable in itself and of such vast influence in its own and subsequent times. They were men of God; they had strong convictions, and they left their mark on the Church in a way that can never be effaced.

We ought to recognize the wonderful Providence of God, which brought this Assembly into existence; we ought to be grateful to God that he gave them grace to continue and complete their labors; we should cherish with sacred regard the memory of this historic Assembly, and we should seek to emulate their spirit and apply the truth of God, which its symbols exhibit to our own age, with its new and perplexing problems, assured that the Gospel is still the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation.

The Doctrine and Polity and the Worship of our Standard is scriptural and complete. Its Calvinism is consistent and moderate, and thoroughly evangelical. Its Presbyterianism is scriptural, and alike stable and flexible, and so suited to be a power wherever it exerts its influence, and to be adapted to the new and changing problems of successive ages. It presents the faith once delivered to the Saints in its most complete and scriptural form, and our true privilege is to declare and teach the whole counsel of God, to

old and young, which our Standards set forth from the Scriptures, for the salvation and reformation of men, and society, and nations, to the glory of the triune Jehovah.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

II. THE WOMAN QUESTION.

At the regular meeting of the Synod of Virginia, October, 1897, at Fredericksburg, Va., the following paper was adopted, viz :

“Resolved : 1. That the Moderator appoint a committee of three ministers and two elders, of which the Rev. Dr. R. P. Kerr shall be chairman, whose duty it shall be to make a thorough and special study of the Word of God upon the sphere and rights of woman in the church of God ; especially in the public exercises thereof, such as leading in prayer and making addresses before mixed audiences, conducting such services and the public preaching of the Word.

2. That this committee be required to report the result of their labors at the next regular meeting of Synod.”

The occasion for the inquiry still exists, and is twofold.

a. First, past deliverances upon this question, although sent forth by the highest court of our church, seem to be inoperative ; fail, apparently, to reach the judgment or the conscience of the church upon this subject. A sufficient proof of this is found in the fact that this inquiry was ordered without one dissenting voice. The conviction seemed general that more was needed besides mere deliverances to stop the innovations creeping among us.

The deliverances of our past General Assemblies upon this subject are as follows :

1. The Old School Assembly of 1832. (Min. Gen. Ass. 1897, P. 16.)

“Meetings of pious women, by themselves, for conversation and prayer, whenever they can be conveniently held, we entirely approve, but let not the inspired prohibitions of the great apostle to the Gentiles, as found in his epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy, be violated. To teach

and exhort, or lead in prayer in public or promiscuous assemblies, is clearly forbidden for women in the holy oracles."

2. The Assembly of our own church, in 1872, reiterated this deliverance. (Min. Gen. Ass. 1897, p. 16.)

3. In 1880 our own Assembly passed the following paper :

"Inasmuch as the public preaching of the gospel is a branch of the ministerial office to the authorization of which ordination or licensure is essential, and inasmuch as inspired Scripture, as interpreted by our own standards, nowhere in the case of women sanctions such a solemnity, but on the contrary does clearly prohibit it; this Assembly does, therefore, declare the assumption of this sacred office by women to be opposed to the advancement of true piety, and to the promotion of the peace of the church, and this to such an extent as to make the introduction of women into our pulpits for the purpose of publicly expounding God's Word an irregularity not to be tolerated." (Alex. Digest, p. 31).

An added statement is to this effect :

"The Assembly declined taking steps towards incorporating in the organic law a provision that all persons elected to office in the church must be members in full communion, on the ground that the Book is sufficiently plain on the subject, and does thus limit eligibility to office to males. This was in response to an overture from the Presbytery of Roanoke." (Alex. Digest, p. 31).

4. 1891.—Our own Assembly. "It is the settled doctrine of our church that women are excluded from licensure and ordination by the plain teaching of the Scriptures, and therefore cannot be admitted to our pulpits as authorized preachers of the Word; and also, that they are prohibited from speaking by way of exhortation, or leading in prayer, or discussing any question publicly in the meetings of the church or congregation as a mixed assembly. This is according to the mind of the Spirit as expressed by St. Paul

in 1 Cor. 14 : 34, 35, and 1 Tim. 2 : 11, 12. But we do not hold that Christian women are prohibited from holding meetings among themselves for mutual edification and comfort by pious conversation and prayer, or to devise ways and means to aid the general branches of church work such as Home and Foreign Missions, etc., or to teach a class in Sabbath School. Work of this kind we approve and commend, but public speaking in the promiscuous assembly of the congregation or church is contrary to the holy oracles, and therefore should be prohibited and condemned by the Presbyteries and church Sessions." (Minutes 1891, p. 260-1).

5. 1897.—Our own Assembly. "The Assembly refers the Presbytery to the clear deliverances of former Assemblies, (i. e. to the foregoing) which settle the principles involved in the overture, and should guide all our church sessions in their procedure." (Minutes 1897, p. 16).

Such are the past deliverances of our highest court on this subject. Yet, so far, unavailing.

b. The truth is we must look beyond the mere church deliverances in order to get at both the true cause of the church's seeming inertia in regard to this matter and the true cause of and necessity for a special inquiry, such as the Synod of Virginia ordered to be made.

What is the true cause ?

The answer is, a revolution is now current and rapidly on the increase as to the sphere and rights of women, a revolution both in and out of the church affecting woman in all of the spheres of life. This revolution we may approve or disapprove, we may welcome or we may fear, but we all feel it, recognize it, know that it is on us. It is, therefore, vitally important that we should find out, if possible, what this revolution is.

3. Note, therefore, that abundant data exists showing that this revolution is already invading all of the spheres in which woman moves, viz : "Society," "the State," "the

home" and "the church;" that the drift and result of the movement is to completely upset all previous prevailing ideas, customs and laws as to woman's proper prerogatives and place in these several spheres! Its very name indicates this. It is called the "Emancipation of Woman." Its product is called the "New Woman." That this movement is one, that it is impossible to think of it or do justice to any part of it without at least recognizing this fundamental fact. Any "inquiry," therefore, that is adequate, must note this fact. It must note also the connection between the phenomena of this revolution, found especially in the church, and the phenomena found in other spheres of woman's activity.

4. Note, further, that this revolution is of recent origin. It is a modern movement, a movement almost wholly of the 19th century, if not indeed, confined mostly to the last sixty or seventy years; and as a movement of any real momentum, confined to the years that have come upon us since the civil war. Proofs of this are abundant. The deliverances of our Assembly are so many hints, or sign posts, upon the religious side of the subject, showing when the movement began first to come in contact with the Presbyterian church, viz: in 1832; showing its growth, especially since the war; showing its antagonism to the settled convictions of all previous years. All this is in accord with secular testimony upon this subject. Sporadic cases of what used to be called, "Women stepping out of their sphere," did indeed occur before this time, both as to matters ecclesiastical, social and political. Wesley's movement, for instance, of the last century, brought forth a few women preachers. The Quakers and Ana-Baptists had them to some extent still further back. But the movement as such, this mighty revolution, wide-spreading, far reaching, of which we now speak and to which is due the great necessity for the inquiry now before us, this is a modern movement, a movement of very recent origin.

Once more. It is a movement widely extended, a movement confined only by Christendom itself. It is not a movement confined to this country. All Europe, all the British colonies are more or less infected with it. It is not a movement confined to Protestantism. Romanism is also invaded by it. This prodigious change, swift, secret, stealthy, which, like all revolutions, "has stolen upon us with slippered feet," is already almost universal. These are grave facts, and being so, one inference must be felt by all, viz., the necessity of rising into the clear, unclouded atmosphere of truth in dealing with this question; an atmosphere far above prejudices of all kinds, where we can see and state things exactly as they are. To do otherwise will betray a littleness and narrowness that will of itself mark the attempted investigation a failure from the outset. The only spirit seemly and suitable for an inquiry of this kind is that of truth-loving, truth-seeking, truth-finding, truth-telling. If mistakes exist, therefore, in any of the statements forthcoming, the writer will be glad to have them corrected. The field is a new one, comparatively untrodden, and he is well aware that to dogmatize would be entirely out of place. Although candor requires him to say that his investigations have aroused in his heart a great fear of this revolution, yet he can easily see many good features in it. In many respects women are going to be better off because of it. Women are receiving a higher, broader education than formerly; they have freer access to the wide realms of literature and art, and other legitimate spheres of industry; their condition before the statute law is becoming more just in many particulars, the comforts and luxuries of life are coming more and more within their reach, and bodily health and strength are benefitted by more of outdoor life and exercise.

I will now endeavor to trace, as rapidly as possible, this great change now going on so stealthily around us, as to woman, in Society, State, Home and the Church; a

change which is affecting her as to her sphere, her rights, her character and even her nature.

First, then, in Society :

This revolution is seen in the change as to dress ; in the tendency to abolish distinction of sex therein, and to approximate, if not attain, entirely to man's garb. This tendency is quite common and widespread, far more so than most of my readers may realize. To illustrate : A private letter from Colorado says, "It is the exception to see a lady's bicycle. Nearly all ladies ride the diamond frame (i. e., a man's wheel), and they ride horses in the same fashion." Of course, such customs necessitate the use of something like masculine attire. Again, this change is seen in manners in the decay in men of chivalry, and in the women of modesty and reserve ; also, in a marked increase of familiarity in the intercourse between the sexes, the woman making the advances more and more, instead of the man, as heretofore ; again, it is seen in great independence and freedom of action ; in a tendency to mannishness in woman's social pleasures, as for instance, in Women's Clubs, Women's Restaurants, and other places of public resort for females, where wines, liquors and cards are often found ; in the great flood of literature written and read by women and the character of much of it ; in what may be called "the passing of childhood," i. e., the abnormal maturing of little girls, among the wealthy and fashionable, through the high pressure character of the pleasures they have, and among the poor because of the bitter necessity of hard work ; in the prevalence and increase of skepticism and free thought among women, and in the frightful prevalence and increase of adultery.

Abundant data exists to illustrate and enforce all of these points. I have in my possession scores of extracts from current papers, magazines, books, secular and religious ; also private letters bearing upon them all. Time and propriety forbid their use here. Constant comment is found

in all these extracts, and illustration after illustration. The force of this article is weakened, of course, by withholding the testimony of this mass of current information, yet it must be done. A few facts, however, will be given. Conversation between men and women in good society is much more free than formerly, and exposure of the person more common. Young girls travel unprotected, night and day, from one end of the land to the other; walk the streets of our cities, towns and villages, or ride their wheels with young men, tandem and otherwise, far into the night.

One million women are in Women's Clubs; novels of the most objectionable sort, impure, sensual, seductive, hostile to morals and religion, are, by the million, found in the hands, the homes and the schools of our women and young girls; dances, which excite the most evil passions, and gambling, but thinly disguised, are so common among female church members of all denominations as to cease to excite remark. As to female authors, some of the books most deadly to morals and religion, and most eagerly and universally devoured, are books written by women. Our large seaside resorts, flocked to by millions, are breeding places of social corruption, spreading moral pestilence continually. But I must pass on to the changes affecting woman as to the State.

These are, briefly and mainly, in regard to (1) suffrage, or the right to vote; (2) eligibility to political and other public offices; (3) public speaking, political and otherwise; (4) access to and entrance upon the whole field of public industry, the trades, professions, commerce, &c.; (5) liberty in divorce; (6) the recognition of her individuality by State laws, as for instance in (a) property rights, and (b) (in one State at least) a movement looking to her retaining her maiden name in marriage—(Colorado). For all these points also, abundant data are existent. Time forbids details of all of them. Take the two changes most significant: First, Woman Suffrage. Women now vote on all public questions, educational,

municipal and political ; they now run for, are elected to and hold public office, political and otherwise, in many of the Western States ; partial suffrage extends over a still greater area, embracing, indeed, all of the Union except the South. In this larger area, women vote and hold office as to the municipal and educational matters. The sentiment in favor of woman suffrage is growing rapidly all through the North and West, as is shown by the speeches and writing of politicians, preachers, editors and other prominent men, by the endorsement of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the most extensive and powerful body of women in the land, and by the astonishing and continual appearance of women in all public places and offices, in business in State and Church. Indeed, one cognizant of the facts can hardly doubt that universal woman suffrage, in the broadest sense of the term, is already almost upon us. Two things especially favor it : First, from the very nature of the case, it has no public protest from the women opposed to it. It therefore monopolizes and sweeps the field of public discussion triumphantly, and has been doing so unobstructedly ever since the civil war. The very thing that makes the anti-suffrage women opposed to woman suffrage makes them also reluctant to mount the platform and publicly discuss it. "The anti-suffrage women," says Mrs. Guild, of Massachusetts, secretary of a society formed to oppose it, "are retiring. They do not wish to push forward, even in print. They are women of the home and have no desire to be otherwise." Second, the very revolution going on now, in and as to women, in Church and outside the Church, has for its most natural climax, woman suffrage.

The other item, I beg you to notice, is the invasion of the whole field of public industrial pursuits by women. As far back as 1890, our census tells us, nearly 4,000,000 women were in gainful occupations. Since then their number has increased prodigiously. Women have literally swarmed into every department of human activity. Night schools in our

cities, to teach every manual trade, are flooded with girls preparing for self-support. The far-reaching effects of all this, as a revolutionary influence, no human wisdom can measure or foresee.

We come now to traces of this revolution in the home. These traces are seen in the rapidly increasing drift to "club life" and "flat life," and "tenement life," all three of which tend to break up "the home" as God would have it, and unfit a woman for it. For, as to the "club," every wife in former years used to dread it for her husband, as weaning him from home. Why should not the "club" nowadays tend equally to wean the wife from home and unfit her for either enjoyment of it or performance of its duties? Data exists to show that it does. As to the "flat," some may defend it upon the score of necessity. I will not deny. I simply point to the fact and to its tendency. And also the "tenement."

Again: Disinclination to offspring and decrease of offspring.

Government statistics just published show a "marked decrease within the last few years." I quote from the *Washington Post*, which gave some gleanings from the statistics not long ago: "People in the Southern States have the largest number of children, while in New England the families are the smallest."

"Disinclination to offspring" also has terrible data to substantiate it. Dr. Josiah Strong, of the *New Era*, explains the decrease of offspring thus-wise. Commenting on the fact of large families in the South and small ones in New England, he says: "A sufficient explanation is found in the fact that the New England stock is highly civilized, and becoming more so with each generation, and as the scale of being rises fecundity decreases." Perhaps there is a different explanation, at least in part, and that is, "Disinclination to offspring."

Disinclination also to marriage itself, and radical and

numerous views as to the nature of marriage, as that it is merely a civil contract, are increasing more and more; vile literature on marriage and the married state; repudiation of the husband's headship by the intended wife, and often by the minister himself performing the ceremony; decay of family religion, family government, and parental authority; the introduction of new seeds of domestic discord into the home life by reason of the woman going out into politics and into other scenes of public life; growing difficulties of domestic service, caused in part, at least, by a preference on the part of women for work in public life; growing unfitness of women for home work, on account of their work outside, either in social life as in "clubs," &c., in politics, or in business; runaway matches and other demoralizing modes of marrying, on the one hand, and facility of divorce on the other; and (11) what must be mentioned again in this connection, the prevalence and increase of adultery. These are the things that mark the revolution, as it is affecting the women in the home to-day. Let me say here two things: First, these features, in their present proportions, are of recent rise and growth; they are the characteristics of the revolution we are endeavoring to trace. Of course, society being imperfect in every age, some of these things exist always; but the point is, not only some, but all, of these things have multiplied so rapidly in the past few years, and are on such frightful increase as to make them rank justly, as the signs of the great change coming over woman as to the home. Second, Proofs of them all are abundant, reliable and terrible! They are at hand. Many of them are unfit for publication in a magazine like this, and yet they are the very ones that touch the most vital parts of the subject. I feel myself in a painful dilemma; urged on, on the one hand by the conviction that every reader of this article ought to know the facts I am withholding, and on the other hand possessed by the strongest reluctance to cite them. All that can be

done, under the circumstances, is to repeat the assurance that the proofs for the foregoing changes affecting women in the home of our land are abundant, reliable, convincing and terrible.

Let me venture illustrations, at least, on two points, viz., the effect of public life on marriage and woman's home life, and 2nd, the increasing custom of divorce. I give quotations. First, as to the effect of public life on marriage and woman's home life. Mrs. Margaret Deland, author of "John Ward, Preacher," and a representative "New Woman," spoke thus not long ago: "It is obvious to the open-minded thinker that the change in the feminine ideal is brought about by discontent; there is a threat and a promise in her present attitude; the hope in itself is a menace, and a grave danger follows in its wake." "The modern woman insists on going to college, she declines to be supported by her father, she objects to church going, she studies, she paints, she is not happy, is not very agreeable, and her life is marked by restlessness. To her mind there are other things than love-making and marriage; marriage, she realizes, has always been an incident to man, and is rapidly becoming so to woman." Again: "Individualism and social responsibility are the two factors in woman's progress that are bringing about this change! In this assertion of individualism lies the threat to the family!" Reader, has she not stated the truth? Here is another "new woman" witness, a writer in the *London Telegraph*: "Now, at the risk, sir, of being denounced as a traitor to the cause of progressive womanhood, I fearlessly assert that marriage and a professional career are incompatible, so far as my sex is concerned. I am writing as an extremely successful professional woman. But I would not marry and undertake to go on earning my present salary. Either my home would be pitifully neglected, and my husband would naturally turn to his club or elsewhere to find the comfort and consideration he looked for, or my duties to my em-

ployers would cease to be performed with that regularity, zeal and good will which they have a right to expect. Therefore, it would appear that the woman who has established a position for herself has to choose between it and the domestic life, and it is at that point that one of the most notable results of the new movement is first seen."

Now when we consider that an increase of 263 per cent., according to government statistics for 1890, represents the outgo at that time of women into industrial pursuits for the previous decade, and that the increase has been far greater since 1890, you have a measurement for the significance of this progressive woman's words, and also for the effect this movement into public life is having on marriage and on woman in the home. Again: Listen to this on women's clubs, restaurants, etc.: "Parisian ladies rarely go to restaurants. In London there are not more than three or four places where ladies are taken to dine, while in this city (New York) there are hundreds!" A lady in *Scribner*, for August, '97, writes thus: "The immediate desire of the young woman, upon graduation, is to stake out for herself a career in the world—with an idea of proving to the world that she can do a man's work as well as a man, displaying no prepossession in favor of doing a woman's work as well as a woman can do it." "I know the argument to the contrary; I used to write about it myself, and believed it, too, but that was before the serious days settled down upon me." "As things are at present, with half the capable women of the world doing men's work and the other half wishing they could do it, while the whole economic situation" (i. e. in the household) is upset by thousands of incapables, there seems to be a desperate need of some serviceable division of labor along the lines of sex!" The *Boston Herald* says, "the 'new woman despises the needle. There is metal more attractive for her, in the club, in the platform, in the pursuit of society, in asserting her independence of the world at large. She has ceased to sew."

Speaking of club life, Col. Higginson, of Boston, in *Harper's Bazar*, says it illustrates the "falsehood of extremes," the "habit of excess," particularly with women, to whom the peril exists far more than with men, of "belonging to so many societies—that they occupy literally every evening of the week time, and leave no time for reading, for thought or for the *Home Life*." As to the effect of this ever growing public life on a woman physically, a physician writes thus, in a medical journal; "the professions, in giving undue employment to the mind, would greatly predispose a woman so employed, to nervous diseases," at a critical period in her life. "Her very employment, to which many are working their way so bravely, is almost sure to entail suffering and danger." "Marriage, in the present relation of the sexes, is an obstacle to professional success; if women remain single, in order to enhance their professional success, celibacy entails many physical and mental evils, which will impair their value in professional life." Of course such facts show how public life unfits women for marriage and the home. Here is another physical fact: "A measurement of the relative muscular strength of men and women of the same ages, and in perfect physical condition and of the same height, shows that the strength of the average man is nearly twice as great as that of the average woman. This proportion of strength possessed by men, was found in nearly every part of the body, attested by a dynamometer, in two hundred cases both of men and women." Of course, if that is true, a woman who goes out in public life, to do man's work, will soon be unfit physically for marriage and home life.

The truth is, this fact, viz: the effect of public life on women as to marriage and the home life, is already recognized and accepted by the advocates of the "emancipation of women," as indeed we have already seen. Dr. Talmadge, in a recent sermon, openly advises women not to marry, but to go out and learn self support. Miss Susan

B. Anthony, the foremost leader of the Women Suffrage movement is quoted, as declaring boldly that we are on the verge of an era of non-marriages. Of course that means also, an era when there will be no homes. That is, in the true sense of the word. The second point, I will illustrate, is divorce.

The *Interior*, of Chicago, says: "In our 48 States we have recognized by the various laws and courts, 42 causes of divorce, including any other reason for granting the decree which may be suggested to the judge, and by him deemed 'sufficient.'" "A summer outing at a hotel is sufficient in the eye of a judge easily blinded, to establish a 'domicile' in another State, and the bond is lightly tossed aside, and the successful litigant goes home to consummate a second marriage." The *Green Bag*, a law magazine, says a man in America can marry and divorce, re-marry and divorce, commit bigamy, trigamy, quadrigamy ad infinitum. Many of the 42 causes for American divorce are of the most shockingly trivial kind: a woman, subject to sick headache, secures a divorce because her husband smoked and the odor of the tobacco made her head ache worse; a man secures a divorce because his wife did not sew on his buttons. A man not long ago, in Indiana, was divorced twice in ninety days. In South Dakota the reform of the fearfully loose laws on divorce was opposed by citizens on the ground that it would imperil the State's "peculiar supremacy," and so prevent immigration! Lawyers openly invite immigration there and to Oklahoma on the ground that they are "divorce centres." Divorce courts are called "Divorce Mills" because of the rapidity with which divorces are furnished. Seventeen years ago a United States Senator, who was on a committee to investigate the polygamy of Utah, told me the practical polygamy of the States was almost as bad. The situation since then has grown far worse. Twelve years ago, in 1886, according to the Hon. Carroll D.

Wright, who, by authority of Congress, prepared a report, 25,535 divorces took place in the United States. That is, in one year, the year 1886. That is to say, there are more divorces granted in the United States than in all the rest of Christendom combined. Since 1886 there is every reason to believe that this work of rending the marriage bond and breaking up homes has gone on to increase by leaps and bounds. In Ohio alone, last year, 4,470 cases were begun and 3,379 divorces granted. In Indiana alone, in 1895, 2,730 divorces were granted, or one divorce to every eight marriage licenses. In one county in Massachusetts 234 cases were to be heard last year at one time. In the city of St. Louis alone, the other day a paper stated that 2,500 suits for divorce were brought in one year and 700 of them granted. "No longer can it be said that the ban of social ostracism is the award of the divorced man or woman." So the paper comments. To illustrate this comment further, take these headlines, &c., of a New York paper: "In Tangled Lives," "Numerous Divorces Complicate New York's Smart Set," "A New Etiquette Needed." What will be the condition of society thirty years hence? And then it proceeds to give the names of men and women in the highest social circles of New York city, and to speak thus: "Divorced wives marry divorced gentlemen and divorced husbands marry divorced ladies." "The children of all of these tangled marriages will be completely at sea when they grow up and take their places in the giddy whirl, &c., &c. Chicago papers say that "Wisconsin is the 'Gretna Green' state, now, of the country. There is no license, no barrier or safeguard whatever. Minors are married daily and no questions are asked. There is even a competition among the unscrupulous in the ranks of the clergy for the fees that may be so easily earned. They employ 'touters' who waylay at the railroad stations or on the steamboat wharves, parties who look eligible, to direct them to themselves." Of course such are the things that feed "divorce

mills." In Kansas the officials of a charitable institution in a certain city (Topeka) say "there are over 500 deserted wives in that city, and that every day adds to the list of the deserted or divorced women." "The 'divorce mill' there is running steadily. Every week divorces are granted—incompatibility of temper being the general charge." "It cannot be denied," says the Northwestern Christian Advocate (Meth.,) of Chicago, "that in this country especially, the marriage bond is fast becoming a simple matter of contract, which contract may be dissolved at the pleasure of the party." And among the causes for this condition of affairs are cited these two, viz: "The over emphasis of the idea of individual liberty," and "the industrial gains of women who, finding themselves capable of providing for themselves, decline to submit to the evils which come from undesirable marriages."

The writer could go on with such quotations indefinitely. But surely these are enough to impress one with the havoc divorce is making among the women and the homes of this land. And once more, let it be noted that this condition of affairs is recent, arising since the civil war, contemporaneous with the emerging of women into public life, in politics, business life and church life, and with the other features of the movement looking to the "emancipation of women;" a factor, indeed, and a leading and significant factor, in that said "emancipation." For instance, according to government statistics, "the aggregate of divorces in the United States ran up in twenty years (1867-1886, less than twenty years, indeed) from 9,937 a year to 25,537." "While the population increased in that time 60 per cent., divorces multiplied 157 per cent."

Now when we consider the scores of thousands of children affected by this thing; when we consider that every one of these divorces means a badly injured if not ruined home; that in every one but two of these 42 causes of divorce, the divorced parties who marry again commit

adultery in the sight of God, and their children are the children of sin; when we remember that this sin is a leading sin, according to God's Word, that is, against the 2nd table, a sin most conspicuous in sacred history; so fundamental, indeed, as to have a distinct mention and prohibition in the moral law; when we remember that it completely annihilates another commandment of that fundamental law, "Honor thy Father and thy Mother." Then will our eyes begin to open and our hearts begin to quake at the prospects which are before our women and our homes in this land.

I turn now to the signs of this revolution as affecting the church as an organization.

1. The topic just treated, viz: The state of marriage and divorce.

Of course, the facts just cited come thundering with equally terrible force against the foundations of the church. For surely here, in this magazine, marshalled as we all are, under the banner of a God of the Covenant, all will agree that the family is the unit of the church, and that whatever dissolves the family dissolves the church. "No family, no church." Is it not so? Imagine a church, where all the adults live in adulterous relation to each other, and all the children are the fruit of sin.

All of the leading denominations, as far as I know, have scriptural laws as to marriage and divorce, but strong and steadily increasing pressure is now brought against those laws, because of the frightful and growing prevalence of the loose customs and facts I have cited. Also, it is to be feared, because with some of them, at least, those loose customs exist among their own membership. Already, in one denomination, the Protestant Episcopal, a great fight is at hand. We can hardly doubt that unless a reaction comes, a great fight will be upon the hands of us all.

2. Again, this revolution affects the "covenant seed" of the church.

How can a church have a "covenant seed," if it has not the family? How can it have a "covenant seed" unless it has godly mothers in the homes of her people, sitting as the handmaids of the Lord, at the very source and fountain of life, to turn the streams thereof to the church, to feed it and perpetuate it? The "children of the church" must cease to be "the hope of the church," if this revolution continues.

3. Again, this movement affects the doctrine of "subordination to man's headship." Its influence is seen (4) in the extension in the church of the privileges of female suffrage; (5) in the holding office and exercising the public functions thereof by women; (6) in the growing preponderance, as to numbers and influence, of women in public worship, public church work and in the church finances; and, on the other hand, in the growth of free-thinking and skepticism and other forms of unbelief, among women.

Once more, let it be said, there is not space here for the proofs on all of these points, although the data are at hand. I can single out only one or two. Take the matter of public speaking, holding public office, &c. Women now speak in public, or hold office or otherwise exercise public functions, including those of the pulpit, in the Universalist, Unitarian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of the North and West. The last census, of nine years ago, cited the number of ordained women preachers as 1,235. There is every reason to believe their number has increased greatly since. These changes exist in the foreign as well as home field. They are advocated boldly by preachers and church papers all through the North and West. One paper says: "If the same ratio of progress is maintained with advancing years, as has been reached in recent years, the women preachers will prove strong competitors with their brother workers in the Christian ministry." Women members for the various "church boards" are advocated and predicted by Presby-

terian and Congregational papers. In the Cumberland Presbyterian Church Assembly of 1894, 33 Presbyteries voted in favor of allowing ordination to women as ministers and elders. It was defeated, but the same assembly endorsed a woman as "lay evangelist." In 1894, in Louisville, Ky., and in 1897 in Baltimore, Md., a "large number of the city pulpits were filled by women on Sunday, at the meetings of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the M. E. Church." In Toronto, in 1897, 83 of the pulpits of the city churches were filled on Sunday by delegates of the World's W. C. T. U. Convention.

And so the writer could go on, indefinitely.

The other point I will illustrate is the spread of free thought, skepticism and other forms of unbelief among the women of the day. It would be interesting, too, to take up the growing preponderance of women in attendance on church worship, in activity in church work, and in furnishing church finances, and show that it is not wholly a matter for congratulation, as some seem to think. It is the same symptom our foreign missionaries observe in decaying Romanism, and may mean the same thing, viz: the simple fact that the men are "handing religion over to the women." But I forbear. Let me turn to the matter of free-thinking.

Note then, first, that a large per cent of the "Woman Suffrage Association" is composed of free-thinkers of some form or other. This Association is, as we all know, the leading and powerful promoter of the movement for the emancipation of women." Its most influential leaders are free-thinkers, Miss Susan B. Anthony, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mrs. Margaret De'land, Louisa Southworth, Lucinda B. Gage, etc., etc. The "Woman's Bible" is an illustration of their attitude towards God's Holy Word. It is the Bible sacrilegiously mutilated and shorn of all teachings concerning the subordination of women, and of all other things which they esteem degrading to their sex, or out of date with the times. It is the work, not merely

of Mrs. Stanton, but of six other ladies, woman suffragists. True, the Association, as such, repudiated it, but that may only mean that the free thinkers are not in a majority, or that the "times are not ripe enough yet" for so advanced a step. For to offset that action, take the following New York item: "The celebration of the 80th birthday of Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, by the 'pioneers and friends of woman's progress' in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, last night, was attended by nearly 3,000 persons." Certainly the indignation of the Association at her treatment of the Sacred Scriptures, was under good control! But note: "The main feature of her address was a demand that the church expunge from all canon law and the Scriptures, invidious references to woman. The Bible account of her creation was an instance," etc., etc.

Turning to other illustrations of free thought: "In 1892, the Minnesota Woman's Auxiliary of the World's Fair voted that the Fair be kept open on Sunday," and "Mrs. May Wright Sewall, of Indianapolis, was advertised to speak at various points in favor of Sunday opening." The Liberal Congress of Religions, a free thinking organization, convened last June at Denver, Col., and women delegates, especially from Western and Northwestern States, took active part. "All the modern spiritual fallacies," says the protest of a Northern preacher against woman preaching, "have been fostered by women," "spiritualism," "Theosophy" and "Christian Science," etc. In this connection, let the reader consider again the character of many of the most widely read novels and other books of the day. They are full of free-thinking, skepticism and other forms of unbelief of the most insidious and deadly nature, and they are written by women.

Of course this is a feature of the momentous change now going on in and in regard to women, and which affects in the most vital manner, the Church of God. Such then, is a hasty survey of the influences of the revolution now

current as to woman, as seen in society, the State, the home and the Church.

In closing, the writer begs to call attention to two or three impressive considerations.

1st. I have said that this movement is comparatively a modern one. I mean, compared with the Christian era. Roman society, at the beginning of the Christian era, i. e. in the time of Christ, bore several features resembling those of this great change now upon us. This is a profoundly significant fact. In what are indeed the salient features of this change, viz., the breaking forth of women into public life, political, ecclesiastical, etc., the changes in statute laws as to property, etc.; the free manners and free social intercourse between the sexes; the degradation, declension and perversion of marriage; the awful ease and prevalence of divorce, there is quite a similarity. The Apostle Paul alludes to some of these things in his epistles; Juvenal, Tacitus, Seneca, Horace, of the contemporary Roman writers, Gibbon, Lecky, Mommsen and other historians of modern times, mention these facts. When Christianity came, all this was gradually changed. The present movement would seem therefore, to be a retrograde rather than an advance, in the career of woman, for it is marked by these same sinister features.

2nd. Again. I have said that this movement is a universal one.

An exception, however, must be made in regard to the Southern States of the Union. In the South, its influences are as yet comparatively slight. But it is coming; and coming rapidly. Its traces are already found, and are multiplying in all the spheres of life, in society, in the State, in the home and in the Church. Proofs of this strong statement are only too abundant. It is coming, in all of its features, and unless a reaction is in some way started, another decade will probably see it supreme.

3rd. The third thought is as to the sources of this mighty movement.

Two remarkable facts exist as to this point. One is, that this change was started and is championed and led still by free-thinkers, Socialists, agnostics, evolutionists and other foes of the Bible and of Evangelical Christianity. This is certainly a suspicious fact. As long ago as 1858 John Stuart still advocated some of its most prominent features; as to evolution, it falls in finely with its theory; that is, in appearance! For 40 years the unitarian interpreters of God's Word have been used by Woman Suffragists, in its advocacy; and as to Socialism, Socialism boasts of being its father and throws all of its fiery zeal in favor of it. The other fact is, that there has been little or no attempt to defend it from the Bible. So far as I know, the Synod of Virginia is the first church body of any denomination, to institute anything like a serious investigation into the phenomena and the tendencies of this profound and revolutionary movement. The attitude of the advocates of it, in the church, seems to be, either a silent ignoring of the Scripture, a resort to ridicule of its statements, or a claim that the Bible must be adjusted on this subject to the demands of 19th century civilization; the attitude of its opponents, has been and is still, with a very few individual exceptions, silence, and apparent submission to what may seem to be "the inevitable." (The writer alludes to the church general). But if the movement be of the character described, then it would seem that no option is left a sworn disciple and defender of the truth. He is bound to oppose it and at whatever cost. For however imperfectly sketched, the features revealed here, are the features of a revolution; a revolution so radical as ultimately to break up the foundations of the church, produce anarchy in morals and religion, and destroy the authority of the Sacred Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice.

The writer would close as he began. While quite sure of his ground, he nevertheless invites investigation of all

the facts and statements herein set forth, and will be glad to correct anything clearly shown to be an error. All that he is after is the truth. But he insists that the issue is upon us ; that the issue is a grave one, and that the issue ought to be met.

P. D. STEPHENSON.

Woodstock, Va.

III. EXPEDIENCY OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

The woman question, in several of its phases, is occupying the attention of the thinking world to-day. We seem to be passing through a revolution of opinion and practice on the subject. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the Expediency of the Higher Education of Women.

It will be necessary at the outset to state what is meant by the Higher Education. Perhaps the clearest idea will be given in the simplest way, when the Higher Education is understood to be a thorough drill in the regular college courses, such as are found in our best institutions, leading to the Bachelor's and Master's degrees, and the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Should our daughters pursue the Mathematics through the Calculus and Quaternions? Should they master Greek and Latin Syntax, and be able to read the classic authors at sight? Should they go beyond the elements in the Sciences, and acquaint themselves with the most and best that is known in this popular department of scholarly research? Should they not only read, but also study History under the guidance of such men as Arnold, Grote, Guizot, Froude, Buckle, Draper and Lecky? Should they undertake the abstractions of Logic, and dive into the depths of Metaphysics? Should there be colleges and universities for women of the same grade and with the same advantages as Oxford and Cambridge, and Harvard and Yale? Should our daughters be admitted to our colleges and universities along with their brothers, and be expected and encouraged to climb with them the long and rugged hill of knowledge?

A. In considering this question, the fundamental inquiry relates to its practicability. However desirable such Higher Education may be for Women, if its attainment is

impracticable, then we must dismiss it as visionary. That it may be feasible, there must be institutions for giving this advanced education to women, and she must be capable of taking it.

I. The present facilities offered for a full collegiate or university course to women are found in schools exclusively designed for her, and in those where she enters in company with the other sex.

According to the last report of the United States Commissioner of Education (that of 1896-7) there are in this country 472 colleges and universities, of all kinds and degrees, where men can pursue the higher branches. In 137 of these the privilege of admission is not granted to woman. The remaining 335 have adopted the plan of co-education, and in them woman takes her place by the side of man. In addition to these 335 colleges for both sexes, there are 157 where women enjoy the exclusive privilege of admission. It thus appears that there are 472 schools where men may take the degrees, and 492 where women possess the advantages of a collegiate course.

These figures, however, do not make an accurate exhibit of the comparative advantages offered to the two sexes. This is true, because those 137 institutions conducted exclusively for men are as a class definitely superior, in all the facilities needed for the best and most extensive work, to the 157 schools where the gentler sex alone are found. There are only 14 of these colleges for women (12 in the North and 2 in the South) which are placed by Commissioner Harris in Division A, and this division is manifestly the only one he regards as composed of real colleges. Division 13, numbering 143 institutions, (of which 114 are in the South) are called colleges, but their curriculum does not extend probably beyond the freshman or sophomore requirements of a first-class college or university. A more just comparison, therefore, of the advantages offered the sexes in the United States would be

to state that there are 472 institutions giving full collegiate privileges to men, and 349 that do the same for women.

Three hundred and forty-nine colleges and universities, if properly distributed, endowed and equipped, ought to furnish fair facilities of culture to all the young women of the land. Proper distribution and equipment are more important for the end in view than excessive multiplication of schools.

II. The practicability of the Higher Education of our Women depends as much upon their ability to avail themselves of the privileges as it does upon the opportunities offered them for mental development.

1. In the great Northern universities, it is said to cost an average of a thousand dollars annually for a young man; in the Southern, about one-half as much. Where are our daughters to get such sums for their education? Manifestly, just where our sons get them. If parents are able and willing to expend their means upon the boys, surely they are no less so in the interest of their daughters. Moreover, women can be, and usually are, more economical in the expenditure of money than are the men.

2. A more serious question presents itself here as to the capacity of women to pass through the ordeal of an extended course in college or university.

a. Dr. Clark, in his well-known book, *Sex in Education*, takes the ground that woman is physically inadequate to the demands necessary for a successful college career. He bases his opinion upon the weakness of her constitution at that period of her life when this long-continued application to study must be made. As health is essential, not only to comfort, but to the greatest success in life work, this seems to shut the door of the college in the face of the entering woman.

But against this professional opinion, may a layman be allowed to urge that, in all the ages and over much the larger portion of the earth, woman has been the physical

drudge of the race? If her body has allowed her to do all the house work and a large part of the field work in the lower stages of civilization, is she naturally and necessarily so delicate in physique that she is not able to walk by the side of her brother up the toilsome step of Science? Is it not probable that Dr. Clark's observation was confined to those whose constitution had been enfeebled by a pampered life of luxury, led by themselves or by their parents?

What is there in a student's life that makes it unfavorable to health? It is not the regularity of habit which properly belongs to it; nor its immunity from unfavorable hygienic conditions as to food, shelter and cleanliness; nor the pleasant congeniality of its associations; nor its delightful companionship with the best minds in their best thoughts; nor in the sweet consciousness of daily mental growth and enrichment.

There is only one unfavorable condition, and that is protracted sedentary confinement. This, carried to excess, while frequently a fact of student life, is neither essential nor even conducive to its success. On the contrary, the highest average of distinction in study is obtained as a rule by those who give themselves relaxation in active physical exercises. Moreover, womanly habit is more accustomed to an indoor life, and better able to bear its confinement.

The truth is, that men or women seldom injure themselves by work either of body or of mind. Hereditary weakness, unfavorable sanitary conditions, injurious personal habits, and unnecessary worry undermine the health and dig the graves of the race, while earnest, persistent, cheerful, useful work, is good for body, for mind, for soul.

b. We have now come to the Alps, to Sebastopol, to the bridge of Lodi, as we inquire into woman's mental capacity to take the Bachelor's, Master's and Doctor's degrees of the university. A negative judgment is common, if it does not prevail as to this issue.

Let us clear the way by bringing before us the exact point to be settled.

The question is not as to whether every woman, or even the average woman, is adequate to the mastering of the mathematical, scientific, linguistic, or philosophic difficulties of the degrees. Of the ten millions (10,661,992) of males in the United States for the school year 1896-7, between five and eighteen years of age, only 52,439 were in college or university, and of these only 9,025 succeeded in getting any of the academic, or non-professional degrees; that is, about one in twelve hundred of the young men of our country are able to take a thorough, full course in college or university. As it is the exceptional man who avails himself of the opportunity offered for Higher Education, we need not insist nor expect that any but the exceptional woman should do so.

It must not be forgotten, moreover, that the nine thousand young men who graduated in 1897 were not the only ones benefitted by their college course. It is sometimes true that the non-graduate has done in mere partial or less regular courses as faithful and as successful work as the graduate has done in the curriculum. Still, more of the fifty-two thousand men enrolled in the colleges, it may be safely said that not less than fifty thousand were developed and strengthened for life's duties by their contact with students, professors and text-books.

The question then presented for our consideration is, has the exceptional woman the mental capacity to avail herself of the benefits of the college or university, so as thereby to be materially aided in doing her work in the world?

That the common judgment is prejudiced upon this issue is doubtless true, and is due to two chief causes. The main one is the force of custom. Until recently, woman's place was held to be that of man's slave, or of man's plaything; she was either a drudge or a doll, a cook or a coquette. For one role she needed no education, and for the other nothing more than to read and write, paint and play on piano

or guitar. Such have been men's thoughts and woman's habits for generations past. As she had never been to college, ultra-conservatism said she ought never to go to college; let her content herself with the training that made her mother and her grandmother good wives and good mothers.

Again, the age tends to materialism in the lower stratum of its civilization; and materialism has essayed to speak with scientific, mathematical certainty and authority upon the question of woman's mental capacity. It is made a matter of ounces and pounds; woman's brain is put into the scales and weighed and said to be wanting; as though quantity was the determinant, irrespective of quality; as though an ounce of diamond were inferior to a ton of coal; as though the disembodied dead, the never-embodied angels and God, destitute of brain, were equally destitute of mind.

We shall not decide this question on the prejudice of custom, nor on the false principles of materialism, but by a candid observation of facts.

The range of observation must be limited to the more recent past. It is within the limits of the life and recollection of the present writer that the college door has been opened for the admission of woman. The first institution with a regular and full curriculum, to admit her to its course was Antioch College in Ohio, in 1855, presided over by the distinguished educator, Horace Mann. In 1874, there were only about a hundred schools in the country that gave woman the opportunity of a liberal course of study. The movement for her higher education, in the establishment of first-class female colleges, dates from the close of our civil war. Vassar, the pioneer, began its work in 1865, and Wellesley and Smith followed in 1875, while Bryn Mawr is of a date still later—1885.

In England, no movement was made for the collegiate enfranchisement of woman until 1863, when Cambridge

University "permitted an experimental examination for girls in connection with the junior and senior local examination for boys."

These facts will show that the Higher Education of Woman has hardly yet passed its initial experimental stage; so that the facts to be noted are of the immediate past and present.

An appeal will first be made to the experience of practical teachers. If the writer may without impropriety introduce himself, as the first and most important witness; he would say that, with a limited experience in the class-room and some further observation, as he has visited other schools at their closing exercises, he has been impressed with the fact that wherever the sexes have come into class competition, the girls have not only been able to hold their own, but have usually carried off the prizes.

There are other witnesses—eminent teachers—who have had the amplest opportunity for testing the capacity of women in their attempt to secure a collegiate education, and who have given us the benefit of their judgment upon the facts observed. Pres. Fairbairn, of Oberlin, says: "During my experience as professor, twenty-seven years in all, I have never observed any difference in the sexes as to performance in recitation." President Angell, of the University of Michigan, late minister to Turkey, testifies: "We have not had the slightest embarrassment from the reception of women. They have done their work admirably and apparently with no peril to their health." President White, of Cornell, now ambassador to Germany, says: "The best Greek scholar among the 1,300 students of the University of Michigan, the best mathematical scholar in one of the largest classes of the institution, and several among the highest in natural science and in the general courses of study are young women." President Magill, of Swarthmore, says: "As a rule, the more faithful and conscientious discharge of their duties, which charac-

terizes the young women, has produced a slight difference in their favor in the matter of scholarship." Recently in the University of West Virginia, a young woman passed a perfect examination in calculus.

As further proof of the capacity of woman to undertake the Higher Education, is the fact that it has been recognized by the majority of the colleges and universities of the progressive nations. We have already seen that of the 472 male colleges of this country, 345 admit her to their classes. In England, Cambridge, Oxford, Durham, and the University of London, arrange university examinations for women. Examinations are conducted for them by the University of Edinburg. The Swiss universities admit them to their various departments; and they are received into the universities of Paris, Vienna, Leipsic, Gottingen, Breslau, and probably into others. At Giston College, Cambridge, established for women, the regular university examinations are given.

As the most conclusive proof of woman's capacity for Higher Education, let us see what she is actually doing in her efforts to secure it. By the courtesy of the officers of the institutions named, some comparative facts will be given as gathered from a few of the leading schools of the North and South. The University of Virginia, Vanderbilt, and Washington and Lee were chosen as representative Southern schools for men; Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, for the North. The Universities of Missouri, Texas, Chicago, Michigan and Cornell were taken as leading schools where the sexes are educated together. Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Vassar and Smith were selected as the great female colleges of the country. It was found that in all these fifteen institutions, for the past three years, there was an average non-professional, undergraduate attendance of 8,621 men, and 3,840 women. Of the men, 1328 took the several Bachelor degrees, or an average of 1 for every 6½ students; 180, the Master's degree, or 1

in 48; and 93 the Ph. D. degree, or 1 in 93. Of the women, 549 took the Bachelor's degree, or 1 in 7; 36, the Master's degree, or 1 in 107; and 12 the Ph. D., or 1 in 312. These figures show that the two sexes were substantially equal so far as the Bachelor's courses are concerned; while comparatively few women attempted the higher work of the Masters, and Doctors. The few that tried this most advanced work, and succeeded, have shown their sisters and the world that woman can do as heavy work in study as her brother can.

We may learn similar facts on a larger scale from the national statistics of the bureau of education. For the year 1896-7, there were in all the colleges and universities, as has been already stated, 52,439 men, of whom 7,051 were graduated Bachelors, or 1 for every $7\frac{1}{2}$ students; 1,119 Masters, or 1 in 50; and 269, Ph. D., or 1 in 195. For the same year in the colleges and universities proper, there were 19,393 young women; of whom 2,371 attained the Bachelor's degree, or 1 in 8 1-6; 211 the Master's, or 1 in 92; and 15 the Ph. D., or 1 in 1,300. Here again we see that the proportion of women, striving for and winning the lowest, and ordinary, college degrees, is nearly as large as that of the men; while it is noted that so far it is only the rare woman whose ambition soars to the aerial flight of the Masterate of Arts or the Doctorate of Philosophy.

This showing is more favorable to the aspirations and capacity of the gentler sex, when we remember that this Higher Education for Woman is still in its infancy, and that they who undertake it or consider it encounter much remaining prejudice and skepticism as to its propriety or feasibility. When these obstacles are noted, the conclusion seems to be justified that woman has fairly proved her capacity to appropriate the advantages offered for Higher Education.

B. As a second and less important inquiry, we ask whether woman desires the advantages of a liberal education. Upon this but little need be said.

The government report for 1896-7, shows that of the pupils enrolled in all the public schools of the United States there were 7,447,748 males, and 7,204,741 females. In all the intermediate or secondary schools, embracing public and private high schools, academies, seminaries, and institutes, there were in attendance 267,289 males, and 218,615 females. Of graduates in these schools, there were 24,391 males, and 37,423 females. Of those attending all the institutions of real college rank there were 52,439 males, and 19,373 females. In 1885-6, the number of women attending the colleges was only about one-half as large.

These figures seem to show that, so far as public opinion and the willingness of parents encourage them, the girls are present in our schools in equal or larger numbers than the boys; and that, despite the fact that the present passing generation has witnessed the inauguration of the movement for the Higher Education of Woman, she is showing her eagerness for its advantages by pressing, as she has opportunity, with increasing numbers into our best colleges and universities. The exceptional woman, just as the exceptional man, desires the Higher Education.

C. Woman not only has capacity for the Higher Education and desires it, but finally, for the successful accomplishment of her highest destiny, she needs the culture of the college and university.

The day is doubtless past when intelligent, judicious men doubt the advantage of a wisely conducted collegiate education. By many, however, it is thought that the time, money and labor expended to secure it are justified only on the part of those who propose to enter one of the professions. There is with these, and probably others, a more or less positive skepticism as to the ability of the Higher Education for Woman.

As the basis for this doubt there is a misapprehension of the main purpose and effect of a liberal college course. Under this misapprehension, Chas. Francis Adams, Jr., put

the ban upon the study of Greek, declaring that in his life he had never found any need for his knowledge of that greatest of languages. It is doubtless true that, with the exception of teachers, whose profession keeps them in constant contact with the text-books, graduates seldom have occasion to apply their college learning in the practical pursuits of business, and soon become dull and hazy as to the languages and sciences, over which they pored to make their degrees. If this were all that men gain from a college career, its utility in most cases might well be questioned.

But not so; the chief benefit of the pursuit of the Higher Education is not the storing of the memory with the details of the text-books; it is the development of all the mental powers, the discipline of the mind, the formation of correct habits of thought and action, the widening of the horizon, the elevation of the ideal of life. The college graduate is a stronger man, physically, mentally, morally, than when he entered as a freshman; if he is not, he has failed to secure the proper and better results of an under-graduate's life. The object of the Higher Education is the building of character, the making of true, strong men and women.

Bearing this purpose in mind, does Woman need the Higher Education? She can take it; she desires it; does she need it?

I. Let us view her first in the relation of marriage, for which she, as well as man, was designed, and where she usually does her noblest, most beneficent work.

1. As a wife, she needs the Higher Education to be a suitable companion for her husband. There are sixty thousand men every year in our highest academic and professional schools receiving the most advanced culture. There should be sixty thousand equally educated women to be their congenial associates in the journey of life. Why drive the husband to his club, that he may spend his earnings there in society whose tastes are like his own? Will

it not be better for his children, will it not be more pleasant for his wife, will it not be more happy and safe for himself, that the home circle shall be made equally congenial, and more attractive and pure for him, in company with his wife, his equal in intelligence and culture ?

2. As a Mother, she needs the Higher Education, that she may be the proper guide and example of her children. This is her highest, her holiest earthly duty. Her daughters and her sons are her constant associates during those precious years in which their habits are forming and their characters are receiving the impress which is to determine their permanent future. The father is away from home, engrossed with the cares and responsibilities of providing for the family. He is not possessed of the sympathetic nature that will cause his children to gather at his feet or to nestle in his bosom. The mother is ever with them; their guide, their comforter by day, their guardian angel by night. She puts her stamp upon the child; shall it be that of ignorance, of mental feebleness? or, with the purity of the diamond, shall the seal be as clean cut and as brilliant? The most intellectual, virtuous and pious mothers are needed for the best training of the coming generation.

II. Woman, as widowed or single, needs the Higher Education.

1. It may be that the support of herself and of others may devolve upon her. As our civilization advances and becomes more and more complicated, the instances seem to multiply, in which, from reverses of fortune, or otherwise, it is necessary for woman to become a bread-winner; sometimes for aged parents; sometimes for invalid brothers and sisters; often for children; and still more frequently for herself. With an untrained mind, she is doomed to a life of drudgery and to employments that involve more or less of social disability, which is galling to her sensitive nature. On the other hand, educated women have resources at their command by which in such emergencies they can,

with respectability and comparative ease, sustain themselves and the loved ones dependent on their bounty.

2. But more than this, whether it be necessary or not for her to gain a livelihood, the unwedded woman needs the Higher Education that she may do her greatest work in the world. The butterflies of fashion may content themselves with a life of indolent ease, or of wearying, worrying, wasting dissipation. But such a career, however gay and brilliant it may be, is unworthy an immortal soul, bearing the image of the infinite Creator. Life is too real and too earnest; eternity is too awful in its dread possibilities, for our years to be frittered away in vacuous idleness or enervating luxury.

There is a higher, nobler, grander pathway opened for the delicate feet of woman; but a pathway she cannot tread, unless her powers of head and heart are developed to their best capacity. Every man may be a hero, and every woman may be a heroine; for the Master has said, "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, let him be your servant." The cross of service is the crown of glory. By serving God in blessing man, every life may become sublime.

How may the unmarried woman do this? If she have the culture of the Higher Education, medicine, journalism, authorship, the professorate, the principalship of schools are all open to her modest occupancy. Many of the most successful schools of the land are under her charge. The bar, the bench, the forum, the pulpit, she will not enter, as these involve a publicity from which her nature shrinks.

In 1896-7, there were nearly two thousand women preparing themselves for the medical profession in the various colleges of our country, besides nearly seven thousand training for the work of nurses. In our public schools there were 271,941 female teachers, with less than half as many male (131,386). In the Southern States 63,560 women

taught in the public schools. In the public night schools of the United States there were 9,151 women teaching, and in the colleges and universities, 3,352. Here are nearly three hundred thousand women (almost twice as many as there are of men) engaged in the most important work connected with our advancing civilization. Who can estimate its value, as a factor influencing the future of the country and the world?

III. As either married or single, woman needs the Higher Education, 1. For her own development. Why should man monopolize the culture of the schools? Woman's interests are as precious as his. She was made in the image of her Maker as was he. She is endowed with the same mental powers; there is not one psychology for him and another for her. She is equally gifted with the endowment of immortality, and she is intended to grace the glories of the New Jerusalem.

3. Woman, as woman, needs the Higher Education because of her relations to the social circle, of which she is meant to be the basis, the bond, and the beauty. Her nature makes her the foundation, the corner-stone, the polished corner-stone, as the psalmist says, of the social structure. As its most important element, its chiefest charm, its most precious jewel, she must receive the most careful, the most perfect polish, the supremest culture of which she is susceptible.

3. Finally, woman, as married or unwed, needs the Higher Education, that she may do her best work in the Church. She may not publicly preach, nor bear rule in Christ's earthly kingdom, nevertheless her influence in the Church may be and is more potent than man's, though it be more privately exerted. In the Sunday school, in her mission circles, in her direct personal influence upon her husband, her children, her servants, and her neighbors, she has a sphere in which she can, if mentally and morally fitted for it, accomplish much for the Master. All observation shows

that she is a willing worker; in every proper department of Christian effort she puts man to the blush by her superior zeal and general eagerness to do. Put the 13-inch gun of the highest culture under her direction, and she will use it effectively upon the fortresses of error, vice, and unbelief.

The Higher Education is expedient for woman; for she can take it, she desires it, and, for her best service, here and hereafter, she needs it.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

IV. BODY, SOUL AND SPIRIT.

The question for discussion is whether these terms, body, soul and spirit, are to be distinguished in certain passages of Scripture, or whether soul and spirit are convertible terms? It is not necessary to prove that Paul, who uses them most frequently, had a theory of trichotomy—that man is composed of these three elements. We may admit that in some passages there seems to be little distinction between soul and spirit. But in other passages to be adduced, we can get no clear meaning from the words unless we recognize such distinction; and the distinction is one that may be clearly and consistently carried out.

In popular language we speak of man as mortal or as immortal. There is no contradiction in these statements; for in one case we refer to the animal nature which is perishable; in the other we speak of the spiritual nature which we believe to be imperishable. But when we treat of these two sides of man's being, we must discriminate between that which is mortal and that which is immortal.

So in certain passages, the higher, intellectual, moral or religious nature, may be referred to either as soul or as spirit. But when the terms are used in contrast with each other, we must admit that there is a distinction to be made between them.

In our ordinary language we speak of man as composed of soul and body. By the soul we understand the intelligent, spiritual, immortal principle; by the body the outer tabernacle of flesh and bones in which the soul has its habitation. If we use the term "spirit," it is as precisely the equivalent of soul, with perhaps a little more emphasis on the religious aspect.

Let us examine carefully the Biblical usage of the terms body or flesh, soul, and spirit

The soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) distinguishes living creatures from dead matter. In Genesis 1:20 we read, "God said, let the waters swarm with the swarming; living soul after its kind; beast and creeping thing," etc. Genesis 2:19, "The Lord God formed out of the ground every beast of the field and every fowl of the air and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatsoever the man called every living soul that was its name." Lev. 24:17-18, "Whosoever shall smite any soul of man shall surely die. And he that smiteth the soul of beast shall make it good, soul for soul."

In other passages soul is applied especially to mankind, as in Gen. 2:7, "Man became a living soul." Gen. 46:26, "All the souls that came into Egypt with Jacob were sixty-six." Numb. 31:40, after enumerating cattle, etc., "The souls of men were sixteen thousand." I Peter 3:20, "Wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water."

In distinction from the higher spirits, man is always spoken of as soul. We never read of the angels as souls, but God "maketh his angels spirits;" while the same term is applied to God himself who is spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

Instead of the body we find usually the flesh used of man, regarded as frail, and corruptible. So in Gen. 6:3, "My spirit shall not always strive with man for that he also is flesh." In verse 12, "All flesh had corrupted his way upon earth." Verse 13, "The end of all flesh is come before me, and behold I will destroy them with the earth."

So we find flesh used of all living creatures; Gen. 7:21-22, "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both fowl and cattle, and beast and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man, all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life, of all that was in the dry land died." The word is used also to signify relationship, as in Gen. 29:14, Laban said to Jacob, "Surely thou art my bone and my flesh." Gen. 37:27, "Come and let us sell Joseph—let not our hand be upon him, for he is our flesh." Rom.

9:3, "Israel my kinsmen, according to the flesh." The flesh is spoken of as receiving spiritual blessings in a mass; Joel 2:28 cf. Acts 2:17, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Luke 3:6, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God."

Flesh as the material of man's body is lifeless, corruptible and perishable. The soul is the principle of animal and human life, as flesh and soul are associated in speaking of living creatures.

Thus in Job 34:14 "If he (God) set his heart upon himself, if he gather unto himself his Spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together and man shall turn again to dust." So Jehovah is called in Num. 16:22, "the God of the spirits of all flesh."

But man is not made up simply of flesh and soul. There is a third principle, a higher element, and this is the spirit. The soul is the ruling power of this lower life, before the spirit is revived. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 8:8. When God created man "dust from the ground" it was the inbreathing of the spirit (נשמה here, usually רוע,) which constituted man "a living soul." Gen. 2:7. All life comes directly from the Spirit of God. It was the Spirit who brooded over chaos and brought order and life out of its confusion. God is called neither flesh nor soul, but he is pure spirit, and from him the spirit is given. It is the image of God in man, the sphere of his higher religious nature, the meeting place between God and the individual. Thus God is said to be the Father of spirits. In Psalms 104:29-30, it is said, "Thou takest away their spirit, they die and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit and they are created." So in Prov. 20:27, "The spirit (נשמה) of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the body." In I Cor. 2:11, "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him?"

The soul which comprehends largely the intellectual and

emotional natures as concerned with the things of this life, is the meeting place between the flesh and the spirit of man. The soul is represented as the subject of passions and desires. "Bitterness of soul;" "loved him as his own soul;" "my soul is exceedingly sorrowful;" "my soul is weary of my life;" "my soul melteth for heaviness;" "my soul breaketh for longing;" "my soul cleaveth unto the dust;" "my soul fainteth for thy salvation." Such are a few of the familiar phrases which represent the soul as suffering strong emotion.

Between the flesh and the spirit of man there is a continual conflict. Gal. 5:17, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, for these are contrary the one to the other." Here spirit should probably be referred to the spirit of man. In Matt. 26:41, "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." John 3:6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Rom. 8:6, "The mind of the flesh is death, but the mind of the spirit is life and peace." Gal. 6:8, "He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth unto the spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life."

As the soul is the scene of conflict and temptation it is in danger of eternal loss. Matt. 10:28, "Be not afraid of them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10:39, "He that findeth his life (soul) shall lose it; and he that loseth his life (soul) for my sake shall find it."

If man were an unfallen being, the spirit would still hold its rightful place of authority and bear rule over the flesh and soul. But it is weakened by sin, dethroned and powerless, needing to be renewed after the image of God by his almighty power, and once more given rule over the other principles of human nature. In this life man has become the "natural man," (*ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός*) dominated altogether by

the soul, the seat of so many passionate desires ; or even "fleshly" (*σαρκικός*) (sensual) "having not the spirit," as in Jude 19, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Yet the flesh itself is not the source of sin. As weak and corruptible it is easily led into sin, but the cause of sin is not the mere presence of the flesh or the body. Paul indeed uses "flesh" sometimes in an ethical sense, making it equivalent to the fallen nature, but it is not necessary to dwell on this aspect of the term here.

We may assert, then, that the spirit is that principle akin to God, able to know him as he reveals himself, and capable of communing with him. This is above the soul, which is the rational, emotional nature distinguishing us as men. Below the soul lies the flesh, the animal nature, akin to that of the lower animals, liable to corruption and dependent on the presence of soul for its existence. Withdraw the soul, and the body sinks into ruin ; withdraw the spirit, and the soul is given up to its own selfish and evil desires.

The seat of the religious life is in the spirit, for by the searching of the intellect alone, the reasonable nature, we cannot find out God. God is called the Father of our spirits (Heb. 12:10). Paul says, "God, whom I serve in my spirit," (Rom. 1:9). "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God," (Rom. 8:16). "I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the understanding also," 1 Cor. 14:15. "The Lord be with your spirit," Gal. 6:18, Philem. 25 ; 2 Tim. 4:22. (It is never said, "the Lord be with your soul.") Jude 19, "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the spirit." Ezek. 36:26, "A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you." Ps. 51:10, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." Rom. 8, 9, 10, "But ye are not in the flesh but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."

In the remarkable passage, 1. Cor. 2:14, we have the contrast between the "natural" or "psychic man" (*ὁ ἀνὴρ ψυχικός*). Paul has *ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος* and *ὁ δὲ πνευματικός*, ver. 15), and the "spiritual man" (*ὁ ἀνὴρ πνευματικός*.) The natural man is he who is altogether under the dominion of the soul, his spirit unrenewed and his intellect incapable of receiving spiritual truth. The spiritual man is he who is renewed by the Spirit of God, and who is filled with that life which gives the spirit power to control the soul and the flesh. He "is not in the flesh but in the spirit," because "the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in him."

The spiritual discernment which Paul speaks of is the effect of the indwelling of the Divine Spirit, opening the eyes, revealing the truth and giving strength to the will to obey that truth.

For this renewed and purified spirit there is to be prepared a new body, the resurrection body, fitted for its habitation. Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:44, 45, "It is sown a natural body (a psychic body) it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body there is also a spiritual body." "The spiritual body" is not a body composed of spirit, which would be a contradiction in terms. It is a body fitted for the use of the spirit, after its final deliverance from union with the corruptible flesh. Here in this life, the body is "psychic," ruled by the soul, and it is a marvellous instrument of all its purposes. But the soul itself is often degraded by the flesh, tempted to sink downwards into a sensual life, and unable to rise to the freedom of the spirit. The resurrection body will be a perfect instrument for the glorified spirit, incorruptible like our Lord's resurrection body, incapable of old age or decay, and utterly free from any lingering taint of sinfulness.

It will be noticed that Christ is said to possess each of the three elements of our humanity, flesh, soul and spirit.

"The Word became flesh and dwelt among us," says John. Paul says, "Rom. 8:3, "God, sending his own Son in the likeness of the flesh of sin condemned sin in the flesh." In his agony the Saviour exclaimed, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful." In the Temple he declared, "Now is my soul troubled;" and again in John 10:15, "I lay down my life (soul) for the sheep." When he announced his Messianic activity he adopted the words of the prophet Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me;" and almost with his last breath he sighed, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Thus he "was in all points like as we are, yet without sin." In him there might be the natural development of the body and the soul, indicated by the words, "Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men." Yet there was no sin in his experience, because in him the spirit ruled always. God gave not the Spirit to him by measure, and he was partaker not of the flesh of sin but of the flesh without its pollution. So Paul says in Rom. 1, 3, 4, "who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." And so Peter in his first Epistle, 3:19, says that the Lord was "put to death in the flesh but quickened in the spirit."

When, therefore, we find such expressions as these, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless;" "The Word of God is living and powerful, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit," Heb. 4:12, and particularly the sharp distinction between the "natural" (psychic) man and the "spiritual" man, we have no right to assume that the two words are equivalent. We need not assume that any positive teaching as to this three-fold distinction is insisted upon as essential; but much light is thrown on difficult passages by keeping the distinction in mind.

Some important practical deductions may relieve this discussion from the appearance of being merely speculative.

1. The point of contact between man and God is to be found in the human spirit. The intellectual nature, however gifted, is not able of itself to "find out the Almighty unto perfection." These things have been hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes. "To this man will I look, saith the Lord, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit and that trembleth at my word," Is. 66:2. In the spirit of man the worst effects of the fall are seen, and it is here that the real restoration of man must take place. Men swayed by the flesh imagined for themselves gods of licentiousness and cruelty; men led by the soul alone, "natural men," sometimes built up lofty philosophies, but by all their wisdom found not God. Life comes from the Spirit and to the spirit of man, and only when the harmonious relation between body, soul and spirit is restored can there be true knowledge of God.

2. The Spirit of God uses means in this work of restoration. In former times holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Now, we have the record of their teaching contained in the written Word, and in this we find the essential truth as to our relation to the Father, through the mediation of the Son. But the Scriptures may be read to no purpose. "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." The illumination of the Holy Spirit will make the written Word like a light that shineth in a dark place. Mere scholarship and literary acquaintance with the letter cannot produce the true knowledge.

3. There is a still closer fellowship of the Holy Spirit, which is invoked in the apostolic benediction, "the communion of the Holy Ghost." "The Spirit who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God," "takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us." He is the Spirit of Truth who abides with us, sanctifying us by the truth, and dwelling in the hearts of the children of God. In no dreamy, mystical sense, but in actual experience, the Spirit dwells among men, develops them in grace, leads them to

higher knowledge and firmer faith. We need not shrink from this belief as if it were presumptuous, for in words as tender as ever came from his lips our Lord speaks directly to our hearts: "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"

W. S. BEAN.

Clinton, S. C.

V. THE DOCTRINAL ISSUES PRESENTED BY THE CASE OF DR. M. H. HOUSTON.

It is not our purpose to discuss the ecclesiastical status of Dr. Houston. We would only say that his present relation to the Presbytery of Louisville reminds us of nothing so much as Mahomet's coffin.

Neither do we purpose to give any detailed statement of his doctrinal views. We have no doubt that Dr. Houston thinks he fully understands his own position. We doubt whether any one else does. What, for example, does the reader understand by the following statement taken from his printed answer to the indictment of Louisville Presbytery ?

“In answer to Specification V., paragraph 5, the undersigned denies that he dissents, or ever has dissented from the statement in the Shorter Catechism that ‘No mere man since the fall is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God.’ He holds that every man is deeply sinful before God. . . . But he also holds that there is a life such as that of the Apostle Paul, which says, ‘Not I, but Christ liveth in me.’ . . . This is the life filled with the Spirit of Christ.” . . . And in his answer to Specification V., paragraph 2, he says : . . . “The perfect or entire sanctification which he affirms is being filled with the Spirit of Christ. He uses the word perfect because it is a word used by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, ‘We speak wisdom among them that are perfect.’ . . . There is such a perfection as being filled with the Holy Spirit.”

We confess our entire inability to fit together the first and last parts of this statement. It is to us just as unintelligible as if he had said, “I have never denied, nor do I now deny, that two and two make four, or that a triangle has three sides. But I do also firmly hold that two and two

make five, and that there is such a thing as a quadrilateral triangle."

But we meet with no such difficulty of comprehension when we turn from Dr. Houston's personal views to the general doctrinal issue, which his case has brought into special prominence. That, the reader need not be told, is the question, whether it is possible to attain to perfect sanctification in this life. There is no difficulty in determining what answer is given to this question by our Standards. The Shorter Catechism question and answer just quoted (of which Dr. Houston omits the latter part) is the end of this controversy, to every man who takes the Standards in their entirety as "the just and true exhibition of his faith and principles." And there ought to be just as little difficulty in deciding which side the Scriptures take upon this issue. "There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us." And such decisive testimonies against Perfectionism might be indefinitely multiplied.

Hence it will be found that only the most ignorant fanatics, or heretics to whom the Word of God is a mere rope of sand, are open, unblushing claimants to sinless perfection. The Perfectionism with which the Church has had to deal, has nearly always been in some disguised or modified form. In the present article, therefore, we will give but brief attention to the barefaced form of this heresy, but will discuss at greater length its subtle, underground developments.

I. As just intimated, Perfectionism, in its undisguised, unblushing form, rarely ever confronts us except in the person of some ignorant fanatic. In nearly every such case, the claimants to entire sanctification are walking refutations of their own pretensions. Argument with them is out of the question. They merit no better treatment, perhaps, than was accorded one of their number by the eccen-

tric Rowland Hill, in the story which Dr. Dabney used to tell with such gusto. It seems that this worthy called on Mr. Hill early one morning and found him making his toilet. During the progress of his ablutions, Mr. Hill asked the reputed saint if it was true that he claimed to be entirely sanctified. The man answered in sanctimonious accents, that he was thankful to say that he had not committed one sin for the past ten years. Whereupon Mr. Hill, without another word, threw the contents of the wash-basin into his face! The sequel need not be described, but it was demonstrated to Rowland Hill's entire satisfaction that the man had not been sufficiently sanctified to lose either his temper or his tongue.

Worthy of more serious treatment, however, is the claim to entire sanctification which has formed part of many heretical movements, in many parts of the Church, and in all periods of Church history. Perfectionism has always displayed a most accommodating spirit, a willingness to ally itself with any and every form of error that would serve its turn. A list of the heresies with which it has been associated would cover a large part of the catalogue of false doctrine. The Nicolaitans and Simonians of the Apostolic age, the Gnostics of the second century, and the Manichæans of the third, were Perfectionists. So were the Brethren of the Free Spirit, and the Molinists and other Quietists and Mystics of the Middle Ages. Perfectionism has been affiliated with such well known forms of error as Pelagianism, Socinianism, Pantheism and Arminianism; and it has formed part of the vagaries of such obscure and short-lived sects as the followers of Jemima Wilkinson and Joanna Southcott. It has never flourished upon Calvinistic soil; we believe that the founders of the Oberlin Theology, C. G. Finney and Asa Mahan, enjoy the doubtful honor of having first introduced the doctrine of entire sanctification into Congregational and Presbyterian Churches. Of all forms of false doctrine, however, Pela-

gianism seems to furnish the most natural basis for Perfectionism. An instructive instance of this is seen in the doctrinal development of C. G. Finney, who began life a moderate Calvinist, rapidly developed into a Pelagian, and ended an out and out Perfectionist. Such, indeed, are the natural affinities of these two heresies, that if you will take off the cover from the most attractive specimen of Perfectionism, you are certain to get a whiff of Pelagianism within.

For this reason we will give the Pelagian heresy a brief examination, in order to see how readily it lends itself to the purposes of the Perfectionists.

As is well known, Pelagius laid the foundations of his doctrinal system in the denial of the penal consequences of Adam's sin upon his posterity. He maintained that all men come into the world with the moral status of Adam before the Fall. He denied, of course, innate depravity or original sin. When confronted with the notorious fact that all men show a distinct bias to evil and aversion to good, he tried to explain that by the power of temptation and the force of evil example. When still further pressed by the fact, that with the most favorable surroundings this bias toward evil still asserts itself, he claimed that this innate propensity was not itself sinful, it was mere natural inclination, like hunger, thirst or pain. It was to be regarded as infirmity, not as sin. He maintained that it would be a violation of the privileges of justice to hold that sinful which was born in a man; applying here the principle that obligation is commensurate with ability. Inasmuch as no man can change his native inclination, he is not to be held accountable for it.

Along with this false theology, he had a false philosophy to match it. In his philosophy he denied the causal connection between motive and volition, asserting that at the supreme moment of choice the will must be *in equilibrio*. He also denied all moral quality to the state of heart, the

motives and dispositions prior to volition; asserting that sin or holiness is predicable solely of the acts of the will, of the naked volition alone. Inasmuch as the act of choice is one and indivisible, he maintained that there was no such thing as the mixed moral quality of actions. "An act must be either right or wrong, and if right it is wholly right; and if wrong, it is all wrong."—*C. A. Finney*.

Such, in brief, is Pelagianism—full worthy of Dr. Dabney's favorite characterization, "A well-knit system of error, proceeding logically from its *πρώτου πσεύδους*." We will not detain the reader with any refutation of it, except to say that Pelagianism stands or falls with the denial of Adam's sin. Whenever, therefore, we see any one casting a slur upon that doctrine (as, for example, *The Interior* in its recent editorial upon Organic Union), we see in such an insinuation a Trojan Horse, which contains Pelagius and all his hosts. What is more to our present purpose, however, is to see how the Perfectionist, when pressed by Scripture and experience, always takes refuge within the ramparts of his friend, the Pelagian.

Almost the only Scriptural argument of any consequence which Perfectionists use is drawn from the Bible commands, "Be ye holy," "Be ye therefore perfect." These commands, they say, imply the possibility of the attainment of perfection in this present life; for God would not require of us that which it is impossible for us to attain. It is evident at a glance, that this argument leans for support upon just such Pelagian principles as we have noted above. "I ought, therefore I can"—ability commensurate with obligation. This, as we have seen is a first principle with Pelagianism. Now we do not deny the principle, we simply dispute this application of it. And we do this upon the ground of that cardinal distinction in a sound philosophy, the distinction between natural ability, determined by man's mental and physical constitution, and moral ability, determined by the dispositions of his heart. We would

freely admit the injustice of God's requiring any man to be seventy feet tall or his punishing a man for not being able to form a mental image of a circular square. But we can see no injustice in his laying upon us many requirements (perhaps holiness, among other) which we are unable to fulfill, only because of the perverse inclination of an unrenewed or imperfectly sanctified heart. The only reason why a man cannot be perfectly holy is because he will not. That is, while a man may, at one time, by one act of his will, choose perfect conformity to the will of God, that act is certain to be negated, or at least neutralized, by other subsequent volitions in conflict with God's will. And these subsequent volitions are caused by the remains of sinful dispositions, which were all the time in his heart, and which rendered even his first volition of partial value. So that, when the Perfectionist comes at us with the Pelagian sophism, "I ought to be perfect, therefore I can be perfect," we smilingly answer, "You can be perfect—if you will."

But here again, the Perfectionist finds a way of escape provided for him in another of the Pelagian tenets noticed above. And that is, the denial of the sinfulness of the inherent dispositions of the soul, or the assertion that they are not sins but infirmities. If the only obstacle in the way of perfect holiness be native depravity, just say that there is no such thing as original sin, or depravity of nature, and so "go on unto perfection!" This is "the easy method" which Pelagius invented about fifteen hundred years ago, and which many have practised since. Or if you must admit that there are troublesome propensities to evil within you, which you find it hard to subdue, just call them infirmities, not to be considered in making up your estimate of the sanctified state. We once thought we had a Methodist brother in a corner, who claimed to have "experienced sanctification." We began to ask him some questions as to the details of his experience, whether he had any wander-

ing thoughts during prayer, whether he ever felt sudden heat of temper when provoked, or whether he was tormented with unclean or blasphemous imaginings like other men. "Oh yes," he answered with a smile, "I feel that just as you do, but that is not sin, it is infirmity."

Of equal assistance to the Perfectionist is the Pelagian philosophy of the will. When pressed by the undeniable fact that the best of men act from mixed motives, remnants of carnality, pride and selfishness, insinuating themselves into our holiest actions, the Perfectionist seeks to save his position by the Pelagian dogma that moral quality resides in volition alone. From the Pelagian point of view it matters not what was the previous struggle in the man's heart nor what was the complexity of the predispositions issuing in the act of choice. You must fix your attention simply on the act of will itself; that act is either right or wrong, and this decides the case. It is easy to see what help this affords the Perfectionist. Arguing along this line Mr. Finney says, "It seems to be a very general opinion that there is such a thing as imperfect obedience to God, i. e. as respects one and the same act. But I cannot see how an imperfect obedience relating to one and the same act can be possible. Imperfect obedience! What can be meant by this other than disobedient obedience! sinful holiness! If an act is agreeable to the law of God, it is right, wholly right. If it is in any respect different from what the law of God requires it is wrong, wholly wrong." No wonder that the man who could do such superficial thinking as this, should have thought himself entirely sanctified.

It is sufficient to say with regard to all such reasoning, that in deciding the right or wrong of any action, the common sense of mankind always asks concerning any man's act, not only, "what did he do?" but "why did he do it?" And as soon as that question is asked, you have admitted as factors in your moral judgment, the whole complex array of affections and appetencies, dispositions and desires,

aspirations, longings, inclinations, preferences, inducements and what not, which issued in the one single act of choice. And with this admission the Pelagian substructure crumbles, and the Perfectionist superstructure tumbles.

And now let us make one remark before passing to our last head. In this discussion of the relation between Pelagianism and Perfectionism, let not the reader suppose that we have laid the cold corpse of a bygone heresy upon our theological dissecting table, just to exhibit our skill as demonstrator in the anatomy of doctrine. Pelagianism, it is true, is nearly fifteen hundred years old; but it is one of Satan's masterpieces, and it will live and influence for evil the thinking of mankind until the devil is finally and forever shut up in hell. Because of necessary brevity we have not burdened our argument with the names of many Perfectionist writers in the past, who show the hand of Pelagianism shaping their views. But if the reader wants a modern instance, let him take down from his shelf of devotional books *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*. (If you haven't it yourself, you can certainly find it in the home of some friend or parishioner.) Now look at the first chapter, and you will see that the Pelagian dictum, "I ought, therefore I can," stands back of all the author's fervent appeals. Turn to Chap. 7 (on *The Will*) and you will find the Pelagian philosophy of volition coloring the entire chapter—and so on, throughout the book.

II. We pass on now to consider Perfectionism in its disguised or modified form, especially as presented in such popular books as the works of Andrew Murray, F. B. Meyer and other leaders of what is commonly known as the Keswick movement. And here our task becomes much more difficult. We have to pass judgment upon the views of men who repel with honest indignation the imputation of Perfectionism.

"Sinless perfection has never been taught at Keswick, and no one holding or teaching it would be allowed to

speak from that platform. Even the suspicion of favoring this view might lead to a man's being dropped from the list of speakers."—*Rev. C. H. C. Macgregor, of London, in New York Evangelist.*

We also have to face the fact that those whose views we criticise are men of eminent piety, tender devotional spirit, and leaders in evangelical enterprises. And further, we do not hesitate to say that the Keswick teaching marks a distinct advance in the apprehension of some of the most important truths upon which sanctification and growth in grace depend. We refer particularly to the fulness and freshness with which these writers present that great central truth of sanctification, the infinite willingness of our Lord Jesus Christ to dwell in the hearts of his people, and to work in them that which is well pleasing in his sight. They also inculcate with great force the necessity of faith and obedience on our part, in order that the great and precious promise of our Lord's indwelling and inworking may be fulfilled in us.

It may seem to some that having made these admissions, we have given up our case. How, it may be said, can writings to which the tribute just paid deservedly belongs, be infected with the taint of heresy? When men of such character expressly repudiate the doctrine of sinless perfection, what justice is there in charging it upon them? But let the reader stop and think. Let him ponder the meaning of this sentence of Holy Writ, "Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savour: so doth a little folly him that is in reputation for wisdom and honour." The truth is, that when Satan wants to give the doctrine of sinless perfection currency among mankind, he does not always entrust it to some rotten hypocrite or crack-brained enthusiast. He manages to secure John Wesley, the founder of a great body of evangelical Christians, C. G. Finney, the leader of one of the mightiest revival movements of this century, an eminent, devotional

writer like Andrew Murray, or a devoted missionary like M. H. Houston, who shall present it to the world in carefully disguised, attractive form.

But the question before us is simply a question of fact. Do the writings of the Keswick school contain the doctrine of Perfectionism, or do they not? Let us search and see for ourselves.¹ Where the constituent elements of a thing are, there is the thing itself. And we find in the Keswick teachings at least three essential features of Perfectionism.

1. The first of these is the claim to a special experience analogous to regeneration, yet distinct from it; and above and distinct from the experience of ordinary Christians. Let the reader ponder this statement closely. Then let him consider what is meant by such expressions as the following, which he finds in all the writings of the Keswick School: "The Higher Christian Life," "This Blessed Interior Life of Rest and Triumph," "This Hidden Life," "A Lady Eminent in This Life of Trust," "The Teaching of the Inner Life Becoming so Widespread on This Side of the Atlantic," "It was only a short time before this that our brother entered into The Fulness of Blessing;" "At this convention the late Canon B. entered into the Rest of Faith;" "It cannot be too definitely stated that those who are asked to speak at this and similar conventions are those and those only who can bear testimony to a Definite Experience of the Fulness of Blessing."

So much for the language used—what is the thing which these terms are intended to describe? The essence of the Higher Life teaching is this: that by one act of the will—"one step of faith" (*Christian's Secret*, p. 30)—we are raised to a totally different Christian life, above our own past life

¹The reader is asked to study if he will the articles on the Keswick movement in *The Missionary Review of the World*, beginning Jan. 1897; with such books as Andrew Murray's *Abide in Christ*, F. B. Meyers' *Christian Living* and *A Castaway*, and Mrs. Smith's *Christian's Secret of a Happy Life*.

and above that of other ordinary Christians. It is claimed that this new life is one of "rest and triumph," "unshadowed by cloud or defeat;" that ordinary Christians have only occasional glimpses of this life, while those, who by an act of faith and surrender have had a "definite experience of the fulness of blessing," abide in this life continually. We are also given explicit directions as to "how to enter in" to this higher life, and encouraged to believe that if we obey these directions we shall at one bound leave our old life of struggle and conflict behind us.

It is not necessary to say that such teaching is both unscriptural and dangerous. The Scriptures nowhere hint at two kinds of genuine Christians—the ordinary Christian, and the one who has entered into the Rest of Faith. They do not represent two distinct experiences—regeneration and the entrance into the Fulness of Blessing. And their description of the Christian life is just the opposite of this idea of one leap of faith, by which you reach a high table-land of ripeness and blessedness, and leave the old life of conflict and struggle behind. "Let us run with patience the race set before us." "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect . . . but I press toward the mark."

And let a man suppose he has had an experience so manifestly unscriptural, and the end must be disappointment, illusion or worse.

2. The second feature of the Keswick teaching which we will notice, is necessarily implied in the first, and is the very thing our Keswick friends indignantly repudiate, viz., Sinless Perfection.

Let a man imagine that by one act of faith and full surrender he has been lifted into a "life of rest and triumph," "a glad, victorious life, unshadowed by cloud or defeat;" and the door is open by which the worst feature of Perfectionism is sure to walk in. For what enemy can bring

defeat into such a life or cast a shadow over it, except sin? The Higher Christian Life is logically a sinless life. And in further proof of this, it can be shown that the Keswick teachers are driven by the logical necessities of this Higher Life doctrine, to use language which describes the very thing which they have in other places expressly repudiated.

Here is a striking example from Mr. Meyer's *Christian Living*. In the chapter entitled, "Sin and Sins," after stating as well as any man could do, the Scriptural doctrine that one element of growth in grace is growing perception of personal sinfulness, pp. 58 and 59, on pages 60 and 61 he whips right around and makes such statements as the following: "Freedom from conscious sin . . . is within the reach of the young disciple and ranks among the elements of Christ . . . as soon as we put ourselves into the true relation to the Spirit of God, we may be kept from conscious sin." That is, the necessities of Higher Life doctrine call for the assertion of some kind of sinlessness. Mr. Meyer's knowledge of Scripture and his own heart require him to assert the presence of indwelling sin in every believer; the result is his holding out before us this remarkable ideal—a man who is consciously sinless, while unconsciously sinful!

This sort of thing calls for no further comment except this one remark. Church History abounds in examples to prove, that no amount of good intentions and earnest protestations can save a religious leader and his followers from the logical consequences of their principles. And deny it as they may, the logical outcome of the Higher Life feature of the Keswick movement is a conceit of sinlessness.

3. A third feature of the Keswick teaching that must impress any thoughtful reader of these books, is their failure to emphasize one most important element of sanctification. We refer to their failure to lay stress on such Bible teachings as, "Watch and pray lest ye enter into temptation;" "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood

striving against sin;" "Fight the good fight of faith;" "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." We do not now remember the occurrence of any one of these texts in their writing. At any rate, no stress is laid upon such passages of Scripture. And this is a radical defect in their whole system—a *suppressio veri*, if not a *suggestio falsi*. They emphasize one aspect of sanctification, and are almost silent upon another which is necessary to fill out the whole truth. Faith, giving yourself up to God, lying passive in his hands as the clay in the hands of the potter, are emphasized to the exclusion of that life of watchful, prayerful endeavor which God has made the equally essential condition of the indwelling and inworking of his grace.

And here is one of the well known ear-marks of Perfectionism. In the leading Perfectionists of half a century ago, C. G. Finney and Asa Mahan, we find almost the same phraseology and essentially the same exaggerated views as in the Keswick writers of to-day. Observe very carefully that the defect of Perfectionism here, is not the teaching of a falsehood but of a half-truth. It is perfectly true that the very God of peace must sanctify us wholly—we cannot sanctify ourselves. It is true that without Christ we can do nothing. It is true that the God of peace must make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ.

But is this all of the truth? Is it correct to say in view of this truth, that, "man's part (in sanctification) is to trust, and God's part is to work?" "The preacher who is speaking of man's part in this matter cannot speak of anything but surrender and trust, for this is positively all the man can do" (Christian's Secret pp. 27-29)? Nay, verily! The whole truth on this subject is in brief, this: The grace of Christ which alone can save us from sin, does so in response to our faith, and in co-operation with our own efforts to

resist sin. His grace is sufficient for us and his strength is made perfect in our weakness, only while we ourselves, in obedience to his express commands, "wrestle," "strive," "keep under the body," "crucify the flesh," "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit," "resist the devil," "fight the good fight of faith" and "lay hold on eternal life."

But we have carried this examination of the Keswick teaching far enough. Our deliberate and sorrowful conviction is, that no one acquainted with the Perfectionism of the past, can fail to recognize some of its most unmistakable features in this popular and, in some respects, helpful movement.

We had hoped to find space in this article for a comparison between the new writers upon the Christian Life and the old-time authorities upon this subject. Our feeling is that "the old is better." We have gotten more real help in fighting sin and keeping close to our dear Lord from Newton, Edwards and Owen than from Meyer and Murray and all the popular school. We would like to institute an extended comparison between the new and the old, but we have already trespassed upon the reader's patience and the editor's indulgence.

We close with one more reference to that ecclesiastical event which gave the occasion for the writing of this article. That event is to be regarded with unfeigned sorrow. The withdrawal of Dr. Houston from the work of our Church is a calamity to the Church itself and to the cause of truth. We believe the severance of his former relations to be necessitated by his new views. And if it had not been voluntary on his part we would not have hesitated to do our part in making it compulsory. But we do none the less deplore it. We mourn the untimely ending of a missionary career which was just beginning to yield its richest fruit. We deplore the clouded sunset which terminates a day whose high noon was so full of honor and usefulness in the

public service of our Church. But what grieves us most is the injury done to the very cause for which he has confessedly sacrificed his private interests and his public career. We fear that he has inflicted a wound upon the cause of Scriptural holiness which it will take years to heal. There is an inevitable swing to the pendulum of public feeling, and the agitation of his extreme views with the necessary criticism of them, tends to weary men's minds with the very words in which God has clothed some of the most precious truths of Revelation. For this our brother has himself to blame, not those whose sad duty it is to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.

R. A. LAPSLEY.

Greenville, Va.

VI. THE RECOIL OF EVOLUTION'S ASSAULT UPON TELEOLOGY—A REVIEW OF THE "ARGUMENT TO DESIGN."

I should perhaps preface this paper upon the Recoil of Evolution's assault on Final Causes, by the statement that in its preparation I have been little concerned with the bearing of Evolution upon Christian Dogmatics.¹

That there is substantial unanimity of opinion among scientists concerning the great law of development will hardly be called into question to-day ; that the triumph of the doctrine of Biogenesis has been so far a vindication of the position of Supernatural Religion, and that in spite of the substantial unanimity of opinion concerning the general factors of the problem, there is a wide and widening divergence of scientific opinion in regard to those phases of Evolution that had seemed to involve the integrity of the Scripture records, cannot, I think, be successfully controverted.

For the sake of brevity, and to emphasize the strength of the teleological position, I have assumed as proven many things which as yet are merely working hypotheses, and to which I should otherwise enter a most emphatic dissent.

The great central problem around which the world of modern thought is revolving is the existence of God. It is not a problem born of ecclesiasticism, nor indeed primarily the problem of Christianity, but the great problem

¹It should be noted in explanation of the style of certain passages, that the article was prepared for a Club of Gentlemen, and was one of a series of three papers, the other two being upon "Evolution" and "The Physical Basis of Life." This article was the second of the series and designed as an *ad hominem* argument in reply to the paper on "Evolution" by a pronounced "Evolutionist." That the writer cannot be so classed doubtless need not be stated.

of all philosophy. The age has been, indeed, even in the nomenclature of the most advanced science, pre-eminently a religious age; there have been gods many and lords many. We have been treated by turns to a "Religion of Humanity," the "Religion of Cosmism" and the "Religion of the Unknowable." Such terms, however, are meaningless, when we recognize the fact that they have at one blow stripped the conception of God of the one element that makes it possible that we can have towards him any of those sentiments that are inseparably associated with the idea of religion—the attribute of personality. And however ardent a devotee one may be of these new religions, with the "virtual negation of a personal God, the universe," as one confesses, "must have lost its loveliness," and the soul be left to "face, godless and alone, the gray, awful waste of waters, whose horizon is eternity, with no star in the infinite night for a pole, and no hope of a haven at any time."¹ This is just the pitiable condition to which, it is boldly affirmed, we have been brought, and however pitiful, it must be accepted. To this Teleology enters its protest, and upon purely philosophical grounds, affirms an intelligent, personal God, as the explanation of the phenomena of the universe.

The argument has found its exponents from the earliest history of philosophy. It is not merely the Psalmist of Israel that sings of "heavens that declare glory of God, and a firmament that sheweth his handiwork," but the evidences of order in nature led Pythagoras and Anaxagoras to believe in a Supreme Intelligence as an explanation of that order. Aristotle declared that the "heavens and the earth hang on final causes," Socrates elaborates the article at length in the "Memorabilia," and Plato not merely develops it in the "Timaeus," but his ideal of order and harmony is based upon the conception of God, as the norm of all ideals.

¹The Great Discourse, p. 11.

Cicero unfolds the argument with rare force and beauty in the "De Natura Deorum," and the literature of the Fathers and Schoolmen is filled with it; while Paley popularized it by his illustration of the watch and the savage, as it had never been before.

During the last half of the century, however, the argument has been subjected to a constant fire of adverse criticism.

I shall endeavor to show that much of this criticism either obscures the real question at issue, or is directed not at the argument, but the manner in which it has frequently been stated. I shall then endeavor to state briefly the argument itself, as illustrated in organic and inorganic nature, considering those criticisms that are directed at the principle involved, and shall lastly sketch briefly the recoil of Evolution's assault, in the elucidation and strengthening of the teleological position.

(1) Of that criticism that obscures the real question at issue we have a striking example in Kant, who remarks, concerning the argument, that "it causes our belief in a divine author of the universe to rise to an irresistible conviction" ("Critique," p. 383), and criticises it on the ground that it at most "demonstrates the existence of an architect, but not of a creator of the world." Others affirm, that "Nature red in tooth and claw with rapine shrieks against" this creed; while Comte adds that the "elements of the cosmic system are not disposed in the most advantageous manner," and modestly insinuates that he could have designed a far "happier arrangement."

It is doubtless sufficient to reply to both these criticisms that the teleological system does not profess to be independent either of the cosmological, the ontological or the purely theological proofs, that it professes to prove neither the creation of the world-matter nor specifically the benevolence of God.

When Mr. Spencer affirms that the cause of the uni-

verse cannot be apprehended as intelligent, because the finite man cannot comprehend the infinite; he ignores the fact that to give genuine assent to any proposition, it is the predicate and not the subject that must be apprehended *per se*¹ and in the proposition the "Cause of the universe is an intelligent cause," which is the affirmation of Teleology, it is not claimed that this cause can be known in itself, but only as it manifests itself, namely *qua* intelligent.

(2) Passing now to those criticisms due to the manner in which the argument has been stated, it is affirmed that Teleology is based solely upon analogy, and an analogy that will not hold, for in works of human art the architect works from without, while in nature the forces all work from within. While the argument has often been stated as though it were merely an analogy, it is more the inference to an intelligent Cause, for the evidence of order and adaptation in nature is as immediate and valid as the inference to the mind of the human artist from the character of his work. I can no more see or touch or directly cognize the mind of my neighbor than I can the mind of God.² I argue my neighbor's intelligence, not merely because he is a man, but because I see evidence of purposeful action, of subordination of the phenomena to a future result, and by as direct and cogent an intellectual process do we pass from the evidence of order and adaptation of means to end in nature to the affirmation of Mind as the explanation of that order and adaptation.

A review of the history of the argument shows that up to recent times, its exposition has largely been concerned with an accumulation of proof of the existence in nature of "order, definite proportions and means fit to produce certain effects," and to Hume and Kant is due the credit of

¹This doctrine of assent has never been more satisfactorily stated than by Cardinal Newman, "Grammar of Assent," page 14, but with a totally different application.

²Flint's Theism, page 158.

pointing out that a mere accumulation of illustrations of order and adaptation left untouched the real issue. There is no better established fact than that of the reign of order, that the earth is indeed a cosmos and not a chaos, but what is the explanation of the fact? Can it be explained on mechanical principles, by physical causation alone? The service to Teleology of this criticism has been enormous; it was seen at once that the question at issue did not involve the fact of order or of adaptation, but the inference to be drawn therefrom. As Prof. Flint has pointed out, there is no longer an argument from design, in which design is assumed, and then the statement boldly made, that 'every design must have a designer,' but it is the "argument to design." Do this order and adaptation manifest design?—(Theism, page 155).

The change in the method of stating the argument furnishes at once an answer to the oft-quoted passage from Bacon, in which he says, "The habit of seeking final causes in physics, has expelled from it the physical . . . and men reposing in appearances, have not given themselves to search for real causes." The objection has weight, and was designed to have weight, only against a false scientific method, and leaves the principle untouched.

(3) The teleological position has perhaps never been better stated than by M. Janet (Final Causes), "All that show order, proportions well chosen, and means fit to produce certain effects, show also an express end, and consequently a formed design and a well regulated intelligence."

Teology thus bases its argument upon the doctrine of Efficient Causes—every effect must have a *causa sufficiens*.

This is emphasized by M. Janet, in his development of the Method of Concordance in Inductive Logic. "This Method," says he, "is governed by the following Law :

"When a given number of phenomena, different in every other point of view, yet present one common and constant circumstance, this circumstance may be given as the cause."

This law finds a striking illustration in the adaptation of the eye for vision. To one who understands anything of the science of optics, almost innumerable concurrences of independent phenomena are observed, yet all subordinated to, and conspiring to render possible, the act of vision.

It is to be noted that the phenomena are said to have conspired, not in order to, but so as to render vision possible, i. e., these various and independent causes of vision, the iris, the retina, the optic nerve, etc., are all so formed, are all so collocated, "both with respect to each other, and to the future phenomenon, the act of vision, as to produce a definite result."

The one common circumstance, which these independent causes present, is the act of vision, and if we would be true to the inductive principle, cited above, we must say that vision was the cause of the coincidence, and concurrence of causes.

Or in the words of M. Janet, "Every agreement of a complex whole, with a future phenomenon, more or less remote, must also have its reason, which is given in the future phenomenon itself."

To this must be added another law, which says that "a cause cannot act before it exists." The act of vision, then, cannot be the true cause of the coincidence and concurrence of causes which have rendered the eye fit for seeing, for vision is their result—is a future phenomenon, and cannot "act before it exists." The true cause, it is argued, must be found in what has been called the "idea of vision"—that is intelligence.

This wonderful adjustment of means to end, this collocation and combination of parts in the formation of a complex whole, which M. Janet thus illustrates in the formation of the eye, is manifest throughout the whole realm of nature. Biology is daily revealing a "subtlety and delicacy of adjustment of part to part, of part to whole, and whole to the surroundings in the organic world." The argument

from adjustment finds its proof also in inorganic nature. Chemistry with its doctrine of definite proportions, Astronomy with its revelation of the persistence of the law of order and adjustment throughout infinite space, Geology unfolding the reign of law throughout infinite time, have combined to strengthen the argument for a controlling, formative intelligence at work throughout the universe.

Nature has thus yielded to scientific investigation, aided by the microscope and telescope, a revelation of the reign of adjustment and order, mathematical relations and numbers, until, as has been said, "it seems a living arithmetic in its development and a realized geometry in its repose."

(4) Evolution, however, directs its keenest shafts of criticism at the very principle of the teleological argument.

It is boldly affirmed that Evolution offers an explanation of all phenomena, without the necessity for the intervention or superintence of Mind, at any stage of the process.

This explanation is found in the universal reign of Law—certain physical laws, the Law of the Survival of the Fittest, of Environment and Heredity, of Natural and Physiological Selection, and of the Persistence of Force, it is held, are sufficient of themselves to explain all the phenomena of the universe.

I cannot better state the supposed effect of Evolution upon Teleology than by quoting the words of the warm personal friend of Darwin—George Romanes: He argues that the structure of the eye may be "proximately due to the operation of physical causes. Thus for the value of the argument, let us assume," he says, "that natural selection has been satisfactorily established as a cause adequate to account for all these effects. Given the facts of heredity, variation, the struggle for existence, and the consequent survival of the fittest, what follows? Why that each step in the prolonged and gradual development of the eye was brought about by the gradual elimination of all the less

adapted structures in any given generation, and the selection of all the better adapted to perpetuate the improvement of heredity."¹

Thus, he argues, all special design is disproved, because the whole process is natural and due to physical causes.

It may be replied, however, that no consistent teleologist attempts always to prove *special design*.

If the higher Teleology be true, and all things constructed after a general plan, nothing surely interferes with our belief in special design except our inability to comprehend the working of an all-wise Intelligence able to embrace within its design every factor of the general plan, but the Teleologist is not called upon to prove this special design. Laws, Natural Selection, Survival of the Fittest, etc., are not "causes" in any true sense of the term, but simply expressions of the *modus operandi* of natural forces, in a word, Evolution is an historical and not a causal process, and these laws only formulæ for the manner in which observed phenomena operate, and the "immutability and uniformity" of these natural laws, an inference from experience. Surely, however, because a "thing has been conditioned is no reason why it cannot have been designed."

That the eye has been constructed so as to be capable of seeing is no reason why it may not have been constructed in order that it might see.²

Yet Huxley, Comte, and a host of others declare that when once this natural process has been described, the last word for design has been refuted, and henceforth the argument relegated to the superstitions of the past.

I give one other illustration of this species of reasoning from Mr. Huxley himself: "The teleological argument runs thus: 'An organ or organism (a) is precisely fitted to perform a function or purpose (b); therefore it was specially constructed to perform that purpose.'"

¹Thoughts on Religion, pages 64, 65.

²Flint's Theism, page 185.

“Suppose, however,” (in Paley’s famous illustration concerning the watch), “that any one had been able to show that the watch had not been made directly by any person, but that it was the result of the modification of another watch which kept time but poorly, and that this again, had proceeded from a structure which could hardly be called a watch at all, seeing that it had no figures on the dial, and the hands were rudimentary, and that going back and back in time, we come at last to a revolving barrel, as the earliest traceable rudiment of the whole fabric. And imagine that it had been possible to show that all these changes had resulted, first from a tendency in the structure to vary indefinitely, and secondly, from something in the surrounding world, which helped all variations in the direction of an accurate time keeper and checked all those in other direction, then it is obvious that the force of Paley’s argument would be gone. For it would then be evidently demonstrated that an apparatus thoroughly well adapted to a particular purpose might be the result of a method of trial and error, worked by unintelligent agents, as well as the direct application of appropriate means to an end by an intelligent agent.”¹

Most of us, however, I think, would hold, that it had been demonstrated only that this revolving barrel was the most remarkable piece of mechanism we had ever seen, and that the “tendency in the structure to vary, combined with the something in the surrounding world, which helped all variation in the direction of an accurate time-keeper and checked all variation in other directions,” was the very thing that most needed an explanation, which cannot be found in the “unintelligent agents” (?), by which the perfected watch was evolved out of the revolving barrel, and the fact that it was *accustomed* to do this sort of thing, would only add to our conviction that this marvelous mechanism was designed to do this very thing.

¹Lay Sermons, pages 330, 331.

Evolution has gone beyond this statement of Huxley, and affirms that not merely certain organisms are the result of these laws of development, but that the totality of phenomena in the universe, is the result of a "primordial molecular arrangement from which these phenomena are evolved."

This primordial molecular arrangement containing within it the possibilities of the cosmos, the potentiality of all life, demands a mind more comprehensive and wonderful than anything ever conceived of, in the mere orderly adjustment of means to end in any single product of nature's workshop, and so far from the mechanist hypothesis having displaced the doctrine of design, we are indebted to it for a higher Teleology, that finds its chief support in this boasted reign of law.

(5) It is evident, however, that the question has only been pushed back a step further. When we asked, What is the cause of the phenomena of nature? it was answered, The Laws of Evolution; when it is further asked, What is the cause of this historical process, Evolution? it is answered, Primordial molecular arrangement. The mind, however, cannot rest here, it presses the query, What is the cause of this "primordial molecular arrangement?" Mr. Spencer answers,¹ "The Persistence of Force"—this is the "unconditioned reality, without beginning or end. To this an ultimate analysis brings us down, and on this a rational synthesis must build up."

That is, given the doctrine of the persistence of force, and the cosmos can be accounted for. "Uniformity of law," says he, "inevitably follows from the persistence of force," and as this uniformity of law is the very thing we have supposed explicable only on the assumption of Intelligence, we have here an hypothesis that, if proven, would drive Teleology from the field. Mr. Spencer's theory has been shown to be "unsatisfactory to mathematicians, physicists

¹"First Principles," Chapter vi.

and logicians," but assuming it established, that it explains fully the phenomena of causation, it does not explain what is critical and most demands explanation, how it is that force and matter alone have produced a cosmos and not a chaos.

It utterly fails to explain the "determination of this force into the particular channel through which it flows."

As Romanes, who was at one time a supporter of this position of Mr. Spencer, says, "Physical causation cannot be made to supply its own explanation and the mere persistence of force even if it were conceded to account for particular cases of physical sequence, can give no account of the ubiquitous and eternal direction of force in the construction and maintainance of universal order."¹

We thus affirm a directing Mind-Intelligence as the true unconditioned reality without beginning or end.

Reviewing briefly the discussion, we find that Teleology, far from being weakened by Evolution's assault, is greatly indebted to it.

(1) To the controversy growing out of Evolution is largely due the clearer and more scientific statement of the doctrine of Final Causes, and the elimination of extraneous matter from the argument.

(2) The establishing of the fact of the universal reign of law, growing out of the hypothesis of Evolution and forming a corner stone of the theory, has forever eliminated Chance as an explanation of the Universe.

(3) Evolution, however, has not merely demonstrated the Reign of Law, by which the Teleologist is enabled to affirm that the universe is a cosmos and therefore the product of Intelligence, but it has gone further and demonstrated the existence of a Law of Progress, in which it is seen that this cosmic order is developing according to a plan that holds us and all things in a vast and yet vaster sweep.

¹"Thoughts on Religion," p. 72.

And with the aid now of this prophet of Science—for even the Saul of Evolution is among the prophets—the devout teleologist proclaims “One God, one law, one element, and one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves.”

It is surely significant, that Evolution itself finds the climax of development, where the Teleologist has always affirmed it, in Man—the evolution of society, humanity, of the religious consciousness in the individual, are assumed to be the goal of the process—“The earnest expectation of creation, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.”

(4) In pushing the hypothesis of Agnostic Evolution to its extreme but logical conclusion, in the assumption of the mere “persistence of force as the true, unconditioned reality,” explaining all the phenomena of the universe, Mr. Spencer has unconsciously done the cause of Teleology great service. Reduced to its “ultimate analysis,” the “peristence of force,” without the intervention of Mind to give direction to that force, does not, and in the very nature of the case cannot explain the phenomena of nature; and routed in the future here, it is evident that however startling may be the assumption of Evolution, it can never eliminate the proof of regulated intelligence at work through these forces.

(5) And lastly, to Evolution is indirectly due the explication of the doctrine of Causation—involving the proof of the immanence of Intelligence. This, indeed, is no new teaching, even the heathen poets declared of the great First Cause, “In him we live and move and have our being,” and Christianity has long ago developed the doctrine fully; but the attack on special creation has driven many theists to Deism in philosophy, and with a multitude, the God of nature had come to be conceived as a sort of *deus ex machina*, sitting since the seventh day of creation “on the circle of the universe and watching it go.” The new impetus given to scientific investigation has led to the

acceptance by a large body of philosophers of the dynamic theory of will—that all causation is in its last analysis of the nature of will-energy. Thus is explained how the immutability and uniformity of natural law are not inconsistent with a free intelligence, but are due to the self-consistency of that will—the immutability of nature is thus the faithfulness of the directing Mind to its plan founded in unerring wisdom. These laws are the systematic exercise of the volition of a Divine Being, whose supreme will is “not only the source of all law, but the working force of nature herself.”

“God is law, say the wise; O Soul, and let us rejoice,
For if he thunder by law, the thunder is yet his voice.”

In this doctrine (of the immanence) of the Intelligent Cause of the universe, we have the union of what have frequently been considered rival doctrines—personality and immanence—and again we exclaim with Tennyson,

“Then speak to him, thou, for he hears, and spirit with spirit can meet—
Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands or feet.”

NEAL L. ANDERSON.

Montgomery, Ala.

VII. AN OLD ENEMY WITH TWO NEW FACES.

The resemblance between the teachings of Mrs. Eddy and those of Madame Blavatsky, not only in substance, but even in identity of terms and expression having been exhibited in a former paper,¹ is now proposed to push the inquiry a step further back, and exhibit the common origin of these two new religious systems.

Glimpses of heresy appear in the New Testament. Ire-næus informs us that the gospel of John was written to refute the heresy of Cerinthus, who denied the proper Divinity and Christhood of Jesus. This statement is borne out by the beloved disciple's own declaration: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through his name." Paul found himself compelled to defend the faith against Judaizing teachers everywhere, and especially in the churches of Corinth and Galatia; but his epistles abound in reference to other forms of error. He speaks of "endless genealogies," referring, doubtless, both to the Jewish teachings as to the propagation of angels, and also, as Alford insists, to "doctrines of emanations;" and warns the churches against "philosophy and vain deceit," "strife of words," and more particularly, "oppositions of science, falsely so-called." His word for science is *γνωσις*, which was the term chosen to designate their philosophy by certain would-be philosophers who were seeking to improve upon the teachings of the Bible and of Christ. The sects which claimed to possess this superior wisdom or *γνωσις*, were termed Gnostics. As many of them professed the Christian faith, and all of them professed to believe in God, they were the Christian Gnostics, or Christian Scientists, and Theosophists of their day. The so-called "science" or "wisdom" of these ancient heretics

¹PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, October, 1898.

has not, as it were, filtered through the centuries, purified in its onward flow, but it has been transmitted rank, whole and entire—the old wine in the old bottles, unchanged in labels, skins or contents.

Two Gnostic sects appear in the New Testament. One is the Simonians, who came before us in the person of their founder, Simon Magus, to whom Peter administers a scathing rebuke for his shamelessly venal and hypocritical spirit.

All the church fathers agree with Irenæus in terming Simon Magus the "Master" and "progenitor" of all heretics in general, and of Gnostics in particular. The other sect is the Nicolaitans, mentioned in Rev. ii, 6-15. These are said by tradition to have derived their origin from Nicolas, an apostate deacon of the Church of Jerusalem. The reference to this sect by the Apocalyptic angel imply that their lives were scandalous. The testimony of the fathers is such as to show conclusively that they were guilty of "turning the grace of God into lasciviousness."

The religious and philosophical principles of these ancient heretics were derived from various sources. Buddhism, with its pantheistic and ascetic notions, had already, in the time of Christ, made its way into Western Asia, and contributed a large share. The teachings of Zoroaster survived in the philosophy and cultus of the fire-worshippers, Pythagoras had not been forgotten, while the Platonic doctrine of ideas was favorably received by men of culture at Rome, at Athens, and at Alexandria; and both systems were sources of the new philosophy. "The Platonic speculation," says Dr. Schaff, "yielded the germs of the Gnostic doctrine of æons, the conceptions of matter, of the antithesis of an ideal and real world, of an ante-mundane fall of souls from the ideal world, of the origin of sin from matter, and of the needed redemption of the soul from the fetters of the body." To these various elements, Gnosticism added something from the speculations of Philo, the Jew, and from the philosophy of the Cabala. All these ingredients were, to use

the apt phrase of the great scholar just quoted, not mechanically mixed, but "chemically combined," and the result was the "grandest and most comprehensive form of religious syncretism known to history." Its whole essence was the transfusion of heathen philosophy and religion into the faith once delivered to the saints. For this reason it was vigorously opposed by the apostles in their day, and in succeeding generations fought by a multitude of able and faithful defenders of the truth. Polycarp, the disciple of John, denounced the Gnostic Marcion as the "first-born of Satan," and in his epistle to the Philippians he exposed Gnostic error with special regard to its gross perversions of Scripture. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, continued the struggle, and his refutation of "Science, falsely so called," was the great polemic of his age. Tertullian, also, wrote a refutation of the same heresy, directed mainly against the teachings of Marcion and Valentinus; and Hippolytus, the disciple of Irenæus, in his elaborate "Philosophoumena," traced the Gnostic heresy to its fountain heads in the several systems of Greek philosophy. By such men was the battle waged, until the foul error was almost entirely driven from the fold of the church, continuing to survive only in the doctrines of obscure heretical bodies, and in the esoteric teachings of oriental heathen sects.

A revival of this ancient ism has recently been brought about, partly through the instrumentality of Madame Blavatsky, a Russian adventuress, whose successful imposture is one of the saddest commentaries upon the gullibility of mankind, and partly through the "inspired" ministry of the "Reverend" Mary Eddy. It is the boast of Mrs. Eddy that "neither tongue nor pen" taught her those precious doctrines which, in a mere jumble of fragments, she sets forth in her miraculous volumes. She acknowledges no earthly master, nor, indeed, any heavenly, save her own master thought; and her views were not inspired by Koot Hoomi letters, nor yet gleaned from Platonic philosophy

or esoteric Buddhism. Madame Blavatsky, however, while claiming special illumination through the masters with whom she was permitted to associate amid the remote fastnesses of India and Thibet, frankly and boastfully acknowledges the kinship of her system with that of Plato and even Simon Magus. Some of Mrs. Eddy's recent followers recognize the similarity of their doctrines to those of Plato; but inasmuch as it is not polite to charge a lady—especially an old lady—with deliberate and wilful falsehood, the following proofs of the identity of Christian Science and Theosophy with ancient Gnosticism are set, so far as Mrs. Eddy is concerned, for the mere illustrations of the marvelous way in which the inspiration of new oracles may repeat the teachings of ancient seers. They simply show her genius for getting at things immediately, without recourse to ordinary methods of investigation, and indicate, to all who are capable of interpreting the facts, that in respect of prophetic insight and inspiration, she must be considered as much superior to Plato and Gautama, as in her own opinion she was to the late Dr. Quimby. Her doctrine, so far as it may have been contained in any older system, was probably like the spirit of that Jesus, whom she recommends to our faith flying as "diffused thought" in the atmosphere of Mind, and she only caught it on the wing.

The very name adopted by Christian Science is the same as that of the ancient Gnostics; and the name, theosophy, differs from it as wisdom and knowledge may be supposed to differ from science, and as a professedly non-Christian must of necessity differ from a Christian system. Like the Gnostics of old, both the prophets of these new religions boast that theirs is the wisdom which has been known through the ages to an enlightened few. Madame Blavatsky identifies the religious philosophy which flourished in the first century of the Christian era with "the spiritual and sacred knowledge, the *gupta vidya* of the Hindus," which she was commissioned by her masters to introduce to the West-

ern world. Mrs. Eddy reads Christian Science into the story of creation, and sees it in the apocalypse; while Madame Blavatsky likewise finds proofs of her doctrines from Genesis to Revelation. Mrs. Eddy, however, surpasses her Russian rival in laying claim to the *very first man* as a Science healer, whereas it seems not to have occurred to Madame Blavatsky to pre-empt a claim so ancient and so doubtful. Mrs. Eddy finds Moses a kindred spirit with herself, inasmuch as he "advanced a nation to the worship of God in Mind instead of matter, and illustrated the grand human capacities of Being;" and discovers that Joshua, Elijah and Elisha were also Science healers, and that the great demonstration afforded by the death of Jesus was that he "fully and finally demonstrated Christian Science!" Madame Blavatsky passes lightly over Elijah and Elisha, but calmly claims Moses, Solomon and Jesus as "adepts" in the occult mysteries of her "Wisdom Religion."

The self-consequence of the Gnostics made them very offensive to plain people in that long gone age. They claimed that they only had the true wisdom, and assumed an attitude of contempt toward all who refused to accept their teachings. Their name as well as their pretensions gave umbrage to sensitive folk. Theosophists and Christian Scientists in our time occupy much the same position. Mrs. Eddy asserts her own infallibility in such words as these:

"It is indeed no small matter to know one's self; but in this volume of mine there are no contradictory statements—at least none which are apparent to those who understand its propositions well enough to pass judgment upon them."

Madame Blavatsky, with somewhat less of diffident reserve, asserts that Theosophy is "Divine Wisdom, such as that possessed by the Gods."

The way in which the Gnostics treated the Bible is duplicated by Christian Science and Theosophical methods of

its use and interpretation. While contending that their doctrines were taught symbolically in the Christian Scriptures, Gnostics rejected the Old Testament, either in whole or in part, for a reason which will presently appear, and relied chiefly upon apocryphal writings, which sprang up in great numbers in the first two centuries. In my first paper I quoted extensively from Christian Science authorities to show how completely they ignore the Hebrew Scriptures, while attributing plenary inspiration to Mrs. Eddy. Of Gnostic interpretations, Dr. Schäff says they "despised the letter as sensuous, and the laws of language and exegesis as fetters to the mind." No better words could be found to describe the expository tactics of Theosophical and Christian Science writers. Mrs. Eddy's Key to the Scriptures, which professes to open the whole Book of God to our comprehension, consists of an attempt to interpret, in a most arbitrary and fanciful way, a few verses from Genesis and a few from Revelation. In her exposition of the creation story she sets aside the account of the creation of woman as "a material view," after having allegorized the first chapter to suit her own fancy. She then proceeds to explain away the story of woman's origin, the fall, the expulsion from the garden, etc., and after showing her confusion by skipping sundry passages, she leaves the record altogether, and finishes her commentary on Genesis with a rambling dissertation on Christian Science. She does not undertake to explain any other book in the Old Testament, nor any considerable portion, except the twenty-third Psalm, which she tries to press into service by substituting the word Love wherever the word Lord occurs, and appends to her explanation of the Apocalypse. She deals in similar fashion with the New Testament. Her Key explains but a few verses. She thus leaves almost the whole body of Scripture, historical, preceptive and prophetic without any explanation, save as the defects of her skeleton (?) key are made up by her glossary, in which she ex-

plains the "spiritual sense" of the names of the principal Old Testament worthies, thus enabling her followers to turn all the Scriptures which refer to them into a sort of allegory. She ignores the whole canon, resembling and even surpassing Marcion, who rejected the whole of the Old Testament and all of the New, except a part of Luke's gospel, which he mutilated to suit himself, and ten of Paul's epistles. Mrs. Eddy's favorite method of interpretation is to substitute the word she wants in any passage under consideration, and in this way arrive at the "spiritual" sense." Thus on page 216 of *Science and Health* she quotes a passage from Smith's Bible Dictionary, and succeeds in deducing from a verse of Scripture, as translated by Dr. Smith, and afterwards garbled by herself, and by the further device of substitution, the fact of man's "eternal and harmonious existence as idea!" The following is her garbled version of Dr. Smith's translation of Genesis vi., 3, with the words she would substitute in parenthesis: "And Jehovah said, My Spirit shall not forever rule (or be humbled) in men, seeing that they are (or, in their error they are) but flesh."

Madame Blavatsky and her school do not pretend to base their system on the Scriptures. They quote many passages from the Bible, finding theosophy not only in the "esoteric teachings of Moses," as they have been handed down by tradition, but in the symbolisms both of the Old and New Testaments. Thus they find theosophy in the story of Solomon's temple, and in the parable of the vine and the branches, etc. But they rely much more upon the Bhagavad Ghita and other Vedantic Scriptures than upon the Bible, as might be expected of those who profess to teach a religion much older by many centuries than the religion of the Bible.

Thus far it may be said I have succeeded only in showing a few superficial resemblances. I now proceed to show that the doctrines of ancient Gnosticism were precisely

those which are being proclaimed, in opposition to Christianity by Madam Blavatsky, and in the name of Christianity by the worshippers of Mary Eddy.

1. Gnosticism was Pantheistic. Both our new oracles declare that "God is identical with nature," and that God is all.

2. Gnostics taught that creation consisted of emanations from God. It was for this reason, probably, that they rejected the Old Testament, which taught a doctrine of creation diametrically opposed to their own. The same doctrine is part and parcel, both of Christian Scientism and Theosophy. Mrs. Eddy says creation consists in the "unfolding" and "reflection" of spiritual ideas, and that man's consciousness and mentality are "emanations" from God. Madam Blavatsky sees in nature only the "universal Reality casting periodical reflections of itself on the spacial depth," stating that her idea was expressed by the word emanation and used by "pre-Christian philosophers and the Orientalists."

3. The Gnostic system accounted for the origin of evil by postulating an eternal antagonism between matter and spirit. The Syrian Gnostics followed the Parsees in holding matter to be intrinsically evil, the veritable kingdom of Satan, waging ceaseless war against the Principle of Good. The Alexandrian Gnostics contrasted in their system the Divine *πλήρωμα*, or fullness, with *κένωμα*, or emptiness, which was related to the Divine Being as darkness to light. The lowest of these æons, or emanations from God falls into matter, and is thenceforth in bondage, yearning to be freed from the chains of sense by which he is bound.

This dualism is repeated in both the new religions. Madame Blavatsky adopts it with scarcely a change in terms, using the word *πλήρωμα* in the very sense which it bears in the Gnostic philosophy, from which she professes to derive her doctrines. She holds matter to be essentially evil. "Our incarnating Ego," she says, "was a God in its

origin, as were all the primeval emanations of the one Unknown Principle. But since the 'fall into matter' having to incarnate through the cycle in succession, from first to last, it is no longer a free and happy God, but a poor pilgrim on his way to regain what he has lost."

Mrs. Eddy's dualism is quite as pronounced, though somewhat confused by reason of her inability to think consecutively, or else from a deliberate purpose to hide her leaven in her meal. She views God as a dual monad, who is the only reality in the universe: The real creation is the unfolding of the ideas, or emanations, of this one God. But opposed to this real and eternal creation is an unreal, material universe. She defines matter as "the opposite of Truth, the opposite of Spirit, the opposite of God," makes it "another name for mortal mind," and then goes on to define mortal mind as "sin, sickness and death." Thus we have two antagonistic forces in the universe, the spiritual, or Divine, and the material, or evil.

4. The demiurgic scheme of the material creation was another peculiarity of ancient Gnosticism. God could not be the author of evil, and as matter was counted evil in their system, something or somebody had to be charged with the blame of creating the visible universe. Hence the invention of the demi-urge. He was represented as a physical being, the off-spring of the fallen æon, whose fall was due to "a sinful passion for the embrace of the infinite abyss." The demi-urge, standing between God and matter, having in him both material and spiritual elements, becomes the creator and sovereign of the material universe.

This is the doctrine of theosophy and of Christian Science, in substance, though not in form. Madame Blavatsky denies creation, on the ground that, in order to create, the Divine Being must think and plan; and quite innocently asks, "How can the absolute be supposed to think?" But, while in her system "periodic and consecutive appearances of the universe from the subjective to the objective plane

of being" take the place of creation, her "Reincarnating Ego," who "fell into matter," and somehow got mixed up with it, is, in respect of rank, if not of function, equivalent to the Gnostic demi-urge. Though now subject to illusion and imprisoned in matter, he is still the only God with whom we have to do.

Mrs. Eddy's account of creation, being inspired and revealed only to herself, is somewhat original. It may be described by one of her own favorite terms as the "inverted image" of the Gnostic doctrine. She simply turns the Gnostic notion upside down by making Adam spring out of the ground, forgetting in her celestial absent-mindedness, to tell how he got into it; and then succeeds beautifully in spilling out what little sense there was in the original notion. Adam dreams the visible universe into existence, is synonymous with the Devil, and in his alias, "mortal sense," becomes the "god of this world." She seems to have gotten her idea from evolutionists, but at the same time comes perilously near the doctrine of Mormonism. Brigham Young declared—and his dictum is accepted by the whole Mormon hierarchy to-day—that "Adam helped to make and organize the world," and is the "only God with whom we have to do." According to Mrs. Eddy, the "solid formations" of the world, as also its "solutions or elements," were "instituted by Mind," by which enigmatical terms we suppose she means that God made the land and water. God having made the ground, Adam sprung or evolved out of the ground, and then his "mortal and material thought" evolved everything else. Adam, therefore, is the Demi-urge of Christian Science.

5. Redemption, in the Gnostic philosophy, was viewed as the liberation of the spirit from the chains of sinful matter. This was effected by the Christos, who is the mediator of the soul in its return from the material to the spiritual world, just as the Demi-urge was the agent of its fall from the *πλήρωμα* the *κένωμα*. Valentinus makes the hea-

venly Saviour bring the fallen æon, or Achamoth, after innumerable sufferings, into the pleroma, and unites himself with her in an eternal spirit marriage, whence results a subsidence of all discord and disturbance, a blessed harmony or heaven of infinite delight, in which all the illuminated or true Gnostics, will participate.

The teachings of our new oracles is the same in every particular, hardly changed in its terminology. Mrs. Eddy, denying the fall of Man, admits the material corruption of humanity, and the Achamoth of Gnosticism corresponds to the "Adamic race" in her scheme. She teaches that heaven is "harmony," and that the destiny of the whole race is to be finally absorbed into the Christ-principle, which is the marriage of the Lamb, "the union of the male and female, no longer two, but one." This elevation of humanity to the plane of Divinity is to be accomplished by "breaking away from the mutations of time and sense," and in this process of man's deification human personality disappears.

Madame Blavatsky's teaching is identical with this. The only difference between the two oracles seems to be that, while Madame Blavatsky appears to hold to the final annihilation in the case of "black magicians and criminals beyond redemptions," Mrs. Eddy teaches a broad, unequivocal, New England Universalism. Both, as has been shown agree, that the individualized spirit loses its personality when united with the Christ-Principle, and that this union is deification; and both agree that Soul can never be lost.

6. The Christology of Gnosticism was peculiar, in that it held that the humanity of Christ was a mere phantom. Valentinus represented the heavenly Saviour, Jesus, as ascending from heaven and assuming the ethereal form. Another view made the man Christos unite with the man Jesus at the baptism and forsake him on the cross, while all agreed that the Christos had no contact with sinful matter. His birth, death and life were idealized into mere deceptive

appearances. "Reduced to a clear philosophical definition, the Gnostic Christ is nothing more than the ideal spirit of man himself, as in the 'Leben Jesu' of Strauss."

On this point, Theosophy, which does not pretend to be Christian, is even less Gnostic than is Mrs. Eddy's science. Madame Blavatsky does not deny the reality of our Lord's humanity, though acknowledging his Divinity in the same qualified sense in which Mrs. Eddy does. The latter idealizes the humanity of Christ into a mere appearance, and resolves the birth, life, passion, death and resurrection of Christ into mere ideas or semblances. Christian Science and Theosophy are at one in considering the Christos Principle the Ideal Man, or re-incarnating Ego.

7. The doctrine of re-incarnation was held by the Gnostics in general form, if not in its full development. The manifestation of God in Jesus was by some of them connected with previous theophanies, and the idea of re-incarnation sprung logically from their theory of redemption. Their only hell being matter, and salvation being the escape of the imprisoned spirit from material bondage and corruption, all who failed of redemption as the reward of their first life on earth, must make further proof of mortality, and be further purified before being finally prepared for exaltation to the pleroma. This doctrine, taught plainly by Madame Blavatsky, and her new school Buddhists, sticks up here and there, a glittering, borrowed bauble, amid Mrs. Eddy's confused and incoherent speculations.

8. Gnosticism led to opposite extremes in its ethical results. Counting matter essentially evil, they were divided into two mutually hostile parties. One, represented by such earnest souls as Marcion, Tatian, and others, hated the body, forbade nuptial intercourse, and abstained from certain foods as corrupting. Others, as the Nicolaitans, exulting in the superiority of the spirit to its fleshly tabernacle, made the blame of sin attach wholly to the perishing body. ran into antinomianism, and gave themselves up unblushingly to the most shameful practices.

Our Russian adventuress and our American charlatan are at one in their attempt to unite the ascetic morality of Marcion with the antinomian postulates of the Nicolaitans. The result must inevitably be a division in both camps. Madame Blavatsky holds it to be impossible for a man to "divide his attention between the pursuit of occultism and a wife." Her highest saints disdain marriage as being "of the earth, earthy," and discard all animal food. Mrs. Eddy teaches that "generation rests on no sexual basis," and, while not forbidding all nuptial intercourse, she shows her usual consistency in permitting the "material conditions" of propagation only "for the purpose of generating." At the same time she intimates that when "the spiritual creation is discerned," marriage will cease to exist, but advises that for the present it should continue, and that we should "permit no such disregard of law as may lead to a worse state of society than now exists." Which is to say, we will do well if we do no worse! She discounts the pleasures of the table with as much zest as any Buddhist ascetic, holding that "gustatory pleasure is a sensuous illusion," and that food is not necessary to sustain life; and yet advises her followers not to hasten too fast in putting her precepts into practice!

The ethical systems of both are full of "sweetness and light," Mrs. Eddy claiming nothing less than moral perfection for all who obey her precepts, and Madame Blavatsky announcing a noble altruism to be the supreme aim of her society; but neither of them is borne out by the ethical results of their systems. Mrs. Woodbury testifies to sundry "patent domestic misfortunes" occurring among Mrs. Eddy's followers, and mentions an "erotic tide" that ought to have been stemmed, but was even "favored in some quarters."¹ Madame Blavatsky has given a specimen of her ethical principles as reduced to practice, in forging letters from Thibet in order to popularize her teachings, and plagiarizing from scripturalistic literature in order to ob-

tain materials for her forgeries. Her immediate followers, Colonel Olcott and Arthur P. Sinnett, Wm. Q. Judge and others, stand discredited before an intelligent and right loving public because they have condoned her admitted frauds, and thus endorsed the Jesuitical maxim that the end justifies the means.

It may be said that Christian Scientism has not yet had a fair trial before the world, being as yet in its infancy. But it holds within itself the seeds both of inevitable domestic discord and of social corruption, not to speak of insanity and other minor evils flowing from it.² Mrs. Eddy's book, claiming to be the *Æsculapius of Mind*, is in truth a new Pandora's box, out of which all manner of evils are destined to swarm. Buddhism, on the other hand, being the organized form of Theosophy in the Orient, has been on trial through the ages, and has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Theosophical writers tell how purity, truth, gentleness and good will prevail in "lovable little Japan, which, thirty odd years ago, was nursing, in quiet, seclusion, a beautiful flower of artistic civilization;" how the Hindoos are so free from crime as compared with their European and Eurasian neighbors; how the Buddhist discipline in China and Thibet has wrought a society in which truth and purity are enthroned, and human brotherhood exalted so that crime is almost unknown; but the facts are otherwise. Sentimental theorists and pleasure-seeking globe-trotters, like Horace Fletcher, may report a rose-colored view of Japanese or Chinese civilization, and Mariame Blavatsky, grown confident of the gullibility of mankind by her own successful impostures, may throw a glamour of pious romance over the mahatmas who are said to reside in the only land which a foreigner may not visit

¹War in heaven.

²The Philadelphia *Medical Record* of March 4, 1899, tells of a woman committed in a police court for insanity. Her delusion was that Mrs. Eddy was God.

save on pain of death ; but well informed people know better. The testimony, not only of Christian missionaries, which might be discredited on the ground of interested motives, but of British officials, and of persevering, self-denying and observant travelers like Mrs. Isabella Bird Bishop, Harry Savage Landor, and many others, discloses the sad fact that the flower of civilization which grew up under the blighting shadow of the "Night of Asia," is an unspeakably malodorous flower, steeped in sensuality. Heathen politeness in the Orient may be at a premium when compared with the blustering rudeness of Western peoples, but it is undoubtedly true that Germany, England, and America are blessed with pure homes, while social purity is unknown in the East, save in Christian communities. Crimes of violence may be less characteristic of the Hindoos, Chinese and Japanese, but lying, unchastity and theft are rampant among them. The regeneration of Japan, so far as it has been effected at all, has been wrought by Christian missions and by Christian education ; and the only hope of India, of China and of Thibet is that Christianity may yet supplant the hoary heathenisms which have bound them with fetters of iron and held them in cruel bondage for so many generations. Buddhism has drugged its myriads of votaries into an apathy of despair, unblest by any ray of light, save the wretched hope of final annihilation. Its fatalistic philosophy may be beautiful ; but its philosophers are self-confessed liars, its vaunted saints are filthy tramps, ragged, half-starved hermits, or wandering mountebanks, and its artistic civilization a thin veneer, scarcely veiling its unutterable corruptions. Whether in ancient or in modern times, in heathen or in Christian lands, the deeds of the Nicolaitans have ever been such as to provoke the displeasure of the God of purity. "Neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit."

9. Once more, Gnostic doctrine had its effect upon worship. Sometimes, indeed, it led to the rejection of all

outward means of grace. We have seen how Mrs. Eddy repudiates prayer, making it an egoistic meditation, and how, in her early zeal she was led to declare against all church organizations; being afterward led to reconsider her decision, possibly by the necessity of retaining some bond of union among her followers as a prop for her own waning authority. We have seen also how she rejects the sacrament of baptism, and substitutes a mystical morning meal for the Holy Supper which Christians commemorate. Theosophy goes just a little further in its departure from true Christianity, makes prayer a mere occult process, and is indifferent toward all religious observances, though, by reason of its eclectic character, permitting its initiates to observe the rites of any religion which they may chance to have adopted.

Again, the tendency of Pantheism, as exemplified by the Prodicians, was to induce a blasphemous exaltation of self "above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." This is inevitable, unless the Pantheist is grossly inconsistent. If a man believes himself a part of God, why should he pray to himself? Why be at the trouble to perform any religious duties, when the Divinity within him is the only God with whom he has to do, and he has only to please himself in order to be sure he is pleasing God? Is not self-worship the only sequence of pantheistic belief? In the very nature of the case, this is the only worship consonant with "Christian Science" or Theosophy. The "occult process" to which prayer is reduced in the latter system, and the egoistic meditation which it becomes in the former, are both of them susceptible to easy explanation on this ground and no other.

10. Lastly, Gnosticism, as plainly appears from the New Testament account of Simon Magus, and from the testimony of the Fathers, was in full accord with magic and occultism. Mrs. Eddy opposes Mesmerism, but takes pains to explain its *modus operandi*; and utters repeated warn-

ings against the danger of malignant thought-transference, while teaching her students that they can send streams of healing thought around the world, and "read mortal mind more infallibly than astronomers can read the stars." This opens the way for further advances along the line of mystery. Madame Blavatsky, proudly acknowledging kinship with Simon Magus, teaches that initiates into the higher mysteries of her profound religion may develop occult powers, become able to extrude their "astral arms," so as to make things at a distance move as by invisible agency, and, by means of mysterious agencies, perform all manner of miracles, etc.

We submit, then, that the title of this paper is justified. We have found in Christian Science and Theosophy an old enemy who is now masquerading with two new faces. And it may be added, they are both dough faces, clumsily made, affording an ill disguise for his native deformity.

WM. P. MCCORKLE.

Graham, N. C.

No 1-

VIII. SALVATION IS OF THE JEWS.

Public attention has been called to the Jews, recently, in many ways. The Dreyfus case in France, with its tragic interest; the anti-Semitism of Russia, and especially of Germany; the Zionistic movement among the Jews themselves; the striking journey of the German Emperor to Jerusalem; the literary brilliance of Zangwill, through pen and platform, in his pictures of Ghetto life; all these things, and others that could be mentioned, have set the world to thinking and talking much about this remarkable race of people.

Obviously Christian thinking cannot be indifferent to discussions trending closely and keenly on a subject so vital to Christianity as the history and prophecy of the Sacred Scriptures concerning this same people. In a mind, saturated with the word of God, everything touching the Jews teems with reflection and inquiry. When the lines seem to be converging towards some crisis in the history of this important race (towards some crisis that may prove to be central and determinative in the history of all the nations of the earth), is it not a fit time to take a broad survey of the part already played and yet to be played, by this people, in the World's Redemption? This paper is an essay towards such an outlook, and hence the broad terms in which the theme is stated: Salvation is of the Jews.

I. This proposition is two, as regards the Person, who acquired and administers salvation.

The statement is a truism, for the Scriptures themselves tell us that Jesus was the "son of Joseph" (reputed), the "son of Mary," the "son of David," the "seed of David," the "offspring of David," the "horn of salvation raised up in the house of David," the "stem of Jesse," the "Lion of the tribe of Judah," the "seed of Abraham," the "son of

Abraham." Matthew, as he begins to write the gospel, gives us his geneological line, "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." Paul reaches the climax concerning his kinsmen according to the flesh, when he writes: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerneth the flesh, Christ came?" (Rom. 9:4, 5.)

When the angel made announcement to Mary of the birth of Jesus, he said: "He shall be great, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever" (Luke 1:31, 32).

And this is his word concerning himself, in his last announcement, from on high, of his glorious return: "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and offspring of David, the bright and morning star." (Rev. 22:16.)

II. The theme-proposition is true, as regards the Book that records and reveals salvation.

The Bible is of the Jews from the beginning to the end. It does not surprise us, that the Old Testament should have been written by Jewish authors only, but, when we remember what a world-wide mission the New Testament was introduced to achieve, there is food for reflection in the fact that it, too, in every part of it, was written by Jews. How emphatic the truth, that God chose the Jew as the organ of revelation! And it is no wonder, when we remember the intimate relation of the Person and the Book, that the two should have a common human origin. Both are expressly called by the sacred writers the Word of God; the first is the Word incarnate, the last is the Word written. Again, the manifestation of both proceeded from the Holy Ghost; the first by way of miraculous conception, the other by way of supernatural inspiration. Next, the Son of God

came down from above and took up his human nature; even so saving truth was revealed from heaven, and embodied in human language. Further, in the one Person of our Lord two whole, perfect, and entire natures were inseparably joined together without conversion, composition or confusion; in like manner the Bible is one book, only one, wherein the two elements are inseparably combined in such manner that the divine does not absorb the human, nor does the human adulterate the divine. In Christ the two natures are so related, that he is at once the Son of God and the Son of Man; In the Scriptures the two elements co-exist in such fullness that the whole book is God's word and the whole is man's word."—(*Dr. E. P. Humphrey.*)

This parallel is striking, and can be extended. As both were of human origin, so both were of Jewish origin. "Jesus is not merely man born of woman, but he is the son of David and the son of Abraham. He came out of Bethlehem. He was brought up in Nazareth. He taught in Galilee and Judea, and over his cross the words were written, "Jesus, King of the Jews;" and the special relation in which Jesus stands to the Jews was not merely for one certain period, but for all ages, as long as the earth stands and the sun and moon endure. Likewise the Scriptures is an interesting Jewish book. All the authors, both of the Old Testament and New Testament writings, not even Luke,¹ the beloved physician, excepted, were Hebrews of the Hebrews. Jewish is the history, Jewish is the tone in which it is written. Even the Greek writings of the New Testament speak with the voice of Israel; and the full contents of Holy Scriptures will never be thoroughly understood, until Israel is again brought back to the allegiance and faith of its Messiah."—(*Adolph Saphira.*) This last remark, as to the thorough understanding of the Scriptures, applies with special force to the Apocalypse. Israel is the

¹Paul, in the 4th chapter of Colossians, seems to distinguish Luke from those "of the circumcision."—ED.

key to its interpretation, because the book is so essentially Jewish. "It is the work of a Jew saturated with Old Testament prophecy, under the guidance of the word of Jesus and the inspiration of God. It is the climax of the prophecy of the Old and New Testaments."—*Briggs*. It pre-eminently concerns Israel of the Future.

The Person and the Book are so bound together in the plan of God and in the organism of Redemption, that it is impossible to comprehend the Word of God written, its authority and significance, if divorced in thought from the Word of God incarnate. The Person and the Book and the Nation sustain a unity in trinity, so that we can interpret fully neither the Word written nor the Word incarnate, unless we learn the secret of their characters from Israel, the Mother of them both. Salvation is of the Jews, because the Scriptures were of the Jews.

III. Salvation is of the Jews, as regards the Nation that proclaims and propagates it.

Under the Old Testament dispensation, this was obviously true. There is no difference of opinion among orthodox thinkers as to the fact that, until the New Testament dispensation began, Israel was the depository and the dispenser of God's truth. Whatever of salvation the Nations experienced before Christ came reached them through the revelation given to this one Nation. This was the contention of Jesus with the woman of Samaria: "Ye worship, ye know not what; we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews."—(Jno. 4:22). (What a rebuke, these words of the Jewish Teacher, to all the modern heresy as to the saving value of the ethnic religious!)

But under the New Testament dispensation, it is equally true, that salvation is propagated by the Jews.

Even in the church-historical age, this plan of God is respected and emphasized.

"The Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone," constitute "the foundation"

upon which "the house of God" in this age is being built, as it "groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord"—Eph. 2:19-22), and, like their Master, they were all Jews. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, as he discourses in the three chapters of Romans on the question of theodicy as to God's temporary and partial rejection of the Jews and his consequent calling of the Gentiles, takes pains to assert, even while magnifying his office as the Apostle to the Gentiles: "For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin."—(Rom. 2:1).

The early Church was composed entirely of Jews, the three thousand converts of Pentecost being "men of Israel." The first period of Church history was "the planting and the extension of the Church among the Jews by the ministry of Peter." So thoroughly Jewish was the Apostolic Church, at the first, that it took a miraculous vision, thrice repeated, to open the eyes of Peter to the world-wide mission of the Gospel, and on his return to Judea from Cesarea, "they that were of the circumcision contended with him;" and it was only after his full explanation of God's evident endorsement of his conduct in the case of Cornelius and others, that they were brought to acknowledge: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."—(Acts 2:18). During this first decade of the Christian church it was undoubtedly Jewish. For the turning to the Gentiles, which fairly inaugurated the beginning of the Church, in which the Gentiles are "fellow heirs and of the same body," did not take place at once, and then only gradually, along with the delayed but finally positive rejection of the Jews as a Nation. May we not legitimately infer, humanly speaking, that, if Israel had repented as a nation, in response to the preaching of the apostles, Jesus would have returned from heaven and restored the kingdom to Israel? What else do the words of Peter mean, which were addressed to the Jews in the Temple, when accusing them of killing the "Prince of Life." "Repent ye,

therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when (in order that) the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3:19-21.)

But they did not repent, and so the threat of Jesus was fulfilled unto them: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a Nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. 21:43). This Nation, to whom the kingdom of God now belongs, is the Church, in the distinct New Testament sense of the word church. It is a Nation, but not according to the flesh, for in it "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female." It is a Nation, being a generation of the spiritual seed of Abraham—"a chosen generation, a holy Nation." Without territorial or racial distinction, the Spiritual Nation is now the sustaining centre of the kingdom of God on the earth—the kingdom of God in the strictly spiritual dispensation of it, as "not of this world." But how is it, that the kingdom of God, which God gave to Abraham and his seed, and finally in definite covenant to David, can be in the hands of those who are Gentiles? It is only because they are Abraham's seed by faith. The Apostle of the Gentiles tells us distinctly in the classical Scripture (Rom. xi.) on the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles, that the reception of the Gentiles was the engrafting of branches from the wild olive into the true olive tree. The original stock is Jewish; the Gentiles have organic connection with it because the natural branches were for a time broken off. The natural branches are yet to be 'grafted' in again. It is God's unchanging plan, "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." In the meanwhile, Gentiles are exhorted: "Be not high-minded," and "Boast not against the branches."

* * * Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." The kingdom of God is now in the hands of a spiritual Nation, made up in the main of Gentiles, because God has allowed this spiritual Nation, during this church-historical age, to occupy the place and do the work that, by an imperishable covenant, belongs to the Jewish Nation. God called the Gentiles into the field, "for to provoke them (the Jews) to jealousy." "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." "All Israel shall be saved." The kingdom will then be restored to Israel. Against that time, the Church is the dispenser of the Gospel, in the room and stead of Israel. The Church is doing Israel's work. By God's sovereign judgment and grace, the Church is the vicar of Israel. That is the clear teaching of the Scriptures, and this truth emphasizes the deep significance of our theme-proposition—that salvation is of the Jews.

In this church-historical age the assertion is true, that salvation is proclaimed and propagated by the Jews. The apostles were Jews. The early church was composed of Jews. The Church, during the whole of this age, is acting under the covenant charter which belongs to the Jews, which has never been wholly and finally taken from the Jews, and which, in God's good time, will be returned to the Jews.

2. In the Millennial Age, this plan of God will be gloriously vindicated and executed.

The word millennial is used in the ordinary acceptation of its meaning, as having reference to that era in the world's history when righteousness and peace shall prevail over all the earth. There are many who think that there is to be no such condition of things till Jesus inaugurates the eternal career of the redeemed race on the renovated planet. They rightly interpret the New Testament, as holding out no hope for anything but a mixed and militant condition of Christianity till Jesus comes for the judgment

of the race, and for the redemption of his people. This is the only view that is worthy of exegetical respect. The only objection to it is that it does not go far enough, and that, like Hegel in his universal philosophy, it leaves the Jew out. A scriptural and full understanding of the Jew demands a millennium.

(a) Certainly the covenant with Abraham seems to imply that there will come a time in the world's history when "all the nations of the earth" as such will be blessed through the "great nation" composed of Abraham's seed. This view is not contradicted by the fact that this covenant is having a fulfillment now, in the blessings of salvation carried to the nations through the spiritual seed of Abraham. The covenant with Abraham was a national covenant, into the very terms of which the promise of a territorial habitation for his numerous seed was specifically wrought. It can have its complete fulfillment only when all the terms of it are fulfilled. It calls for a career of the Jews as "a great nation," in their own "land," during which time they shall be instrumental in conveying blessings to "all the nations of the earth." As a revelation to Abraham and Old Testament saints, this was necessarily its meaning. It, therefore, awaits fulfillment in a future era of the world's history. This will be the World's Millennium.

(b) The burden of Old Testament prophecy looks in the same direction.

Written prophecy began when the hope of Israel, resting on the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, seemed to be failing. The theocratic kingdom, which had reached so glorious a development under Solomon, had been sundered in twain, and the two portions were rival and hostile to each other. Rapid decline, religious and national, was being realized in Israel and in Judah. The nations surrounding them were pressing closely on their territory and threatening their continued national existence. How vain the hope, to all appearances growingly so, that this nation,

now broken in twain and fast losing its religious and earthly prestige, should expect to be "a great nation" and a blessing to "all the nations of the earth!" The prophet found his mission in speaking for God to those in this state of things. He was raised up and divinely qualified to proclaim the coming of "the day of the Lord," as the only solution of the problem. He pronounced guilt upon the nation and foretold a doom awaiting it, worse than that already experienced. He pronounced guilt upon their enemies and foretold heavy judgments for them also. He foretold the Messiah as the hope of God's people, and the fulfilment of all God's promises in his day. Then would God's chosen nation be brought to repentance, and the nations of the earth be blessed through them, This was the burden of prophecy—a revelation of God's mercy, in perfect harmony with previous relations, and a promise of redemption through which all previous promises were to find complete fulfilment. "The solution of the great problem of Israel's future sprung from the breach in David's kingdom, is the solution of the problem of the Millennial Kingdom, and comes with Israel's acceptance of David's son as their Lord, the closing up of the ancient breach in David's kingdom, the union of Judah and Israel in one nation on the mountains of the Fatherland forever; in short, Israel a converted people and nation, acknowledged by Christ in person, the nations applauding. With that consummation, after judgments and mercies unknown before, and the revelation of Christ himself in his glory, dawns the Millennial Age. Search where we may, through all the prophets, this is the one theme, the redemption of Israel, and of the nations through Israel, after judgment has fallen on both; Christ the glory of all. It is the time of the Kingdom restored to Israel"—(*Nathaniel West*).

But, with many, an answer is ready for this statement, in that theory of prophecy, by which a figurative interpretation transfers these predictions from the literal Israel to

the New Testament Church. What reply shall be made to this answer ?

1. It is based upon a confused view of the laws of language.

In symbolic prophecy, living agents and actions are the media, which must be interpreted according to the laws of symbols. No one claims that symbolic persons and actions, found in such prophecies as Ezekiel, Daniel and Zechariah, are to be dealt with in a literal way ; though, after we ascertain the meaning of these symbolic figures that meaning is definite and fixed, not vaguely double. In the case of verbal prophecy, words are the media ; and such prophecies can be called figurative only when they have figures of speech in them. These figures of speech are to be interpreted by the law of figures. That gives a single and not a double sense, even in figurative prophecies. There are, moreover, many prophecies concerning Israel's future which are literal, and cannot be put aside by the double sense process. Besides a figure of speech in prophecy concerns that which is affirmed, and does not do away with the literal existence of that of which the affirmation is made. "There is no axiom in mathematics of more absolute certainty and self-evidence than the law of figures, that the agent or object to which the figure is applied is the agent or object whose acts or conditions it is employed to illustrate ; and that in figurative prophecies, therefore, the agent or object designated in the prediction, and the subject of the figure, is the agent or subject of the act or event, which the prophecy foreshows." (Lord's Restoration of the Jews).

This appeal to the figurative character of prophecy is a vague makeshift to get rid of giving a future to Israel, and involves a confused view of the law of language. To dignify the method, it is called "Spiritual." Alas, how many crimes against a grammatico-historical exegesis are hid behind this much abused word "Spiritual."

2. But there are certain features of the prophecies con-

cerning Israel's future that cannot be dissolved in the alembic of this so-called spiritual method of interpretation.

One is found in the Land which is everywhere declared to be the scene of Israel's future. "For lo the days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord; and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers and they shall possess it" (Is. 30:33). "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, now I will bring again the captivity of Jacob and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel, and will be jealous for my holy name. * * Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them into their own land, and have left none of them any more there" (Ez. 39:25-28). "And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." (Amos 9:15.)

Another of these features is found in the reunion of the sundered tribes, as an essential part of Israel's future, and this in connection with the land. "And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God; behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them from every side, and bring them into their land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." (Ez. 37:21, 22.)

Still another feature is found in that spirit—not transformation, which is an essential condition of Israel's future. "And I will cause the captivity of Judah, and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them, as at the first. And I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me. And it shall be to me a name of

joy, a praise and an honor before all the nations of the earth, which shall hear all the good that I do unto them." (Jer. 33:7-9.) These things cannot be figurative and must be interpreted as predictions concerning the Jews. When Israel and Jacob have been restored to their Land, have been re-united, and have been spiritually transformed, then there will be a complete fulfilment of the covenant made with Abraham and confirmed to the fathers. Then will the seed of Abraham be "a Great Nation," through whom "all the nations of the earth" will be blessed.

Jonah's experience was an enacted prophecy of Israel's future career. As a representative of Israel, in her mission of salvation to the nations, Jonah was sent to preach repentance to Nineveh, a representative city of the Gentile world. He refused to go. He was buried in a whale's belly for two days, and only when cast up on dry land the third day did he obey the command of Jehovah. His final obedience secured the repentance of the whole city. So Israel turned aside from her mission to the Gentile world, and in consequence lies now a buried nation. When she is raised from the dead in the gracious Restoration, she will then realize her calling as God's messenger of salvation to the nations. The interpretation which Jesus puts upon Jonah's experience, as having reference to his own death and resurrection, in no way militates against but rather confirms this view of the prophecy of Jonah. The seeming conflict between the two finds its explanation in the organic oneness in prophecy of the national Israel and the personal Israel, of the national Son of God and the personal Son of God, of the national servant of Jehovah and the personal servant of Jehovah. Two passages strikingly illustrate the relation of Christ and Israel.

In Psalm 118:22, we have these words as affirmed of Israel: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner." In I. Peter 2:7, they are used with reference to Christ.

In Hosea 11:1, we read: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Matthew tells us that this prophecy was fulfilled in the person of Jesus, when he was taken into Egypt by Joseph to escape the rage of Herod. And so it is, that Jonah's experience was a prophecy both of Israel's future, and of the Messiah's future. Hosea evidently refers to it as having reference to Israel, when he prophesied of the coming of the Lord: "Come and let us return unto the Lord. For he hath torn and he will heal us: he hath smitten and he will bind us up. After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." (Ch. 6:1, 2.) Ezekiel takes the same figure of burial and resurrection to picture Israel rejected and restored, in the vision of the valley of dry bones (Ch. 37) which he explicitly shows has this application. And this is the very figure which Paul uses in Rom. 11:15: "For if the casting away of them (the Jews) be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" Then Israel, restored to national, as well as spiritual life, will be the minister of life to the other nations of the earth, returning as she will have done to her original mission, as the dispenser of God's salvation to the world.

The present condition of Israel, and the promised conversion of the Nation as such, together, make an argument in which God's providence and God's prophecy answer to each other in double assurance. Israel is a standing miracle to the preservation which God has granted the Nation. She has no common land as a territorial land; she has no common law to hold her together in the cohesion of social institutions; she has no common language to assimilate the individual in the community of thought and sentiment; she has been subjected to all the disintegrating forces of persecution and dispersion: and yet Israel is today one people, vital and vigorous. Is this not indeed a standing miracle of providence? And what does God mean by it? Look at the

fact, in the light of the promises of Old Testament and New Testament alike, that "all Israel shall be saved," and what can it mean, but that God has a career for Israel as a distinct nation in the future after her conversion, even a career such as all the holy prophets vie with each other to make plain to us.

Salvation is of the Jews. The Jews gave the world a Saviour. The Jews gave the world a Bible. The Jews will yet give the world that salvation, which the Saviour purchased, and which the Bible proclaims. The day of the Lord will reveal it. And all the universe of intelligent, sympathetic creatures will join the Jewish Apostle to the Gentiles in the worshipful words with which he contemplated the glorious issue: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" (Rom. 11:33.)

Now may Israel say: "God be merciful unto us and bless us, and cause his face to shine upon us. Selah. That thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations." (Ps. 67:1, 2). For the word of prophecy is sure: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Is. 2:2-4).

"And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord and his name one." (Zech.

14:9). "And they shall look upon one whom they have pierced and they shall mourn for him." (Zech. 2:10). "My tabernacle also shall be with them: Yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people, and the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forevermore." (Ez. 37:27, 28). "He which testifieth these things saith, surely, I come quickly; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22:20.)

JULIUS W. WALDEN.

Athens, Ga.

IX. THE POLEMICS OF INFANT BAPTISM.

The question of the Subjects of Baptism is one of that class of problems the solution of which hangs upon a previous question. According as is our doctrine of the Church, so will be our doctrine of the Subjects of Baptism. If we believe, with the Church of Rome, that the Church is in such a sense the institute of salvation that none are united to Christ save through the instrumentality of her ordinances, then we shall inevitably determine the proper subjects of her ordinances in one way. If, on the other hand, we believe, with the Protestant bodies, that only those already united to Christ have right within his house and to its privileges, we shall inevitably determine them in another way. All Protestants should easily agree that only Christ's children have a right to the ordinance of baptism. The cleavage in their ranks enters in only when we inquire how the external church is to hold itself relatively to the recognition of the children of Christ. If we say that its attitude should be as exclusive as possible, and that it must receive as the children of Christ only those whom it is forced to recognize as such, then we shall inevitably narrow the circle of the subjects of baptism to the lowest limits. If, on the other hand, we say that its attitude should be as inclusive as possible, and that it should receive as the children of Christ all whom, in the judgment of charity, it may fairly recognize as such, then we shall naturally widen the circle of the subjects of baptism to far more ample limits. The former represents, broadly speaking, the Puritan idea of the Church, the latter the general Protestant doctrine. It is on the basis of the Puritan conception of the Church that the Baptists are led to exclude infants from baptism. For, if we are to demand anything like demonstrative evidence of actual participation in Christ before we baptize, no infant, who by reason of

years is incapable of affording signs of his union with Christ, can be thought a proper subject of the rite.

The vice of this system, however, is that it attempts the impossible. No man can read the heart. As a consequence, it follows that no one, however rich his manifestation of Christian graces, is baptized on the basis of infallible knowledge of his relation to Christ. All baptism is inevitably administered on the basis not of knowledge but of presumption. And if we must baptize on presumption, the whole principle is yielded; and it would seem that we must baptize all whom we may fairly presume to be members of Christ's body. In this state of the case, it is surely impracticable to assert that there can be but one ground on which a fair presumption of inclusion in Christ's body can be erected, namely, personal profession of faith. Assuredly a human profession is no more solid basis to build upon than a Divine promise. So soon, therefore, as it is fairly apprehended that we baptize on presumption and not on knowledge, it is inevitable that we shall baptize all those for whom we may, on any grounds, fairly cherish a good presumption that they belong to God's people—and this surely includes the infant children of believers, concerning the favor of God to whom there exist many precious promises on which pious parents, Baptists as fully as others, rest in devout faith.

To this solid proof of the rightful inclusion of the infant children of believers among the subjects of baptism, is added the unavoidable implication of the continuity of the Church of God, as it is taught in the Scriptures, from its beginning to its consummation; and of the undeniable inclusion within the bounds of this Church, in its pre-Christian form, as participants of its privileges, inclusive of the parallel rite of circumcision, of the infant children of the flock, with no subsequent hint of their exclusion. To this is added further the historical evidence of the prevalence in the Christian Church of the custom of

baptizing the infant children of believers, from the earliest Christian ages down to to-day. The manner in which it is dealt with by Augustine and the Pelagians in their controversy, by Cyprian in his letter to Fidus, by Tertullian in his treatise on Baptism, leaves no room for doubt that it was, at the time when each of these writers wrote, as universal and unquestioned a practice among Christians at large as it is to-day—while wherever it was objected to, the objection seems to have rested on one or the other of two contrary errors, either on an overestimate of the effects of baptism or on an underestimate of the need of salvation for infants.

On such lines as these a convincing positive argument is capable of being set forth for infant baptism, to the support of which whatever obscure allusions to it may be found in the New Testament itself may then be summoned. And on these lines the argument has ordinarily been very successfully conducted, as may be seen by consulting the treatment of the subject in any of our standard works on systematic theology, as for example Dr. Charles Hodge's (III, p. 546). It has occurred to me that additional support might be brought to the conclusions thus positively attained, by observing the insufficiency of the case against infant baptism as argued by the best furnished opponents of that practice. There would seem no better way to exhibit this insufficiency than to subject the presentation of the arguments against infant baptism, as set forth by some confessedly important representative of its opponents, to a running analysis. I have selected for the purpose the statement given in Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 534 sq. What that eminently well-informed and judicious writer does not urge against infant baptism may well be believed to be confessedly of small comparative weight as an argument against the doctrine and practice. So that if we do not find the arguments he urges conclusive, we may well be content with the position we already occupy.

Dr. Strong opens the topic, "The Subjects of Baptism" (p. 530) with the statement that, "The proper subjects of baptism are those only who give credible evidence that they have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit—or, in other words, have entered by faith into the communion of Christ's death and resurrection"—a statement which if, like the ordinary language of the Scriptures, it is intended to have reference only to the adults to whom it is addressed, would be sufficiently unexceptionable; but which, the "only" advertises us to suspect to be more inclusive in its purpose. This statement is followed at once by the organized "proof that only persons giving evidence of being regenerated are proper subjects of baptism." This proof is derived:

(a) From the command and example of Christ and his Apostles which show: First, that those only are to be baptized who have previously been made disciples. Secondly, that those only are to be baptized who have previously repented and believed.

(b) From the nature of the church—as a company of regenerate persons.

(c) From the symbolism of the ordinance, as declaring a previous spiritual change in him who submits to it."

Each of these items is supported by Scripture texts, though some of them are no doubt sufficiently inapposite. As e. g. when only John 3:5 and Rom. 6:13—neither of which have anything to do with the visible Church—are quoted to prove that the visible Church (of which baptism is an ordinance) is "a company of regenerate persons;" or as when Matt. 28:19 is quoted to prove that baptism took place after the discipling, as if the words *ἄνθρωποι μαθητεύσαντες βαπτίζετε*, whereas the passage, actually standing *μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες*, merely demands that the discipling shall be consummated in, shall be performed by means of baptism; or as when Acts 10:47, where the fact that the extraordinary power of the Holy Spirit had come upon Cornelius is pleaded as reason why baptism should not be withheld

from him,¹ and Rom. 6:2-5, which only develops the spiritual implication of baptism, are made to serve as proofs that the symbolism of the ordinance declares always and constantly a "previous" spiritual change. Apart from the scriptural evidence actually brought forward, moreover, the propositions, in the extreme form in which they are stated, cannot be supported by Scripture. The Scriptures do not teach that the external Church is a company of regenerate persons—the parable of the tares for example declares the opposite: though they represent that Church as the company of those who are presumably regenerate. They do not declare that baptism demonstrates a "previous" change—the case of Simon Magus, Acts 8:13, is enough to exhibit the contrary: though they represent the rite as symbolical of the inner cleansing presumed to be already present, and consequently as administered only on profession of faith.

The main difficulty with Dr. Strong's argument, however, is the illegitimate use it makes of the occasional character of the New Testament declarations. He is writing a "Systematic Theology" and is therefore striving to embrace the whole truth in his statements: he says therefore with conscious reference to infants, whose case he is soon to treat: "Those only are to be baptized who have

¹ This interpretation of Acts 10:47 must certainly greatly embarrass Dr. Strong when he comes to interpret the case of the Samaritans in Acts 8: For the same falling of the Holy Ghost which was poured out on Cornelius and his friends and exhibited itself in "speaking with tongues and magnifying God" (Acts 10:46); and was made by Peter the plea why water should not be forbidden for baptizing them; not only did not precede baptism in the case of the Samaritans, but actually did not take place until a considerably later date. The Samaritans are baptized, Acts 8:12; but the Holy Ghost had not been received by them, Acts 8:16. and was not received until Peter and John visited them and laid their hands on them, (Acts 8:12). If the case of Cornelius proves that baptism is not administered until after the Holy Ghost is received, that of the Samaritans proves that it precedes the gift of the Holy Ghost. In truth neither passage proves the one or the other, this outpouring of the Holy Ghost referring to the *charismata*.

previously repented and believed," and the like. But the passages he quotes in support of this position are not drawn from a "Systematic Theology" but from direct practical appeals to quite definite audiences, consisting only of adults; or from narratives of what took place as the result of such appeals. Because Peter told the men that stood about him at Pentecost, "Repent ye and be baptized," it does not follow that baptism might not have been administered by the same Peter to the infants of those repentant sinners previous to the infants' own repentance. Because Philip baptized the converts of Samaria only after they had believed, it does not follow that he would not baptize their infants until they had grown old enough to repeat their parents' faith, that they might, like them, receive its sign.

The assertion contained in the first proof is, therefore, a *non sequitur* from the texts offered in support of it. There is a suppressed premise necessary to be supplied before the assumed conclusion follows from them, and that premise is that the visible Church consists of believers only without inclusion of their children—that Peter meant nothing on that day of Pentecost when he added to the words which Dr. Strong quotes: "Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins"—those other words which Dr. Strong does not quote: "For to you is the promise and to your children" (Acts 2:38). This suppressed premise Dr. Strong adjoins in the second item of proof which he adduces; but we must observe that it is not a second item, but a necessary element in the first item which without it is invalid. In a word, when we correct the Scripture he adduces and the illegitimate use he makes of Scripture, Dr. Strong's whole argument reduces to the one item of the "nature of the Church, as a company of regenerate persons." It is only on the ground that this is the true idea of the Church that the passages quoted to prove that baptism is to be

administered "only" to such as have previously repented and believed, and those quoted to prove that the symbolism of the ordinance declares a "previous" spiritual change in him who submits to it, will justify the "only" and "previous" in which lies their point. The validity of the proof he offers thus depends on the truth of the assertion that the Church consists of regenerate persons; and whether this be true or not we need not here stay to examine: certainly the texts he adduces in proof of it, as already intimated, make no approach to establishing it. We rest securely in the result that according to Dr. Strong's argument as well as our own conviction, the subjects of baptism are the members of the visible Church: and who those are, will certainly be determined by our theory of the nature of the Church.

A page or two further on (p. 534) he takes up the question of "Infant Baptism" *ex professo*. This "he rejects and reprehends," and that for the following reasons, viz.:

"(a) Infant baptism is without warrant, either express or implied, in the Scripture.

(b) Infant baptism is expressly contradicted [by scriptural teaching.]

(c) The rise of infant baptism in the history of the church is due to sacramental conceptions of Christianity, so that all arguments in its favor from the writings of the first three centuries, are equally arguments for baptismal regeneration.

(d) The reasoning by which it is supported is unscriptural, unsound, and dangerous in its tendency.

(e) The lack of agreement among pædobaptists as to the warrant for infant baptism and as to the relation of baptized infants to the church, together with the manifest decline of the practice itself, are arguments against it.

(f) The evil effects of infant baptism are a strong argument against it."

Here is quite a list of arguments. We must look at the items one by one.

(a) When we ask after a direct scriptural warrant for infant baptism, in the sense which Dr. Strong has in mind, in

the first of these arguments, we, of course, have the New Testament in view, seeing that it is only in the new dispensation that this rite has been ordained. In this sense of the words, we may admit his first declaration—that there is no express command that infants should be baptized; and with it also his second—that there is in Scripture no clear example of the baptism of infants, *i. e.*, if we understand by this that there is no express record, reciting in so many words, that infants were baptized. When he adds to these, however, a third contention, that “the passages held to imply infant baptism, contain, when fairly interpreted, no reference to such a practice,” we begin to recalcitrate. If it were only asserted that these passages contain no such stringent proof that infants were baptized as would satisfy us on the point in the absence of other evidence, we might yield this point also. But it is too much to ask us to believe that they contain “no reference to the practice” if “fairly interpreted.” What is a “fair” interpretation? Is it not an interpretation which takes the passages as they stand, without desire to make undue capital of them one way or the other? Well, a fair interpretation of these passages, in this sense, might prevent pædobaptists from claiming them as a demonstrative proof of infant baptism, and it would also certainly prevent anti-pædobaptists from asserting that they have “no reference to such a practice.” It should lead both parties to agree that the passages have a possible but not a necessary reference to infant baptism—that they are neutral passages, in a word, which apparently imply infant baptism, but which may be explained without involving that implication if we otherwise know that infant baptism did not exist in that day. Fairly viewed, in other words, they are passages which will support any other indications of infant baptism which may be brought forward, but which will scarcely suffice to prove it against evidence to the contrary, or to do more than raise a presumption in its favor in the

absence of other evidence for it. For what are these passages? The important ones are Acts xvi, 15, which declares that Lydia was "baptized and her household," and Acts xvi, 33, which declares that the jailer was "baptized and all his," together with I Cor. i, 16, "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." Certainly at first blush we would think that the repeated baptism of households without further description, would imply the baptism of the infants connected with them. It may be a "fair" response to this that we do not know that there were any infants in these households—which is true enough, but not sufficient to remove the suspicion that there may have been. It may be a still "fairer" reply to say that whether the infants of these families (if there were infants in them) were baptized or not, would depend on the practice of the Apostles; and whatever that practice was would be readily understood by the first readers of the Acts. But this would only amount to asking that infant baptism should not be founded solely on these passages alone; and this we have already granted.

Neither of these lines of argument are adduced by Dr. Strong. They would not justify his position—which is not that the baptism of infants cannot be proved by these passages, but much more than this—that a fair interpretation of them definitely excludes all reference to it by them. Let us see what Dr. Strong means by a "fair" interpretation. To the case of Lydia he appends "cf. vs. 40," which tells us when Paul and Silas were loosed from prison "they entered into the house of Lydia, and when they had seen the brethren they comforted them and departed"—from which, apparently, he would have us make two inferences, (1) that these "brethren" constituted the household of Lydia that was baptized, and (2) that these "brethren" were all adults. In like manner to the case of the jailer he appends the mystic "cf. vs. 34," which tells us that the saved jailer brought his former prisoners up into his house and set meat before them and "rejoiced greatly, having believed, with

all his house, on God"—from which he would apparently have us infer that there was no member of the household, baptized by Paul, who was too young to exercise personal faith. So he says with reference to 1 Cor. 1, 16, that "1 Cor. 16, 15, shows that the whole family of Stephanas, baptized by Paul, were adults." Nevertheless when we look at 1 Cor. 16, 15, we read merely that the house of Stephanas were the first fruits of Achaia and that they had set themselves to minister unto the saints—which leaves the question whether they are all adults or not just where it was before, i. e., absolutely undetermined.

Nor is this all. To these passages Dr. Strong appends two others, one properly enough, 1 Cor. 7, 14, where Paul admonishes the Christian not to desert the unbelieving husband or wife, "for the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." This is doubtless a passage similar to the others; a passage certainly which does not explicitly teach infant baptism, but equally certainly which is not inconsistent with it—which would, indeed, find a ready explanation from such a custom if such a custom existed, and therefore stands as one of the passages which raise at least a suspicion that infant baptism underlies the form of expression—since the holiness of the children is taken for granted in it and the sanctification of the unbelieving partner inferred from it—but is yet no doubt capable of an explanation on the supposition that that practice did not exist and is therefore scarcely a sure foundation for a doctrine asserting it. Dr. Strong is, however, not satisfied with showing that no stringent inference can be drawn from it in favor of infant baptism. He claims it as a "sure testimony," a "plain proof" against infant baptism, on the grounds that the infants and the unbelieving parent are put by it in the same category, and (quoting Jacobi) that if children had been baptized, Paul would cer-

tainly have referred to their baptism as a proof of their holiness. And this in the face of the obvious fact that the holiness of the children is assumed as beyond dispute and in no need of proof, doubt as to which would be too horrible to contemplate, and the sanctification of the husband or wife inferred from it. Of course, it is the sanctity or holiness of external connection and privilege that is referred to, both with reference to the children and the parent; but that of the one is taken for granted, that of the other is argued; hence it lies close to infer that the one may have had churchly recognition and the other not. Whether that was true or not, however, the passage cannot positively decide for us; it only raises a suspicion. But this suspicion ought to be frankly recognized.

The other passage which is adjoined to these is strangely found in their company, although it, too, is one of the "neutral texts." It is Mat. 19, 14: "Suffer the little children and forbid them not to come unto me; for to such belongeth the kingdom of heaven." What has this to do with baptism? Certainly nothing directly; only if it be held indirectly to show that infants were received by Christ as members of his kingdom on earth, i. e., of his Church, can it bear on the controversy. But notice Dr. Strong's comment: "None would have been 'forbidden,' if Jesus and his disciples had been in the habit of baptizing infants." Does he really think this touches the matter that is raised by this quotation? Nobody supposes that "Jesus and his disciples" were in the habit of baptizing infants; nobody supposes that at the time these words were spoken, Christian baptism had been so much as yet instituted. Dr. Strong would have to show, not that infant baptism was not practiced before baptism was instituted, but that the children were not designated by Christ as members of his "kingdom," before the presumption for infant baptism would be extruded from this text. It is his unmeasured zeal to make all texts which have been appealed to by pædobap-

tists—not merely fail to teach pædobaptism—but teach that children were not baptized, that has led him so far astray here.

We cannot profess to admire, then, the “fair” interpretations which Dr. Strong makes of these texts. No one starting out without a foregone conclusion could venture to say that, when “fairly interpreted,” they certainly make no reference to baptism of infants. Nevertheless, I freely allow that they do not suffice, taken by themselves, to prove that infants were baptized by the Apostles—they only suggest this supposition and raise a presumption for it. And, therefore, I am prepared to allow in general the validity of Dr. Strong’s first argument—when thus softened to reasonable proportions. It is true that there is no express command to baptize infants in the New Testament, no express record of the baptism of infants, and no passages so stringently implying it that we must infer from them that infants were baptized. If such warrant as this were necessary to justify the usage we should have to leave it incompletely justified. But the lack of this express warrant is something far short of forbidding the rite; and if the continuity of the Church through all ages can be made good, the warrant for infant baptism is not to be sought in the New Testament but in the Old Testament, when the Church was instituted, and nothing short of an actual forbidding of it in the New Testament would warrant our omitting it now. As Lightfoot expressed it long ago (*Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Matt. 3:6): “It is not forbidden” in the New Testament to “baptize infants, therefore they are to be baptized.” Dr. Strong commits his first logical error in demanding express warrant for the continuance of a long-settled institution, instead of asking for warrant for setting it aside.

(b) If thus the first argument is irrelevant as a whole as well as not very judiciously put in its details, is not its failure well atoned for in the second one? His second argu-

ment undertakes to show that "Infant baptism is expressly contradicted" [by scriptural teaching]. Here, at length, we have the promise of what was needed. But if we expect stringent reason here for the alteration of the children-including covenant, we shall be sadly disappointed. Dr. Strong offers four items. First, infant baptism is contradicted "by the scriptural prerequisites of faith and repentance, as signs of regeneration," which is valid only on the suppressed assumption that baptism is permissible only in the case of those who prove a previous regeneration—which is the very point in dispute. Secondly, "By the scriptural symbolism of the ordinance." "As we should not bury a person before his death, so we should not symbolically bury a person by baptism, until he has in spirit died to sin." Here not only that the symbolism of baptism is burial is gratuitously assumed, but also that this act, whatever be its symbolism, could be the symbol only of an already completed process in the heart of the recipient—which again is the very point in dispute. Thirdly, "By the scriptural constitution of the church"—where again the whole validity of the argument depends on the assumption that infants are not members of the church—the very point in dispute. These three arguments must therefore be thrown at once out of court. If the Scriptures teach that personal faith and repentance are prerequisites to baptism, if they teach that one must have previously died to sin before he is baptized, if they teach that the visible Church consists of regenerate adults only—why, on any of these three identical propositions, each of which implies all the others, of course infants may not be baptized—for this again is but an identical proposition with any of the three. But it is hardly sound argumentation simply to repeat the matter in dispute in other words and plead it as proof.

The fourth item is more reasonable—"By the scriptural prerequisites to participation in the Lord's Supper. Participation in the Lord's Supper is the right only of those who

can discern the Lord's body (1 Cor. 11:29). No reason can be assigned for restricting to intelligent communicants the ordinance of the supper which would not equally restrict to intelligent believers the ordinance of baptism." Hence Dr. Strong thinks the Greek Church more consistent in administering the Lord's Supper to infants. It seems, however, a sufficient answer to this to point to the passage quoted: the express declaration of Scripture, that those who are admitted to the Lord's Supper—a declaration made to those who were already baptized Christians—should be restricted to those who discern the Lord's body, is a sufficient scriptural reason for restricting participation in the Lord's Supper to intelligent communicants; while the absence of that Scripture restriction in its case is a sufficient scriptural reason for refusing to apply it to baptism. If we must support this scriptural reason with a purely rational one, it may be enough to add that the fact that baptism is the initiatory rite of the church supplies us with such a reason. The ordinances of the church belong to the members of it; but each in its own appointed time. The initiatory ordinance belongs to the members on becoming members, other ordinances become their right as the appointed seasons for enjoying them roll around. We might as well argue that a citizen of the United States has no right to the protection of the police until he can exercise the franchise. The rights all belong to him: but the exercise of each comes in its own season. It is easily seen by the help of such examples that the possession of a right to the initiatory ordinance of the church need not carry with it the right to the immediate enjoyment of all church privileges: and thus the challenge is answered to show cause why the right to baptism does not carry with it the right to communion in the Lord's Supper. Cf. Cotton Mather, as quoted in Hodge, III, 572. With this challenge the second argument of Dr. Strong is answered, too.

(c) The third argument is really an attempt to get rid of the pressure of the historical argument for infant baptism. Is it argued that the Christian Church from the earliest traceable date baptized infants?—that this is possibly hinted in Justin Martyr, assumed apparently in Irenæus, and openly proclaimed as apostolical by Origen and Cyprian while it was vainly opposed by Tertullian? In answer it is replied that all these writers taught baptismal regeneration and that infant baptism was an invention coming in on the heels of baptismal regeneration and continued in existence by State Churches. There is much that is plausible in this contention. The early Church did come to believe that baptism was necessary to salvation; this doctrine forms a natural reason for the extension of baptism to infants, lest dying unbaptized they should fail of salvation. Nevertheless, the contention does not seem to be the true explanation of the line of development. First, it confuses a question of testimony to fact with a question of doctrine. The two—baptismal regeneration and infant baptism—do not stand or fall together, in the testimony of the fathers. Their unconscious testimony to a current practice proves its currency in their day; but their witness to a doctrine does not prove its truth. We may or may not agree with them in their doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But we cannot doubt the truth of their testimony to the prevalence of infant baptism in their day. We admit that their day is not the Apostles' day. We could well wish that we had earlier witness. We may be sure from the witness of Origen and Cyprian that they were baptized in their infancy—that is, that infant baptism was the usual practice in the age of Irenæus—a conclusion which is at once strengthened by and strengthens the witness of Irenæus. But the practice of the latter half of the Second Century need not have been the practice of the Apostles. A presumption is raised, however—even though so weak an one that it would not stand against adverse evidence. But where is the adverse

evidence? Secondly, Dr. Strong's view reverses the historical testimony. As a matter of history it was not the inauguration of the practice of infant baptism which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration secured, but the endangering of it. It was because baptism washed away all sin and after that there remained no more laver for regeneration, that baptism was postponed. It is for this reason that Tertullian proposes its postponement. Lastly, though the historical evidence may not be conclusive for the apostolicity of infant baptism, it is in that direction and is all that we have. There is no evidence from primitive church history against infant baptism, except the ambiguous evidence of Tertullian; so that our choice is to follow history and baptize infants or to reconstruct by *a priori* methods a history for which we have no evidence.

(d) Dr. Strong's fourth item is intended as a refutation of the reasoning by which the advocates of pædobaptism support their contention. As such it naturally takes up the reasoning from every kind of sources and it is not strange that some of the reasoning adduced in it is as distasteful to us as it is to him. We should heartily unite with him in refusing to allow the existence of any power in the church to modify or abrogate any command of Christ. Nor could we find any greater acceptability than he does in the notion of an "organic connection" between the parent and the child, such as he quotes Dr. Bushnell as advocating. Nevertheless we can believe in a parent acting as representative of the child of his loins, whose nurture is committed to him; and we can believe that the status of the parent determines the status of the child—in the Church of the God whose promise is "to you and your children," as well as, for example, in the State. And we can believe that the Church includes the minor children of its members for whom they must as parents act, without believing that it is thereby made a hereditary body. I do not purpose here to go over again the proofs, which Dr. Hodge

so cogently urges, that go to prove the continuity of the Church through the Old and New dispensations—remaining under whatever change of dispensation the same Church, with the same laws of entrance and the same constituents. The antithesis which Dr. Strong adduces—that “the Christian Church is either a national hereditary body or it was merely typified by the Jewish people”—is a false antithesis. The Christian Church is not a natural, hereditary body and yet it is not merely the antitype of Israel. It is, the Apostles being witnesses, the veritable Israel itself. It carried over into itself all that was essentially Israelitish—all that went to make up the body of God’s people. Paul’s figures of the olive tree in Romans and of the breaking down of the middle wall of partition in Ephesians, suffice to demonstrate this; and besides these figures he repeatedly asserts it in the plainest language.

So fully did the first Christians—the Apostles—realize the continuity of the church, that they were more inclined to retain parts of the outward garments of the church than to discard too much. Hence circumcision itself was retained; and for a considerable period all initiants into the church were circumcised Jews and received baptism additionally. We do not doubt that children born into the church during this age were both circumcised and baptized. The change from baptism superinduced upon circumcision to baptism substituted for circumcision was slow, and never came until it was forced by the actual pressure of circumstances. The instrument for making this change and so—who can doubt it?—for giving the rite of baptism its right place as the substitute for circumcision, was the Apostle Paul. We see the change formally constituted at the so-called Council of Jerusalem, in Acts xv. Paul had preached the Gospel to Gentiles and had received them into the Church by baptism alone, thus recognizing it alone as the initiatory rite, in the place of circumcision, instead of treating as heretofore the two together as the initiatory rites

into the Christian Church. But certain teachers from Jerusalem, coming down to Antioch, taught the brethren "except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses ye cannot be saved." Paul took the matter before the Church of Jerusalem from which these new teachers professed to emanate; and its formal decision was that to those who believed and were baptized circumcision was not necessary.

How fully Paul believed that baptism and circumcision were but two symbols of the same change of heart, and that one was instead of the other, may be gathered from Col. 2:11, when, speaking to a Christian audience of the Church, he declares that "in Christ ye were also circumcised"—but how?—"with a circumcision not made with hands, in putting off the body of the flesh,"—i. e. in the circumcision of Christ. But what was this Christ-ordained circumcision? The Apostle continues: "Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye were raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Hence in baptism they were buried with Christ, and this burial with Christ was the circumcision which Christ ordained, in the partaking of which they became the true circumcision. This falls little, if any, short of a direct assertion that the Christian Church is Israel, and has Israel's circumcision, though now in the form of baptism. Does the view of Paul, now, contradict the New Testament idea of the Church, or only the Baptist idea of the Church? No doubt a large number of the members of the Primitive Church did insist, as Dr. Strong truly says, that those who were baptized should also be circumcised: and no doubt, this proves that in their view baptism did not take the place of circumcision. But this was an erroneous view: is represented in the New Testament as erroneous; and it is this exact view against which Paul protested to the Church of Jerusalem and which the Church of Jerusalem condemned in Acts xv. Thus the Baptist denial of the substitution of baptism for circumcis-

ion leads them into the error of this fanatical, pharisaical church-party! Let us take our places in opposition, along with Paul and all the Apostles.

Whether, then, that the family is the unit of society is a relic of barbarism or not, it is the New Testament basis of the Church of God. God does make man the head of the woman—does enjoin the wife to be in subjection to her husband—and does make the parents act on behalf of their minor children. He does, indeed, require individual faith for salvation; but he organizes his people in families first; and then into churches, recognizing in their very warp and woof the family constitution. His promises are all the more precious that they are to us and our children. And though this may not fit in with the growing individualism of the day, it is God's ordinance.

(e) Dr. Strong's fifth argument is drawn from the divergent modes in which pædobaptists defend their position and from the decline among them of the practice of the rite. Let us confess that we do not all argue alike or aright. But is not this a proof rather of the firm establishment in our hearts of the practice? We all practice alike; and it is the propriety of the practice, not the propriety of our defence of it, that is, after all, at stake. But the practice is declining, it is said. Perhaps this is true. Dr. Vedder's statistics seem to show it. But if so, does the decline show the practice to be wrong, or Christians to be unfaithful? It is among pædobaptists that the decline is taking place—those who still defend the practice. Perhaps it is the silent influence of Baptist neighbors; perhaps it is unfaithfulness in parents; perhaps the spread of a Quakerish sentiment of undervaluation of ordinances. Many reasons may enter into the account of it. But how does it show the practice to be wrong? According to the Baptist reconstruction of history, the Church began by not baptizing infants. But this primitive and godly practice declined—rapidly declined—until in the second century all infants were bap-

tized and Tertullian raised a solitary and ineffectual voice crying a return to the older purity in the third. Did that decline of a prevalent usage prove it to be a wrong usage? By what logic can the decline in the second century be made an evidence in favor of the earlier usage, and that of the nineteenth an evidence against it?

(f) We must pass on, however, to the final string of arguments, which would fain point out the evil effects of infant baptism. First it forestalls the act of the child and so prevents it from ever obeying Christ's command to be baptized—which is simply begging the question. We say it obeys Christ's command by giving the child early baptism and so marking him as the Lord's. Secondly, it is said to induce superstitious confidence in an outward rite, as if it possessed regenerating efficacy; and we are pointed to frantic mothers seeking baptism for their dying children. Undoubtedly the evil does occur and needs careful guarding against. But it is an evil not confined to this rite, but apt to attach itself to all rites—which need not, therefore, be all abolished. We may remark, in passing, on the unfairness of bringing together here illustrative instances from French Catholic peasants and High Church Episcopalians, as if these were of the same order with Protestants. Thirdly, it is said to tend to corrupt Christian truth as to the sufficiency of Scripture, the connection of the ordinances, and the inconsistency of an impenitent life with church membership, as if infant baptism necessarily argued sacramentarianism, or as if the churches of other Protestant bodies were as a matter of fact more full of "impenitent members" than those of the Baptists. This last remark is in place also, in reply to the fourth point made, wherein it is charged that the practice of infant baptism destroys the Church as a spiritual body by merging it in the nation and in the world. It is yet to be shown that the Baptist churches are purer than the Pædobaptist. Dr. Strong seems to think that infant baptism is re-

sponsible for the Unitarian defection in New England. I am afraid the cause lay much deeper. Nor is it a valid argument against infant baptism, that the churches do not always fulfil their duty to their baptized members. This, and not the practice of infant baptism, is the fertile cause of incongruities and evils innumerable.

Lastly, it is urged that infant baptism "puts into the place of Christ's command a commandment of men, and so admits the essential principle of all heresy, schism, and false religion"—a good, round, railing charge to bring against one's brethren: but as an argument against infant baptism, drawn from its effects, somewhat of a *petitio principii*. If true, it is serious enough. But Dr. Strong has omitted to give the chapter and verse where Christ's command not to baptize infants is to be found. One or the other of us is wrong, no doubt; but do we not break an undoubted command of Christ when we speak thus harshly of our brethren, his children, whom we should love? Were it not better to judge, each the other mistaken, and recognize, each the other's desire to please Christ and follow his commandments? Certainly I believe that our Baptist brethren omit to fulfil an ordinance of Christ's house, sufficiently plainly revealed as his will, when they exclude the infant children of believers from baptism. But I know they do this unwittingly in ignorance; and I cannot refuse them the right hand of fellowship on that account.

But now, having run through these various arguments, to what conclusion do we come? Are they sufficient to set aside our reasoned conviction, derived from some such argument as Dr. Hodge's, that infants are to be baptized? A thousand times no. So long as it remains true that Paul represents the Church of the Living God to be one, founded on one covenant (which the law could not set aside) from Abraham to to-day, so long it remains true that the promise is to us and our children and that the members of the visible Church consist of believers and their chil-

dren—all of whom have a right to all the ordinances of the visible Church, each in its appointed season. The argument in a nutshell is simply this: God established his Church in the days of Abraham and put children into it. They must remain there until he puts them out. He has nowhere put them out. They are still then members of his Church and as such entitled to its ordinances. Among these ordinances is baptism, which standing in similar place in the New Dispensation to circumcision in the Old, is like it to be given to children.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.

NOTES.

I. IS THE STANDARD DECLINING ?

Progress may be judged from either of two different points of view, and the estimate be very diverse accordingly. It depends very much upon whether you measure from the starting point or from the goal; judged from the goal the progress may appear inappreciable, judged from the starting point it may be vast.

When one hears the devoted temperance orator marshalling statistics and portraying the desolation wrought by the rum-devil, the whole nation seems rapidly being drowned in drink and the effect is depressing well nigh to the verge of hopelessness; on the other hand, when our oldest people tell us that in their youth whiskey was a part of the regular stock of all "general merchandise" stores, sold as uniformly as coffee and sugar, with no license, restriction or supervision; that prominent Presbyterian elders regularly manufactured it, and hauled it to town for sale as they now do bacon and flour; that it was much in evidence on the sideboard and table; that pious pastors in their visits had it offered without apology and were accustomed to drink it without scruple and sometimes without water—when we hear such things they seem to us incredible, almost. This fact is one measure of the advance of temperance sentiment within the compass of a single lifetime.

There has been a good deal said of late about the decline of scholarship in the Presbyterian ministry; some very strong statements have been made, and some rather severe indictments have been brought.

It is one thing to assert a low standard, and another to assert a decline of standard; moreover, a standard may be low absolutely which is not low relatively; a man, tried by an absolute standard, may be a very poor scholar, whereas

comparatively or relatively his scholarship may be highly creditable.

Once more ; as to the matter of a decline, the measure is still different, even a comparatively low standard is not necessarily a declining standard.

I have been connected with two Presbyteries only, and my term of ministerial service, is not a very long one, but during the whole of it in both Presbyteries I have been concerned in the examination of candidates, and my department has been that of the ancient languages, the Greek, the Latin and the Hebrew, just the field singled out by critics and by them stigmatized as most farcical.

Now, I do not undertake to speak for the whole church, but I do most solemnly affirm that constant and close observation, based upon numerous examinations in this very department, warrants the confident assertion that, so far from there having been a decline of scholarship, there has, on the contrary, been a decided elevation of the standard.

I can recall very distinctly the examination given me ; at that time the first two verses of Genesis seemed to be universally the passage selected for the Hebrew, and for Greek the corresponding verses in John's gospel. I wish to say that for four years or more I have not in a single instance assigned a candidate a passage for examination in either Greek or Hebrew without being first assured that he had never before read the passage.

As a matter of interest I append here the latest examinations I have given. The publication of the papers is an afterthought ; there was no idea of the sort in my mind at the time they were assigned, but I have been advised by several friends to publish them as a contribution to the discussion. Let the reader understand that the candidate had never before read either passage in the original and that he had the help of no lexicon, grammar or translation and signed the same pledge that colleges require appended to such papers :

HEBREW.

Judges 19:1-3 inclusive.

- I. A literal translation :
- II. Discuss :
 לְרַבֵּר ; וַתְּבִיאָהּוּ ; לְהִשְׁבִּיבּוּ ; וַתִּלְקֶךְ ; בְּיַרְכָּתִי ; רָהֵם ; וַיְהִי
- III. Compare and distinguish אִשָּׁה in verse 1 and אִישָׁה in verse 3.
- IV. Inflect through tense occurring in text, omitting ו conversive : וַיִּרְאֶהוּ וַתִּן נָה ; וַיְהִי
- V. Analyze into component parts : לְקַרְאָתוֹ ; עַל-לִבָּהּ ; מֵאֵפוֹ ; וַיִּקְרָם ; וַיִּקְרָה ; וַיְהִי
- VI. Give complete synopsis (3rd pers. sing. only in Perf. and Imperf.) omitting ו conversive : וַיִּקְרָם ; וַיִּקְרָה ; וַיְהִי
- VII. GRAMMAR :
 1. Methegh ; definition and chief uses ?
 2. Daghesh-forte ; how many kinds, and chief uses ?
 3. Some discussion of tone-shifting.
 4. Number in nouns ; how many kinds of ? Illustrate formation of each in both Masc. and Fem.
 5. Construct Case : What is it ? Illustrate formation and use in both genders and in each number.
 6. Translate into Hebrew :
 - (1) And the Lord said unto Moses.
 - (2) And he called upon the name of the Lord.
 - (3) And he arose and went into the house of the Lord.

GREEK.

Mat. 14:1-5 inclusive.

- I. Translation.
- II. Discuss : ἐκέλευε, &c., κρατήσας, διὰ.
- III. Decline : παισιν, τούτο, γυναίκα, Ἡρώδης, Ἡρωδιάδα.
- IV. Syntax of : ἀκοήν, γυναίκα, ἔξεστι, σοι, ὡς.
- V. Principal parts of : ἤκουσεν, ἔθετο, ἔχεν, ἀποκτείνει.

- VI. Conjugate through tense occurring in text : *ἐνεργούσιν* and *ἔδησαν* and explain the accent in each word, taking some one form for illustration.
- VII. Etymology and meaning of *τετράρχης*.
- VIII. GRAMMAR :
1. How many declensions ? An example of each ?
 2. How many conjugations ? An example of each ? Which is older ?
 3. Difference in *significance* between : The 1st Aor. and 2nd Aor. ? between the 1st Aor. and Imperf. ?
 4. How many classes of contract verbs ? Give one example of each.
 5. Difference between *μη* and *οὐ*.
 6. How many ways of expressing purpose in Greek ?
 7. The forms of the conditional sentence ?
 8. Explain the syntax of the phrase : *ἐν τῷ τότε ἰδεῖν*.

I may add that six hours' work on the examination brought papers which "passed" very creditably. There is nothing in the examination that need worry a man who has been a faithful student, it was not designed for that purpose; but I humbly submit that few readers will call it farcical.

It is altogether likely that other Presbyteries are equally serious.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

Columbia, S. C.

II. "IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN."

BY WM. FROST BISHOP, D. D.

The dialect of the New Testament is not classic Greek. It is not the speech of Thucydides or Plato, but a species known as "Hellenistic." By this we mean the Greek spoken by foreigners who learned it as a secondary tongue, specially around the Mediterranean coast. It is mixed with forms of Hebrew speech. There are departures from the grammatical tongue. Much of the synthetic terseness of the best Attic is lost to us in the Greek of the New Testament. However, we have really lost nothing. While a dialect may be less ideally perfect, it may be more available for specific purposes. St. Augustine is more forceful than Tully, and Tertullian more impassioned than Cicero, although their Latin is inferior as a language. The New Testament Greek had to convey new ideas. Fortunately it was plastic for the reception of new conceptions. As Canon Farrar has aptly said: "The seething ferment of the new wine could no longer be contained in the old bottles, however perfect their external finish."

Grateful as we are to Dale for his labors in this field, we need to be on our guard. Hellenistic Greek has a genius of its own. A thing may be possible in Matthew's syntax which is not possible in Attic. While the loftiest eloquence of the Apocalypse is not incompatible with a dialect proverbially uncouth, and even ungrammatical. The Greek of Inspiration has a genius of its own. It is deeply dyed with Hebrew words and idioms. It is a fuller tongue than the classic and must be interpreted by its own canons of speech.

We are well nigh shut up to a consideration of the New Testament dialect alone, with but little hope for extraneous aid. And as to our present discussion—the question of

the baptismal formula—it is unsafe to venture beyond the five historical books, the four Gospels and the Acts. There are theoretical liberties and metaphorical forms of speech in the Epistles, that render deductions doubtful. The Epistles contain what might be called the philosophical statement of Gospel principles in familiar and colloquial language, where allegorical phraseology is entirely admissible.

The formula of baptism belongs to and is imbedded in the historical books, and the meaning attached to the formula in the historical books establishes and limits the meaning of the formula in all other writings. We ought by this time surely to have learned something from the experience in debate of the familiar words: "Buried with him in baptism." We will not say this phrase has fallen among thieves, like the man that went down from Jerusalem to Jericho; but we will say that it has certainly suffered many things at the hands of both Priests and Levites.

Looking then solely within the lids of the Gospels and the Acts (historical books, strangely unimpassioned and without color of emotion on the part of the authors) we find:

1. That, if the phrase (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*) in the baptismal formula is to be translated "into the name," it is the only place in Matthew's Gospel where such translation is possible. Everywhere else in his Gospel it must be translated "in the name," as for example, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Matt. 18:20. He makes use of the phrase five times and in every case we can translate "in the name" and make sense.

2. That Matthew's use of the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* makes it the equivalent of *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνομάτι*, which can never mean "into the name" (compare Mat. 10:41 with Math. 18:5). In the other case it is: "He that receiveth a prophet in the name (*εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*) of a prophet shall receive a prophet's

reward.” In the other case it is: “And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι) receiveth me.”

3. That the word “baptize” is not always joined with *εἰς*. Consult Acts 2:38, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.” Here we have ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, which can never mean “into.” Consult Acts 10:48, “And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.” Here we have ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, which also can never mean “into.” In the Book of Acts no special significance is attached to the preposition *εἰς*, even when conjoined with “baptize.” If its author, St. Luke, is infallible, our opponents are wrong by insisting upon a shade of meaning which is peculiar to *εἰς* and which cannot be borne by the prepositions ἐπὶ and ἐν.

4. That the Revised Version itself does not always translate *εἰς* as “into,” when conjoined with “baptize.” Consult I Cor. 10:2, “I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, how that our fathers were all under the cloud, and passed through the sea, and we were all baptized unto Moses.” The Victorian Version does not always translate *εἰς* by “into” when conjoined with “baptize.”

5. The much vaunted Revised Version retains the old familiar formula, and does not hesitate to translate “baptize in the name.” And, if so, why should we? Here are the exact words of the baptismal formula, so far as the disputed phrase is concerned, in the New Version: “Repent ye and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ,” Acts 2:38. Again we read in the New Version, “And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ,” Acts 10:48. The phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* occurs at John 10:12, and the Revised Version reads, “To them that believe in his name.” Also at John 3:18, Heb. 10:10 and John 5:13 the New Version translates *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* to mean “on the name” or “toward the name.” In other words, the familiar words of the ancient formula are still found in the New Bible; why not, also, then in the new Directory?

Let me remind Dr. Primrose, that the triumphant theory is that which takes in all the facts. By translating εἰς τὸ ὄνομα to mean "in the name," we can go straight on through the Gospels and the Acts without any trouble. But he, on his theory, must change his hypothesis no less than three times in considering only three texts: at Mat. 28:19 he translates "into the name," at Acts 10:48, to avoid a difficulty fatal to his theory, he has to change the natural order of the words; while at Acts 2:38 he is actually driven to the necessity of importing words into the text which are not there at all. Were this a controversy instead of a friendly conference, such liberties would be allowed not for one moment. We know when a train is off the track, by the frequent bumps and jolts. Something must be wrong when three distinct hypotheses are needed in as many texts.

As to changing the order of the words, I shall never forget the shock that came to us when the Rev. John Miller, of most blessed memory, through stress of weather, changed the natural order of the text: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise, (Luke 23:43,) and made it read, "To-day, I say unto thee, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." It was as though the sun had been stricken from the sky. It is a dangerous device.

And, as to importing words into the text which are not there at all, let us try Dr. Primrose's expedient upon a familiar text, which supplies all the conditions upon which he insists. Take the text: "For many shall come in my name, saying, I am the Christ; and shall deceive many." The good doctor says that with ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματι (as the phrase is here,) we must understand the omitted word "believing" (making us complete the sense "believing upon the name"). Now, let us try this device. Here is the result: For many shall come (believing) in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." Comment is unnecessary. That is the triumphant theory which takes in all the facts and does violence to none.

In what follows, any allusion to Dr. Primrose is disavowed. But it may be necessary to call to mind that *eis*, as a Greek preposition, has a variety of meanings, one shade of which is expressed by "into." Another shade of which is expressed by "in," as "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." And, as a clear case where *eis* cannot mean "into," we have the running of the two disciples to the tomb of Christ, in which John came "to" (*eis*) the tomb, but did not enter, while Peter came up and went "into" (double *eis*) the tomb straightway.

But to a much graver view of the discussion. In the Bible "name" generally means "nature," and it may be that some hold that the ordinance of baptism makes the subject *ipso facto* a partaker of the Divine nature. This may be the lurking motive of some in their contention. If so, then the time has come for another Reformation and the hour has struck for another Martin Luther.

It is no more possible to get Gospel honey out of the flinty rock of the Law, than a radical change of heart out of the machinery of ritual.

Some time ago, two years perhaps, the *Observer* laughed good-naturedly at an article of mine, because in it there were nineteen objections to the new reading of the baptismal formula. The laugh gave no offense. But it supplies an opportunity to say that the writer will engage to furnish, not alone nineteen arguments against the new reading, but arguments enough to fill an entire issue of the *Observer*, even to the exclusion of advertisements. The chief of such arguments would be the citations from history, to show the pernicious influence of such phrases as "baptize into the name," where "name" means "nature," and the vicious *opus operatum* heresy is taught.

Baptism in the hands of a Protestant minister is a teaching symbol; it is neither antecedent nor supplementary to the Gospel; it is an integral part of it, in its preceptive or declarative form.

Scripture nowhere ascribes to baptism a special function in consequence of its symbolical character.

If baptism *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς*, etc., designates the subject as partaker of the Divine nature, the Protestant minister cannot formally imitate a function peculiar only to the Holy Spirit.

The Protestant minister cannot ascribe to any function of his office a higher validity than to the office itself.

Hence, the change of "in the name of" to "into the name of" in the formula of baptism, has given an unscriptural significance to the function and office of the Protestant minister.

The writer never saw the truth as it is in the Lord's Supper—never felt sure of his ground—till he read a remarkable exposition of that ordinance in the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY some years ago by Dr. Thos. E. Peck. His cardinal position was: "The simpler our views of the sacrament (of the supper) the better." Allow me to add, the simpler our views of the sacrament of baptism the better.

WM. FROST BISHOP.

Liberty, Mo.

EDITORIAL.

COMMENTS.

Rev. F. R. Beattie, D. D., was the originator of the movement in this country to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, which has been so happily carried out, first in the Southern and then in the Northern Church. His article on the Genesis of the Westminster Assembly will be read with added interest on that account. The Woman Question is ably discussed by Rev. P. D. Stephenson. His array of facts and statistics is appalling. We need just such careful researches as he has made, and the QUARTERLY is here for the sake of giving the results to the church, but the reader will bear in mind that this is but one side of the truth about Woman in America. Not by design, but with the appearance of presenting another side, Dr. Quarles publishes a delightful article on the Higher Education of Women. Rev. W. S. Bean, D. D., writes a thoughtful disquisition on the philosophical distinction between soul and spirit, which is in striking contrast to the crude output of Dr. Trumbull in the *Sunday School Times* last year. Rev. R. A. Lapsley presents the Doctrinal Issues of the Houston Case in a calm, clear and convincing way. Rev. Neal L. Anderson's article on Evolution and Teleology will repay careful consideration. Rev. W. P. McCorkle has become an authority on Christian Science, his two former articles on the subject in the QUARTERLY having been much in demand in the North and West, where the mischief of the delusion has been most manifest. But this science, falsely so-called, is becoming a living issue in the South, a church of Christian Scientists having been recently organized in Atlanta. Mr. McCorkle traces the "science" back to the old Gnosticism and shows that Theosophy is another face of the same old enemy. Rev.

Julius W. Walden, D. D., discusses the theme, Salvation Is of the Jews, from the Pre-millennial point of view.

It is an able presentation from that point of view. We presume that most of our readers will part company with him where he parts company with history and begins his interpretation of prophecy. We are compelled to believe that the attitude toward the Jews which many Christians have assumed, that they are not to be converted to Christianity by the ordinary methods of the Gospel, but must wait until the coming of Christ, and the reunion of Judah and Israel in Palestine, then themselves becoming the missionaries of the nations, is an actual discouragement to the work of preaching the gospel of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Warfield, of Princeton, a long time contributor to the QUARTERLY, supplements the work of his Southern brethren in this number with an article on the Polemics of Infant Baptism, which is worthy of closest study and should serve as an armory for those who desire equipment for the defence of the baptismal covenant.

Dr. S. M. Smith writes an interesting "note" answering in the negative the question, "Is the Standard Declining?" Dr. Wm. Frost Bishop and Dr. J. W. Primrose have been carrying on a controversy in the religious papers on the Baptismal Formula, which is in a measure transferred to the QUARTERLY. Dr. Bishop's note, however, was written before Dr. Primrose's article in the last QUARTERLY appeared. The text of Westcott and Hort relieves the latter of a difficulty and takes away an argument from the former, by reading *ἐν* instead of *ἐπί* in Acts 2:38. There is thus, according to the best authority, no instance of a conjunction of *βαπτίζο* and *ἐπί* in the New Testament. The two instances, Acts 2:38 and 10:48, in which the phrase, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* occurs with baptise, may well be discriminated from the sixteen instances in which *βαπτίζειν εἰς* is employed.

Winer (Grammer of the New Testament Diction, pp. 432, 433, 436) proves that this discrimination is necessary. In the two instances Peter probably meant just what he did when he said, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." In the other sixteen references we must either say "baptize into" or mean that when we say "baptize in." Dr. Bishop carefully excludes all Hellenistic Greek except the New Testament, and then confines us to the Gospel and Acts. He thus throws Paul's exposition of the rite out of court. However, as long as Paul could speak of baptism "into Christ," "into his death," "into one body," we need not hesitate to speak of baptism "into the name of Christ." If Paul had asked, "Were ye baptized by the authority of Paul?" (*in* the name), he would have been questioning his apostolic power in the very chapter in which he expressly asserted it.

The other references in which *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* must be translated "in the name" are simply explained by saying that the English idiom requires *in*, as after verbs of believing, where the Greek requires *εἰς*. And as to the *opus operatum* heresy, Dr. Bishop must first attack the Standards, which are explicit enough as to the "ingrafting into Christ," "into whom we are baptized;" after which he may settle the matter with Calvin and Turretin who changed the "*in nomine*" of the Vulgate into *in nomen*, as giving the accurate translation of the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*.

We have noticed this article particularly because the amendment to the Directory of Worship, substituting "in" for "into," is to come before the Southern Assembly for enactment. We confess to some pride that our Church has taken an advanced position, justified by Christian scholarship everywhere, that baptism is "into the name." The Catechism of the English Evangelical Churches has followed the example set by our Directory, and other churches will without doubt adopt the same reading. In the face of

the overwhelming authority for the present rendering the change seems worse than needless. As to a "baptismal formula," we doubt if one can be discovered in the New Testament.

Another amendment to be voted on by the Presbyteries and the Assembly is the clause permitting the ruling elder appointed on an installation committee to deliver the charge to the people, thus denying him by implication the right to deliver the charge to the pastor. As the law now stands, according to the interpretation of the Assembly of 1898, the ruling elder can deliver the charge to both pastor and people. To put the distinction into our organic law would be to deny the parity of the eldership for which the Southern Church has so earnestly contended.

But while our Southern Assembly has only these trivial questions before it, a heavy shadow hangs over our Northern brethren. The McGiffert case is as yet unsettled and there seems as yet no escape from the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline. The Presbytery of Pittsburg called the attention of the last Assembly to Dr. McGiffert's work, *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, and overtured the Assembly, to take suitable action in the premises. The Bills and Overtures Committee offered three reports to the Assembly, one, practically to let the matter rest; another, ably advocated by Rev. W. S. Plumer Bryan, D. D., to order the Presbytery of New York to proceed to a trial of the case; and the majority report which was adopted, from which we extract the following :

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 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 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, in the 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 can not conform his views to the Standards of our Church, then peaceably to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministry.

Dr. McGiffert has given no sign either of retraction or of a purpose to withdraw from the ministry. Recent utterances of his have rather aggravated the situation. It will be impossible for the Assembly not to continue the case to the bitter end, now that it has decided that his views are not only not Presbyterian but not even evangelical. Without going into particulars, unitarianism could ask for no better premises for its argument against the Divinity of Christ than Dr. McGiffert's positions. The issue is a much more serious one than that presented by the Briggs' case—the infallibility of Scripture. Dr. McGiffert is in the Assembly's hands, and unless it wishes to endorse his views he must cease to represent the Assembly as a Presbyterian minister.

As the case stands now, there is nothing for the Assembly to do but adopt the plan indicated by Dr. Bryan last year and proceed to a trial for heresy. And those who are willing to make this sacrifice for the purity of the Church will have well nigh the unanimous support—so far as sympathy goes—of their Southern brethren.

Rev. P. P. Flournoy, D. D., sends us a letter from Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum, from which we quote: "Your very appreciative article upon the tablets that refer to Ari-Eaku, Tudhula, Kudurlahgamal, etc., has gratified me greatly, and I hasten to thank you for it as well as to answer the query in the letter that accompanied it. Emphatically the last word has not yet been said upon the subject. The tablets that I have published remain unaf-

fectured by Mr. King's book. What Mr. King has discovered is that Father Scheil was wrong in reading the name that he found as Kudur-lahgamar." (See editorial note on Dr. Flournoy's article in the January QUARTERLY on "The Discovery of the Kings.")

We may be permitted to call attention to the enlarged size of the QUARTERLY under the present management as well as to express our appreciation for the hearty support of the review by old friends and new. The January edition has been entirely exhausted.

We offer to send to those who are subscribers to neither periodical, the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY and the *Bible Student* and *Religious Outlook*, for \$3.00 a year, introductory price.

Also the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY and the *Presbyterian Standard* for \$4.00 a year. To ministers, \$3.00.

This is an introductory price to new subscribers only.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN—MORTUARY REPORT.

At the beginning of the year 1898 the Southern Presbyterian Church had upon her roll the names of four great men: R. L. Dabney, J. L. Girardeau, M. D. Hoge and B. M. Palmer. Within the circle of the year she was called to mourn the departure of the first two, the third entered into rest January 6th, 1899, while the other, with eyes dimmed to the scenes of earth, waits for the breaking of the heavenly radiance upon his enraptured vision, and would check the prayer that rises from many a heart that he may be long spared to our beloved Zion.

They were all great as scholars, preachers and masters of assemblies. If comparison be made between them, it would probably be agreed that Dr. Dabney was the profoundest scholar, Dr. Girardeau the most impassioned orator, Dr. Palmer the most influential presbyter, and that

Dr. Hoge possessed in rare and happy combination the qualities that distinguished the other three. A prince has fallen in Israel. And no one who has ever come under the spell of that eloquent voice but feels a sense of personal loss. It will be long before the Southern Church has so able a representative before the Presbyterian or Evangelical assemblies of the Old World or the New.

Moses Drury Hoge came of a long line of godly ancestors. The Hoges were Scotch Presbyterians who settled in Frederick County, Virginia, in 1736. On the maternal side he was descended from the Lacys, another colonial family of the Old Dominion. His two grandfathers, Moses Hoge and Drury Lacy were both distinguished preachers and educators, and among the first Presidents of Hamden-Sidney College, where their grandson, named for both, was afterwards educated, showing first in its society halls his remarkable gifts of eloquence.

He was born on September 25, 1818, and reared in Prince Edward County, Virginia. After his graduation from college, he studied theology for a while and preached in a country church in Mecklenburg county, Va., to which he would have been called but for the fact that one of the elders doubted his ability to fill the pulpit. He was called to be assistant pastor to Dr. William S. Plumer, of the First Church, Richmond. The zealous young minister soon gathered together a congregation of his own, which was organized into the Second Presbyterian Church. He remained as pastor of this church to the day of his death, growing with the growth of Richmond, until he was universally recognized as its First Citizen. Four years ago the fiftieth anniversary of his pastorate was observed. His long career was most eventful. He was in the prime of life when the Civil War began, and he performed distinguished service to the Confederacy, not only as the tireless minister to the spiritual wants of the soldiers but as a diplomat in Europe. He had been distressed at the scarcity of Bibles

in the Confederate camps, and as a representative of the Virginia Bible Society he embarked on one of the blockade runners and went to England, where a public address of his was instrumental in obtaining a free grant of 400,000 Bibles, or parts of the Bible, for the Southern soldiers. Leaving London he went to Paris on a joint mission with L. Q. C. Lamar, for the purpose of obtaining recognition from the Confederate Government from the Emperor Napoleon III. The Emperor was, however, persuaded by the United States agents not to give him an audience, and he returned home, successfully running the blockade a second time.

He remained loyal to the sentiments and principles of the Lost Cause, yet no Southern minister has done more toward uniting the two sections. His voice was ever for peace and reconciliation. He was a Presbyterian by strongest conviction, yet few men have done more to cultivate the spirit of Christian unity in the different denominations. One of the constant efforts of his life was to avoid personal enmities in his stand for principle.

One of his most striking characteristics was the readiness with which he could draw upon his resources of knowledge and experience. At the Alliance of the Reformed Churches which met in Copenhagen, Denmark, one of the expected speakers failed to appear and the presiding officer called on Dr. Hoge to take the subject, just as he entered the auditorium. He at once delivered an extemporaneous address that captured the vast assembly and was published on two continents. He had no peer in his generation, for saying the fitting word at the right time. The public occasions at which he has been the chief figure, would require a volume to be described. One of the most notable of his orations was at the unveiling of the Stonewall Jackson statue in Capitol Square, Richmond, in 1775. He delivered an eloquent discourse in Dr. John Hall's pulpit on President Garfield's death. One of his more recent funeral orations was on the death of North Carolina's great

Senator, Vance. The most distinguished company that could be found in America were gathered in the Senate Chamber. Dr. Hoge began with the quotation, "There is nothing great but God." His last appearance on such an occasion was at the funeral of Miss Winnie Davis. He had been asked to lead in prayer. But during a pause in the service he stepped forward, and with that glance of his that held every eye said: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

His pulpit and pastoral work, his varied benevolences, his sympathy with every good enterprise, his tenderness in the chamber of suffering and bereavement, his interest in all that concerned his Church and his country are too well known to need comment here. Once only did he enter the political arena, in defense of the honor of Virginia, proclaiming in phrase that deserves to live: "That which is morally wrong cannot be politically right." At rare intervals he would let fall an epigram from his pulpit that showed how keen an interest he took in public affairs, as when, after some Indian outbreak, he spoke of the same Government having given "the bullet to the Indian and the ballot to the Negro."

And now the eloquent tongue is still to the ears of men, and his body sleeps in beautiful Hollywood, which he has seen grow into a vast city of silence. Scholar, Patriot, Man of God. His memory will be revered while men honor nobility and virtue.

Rev. Joseph Crockard was born in Ontario, Canada, April 18, 1868. After graduation from the Normal School, Toronto, he engaged in teaching for a few years and then continued his studies at the University of Canada one year and at Knox College two years. He came South to avoid the severity of his native air, and studied theology in Columbia Seminary, graduating in '94. He served Summerton, Tirzah and Wedgefield churches, in South Carolina, until two years

ago, when he accepted the call from Mulberry and Mt. Holly churches in Mecklenburg Presbytery. After a faithful ministry to this people, which endeared him to all hearts, and which was sealed with the Divine blessing, he was called to the higher service of Heaven. After an operation at St. Peter's Hospital, Charlotte, which revealed an incurable disease, he gently and peacefully fell on sleep. He was conscious to the last, and his triumphant death was a testimony to the power of the Gosp'l of Christ that has already borne its fruit. His last words were, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

Rev. James Whitfield Graham passed quietly away at the home of his daughter, Mrs. Henry C. Giddens, in Tampa, Fla., on New Year's night. He lacked but a few years of rounding up his 85th year. During that time his experience had been varied and he had served his race in manifold ways.

Jonh Bailey Adger, D. D., died in Pendleton, South Carolina, on the 3d of January, in the 89th year of his age.

Dr. Adger was born of Scotch-Irish parentage in Charleston, S. C., December 13, 1810. He graduated when 18 years of age at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1833, of which, at the time of his death, he had been for some time the senior surviving alumnus. Shortly after his ordination by the Charleston Union Presbytery in 1834, he went as a missionary to the Armenians, under appointment of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and served in this work for twelve years at Constantinople and Smyrna, until the failure of his eyes and other circumstances compelled his withdrawal from the foreign field. During his missionary service he translated into Armenian the New Testament, Pilgrim's Progress, the Shorter Catechism, and other books, which translations are still in use among that people.

After his return home he engaged in work among the

negro slaves in his own native city. A church, connected with the Independent Presbyterian Synod, whose house of worship stands hard by his late residence in Pendleton, is appropriately named for him, "The Adger Memorial Church."

Upon the withdrawal, in 1856, of Dr. Palmer from the Chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Columbia Theological Seminary, Dr. Adger was elected his successor, and filled that position with great zeal and ability for seventeen years. After his retirement in 1874, although he had then reached the age of 64, he entered with energy and vigor upon the pastoral work in his own Presbytery of South Carolina, which he continued until, having attained the age of 83, he was reluctantly constrained, by physical infirmities, to give up the public preaching of the Gospel.

At this advanced age, and amid these hindering infirmities, with courage and energy, he undertook what was perhaps the greatest task of his life, the writing of a large book, which he called "My Life and Times." His life had been a long one, the times through which he had passed, eventful in Church and State; and he undertook to write a history and discussion of the various questions he had to meet and help to solve. With the assistance of a devoted daughter, and such other help as he could procure, he gathered up the facts, studied out the questions, and dictated chapter after chapter of his book. His mind, still clear and vigorous, and his body wonderfully strong and active, he labored systematically and diligently for several years at this work. And almost as soon as the last chapter was finished, the last page written, and the valiant servant of God had laid down his fruitful pen, the Master called him to the everlasting rest.

Rev. John Hunter, D. D., died at his home in Jackson, Miss., Sunday morning March 12. He had been pastor of the First Presbyterian Church for forty-one years; for the

past three years occupying the position of pastor *emeritus*. He was born in Ireland, and his wit and eloquence were characteristic of his race. He graduated at Center College, Kentucky, in 1852, at Danville Theological Seminary in 1856, and was ordained pastor of the First church, Danville, in 1858. Two years afterward he went to Jackson.

He was an eloquent preacher and a beloved pastor. His work was well done, and he has left behind him the record of a useful, honored life.

John Montgomery, D. D., died on February 10, at the age of eighty-eight. He was born at Danville, Kentucky, educated at Centre College and Princeton Seminary. After preaching for seventeen years at Harrodsburg, Kentucky, he went to Missouri as a Home Missionary, and did noble work for the Master there. For two years he was President of Westminster College.

Rev. G. E. Chandler had just undertaken the work of raising funds for the Assembly's Home, at Fredericksburg, when he was stricken down with pneumonia, dying in Richmond, at the home of Dr. Kerr. He was thirty-eight years of age. He had been pastor at Selma, Alabama, West Point, Mississippi, and had labored as an evangelist in Missouri with great success.

Rev. S. I. Reid died at Sylvania, Arkansas, January 21, at the age of eighty. He had been a useful and effective Home Missionary for forty-three years in Mississippi and Arkansas.

Rev. William T. George graduated at Louisville Seminary in 1898, and was ordained last fall by Dallas Presbyterian pastor of Iowa Park and Wichita Falls, Texas. He was an earnest and faithful minister.

NORTHERN PRESBYTERIAN.

JANUARY.—Dr. Howard Agnew Johnston, of Chicago, becomes pastor of Madison Avenue Church, New York,

made vacant by the election of Dr. Charles S. Thompson to the Secretaryship of Home Missions.

Dr. Thomas C. Hall, of Chicago, son of John Hall, has been elected professor of Christian Ethics in Union Seminary, New York. Dr. George W. Knox has also been appointed professor of the Philosophy and History of Religion. Dr. Knox was formerly a missionary to Japan and professor in the Imperial University in Tokio.

Bishop Nicholas, of the Greek Church in Alaska, made an attack upon Sheldon Jackson, the great pioneer missionary of the Northwest, whom the Northern Assembly recently honored with the Moderatorship, that has brought this remarkable man into notice again, besides giving an insight into the influence of Russia in Alaska. Bishop Nicholas wrote a letter to President McKinley, referring to the abuses of administration in Alaska, and charging that appointments were made solely on the recommendation of Sheldon Jackson, from whom Alaska must be delivered.

Dr. Jackson replied that he had nothing to do with the appointments, and then showed that the Greek Church was the enemy of the public schools, even imprisoning young boys to keep them from school, but that the Church was fast disintegrating in spite of the \$60,000 a year which the Russian government pays for its support.

FEBRUARY.—Rev. Charles S. Robinson, D. D., died at his home in New York on February 1. He had filled many places of responsibility in the church and gave as liberally of his means as he did of his talents for the Master's work. He had been pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church in Troy, N. Y., of the First Church, Brooklyn, and of the Madison Avenue Church, New York City, whose building was erected during his pastorate and largely with his financial aid. But Dr. Robinson's chief service to the Church was in editing the series of hymn books that bear his name. *Songs of the Church*, *Songs for the Sanctuary* and *Laudes Domini* have done more than any other collections to elevate the standard of American hymnology.

Dr. Henry Van Dyke, now the foremost Presbyterian preacher in New York City, has received two tempting offers to leave the pastorate; one to become professor in Johns Hopkins University, and the other to take the chair of English Literature at Princeton University. He refused the first offer and accepted the second, though he intends to remain with his church for some time to come. He is eminently fitted for the English Literature chair, though his removal from New York will be a blow to Presbyterianism in that city.

MARCH—Rev. T. DeWitt Talmage, D. D., has offered his resignation as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Washington, and the people offer no opposition to his withdrawal. He was called to the church after the destruction of the Brooklyn Tabernacle—Dr. Sunderland and Dr. Allen being co-pastors. Soon afterwards, under the vicious system by which the trustees are allowed to control even the spiritual interests of the church, Dr. Allen was forced to resign, Dr. Talmage taking both services on Sunday. Later Dr. Sunderland resigned leaving Dr. Talmage in full possession. The result has not been gratifying to the trustees while it should be to all who are opposed to subordinating the spiritual interests of a church to its financial. The debt, to raise which Dr. Talmage's drawing powers were employed, remained unpaid, the crowds who attended his preaching added nothing to the financial strength of the church, and the dissatisfaction at the total lack of pastoral work alienated the most useful members of the church. The Presbytery will undoubtedly dissolve the pastoral relation existing.

There are only two excuses for sensationalism in the pulpit, namely, that the crowds who go to feed upon it will bring more members into the church or more cash into the treasury. It is hardly probable that this generation will produce a sensational preacher whose genius can compare with that of Dr. Talmage. And this is written with no idea

of decrying the good that he has undoubtedly done, but to impress the chief lesson of his life—that neither the membership nor the finances of a church can be built up by his methods. Sensationalism in the pulpit does not pay.

CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

The Canadian Presbyterian Church sustained a heavy loss in the death of Rev. John King, D. D., principal of Manitoba College, Winnipeg. He was born in Scotland. After studying in the universities of his native land and of Germany he came to Canada, giving the whole of his ministerial life to the service of the Canadian Presbyterian Church. He was appointed by the General Assembly principal of Manitoba College in 1883, and did excellent and lasting work in removing the debt resting on the college and establishing a good theological department.

CONGREGATIONAL.

FEBRUARY.—The most noteworthy event in Congregational circles this quarter has been the resignation of Lyman Abbott, pastor of Plymouth Church, and the election of his successor Newel Dwight Hillis, of Chicago.

Dr. Abbott has the satisfaction of turning over Plymouth Church to his successor in very much better condition than when he became the successor of Henry Ward Beecher. He continues his work as editor of the *Outlook*, a work which is congenial to him and for which he is eminently fitted. And yet we believe that it would have been better for his fame, as well as for the development of his church, if he had resigned his pastorate five years ago. Since he began to give out from Plymouth pulpit the latest results of the radical criticism, he has ceased to be one of whom it could be said, the common people heard him gladly. His attacks upon the traditional views of the historicity and inspiration of the Bible have made him an authority with every infidel in the country. It is true that a meaning has

been put into his words for which he is hardly responsible, yet his position of favoritism with skeptics is a "bad eminence" for a preacher of the gospel to occupy. If we know anything of human nature, especially of redeemed human nature, his people have hungered for something better. And Plymouth Church has called a man who preaches Christ. Dr. Hillis is antipodal to Dr. Abbott. Not so strongly intellectual perhaps, nor so accurate a scholar, but with an eloquence that is nothing less than genius, with a love of fellowmen that is almost a passion and above all, with a consuming desire to magnify the name of Jesus, he has already won his place in the hearts of his people.

EPISCOPAL.

FEBRUARY.—Rt. Rev. John Williams, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, died at Middletown, Conn., Feb. 7th. He was a voluminous author, a teacher of rare gifts and influence, and having been Bishop since 1851, occupied a large place in the esteem and affection of his denomination.

The ritualistic controversy in England still continues to agitate the British mind. Mr. Kensit, whose public protests in church against the "lawless" acts of the clergy called attention to the abuses, has been cast into the background by such a leader as Sir Vernon Harcourt. With the *Church Times*, the High Church organ, declaring that "not the very smallest allusion to Protestantism can be found by microscopic search" in the worship and creed of the Church of England, and Sir Vernon Harcourt protesting that the offending clergy "need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that they are going to carry off the Protestant plant of the National Church in order to carry on their Romish manufactures," the crisis of the conflict would seem to be not far distant. Parliament will have something to say now that the orders of the Bishops have so signally failed,

and once in English politics there can be but one end—dis-establishment.

LUTHERAN.

JANUARY.—Two hundred ministers and many laymen, representing the General Council, the General Synod and the United Synod of the South, met in Philadelphia in a general convention. The three bodies together number 650,000 communicants and were united before 1860. And while the question of Organic Union was not discussed, much was accomplished in the line of co-operation in the Home and Foreign Fields. The meeting was noted for its harmony and cordiality, and no doubt the way was made easier for union in the future.

INTER DENOMINATIONAL.

JANUARY.—The Seventh Annual Conference of Foreign Mission Boards of the United States and Canada met in New York. Interesting and valuable discussions were had of the "living link" idea, that is the support of missionaries by individual churches; of the training and qualification of missionaries; of denominational comity; and of the Ecumenical Conference of Foreign Missions in 1900. Plans were perfected and the business arrangements made for this great conference.

A formal appeal from the missionary societies of the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian and Reformed Churches has been sent to Congress against the seating of Representative Brigham H. Roberts, of Utah, a polygamist. As Congress is the sole judge of the qualifications of its members it is hardly possible that the unanimous Christian sentiment of the country will be disregarded, in favor of a man whose life is a violation of law and whose election is an affront to the government which trusted too implicitly the solemn pledge of the Mormon Church.

The Federation of Free Churches, through its committee, appointed for the purpose, has issued its Catechism, as a "monument to the unity of evangelical faith." The committee represented the Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches—the last including four varieties of Methodists. The Catechism has received a large amount of criticism favorable and unfavorable. While it cannot compare in terseness and vigor with the Shorter Catechism, it is yet a remarkable expression of the common faith of the evangelical churches. It will serve the purpose of calling renewed attention to the essential injustice of the Establishment, and hasten the day of the complete separation of Church and State in England.

The Dissenting Churches now actually number more members in England and Wales than the Established Church, and are growing at a more rapid rate, while of course, in Scotland and Ireland the Episcopal Church is still more in the minority. For a minority church to enjoy the privileges of the Establishment will soon be impossible in a country with a representative government. And the situation is further aggravated by the fact that the English Church is divided into conflicting camps, and that the Evangelical Churches have just indicated their oneness of faith by this Catechism. Clear-sighted Episcopalians, such as the editor of the *Southern Churchman*, already declare that the days of the Establishment are numbered.

Under the auspices of the Chicago University Principal Fairbairn is lecturing in India, and his addresses on Christianity have met with a remarkable reception. The learned Buddhists have been particularly impressed with the logic and eloquence of his demonstration that Christianity is the only religion.

[The July QUARTERLY will contain valuable reviews of the Presbyterian Assemblies and the meetings of other Church Courts.]

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

ABBOTT'S LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF PAUL, THE APOSTLE, *by Lyman Abbott.*
Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. The River-
side Press, Cambridge. 1895. Pp. viii., 332.

The topic treated in this work is one of neverfailing interest, and it loses none of its interest under the skillful pen of the retiring pastor of Plymouth Church. It is an eminently stimulating book, and there is not a dull page in it.

As stated in the preface, it is an attempt "to apply the principle of evolution to the elucidation of spiritual truths," and to trace the progress of doctrine in the writings of Paul.

We are not of the number of those who believe that Saul of Tarsus began his ministry with a system of theology thoroughly elaborated, and that there was no need for study, and no room for growth. On the contrary, we believe that there were many points which as yet had never occurred to him, and that by study and meditation, under the Divine guidance, he gained a deeper, and yet deeper insight into spiritual truth, and that there was a growth in knowledge as well as in grace. But while we hold this most tenaciously, we also hold that his growth was a genuine growth—an evolution, if you please—and that his progress was ever onward, like that of a tree.

Dr. Abbott holds a radically different view. He holds that the Apostle made progress by a series of mistakes; that he arrived at truth by finding error untenable. He is often in the dark. "Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether he is a critic or an advocate of a doctrine; sometimes, like Browning, he hardly knows himself which he is" (p. 15). At one time he holds and teaches as Gospel truth a doctrine, and then afterwards discovers that he is entirely mistaken, and so it comes to pass that at different times he teaches doctrines diametrically opposed. Under such circumstances chronology becomes a matter of the greatest moment, and it is to no purpose to show that Paul held a particular view, unless you can also show that it is his "latest." Dr. Abbott is in doubt as to whether the Pastoral Epistles came from the pen of the Apostle, though he admits that they are Pauline in character, and so we are left in painful uncertainty as to what were his latest views.

In order to understand the book, the author assures us that it is necessary to lay aside all theological preconceptions, and to look at the Apostle from his point of view. He says: "First of all, we have to realize that Paul is a prophet, a seer. Some men grope their way to truth; some men rise like birds upon wings, and, looking down upon truth from above, see it spread out beneath them in God's sunlight.

These are poets and seers. Such a man was Isaiah, Plato, Carlyle, Emerson, Browning; such a man was Paul. He has been studied as though he were a logician, a deducer of truth from premises, a formulator of a system's sake, an ancient John Calvin. The student has been puzzled to trace the logical connection in his Epistles; often there is no logical connection. Paul is not a logician; he is often unlogical, sometimes illogical. He uses arguments, not because they are philosophically sound, but because they will accomplish his purpose. He was born and bred in a dialectic age, educated in a dialectic school, and speaks to audiences trained in dialectics. He therefore uses this dialectic method. But he does not arrive at truth by logical processes; he perceives it" (pp. 10, 11).

An assumption so violent as this, and so contrary to the almost universal verdict of the ages, needs the strongest evidence to support it. The evidence presented in this volume is so utterly inconclusive as to almost drive us to the conclusion that Dr. Abbott is himself a "seer," and "just knows it," without any reference to the reasons for or against it. Take for instance this account of Paul's sermon at Antioch. "In the synagogue at Antioch Paul begins by praising the history of the Jewish people, breaks off in that history; narrates the birth, the death, and the resurrection of Christ, and brings his discourses to a conclusion with a picture of a judgment which this Christ will initiate at his coming" (p. 790).

It is very evident that the author sees in this only a rambling and disconnected discourse. We think, however, that it can be easily shown that this discourse is a thoroughly logical one from beginning to end. Is it possible that a trained mind like that of Dr. Abbott fails to see the direct bearing of these introductory statements? When one does not see fit to accept the conclusions of another, it is easy to say that he is illogical, but this does not by any means prove it.

He does indeed give him credit for being an "orator," but this is a very doubtful compliment, for he is represented as being unscrupulous; the only question with him being whether an argument would accomplish the end in view, little caring whether it was sound or not. Profit to his hearers is his standard in teaching. He doesn't care whether he is consistent or not, for to him, as to Emerson, "consistency is the vice of small minds" (p. 16). How different is this from the Apostle's indignant repudiation of the principle that we may do evil that good may come!

But let us come now to the body of this book. It might well have been entitled, "The Mistakes of Paul," for only by a series of blunders which are fortunately discovered, does he arrive at the truth. We can but rejoice at the attainment of truth in the end, but we feel a deep sympathy for all his earlier converts upon whom he imposed his crude and erroneous notions, backed by all the authority of an Apostle.

The book is so full of statements and positions which we regard as erroneous and untenable, that we are at a loss to know where to begin,

and will content ourselves with giving a few samples only: (1). At the time of his visit to Thessalonica, Paul held certain clear-cut views as to the second coming of Christ, "What he believed, as we gather from his earlier writings and his sermons, was that Jesus who died and rose again would presently descend to the earth; that he would bring with him the celestial forces from heaven; that he would gather together Israel: that he would put himself at the head of this army, celestial and terrestrial; that he would conquer—utterly, absolutely, entirely, and forever; that he would extricate the enemies of God, and would reign King over kings and Lord over lords" (p. 71). Again he says: "Paul believed that the Messiah was to come again, and to come in his own generation—but Paul was mistaken, not only in his conception of the time of the Messiah's coming; he was mistaken also in his conception of the secret of the power of the kingdom" (pp. 89, 90). Still laboring under this delusion the Apostle writes his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, reiterating his former erroneous teachings. The effects of his teachings were very different from what he had expected, and in the short interval between his two letters, "in some way or other Paul reached the conclusion that the kingdom of God could not come until the kingdom of evil was itself perfected" (p. 88), and now he writes that Christ will come as he taught, but not immediately.

Now upon the assumption that the views and teachings of the Apostle had undergone a change, was it honest in him to try to make it appear that he had never advocated the position now discarded? How could he say to them, "we beseech you to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled either by spirit or by word, or by epistles as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" (2 Thess. 2: 2, 3). Does not the Apostle here affirm that he had never taught that the coming of the Lord was "present," and yet according to Dr. Abbott, this was precisely what he did teach when he was among them, and also reaffirmed it in his first letter. We are consequently driven to the conclusion either that the author is mistaken in affirming that the Apostle advocated such views, or else that the Apostle, instead of acknowledging his mistake, shamelessly sought to preserve his own reputation as a teacher by a direct falsehood as to his former views.

In this connection our author makes a number of sweeping assertions, which are not borne out by the facts in the case. Speaking of his visit to Corinth, he says, "Up to this time in Paul's experience he has said nothing of the crucifixion, except incidentally to refer to the death of Christ as a basis for setting forth the resurrection of Christ. From this time forth he has little to say about the resurrection of Christ; so little apparently, in his preaching to the Corinthians, that some of the church came to the conclusion that there was no resurrection, and he writes them at length on the subject" (p. 112). But what are the facts? In Acts, 15: 27-29, and again in 17: 5, his death is distinctly set forth as a proof of his Messiahship, while in 1 Thess., 4: 14, it is presented as an

article of faith, and again in 5: 10 it is the basis of our salvation. Up to this time we can point to seven references in his writings to the death of Christ, as against four references to his resurrection.

Again he says: "In his previous sermons and in his previous letters to the Thessalonians he has *nothing* to say about the crucifixion and much to say of the second coming; in his future letters, *little* to say of the second coming" (p. 112).

We grant that the second coming is quite prominent in these two epistles, but the assertion that in his later letters he has little to say on the subject, does not accord with the facts, as may be readily seen by a reference to the following passages: 1 Cor. 1: 7, 8, 4: 5, 5: 5, 11: 26, 15: 25; 2 Cor. 4: 14, 5: 10; Phil. 1: 6, 3: 20, 21, 4: 5; Col. 4: 5; 1 Tim. 6: 14; 2 Tim. 1: 18, 4: 8; Titus 2: 15. Thus it will be seen that he presents it in all except four of his epistles that follow, and if he has discarded the doctrine why present it to the very last?

According to Dr. Abbott, Paul's visit to Corinth was an epoch in his life. Now after full two-thirds of his ministry has passed, his views undergo a mighty change—a change as radical as that which took place when he forsook Judaism to become a follower of Jesus of Nazareth (p. 114). His work in the past has been a failure. "Nothing had come of his mission. . . . In no single place had he been able to stay more than a few days, or a few weeks at the utmost. . . . He reviewed the past, and saw that his message of a second coming of Christ within the present generation to revolutionize the world had accomplished nothing" (p. 102). "Christianity becomes more and more to him a present life, less and less a mere hope of the future life. It is after this that he writes to the Romans that men are justified by faith alone. It is after this that he writes to the Philippians that because Christ hath humbled himself, and taken the form of a servant, and been obedient even unto death, and that the death of the cross, therefore God hath highly exalted him. . . . From this time forth he is the preacher of two things: First, the glory of self-sacrifice; and secondly the mystical life of the inward faith. . . . In the third stage of his experience he is no longer a Pharisee, and he is no longer a Pharisaic Christian. . . . Along with this change comes a change in his conception of his function and his work. He begins to see now that the Roman Empire is to last. He begins to see that the Christian religion must be made the religion of the Roman Empire. He no longer goes from place to place as a mere herald of a coming king. He stays a year and a half in Corinth; he stays two years in Ephesus. He plans also to extend his missionary tour. He resolves that he will go to Rome" (pp. 113-115). But is there any evidence that the views of the Apostle underwent any material change, such as that here described?

Dr. Abbott accepts the "South-Galatian theory, and hence the gospel the Apostle preached to the Galatians represented that gospel in its earliest form, as also the Apostle himself expressly declares (Gal. 1: 11, 12), and yet after this alleged change has taken place he writes to them:

"But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:8).

(2). Perhaps the most remarkable change of view attributed to the Apostle is that touching the resurrection. Up to the time of that memorable visit to Corinth, he held the prevalent view of the Pharisees and others, that there would be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust at the last day, but along with other superstitious notions this is now laid aside. "He had been brought up in the Pharisaic faith that all men's bodies would wait in the grave until some general resurrection, their spirits in the meantime remaining in an intermediate state until the day of general resurrection, when the graves would open and the bodies would come forth and the spirits would be rehabilitated. But he had been down to the gates of death, and had looked through the mystic door into the unknown world beyond, and this hope in a general resurrection of the just and of the unjust. in some far off day, did not sustain him any more than it sustained Martha and Mary to believe that their brother would rise in the general resurrection at the last day. . . . Never again shall we find Paul thinking of a day in which all the dead shall rise from their graves and the sea shall give up its dead" (pp. 175, 176). But what of the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, which was written after this alleged change in his views? Oh, well, there is no trouble upon that score, for he says: "Many scholars have read the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians as an argument for the resurrection of the body. It seems to be clearly, explicitly, palpably, unmistakably, a cumulative argument against the resurrection of the body" (p. 153). After such a feat as this it would not be very difficult to explain away such statements as those made in Phil. 3: 11, 20, &c., but we are still puzzled to know how he would reconcile the statement that the Apostle had forever renounced the old Pharisaic doctrine of a general resurrection at the last day with the Apostle's explicit declaration in the council: "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question" (Acts 23:6)? And then, as if to leave no loophole of escape, a few days later he reiterates this statement, saying, "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (24: 25, Cf., also 24: 21). Was the Apostle simply lying, in order to divide the council and to secure the support of the Pharisees in that body.

But hear him again: "If the New Testament means to teach the resurrection of the body, if Paul means to teach that doctrine, it is very strange that the phrase never occurs in the New Testament. The notion that the body which is laid in the grave must rise again in order to preserve personal immortality is a relic of paganism which ought long since to have been forgotten. The body that lies in the grave will rise in grass and flowers only. . . . Every death is a resurrection; and the mother who stands looking down into the grave and hearing the clod falling upon the coffin should turn and lift her eyes and see the loved

one at her side trying to caress her. For she should know, not that there will be, but that there is a spiritual body, and that the last gasp on earth is contemporaneous with the first great inhalation of a new spiritual life in the celestial sphere." (p. 162).

Even Dr. Abbott admits that there is a resurrection, but of what? He thinks it strange that if it is the body that phrase never occurs in the New Testament. We retort that if it is something else that is raised up, it is passing strange that that phrase never occurs. If it is not the body, what is it? Can that be raised up which does not die? We have in mind numbers of passages which most clearly imply that it is the body and that alone; but we are afraid that we will be told that this is nothing but a lingering trace of the old Pharisaic notion. Now our author graciously admits that our Lord held correct views on the subject, though he was misinterpreted by others, and we can content ourselves by giving one explicit declaration of our Lord on the subject: "The hour cometh, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (Jno. 5:28, 29). Will Dr. Abbott please explain what will come forth from those graves in that great day?

(3) The author's view on the subject of the Atonement are fully set forth in his discussion of the Epistle to the Romans. As might be expected, the vicarious work of Christ is emphatically set aside, for the simple reason that there is no need of it. The idea that the claims of justice must be satisfied is nothing but an old pagan idea. But let him speak for himself: "Sin produces two different effects upon the human soul. It disorders the soul itself and it estranges the soul from God. . . . A little child disobeys the mother, pouts, is angry, cries. The crying shows the discomfort and the disorder within. The mother takes the child into her lap. The child struggles to get away, jumps down, and runs away again, showing estrangement between the child and the mother. . . . As the two effects of sin are one, so the two remedies are one. . . . The moment the child ceases to be disobedient, the moment love comes back into the child, that moment the child is ready to climb into the mother's lap. Nor is it ready to climb into the mother's lap and take the mother's caresses and be at one so long as it is disobedient to her. . . . It is impossible that God should declare a man to be right when God sees him to be wrong. That would make God a liar, because he sees in the penitent the beginning of righteousness he accepts it as righteousness, recognizes it, fosters it, develops it. . . . The beginning of righteousness is in him, and therefore the reconciliation between him and God is accomplished." (Pp. 229-251).

According to this scheme, man virtually saves himself. The Prodigal arises and returns to his father, and there is nothing for that father to do but to receive him (p. 250.) But has Christ no part in this work? Oh yes! he is one who "comes to earth, searches men out; suffers in their suffering, bears the burden of their sinning and offers to fill

them with himself that they may become like him" (p. 238). By the power of his personality ("magnetism" the author suggests) which he imparts, he inspires men, just as the Little Corporal did at the Bridge of Lodi, or Sheridan at the battle of Winchester (?) (p. 240).

Summing up, he says: "Thus there were in Jewish history three systems—the Pagan system, the Mosaic system, and the intermingling of the two in the Levitical systems" (p. 520). Christ rejected all of them, but "the disciples did not understand, and after Christ died they interpreted this message of the gospel through Mosaism, and later theology modified it to make it harmonize with Leviticism. To Paul, above all the Apostles, we owe the interpretation of this gospel of Christ, as contrasted with Paganism, and even with Mosaism. . . . So Paul says the Pagan is wrong, there is no wrath of God to be appeased by sacrifice; the Jew is wrong, there is no distance from God to be bridged by a priest, and an altar and a Jewish ritual; the Pharisee is wrong, there is no satisfaction of God to be purchased, no reconciliation with him to be bought, by obeying the laws which he has issued. We are simply to take the free gift of God—his life—and then live freely, spontaneously, naturally, because we have received it." (Pp. 522-3).

(4) The author's treatment of the question of Divine Sovereignty is, to say the least, unique. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of Romans, he says, are confessedly the most difficult portion in all his writings, not only by reason of the difficulty of the theme, but also because Paul's arguments are archaic and ineffective, and it is also difficult, "by reason of the fact that in America, where individualism has received its highest development, and where popular sovereignty has become a popular cry, there is a disinclination to recognize any sovereignty but popular sovereignty, any law above that which men make for themselves, anything greater than human free will." (P. 255).

Evidently it is the doctor's aim to formulate a doctrine of Divine Sovereignty which will not conflict with his American "disinclination," but notwithstanding this benevolent desire, and his skill in distorting language, he still finds it difficult to get rid of Paul's plain statements. He at length solved the difficulty by the discovery that Paul himself was sorely puzzled, and in the very midst of the epistle changed his mind, and repudiated the views he had expressed in the former part. "Paul was himself in perplexity. He did not himself understand how to reconcile this new faith which was a part of his new life, and this old faith which was a part of his old life. . . ." Then Paul stops. We can imagine that in his dictation he has gone as far as he can when he reaches that calculation, and he says to his amanuensis, "I will wait a little." There is clearly a break between the eighth chapter and the ninth. During this break in time he ponders this question within himself: How is it that this free gift of God is given? How can I reconcile the universality of this gift with my belief in the election of Israel? How can I commend it to a people who believe either in necessity or in fate, or in an arbitrary Jehovah? The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters are his answer to

these questions. (Pp. 260-2). Paul's conclusion is that "the end and object of sovereignty, the purpose which it inflexibly maintains, the result which it will achieve, is "mercy upon all." (P. 265). In order to leave no doubt as to his meaning, the author quotes approvingly in a footnote, the following from Dr. C. A. Gordon: "The affirmation that God has a Christian purpose toward our entire humanity involves an extension of the field of redemption so enormous as to make obsolete, at a single stroke, the whole theological map of the traditional view. And what seems worse, while all clear seeing men are aware that this does not necessarily imply universal salvation, it is true that it looks that way. If God shall succeed, universal salvation will be the final result." (P. 267).

There are a number of other points we had intended to notice, but time forbids. Dr. Abbott professes great admiration for the Apostle to the Gentiles, rating him far above all the other apostles, and yet he cannot conceal his contempt for his narrow and contracted views. How patronizingly he speaks of his religious views: "He was orthodox of the orthodox. . . . He believed that the law had been given to Moses in the Mount; that every word and every letter had been so given. He would have been a great deal more impatient with the Higher Criticism than the most impatient critics of that criticism are in our time. He would have had none of it. He believed that Moses wrote every word and every letter of the Pentateuch, including the account of his own death; and that Moses wrote this by dictation, word for word, as God gave it to him; unless, indeed, he went still further and believed, as some Pharisees did, that God wrote the book himself in heaven and handed it down to Moses on the Mount, finished and ready for reading. (P. 22).

Or take again his comments upon Paul's argument as to the position of woman in the church: "This is an excellent illustration of Paul's oratorical temperament. . . . He uses those arguments which he thinks will appeal to them, and which are suggested by his rabbinical training. . . . Some of his arguments, few, if any, American readers believe to be sound. They do not believe that woman was made for man. They believe that God made man, male and female, in his own image; not for woman man, more than for man woman; but each for the other, and both for their God." (P. 145). What a pity Paul was not born an American!

T. R. ENGLISH.

CHRIST IN THE DAILY MEAL; or, The Ordinance of the Breaking of Bread. *By Norman Fox, D. D.* Cloth, 16mo., New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 50 cents.

This little book is the expansion of a paper read before the Baptist Ministers' Conference of New York and vicinity and published in *The Independent* (March, 1895). Since the appearance of Dr. McGiffert's *Apostolic Age*, and the discussion of the Lord's Supper which it has caused, the author, Dr. Norman Fox (late Professor of Church History in William Jewell College, Missouri), has been encouraged to enlarge his essay and put it forth in book form.

He makes a protest against the sacramentarianism which he finds in all the churches. He thinks that certain mediæval ideas about the Lord's Supper still survive even in the most Protestant circles. It is his aim to get rid of these inherited superstitions, and get back to Apostolic simplicity.

He holds that whenever the believer eats and drinks, even in his daily repast, he is commanded to do it in remembrance of Christ; that not only the bread and wine on the church table, but all bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ, and that his command is that as often as we eat and drink (in the daily meal), we are to do it in remembrance of him; that the modern ecclesiastical supper, the taking of a morsel of bread and one swallow of wine, directly and solely for memorial purposes, instead of for the purpose of satisfying hunger, is not what Jesus instituted; that one disciple may observe the command alone; that there is no necessity for sacerdotal ministration; that it is only by virtue of its color that wine represents Christ's blood, and so unfermented juice is as good, or the red juice of some other berry than the grape could be used.

This is strange doctrine for which to claim the authority of the Scriptures, yet it is claimed that the argument is strictly Biblical. It seems to us a clever attempt to fix on the words of Scripture a meaning which might be possible if they stood alone, or in another context, but which cannot be the true meaning when the context in which they occur is considered. The author seems to take advantage of little accidents and peculiarities of language to uphold his preconceived views in a manner which is not worthy of a candid interpreter of the Bible.

For instance, he lays great stress on 1 Cor. xi. 25, last clause, "this do ye, as oft as ye drink, in remembrance of me." Now the context evidently supplies "this cup" after "drink," and this is so evident that there is no difference of opinion about it among translators and commentators. And yet our author takes it to be, not a particular command with reference to this cup, but a general command to remember Christ every time we eat and drink. The clause as it stands cannot possibly have this meaning, as any one who has regard to the context will see. This is only one instance of the way our author wrests Scripture, yet it is the strongest scriptural argument he has to uphold his position.

Not only does he make a wrong use of the Scripture, but he is also in error as to his ideas of symbolism. He claims that bread and wine are natural symbols of Christ's body and blood, and always have been in their very nature. In the words of institution he understands Christ to mean: "This is my body, as it has been indefinitely heretofore." He says: "The bread and wine are not arbitrarily appointed remembrances, they are remembrances by their very nature. . . . There is no symbolism in one loaf which is not found in every loaf. . . . The symbolic theory makes every loaf Christ's body, all wine his blood."

There is great confusion here. It is very evident that bread and wine have a fitness for the use to which our Lord puts them in the Supper,

but they become to us symbols of Christ's body and blood because of his appointment, and that bread and wine when given and received in the manner of his appointment have a memorial quality which they did not possess before, and which they do not possess on other occasions.

Our Saviour did not say: "Bread is my body," and "Any red drink is my blood," (as our author understands him to say). In saying: "This is my body" and "as oft as ye do this," he particularizes and confines the statement to the eating and drinking of bread and wine in the particular manner of his appointment.

Our author is wrong in saying that wine represents Christ's blood only by virtue of its color, and that the red juice of some other berry than the grape could represent his blood. He finds the symbolism of the bread to consist not in its color but in its use as food, why does he not find the symbolism of the wine also in its use. Bread nourishes, wine exhilarates ("maketh glad the heart of man" according to scripture). So the soul finds its nourishment and exhilaration in eating Christ's body and drinking his blood. And is there anything that can rejoice the heart with such unspeakable joy as the appropriation of this blood of the covenant shed for many for the remission of sins? It is fitly symbolized by wine, and it would not be proper to substitute anything else for the wine.

But why insist on changing the institution, and substituting something else for the element which it is agreed Christ appointed? Who that loved a friend would wish to substitute something else for the sacred moments of friendship left him; who would be searching about for something better to put in its place? Would such conduct not show dislike for the real memorial arising from a lurking disgust for the taste and judgment of the friend who left that memorial?

Our author is wrong in holding that the Lord's Supper must be a full meal for the purpose of satisfying hunger. He objects very earnestly to "a purely ceremonial eating," "the mere imitation of a meal," taking simply "a morsel of bread and one swallow of wine."

If the disciple eat but a morsel and drink but a sup has he not obeyed the command to eat and drink? The quantity is not made essential. There is no evidence that it was ever intended that these elements should be eaten to satisfy hunger, as a full meal, for while often taken by the early church in connection with a meal, they never constituted the meal itself. A full meal to satisfy the hunger is not made from bread and wine alone.

For his view that single individuals may celebrate this rite alone, he gives no Scripture warrant, and in fact there is nothing in the Scripture record to even remotely indicate that a believer ever ate the Lord's Supper alone. On the other hand the apostle writes of them "coming together to eat the Lord's Supper."

Our author says his purpose is not to level down, but only to level up that he only wishes to make sacred the daily meal. His purpose may be good, but the practical outcome, if he could get the men to believe and practice what he advocates, would only be to destroy the Lord's Supper.

as divinely instituted. He, however, does not expect his book to have much effect, he says, on account of established conceptions, habitual training and personal prejudice, which argument can not change. He says: "Though every unbiased reader declared the argument in the foregoing pages as conclusive as a demonstration in Euclid, one could not expect it to have any very great effect."

With the author's own estimate of the practical results expected from this book, we fully agree.

J. W. LAFFERTY.

Berkely, Springs, W. Va.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROGRESS OF MAN, as illustrated by Modern Missions. *By W. Douglas MacKensie.* Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co. Cop. 1897. 16 mo. Pp. 250. \$1.25.

"How the one universalistic religion has been molding the life of the one race of mankind during the nineteenth century—that is the subject of this little book."—*Preface.*

In this instructive volume there are ten chapters. The first, which is introductory, gives a forecast of what is to follow. Then the second treats of the Universalism of Christianity; how at first and largely in all other religions, except Buddhism and Confucianism partially, patriotism is so blended with the religion as to be identified with it, to prevent any missionary effort on the part of its adherents and forestall its adoption by aliens, except at the edge of the sword. But Christianity, even in its earlier phase of Judaism, by recognizing the unity, sovereignty and fatherhood of God; the unity, dependence and brotherhood of man, and the suffering Messiah, coming as God's son and man's brother to atone for sin, was prepared to be the religion of man, not merely of a nation. While the Christ limited his work to the Jewish race, it was under a divine restraint, and the gospel shows clearly enough that when he is lifted up from the earth he will draw all men unto him. Into all the world, to every creature, his followers must go, and he with them. The simplicity of his gospel, God's grace and man's faith are in keeping with this. Then from Pentecost, where the Babel of tongues were made one again, as it were, on down how rapidly did it spread. Even in the Dark Ages, when its activity largely ceased, it was mastering the most powerful and intellectual nations of the earth, the nations of Europe, thus preparing a base of operations for its future conquests. Propagandism was not entirely forgotten, and after the intellectual awakening the work began anew and increased till our own century, which marks a vigorous foreign movement into every land.

The third chapter treats of the Missionary as Pioneer, as he has gone into the unexplored and undiscovered parts of earth. Much has he contributed to geography and ethnology, to meteorology, zoology and botany. He has been the means of the interchange of influences and ideas, and thus becomes a factor in the unification of the race.

The fourth deals with the Missionary as Translator, detailing the

wonderful self-denying labors which have put the Bible into the vernacular of nearly all of mankind. A thoroughly instructive chapter, not prosy even to one who is already familiar with the main facts. He shows the philological value of all this work, and its use in unifying the race. But these were incidental; the Bible in the vernacular has been the power of God for man's salvation. It has preceded, attended and succeeded the Missionary, and won men by its own inherent power under the Spirit's direction.

Chapter five shows us the Missionary as an Educator. Missions and education have necessarily gone together. Evangelical Christianity is the only religion that does not tolerate ignorance. Examples such as Madagascar, Turkey, India and others, are discussed at large. It is a moot question to what extent the Missionary should employ the higher education in his work. But to us it seems that the Missionary awakens the desire, and if he does not gratify it a Bible-less education will be sought and secured, and Spencer will reign where Christ should.

Chapter six treats of the Missionary as Martyr. The meliorating and mollifying effects of his self-sacrifice are great. The author turns aside to discuss the value of martyrdom from an evidential standpoint. He determines a real difference between Christian martyrdom and that of fanaticism.

The Missionary as Civilizer supplies the matter for consideration in the next chapter. On this all are practically agreed. The case is ably presented here.

Perhaps the best chapter of the book is the eighth, which treats of the Missionary in relation to other religions, showing what is common ground on which he can meet their devotees and at the same time exhibiting the great superiority of Christianity. The heathen have already noted this extensively, and are destined to observe it more and more.

This prepares the way naturally for the next chapter—"The Missionary as Saviour." Everything else looks to this one supreme object of the true missionary—is ancillary to it; he wants to establish Christ as Master in the heart of everyone of these degraded, sin-cursed, devil-deceived, priest-ridden, idolatrous sons of our common Father. "Even for this cause came I into the world;" even for this cause he foregoes all the amenities of life, if possibly he may be the means of saving some. To do this he must be able to proclaim what Christ has done for him, and he must show Christ, evidently set him forth in his own life. Medical missions furnish a great opportunity for this. What it has been able to do for man is one of the most palpable arguments for the divine origin of Christianity. The apologetic value of missions is great.

The title of the book is also the title of the last chapter. A valuable chapter it is. The elements of progress he determines to be the elaboration of social relations, triumphs over nature, and unification of the race. Then progress is dependent upon character, it is identified with development of character. This is only the expression of moral improvement. Morality cannot be dissociated from religion. As a man's

god is so will he be. Christianity then furnishes the true basis for progress. It alone puts man in fellowship with the true, the perfect God. It alone gives us the perfect man in association with God in Christ. It alone gives the high ideal; it alone holds out a purifying and ennobling hope. It has as a matter of fact uplifted every race with which it has come in contact. The author accepts evolution, and considers Christianity a great factor in social evolution. He may use the word "evolution" in the sense of "development." In that sense his statements are not generally objectionable. Nevertheless at one point in the book he evidently regards Christianity as itself a product of evolution, and minimizes, if he does not ignore divine interference. Huxley's dark forecast is the only logical outcome of a consistent evolutionary philosophy; and Christianity has no place in that picture. Whether man is a product of evolution or not—and we firmly believe the negative—Christianity could never have been evolved; the Bible and its religion could only have come by direct communication from an all-wise and infinitely gracious God. The sense of sin and need of a God-man Savior could never have unfolded itself in the consciousness of an animal-descended being, no matter how high a degree of intelligence he may have reached. Conscience ever would be no more than the voice of expediency.

This volume will repay careful perusal.

"The book is rich in illustrative matter drawn from almost every missionary field and contains copious references to the most valuable literature on the subject. Each chapter is suggestive and thoughtful, and a pastor could do no better thing for his people than to plan a course of sermons along this line of Christian Evidences."

The mechanical execution, the paper, the binding are good.

D. J. BRIMM

Columbia, S. C.

TERRY'S BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS.

BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS: A Study in the Most Notable Revelations of God and of Christ in the Canonical Scriptures. *By Milton S. Terry, D. D.*, Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Eaton & Maine, Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 1898. Pp. 513, 8vo. \$3.00.

Professor Terry has published many books. The one before us is the middle one of a series, the first in the series being *Biblical Hermeneutics*, and the third, not yet issued, is to be *Biblical Dogmatics*.

The subject-matter and the author's ability to set down his sentences bring this volume to the verge of fascination, but it is sadly blemished by its exorbitant concessions to radical criticism. He makes these concessions, not because he agrees with the critics, but because he wants to show that we may grant all they ask without losing the Bible as a guide to God and to Christ. To put weapons into the hand of an enemy just to show that you can out-parry him, is nothing less than foolish, if your cause is great and your zeal is earnest.

The author selects for exposition those "portions of the Holy Scrip-

tures which are remarkable for symbolic presentations of the works and ways of God." His task is that of the artist who seeks to translate pictures into prose.

He gives an introduction, in which he discusses the hermeneutical laws of apocalypics, and the apocalyptic elements in Hebrew song. Then follow his comments upon the interpretations of such special apocalypses as those of Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, the Babel Dispersion, Abraham, Dreams, the Exodus, the Tabernacle, sundry passages in Jewish history, Isaiah, Ezckiel, Zechariah, Joel, Daniel, and certain portions of the Synoptic Gospels. But of course the larger part of the book is devoted to the Revelation of John. There is finally an appendix on the Apocryphal Apocalypses.

The author does not attempt a textual commentary upon the portions of Scripture brought into the discussion, but he aims simply to translate the symbolism. Sometimes he does it to your satisfaction, but often you feel that he takes the view he does because he desires to show that the positions of the higher critics do not destroy the religious value of the Bible. But the book is certainly worth careful study.

R. A. WEBB.

DIVINE PENOLOGY. *By the Rev. L. B. Hartman, D. D.* New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 306. \$1.25.

There is a growing and alarming hostility to theology's doctrine of penalty. Much thought is expended in the effort to eliminate it altogether; other schemes are advanced for the purpose of scaling it to a minimum. "Flabby theories" and "molluscous formations" are offered to men as substitutes for the strong, but offensive, doctrine of hell.

Dr. Hartman, with loyal heart and with a clear head, and with a well trimmed pen, comes to the defence. His book is a philosophical study of the wide doctrine of Divine Retribution and Future Punishment of the impenitent and incorrigible. He considers his subject in the light of Reason, Science, Revelation and Redemption. Everywhere he finds law; everywhere he finds the transgressor of law pursued by penal consequences. The "penal element" is a topic in all philosophies, a deduction from all the sciences, a fact revealed in the Bible, and clearly exhibited in the atonement of the gospel.

In preparing this book, and for the purpose of refuting the slander that the Church of to-day has surrendered its traditional doctrine of future punishment, Dr. Hartman submitted this question to fifty-five prominent leaders of thought: "What will be the ultimate destiny of the finally impenitent and incorrigible sinner?" The persons addressed were of all denominations, preachers, authors, professors, presidents, bishops, editors. He gives their answers in his twenty-eighth chapter. They all answer, in varying language, his question with the awful word, "Hell," except two. Dr. E. B. Andrews, President of Brown University, answers with the one word, "Annihilation," and Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, says "I don't know." These testi-

monies prove that the Church of to-day is holding firmly to the doctrine of future punishment, so preaching and so teaching.

Dr. Hartman says concerning his work, "There has been no effort at scholastic display; the constant aim has been simplicity; scientific and other technicalities have been studiously avoided, as far as possible, and all subjects have been treated in a manner to interest the ordinary reader." He has written tenderly, piously, but firmly. Though handling the most awful of all subjects, he has not harrowed the feelings of his reader by the use of coarse language or distressing figures. The man who wishes the doctrine of hell were not true, if he reads this book will feel that he must hold it, however terrible, however sorrowful, it may be to his own soul. The man who feels tempted to look upon the gospel as a mere scheme of religious culture, if he reads this little volume will feel that the educational and refining influences of Christianity are the least significant of all its influences. The man who is tempted to preach "another gospel," will, if he reads this author, feel that he must "preach Christ and him crucified" or make his ministry a mere mockery of the miseries of men.

R. A. WEBB.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND ITS PROBLEMS. *By J. H. Bates, Ph. M.*
New York: Eaton & Mains. Curtis & Jennings. Price 50 cents.
Pp. 141.

This little volume gives a very clear and satisfactory discussion of a number of the salient points of Christian Science. The opening chapter, on the Immanence and Transcendence of God, is especially valuable, as bearing against the chief negations of Mrs. Eddy and her school. The author's discussion of life, in his second chapter, is, however, weakened by his pronounced evolutionism, and his effort to uphold the faith of Christendom by his fling at creeds. We cannot imagine what good is to be accomplished by such statements as these, for instance: "The art of Christ has been distorted and obscured by the artifice of the church. Creeds, devised with ever so good an intent, and performing no little service in their way, have, nevertheless, hidden the simplicity that is in Christ. Weary of the problems of metaphysical theology, of a benumbing scholasticism, we welcome the call of the age that turns us back again to the archetypal, historical and immanent Christ," etc. The fact is, a creedless Christianity is an invertebrate and powerless Christianity, and the people who are doing as much as Mrs. Eddy and her worshippers to turn men away from the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus, are those who are making common cause with all the enemies of the faith in denouncing the historic creeds of the church. "Integumentary doctrines," as our author, in his blundering tirade, terms credal statements, cannot be dispensed with, save at the cost of having a doctrinal system, as it were, flayed alive, exposed and bleeding at every pore.

Mr. Bates' discussion of the philosophy of Christian Science is in the main, creditable, and his chapter on cures, showing the abundant ground for refusing to give credence to this new ism because of its vaunted suc-

cess, is a very valuable compilation of facts bearing on the subject. The closing paragraphs on Christianity and Health, are interesting and suggestive in some degree. We regret to note, however, that our author's views of the plan of salvation are strongly tingured with the naturalism of John Watson, and others. Christ is able to save, he tells us, by "leading us back to nature, and persuading us that nature is a safe guide." And he defines the faith that saves as "faith in nature." The book closes with statements than which we can imagine none more misleading and contradictory of evangelical truth.

God, according to Mr. Bates, "has left man to work out his own salvation, a task that man is steadily accomplishing through the systematic methods of science. He has opened the world before us to be conquered by intelligence, a conquest in which man is to rise into strength and moral beauty, into harmony and communion with God."

This is good evolutionism. Salvation is wrought by science, and holiness evolved in the ordinary development of the human intellect and in the natural progress of human knowledge. This is, unmistakably, the new gospel of culture, which is as much an enemy to true Christian faith as is the crazy creed of Christian Scientism. Indeed, the points of resemblance between the views of Mrs. Eddy and those of Mr. Bates are numerous and striking. Not to mention others, we note that both are fond of using the terms of revolutionary philosophy, both are undisguisedly hostile to creeds, and both are agreed in teaching that men are to be *saved by science*. On the latter point the only difference between them is, that Mrs. Eddy has a private science factory of her own, and is therefore startlingly original, while Mr. Bates borrows his "saving knowledge" from Darwin, Huxley, and others.

Against these new fads of rationalism we urge the statement of the beloved disciples: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," and the faith that saves is not mere faith in the invariable sequences of natural laws, but faith in Christ as a personal, all-sufficient, Divine Saviour, Teacher and Exemplar—our Prophet, Priest and King. Such a faith impels to all holy obedience, and conduces to the largest health of both soul and body. To assert that we are to overcome all evil simply by following nature and by practicing self-culture, is to contradict the word of God.

We regret that a book which is for the most part so attractive in its style, so happy in its treatment of the prominent features of a very dangerous heresy, and withal so clearly satisfactory in its exhibition of the unscripturalness of Mrs. Eddy's teaching, and the absurdities of her philosophy, is itself so signally weak and misleading in its attempts to state the fundamental truths of the Gospel. WM. P. MCGORKLE.

Graham, N. C.

THE MEDICAL MISSION. Its Place, Power and Appeal. *By W. J. Wanless, M. D.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1898. 16mo. Pp. 96.

Wanted! 750,000 trained and consecrated medical missionaries in the

Foreign field alone! And then the proportion of physicians and surgeons to the population will be two and one-half times as great in the United States as in the missionary territory. This little book, by a medical missionary of the Northern Presbyterian Board, is directed primarily as an appeal to medical students and intended, secondarily, to arouse all and stir them up to greater efforts. It is a well written book. It deserves wide circulation. It will accomplish good wherever it goes. Why cannot the Church as a Church and individual Christians throw off some of this corroding selfishness and do more for the suffering, sin-stricken, disease-racked, priest-ridden and quack-persecuted myriads of millions of our degraded and unfortunate brothers. Their condition is pitiable in the extreme. This book draws the curtain and gives us a glimpse. The opportunity for serving God in Medical Missions is wonderful almost beyond imagination, and here it is shown as well as can be in as brief a compass.

THE SETTING OF THE CRESCENT AND THE RISING OF THE CROSS; OR KAMIL ABDUL MESSIAH: A Syrian convert from Islam to Christianity. *By the Rev. Henry Harris Jessup, D. D.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1898. 16 mo. Pp. 156.

This little book has besides the narrative by Dr. Jessup, an introduction by F. F. Ellenwood, and an appendix on "The Arabian Mission," by S. M. Zevmer. It is a truly interesting sketch. No one can read it without drawing several lessons, viz: (1.) That Raymund Lull, Henry Martyn and a host of others have been right in maintaining that even high-class Mohammedans can be converted to Christianity; (2) that missionaries need be perfectly familiar with the religions, ideas and sacred books of those among whom they labor; (3) the tenacious hold that Islam has upon the Moslem; (4) what a beautiful character is one thoroughly molded to God's will and imbued with Gospel principles. It is a good book for the Sunday School library. It cannot fail to benefit anyone that reads it.

ISLAM; OR THE RELIGION OF THE TURK: *By Rev. E. M. Wherry, D. D.* New York: American Tract Society. 16mo. Pp. 64. Cloth 35 cents.

There is considerable information compacted into this brief tractate, presented in concise but popular form. The purpose is to show that the faith of Islam is behind the American atrocities which have so horrified the Christian world. The Koran, Ahadis, Ijma and Qigas, the foundations of the systems are described first. Then the system erected on this foundation is depicted—the Kalima and other meritorious exercises; on top of all the Jihad or crusade against those of other faiths. The author finds hope in the number (150) of influential and bitterly opposing sects.

The author says (p. 36). "The God of Islam is undoubtedly the true God," the objections being to the Moslem's conception of him. If we understand the statement we certainly cannot accept it. While we are

glad to see and acknowledge that there are elements of truth and good in all false systems of religion, we have not yet been educated in Comparative Religion up to the point of believing that there is more than one true God—the triune Spirit of absolute perfection and infinite in every attribute, as made known to us in the Bible. Islam's conception of God is Islam's god, and beside the true God it is little short of a monster. The Moslems are just as surely—though of course not as grossly—*ἄθεοι* as any people on earth.

The author is mistaken in claiming that Islam, next to Christianity, has the greatest number of adherents of any of the world religions (p. 57). Buddhism has about 500,000,000 adherents, and Mohammedanism, not more than 200,000,000.

Lastly, we venture to criticise the pedantic spelling of Arabic words. It is, of course, more accurate to say "Makkah" for "Mecca," "Madina" for "Medina," "Quran" for "Koran," "Darweesh" and "Muazzin," but many a reader will fail to detect the familiar words in the new dress, and the old is too well established to change, in popular works. Strangely, he does not give the False Prophet's name as "Muhammed," but the common "Mohammed."

D. J. BRIMM.

BOOK NOTICES.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. By Local Application ; Not by a Total Covering.
By Rev. A. H. Caldwell, Senatobia, Mississippi. Paper. Pp. 183,
12mo New Orleans: E. S. Upton. 1898.

This is another attempt to run the Baptist into a rat-hole and plug him up. The author undertakes to prove that immersion is positively unscriptural. He does so by showing that all the elements employed to symbolize truths in religion were applied in some other mode than immersion. All the doctrines of salvation are symbolically included under the terms Blood and Water—the Blood symbolizing the objective elements, and the Water the subjective elements. Now the Blood and the Water were historically sprinkled ; the subject was never represented as totally covered by either. Immersion is out of line ; no elements were ever used in that mode.

THE MIRAGE OF LIFE. *By W. Haig Miller.* Illustrated by Teuniel.
Vol. 4, No. 68 of "The Colportage Library." November, 1898. Chi-
cago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 12 mo. Pp. 121.
10 cents.

"Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." The author has attempted to prove by many historical examples that those who pursue happiness by unsanctified lives in the various spheres of human activity, enterprise and recreation are like the famished desert traveller that pursues the natural mirage till he sinks down exhausted. He takes examples of the Man of Fashion, Beau Brummell; the Man of Wealth, William Beckford; the Hero, Lord Clive; the Statesman, William Pitt; the Orator, Richard Brinsley Sheridan; the Artist, Haydon; the Man of Literature, Scott; the Poet, Byron; the Man of Wit and Humor, Hood; the Man of the World, Chesterfield; the Beauty, Lady Hamilton; the Monarch, Napoleon. A number of other characters are introduced incidentally. Profitable reading.

THE STORY OF JOHN WESLEY. Told to Boys and Girls : *By Marianna Kirlow.* New York: Eaton and Mains, Cincinnati: Curtis and Jennings.

This work is an effort, a successful effort, to tell the story of the founder of the Methodist Church, so as to render it intelligible and interesting to young children. As we should naturally expect, the history of his childhood days in the humble rectory at Epworth, with his conscientious father, his wise and pious mother, and his eighteen brothers and sisters, are told with some fulness. Next we see him as a school boy at the Charterhouse school in London and Westminster, and as a college boy at Oxford, where he won college honors and a fellowship. But his character as a minister of the gospel and self appointed missionary to the

poor and degraded, and the founder of a great church are not less faithfully described. In some cases we cannot but think that the simplification has been carried to an unnecessary extreme, but altogether it is a beautiful book for children, and suggests the thought that if books of a historical or biographical character constructed on the plan of this were substituted for the works of fiction which now compose the larger part of our Sunday School literature, it would be better for the children.

OUR BIBLE. Where Did We Get It? *By Rev. Charles Leach, D. D.* TEN REASONS WHY I BELIEVE THE BIBLE. *By R. A. Torrey.* Pp. 132. Paper. 15 cents. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association.

This is a short history of the Bible as a book. The object of the work is to prove that the Bible, as we have it to-day, is true, by considering where it came from, who wrote it, and when and where it was written, and how it has come down to us. The contents are as follows: Part I.—Introduction; Christ Before the Apostles; The Three Oldest Bibles in the World; The Ancient Fathers of the Church; The Apostolic Fathers; Polycarp; Papias; Ancient Versions of the Scriptures. Part II.—The Old Testament; Our Lord's Bible; The People's Bible Before Christ; The Fountain Head. Part III.—Our English Bible; The First Versions; The Scriptures in Anglo-Saxon; John Wycliffe; William Tyndale; Authorized Versions; The Revised Version. The book then closes with Ten Reasons Why I Believe the Bible is the Word of God. Many interesting and useful facts are gathered here for ready reference. And no doubt many perplexed seekers after truth will be guided to a happy decision by the ten simple, plain, practical reasons given by Mr. Torrey for believing the Bible to be the Word of God.

R. A. WEBB.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BIBLE: *By Walter F. Ardney, M. A.* Pp. 88, 16 mo., cloth, 50 cents. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1898.

This book consists of two lectures which were given at the Chautauqua in Matlock in the summer of 1897. The title is a little misleading. By "The Construction of the Bible" the author does not mean the origin of its contents in the minds of the writers, but rather the "putting together" of the several parts of Scripture in one volume. It is more a history of the Bible text. The study of construction is, therefore, literary and historical. The usual divisions of the Bible are made, and the construction of these considered separately and in order. Of course the work is too small to allow any extended study of the questions, but many helpful facts are gathered. While we might not agree with the author in the application of certain terms he employs, yet the book is, in the main, reliable and will be found handy.

R. A. WEBB.

THE BREMEN LECTURES.

THE BREMEN LECTURES ON GREAT RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY: *By Various Eminent European Divines.* Translated from the Orig-

inal German. *By David Heagle, D. D.* Professor in the Theological Department of the Southwestern Baptist University. New and Improved Edition. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1898. Pp. 406.

These are excellent *lectures*, noble defences of evangelical truth, valuable contributions to Christian apologetics. They were delivered and first published in the city of Bremen, in 1868, the occasion being "certain disorders of an ecclesiastical nature existing in Bremen." Thirty years put many books out of date, but the topics here discussed, and the "disorder" here combatted, are not decrepit, and these *lectures* are not antiquated. While not wishing to endorse every sentiment expressed by the various lecturers, we wish for this volume a very wide circulation, and believe it will buttress the Christian faith wherever it goes.

That mighty man who has given us *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, and whose open face and magnificent countenance inspires confidence and begets love in the hearts of those who never saw him, Theodor Christlieb, D. D., University preacher and professor at Bonn, discusses "The Biblical Conception of God." Then follow "The Doctrine of Creation and Natural Science," by Dr. Otto Zockler; "Reason, Conscience and Revelation," by Dr. Herman Cremer, the professor of Theology at Griefswald, and eminent Greek lexicographer; "Miracles," by Rev. M. Fuchs, pastor at Oppin; "The Person of Jesus Christ," by Chr. E. Luthardt, D., professor of Theology at Leipsic; "The Resurrection of Christ as a Soteriologico—Historical Fact;" by the great Court Preacher, Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, "The Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement," by W. F. Gess, D. D., professor at Gottingen; "Authority of our Gospels," by Constantin Tischendorf, D. D., professor of Theology at Leipsic, and well-known to all Biblical critics; "The Idea of the Kingdom of God as Consummated, and what it tells us regarding Historical Christianity," by that great Commentator, J. P. Lange, D. D., professor in Bonn; "Christianity and Culture," by Rev. Julius Disselhoff, pastor and inspector in Kaiserswerth. With candor, with breadth, with logical force, with zeal for Christian truth, these great representatives of the evangelical and orthodox party in Germany have discussed these topics at their best. Every lecturer seems to have been on his mettle.

The title page tells us that this is an improved edition, got out by one of the professors in the Southwestern Baptist University at Jackson, Tennessee. These improvements are in the main, three: (1) a splendid portrait of each lecturer; (2) a condensed biographical sketch which helps us to get acquainted with the men whose words are read, and (3) a good "summary" of each lecture, given at the beginning, so that the reader has a chart as he sails into each discussion.

The purpose of this notice is to commend this volume as a brave, worthy, edifying, and quickening defence of Christian truth, without subscribing to every sentiment.

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

UNION Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS FIRST WEDNESDAY IN OCTOBER.

SESSION CLOSES FIRST WEDNESDAY IN JUNE.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, apply to
Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty, Richmond, Va.

For information as to rooms, &c., apply to
Dr. JOHNSON,
Intendant, Richmond, Va.

JULY, 1899.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

CONTENTS.

No. 3.

- I. SOME PERILS OF MISSIONARY LIFE. Benj. B. Warfield.
- II. THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND CATECHISM. J. RITCHIE SMITH.
- III. LANIER AS A POET. Edwin W. Bowen.
- IV. THE BOOKS OF THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS. W. M. McPheeters.
- V. HOW TO MAKE OUR BRIEF COURSE IN CHURCH HISTORY MOST PROFITABLE.
R. C. Reed.
- VI. OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD MODERN THEOLOGY. Eugene Daniel.
- VII. THE FIRST PRESBYTERY. R. K. Smoot.
- VIII. CRITICISMS.
- IX. BOOK NOTICES.
- X. EDITORIAL.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR. - - - - 75 CENTS A COPY.
IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly :

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by
an Association composed of the following Ministers :

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.
W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.
D. J. BRIMM, D. D.
JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.
WM. C. CLARK, D. D.
J. N. CRAIG, D. D.
A. B. CURRY, D. D.
C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D.
T. W. HOOPER, D. D.

C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.
W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.
B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.
ROBERT PRICE, D. D.
J. B. SHEARER, D. D.
SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.
R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.
C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.
ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D.;
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D.; S, C. BYRD, A. M.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. :

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and
settlement of account to date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. SOME PERILS OF MISSIONARY LIFE. BENJ. B. WARFIELD.....	38
II. THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION AND CATECHISMS. J. RITCHIE SMITH.....	40
III. LANIER AS A POET. EDWIN W. BOWEN.....	41
IV. THE BOOKS OF THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS. W. M. MCPHEETERS.....	42
V. HOW TO MAKE OUR BRIEF COURSE IN CHURCH HISTORY MOST PROFITABLE. R. C. REED.....	45
VI. OUR ATTITUDE TOWARD MODERN THEOLOGY. EUGENE DANIEL.....	47
VII. THE FIRST PRESBYTERY. R. K. SMOOT.....	50
VIII. CRITICISMS.	
IX. BOOK NOTICES.	
X. EDITORIAL.	

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 49--JULY, 1899.

I. SOME PERILS OF MISSIONARY LIFE.¹

I suppose we all recognize that missionaries are the cream of Christians. They may say with Paul, in the whole length and breadth of his meaning, that unto them the grace has been given to preach unto the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii., 8). They are the bold and faithful spirits who bear the banner of the cross courageously to the front. We who abide at home, hope that we are at home by the will of God and to his glory; but we cannot withhold our admiration from those whom God has chosen to form the advance-guard of his conquering host. We recognize that these "picked men" are the *elite* of the army of the cross. Their bearing justifies this recognition. There is no body of men in the world of equal numbers who so thoroughly meet the trust reposed in them and the lofty sentiments entertained towards them by their fellow Christians.

So exalted is our well-founded appreciation of the character of missionaries in general that it comes with something of a shock to us to discover, as we are now and then led to discover, that even missionaries are, nevertheless, men, and are sometimes liable to the temptations, and shall

¹An address to a body of prospective missionaries.

we not even say, the failings? that are common to men. In the difficult situations in which they have been placed, they have exhibited, in general, a wisdom, a faithfulness, a power of adaptation, a devotion, which seems almost super-human, and which can be accounted for only as the fulfilment of the promise with which the Lord accompanied their marching orders—that he would be with them to the end of the world. But in the midst of this general marvelous success, we find just enough of short-comings to warn us that there are dangers attending the work of the missionary which it is requisite to face and to guard against. I do not here speak of such dangers as that of spiritual pride, which may be thought to lie very close to a calling which is recognized among us as one which in an especial manner undertakes the work of God and may lay particular claim to his smile, and which may be peculiarly near to men who are everywhere esteemed, and may haply come to esteem themselves, as the *elite* of Christians. I am bound to testify that I have seen very little of anything resembling spiritual pride among missionaries, though doubtless it here and there exists, as how could it fail to exist? The dangers I wish to speak of are not those which spring from the very essence of the calling, but rather such as attend the work missionaries are called on to do, and such as show themselves in the manner of its prosecution. Here, too, the greatest danger is that we may fancy there is no danger. To be forewarned is to be partially, at least, forearmed; at all events it places it in our power to forearm ourselves.

Let us spring at once *in medias res* and mention at the beginning the supremest danger which can attend a missionary in his work—the danger that he who has gone forth to convert the heathen may find himself rather being converted by the heathen. The idea is monstrous, you may think. But the danger is an actual and a real one, and its working is not unillustrated by sad examples. It is no doubt

exceedingly rare that a missionary is so fully converted to heathendom that he lays aside his Christian profession and adopts in its entirety the religion of those whom he was set to convert, though even this is not absolutely unexampled. Dr. A. J. Behrends, for instance, in his little volume of missionary addresses delivered on the Graves' foundation at Syracuse University ("The World for Christ," p. 102), tells of a classmate of his own to whom even this occurred. He says:

"I had a classmate in the Theological Seminary who, thirty years ago, went as a missionary to China. He abandoned his calling and his faith, became a Mandarin of the 'third button,' and for many years has been associated with the Chinese legation in the courts of Europe. He writes of the 'iced champagne' which he drinks when the heat of summer is oppressive, and talks flippantly of the 'so-called' Holy Land and of the 'historic cross of the carpenter philosopher,' which annoys him at every step from Munich to St. Petersburg. He has developed into a Confucianist."

It much more frequently happens, however, that the impact of the heathen mind upon his thought has led the missionary only to modify his belief until he has laid aside the fundamentals of Christianity, or even now and then, under the ethical influences of his surroundings, has made shipwreck of faith in a practical sense and adopted the ethical views and fallen into the debased modes of life of his community. All this, of course, unhappily occurs to the pastor at home exceedingly frequently, despite the conserving energies of the society in which home pastors are immersed. The forces of the world impinging upon them, and reinforced, it may be, by native tendencies of thought and feeling, draw them away from their adopted lines of thought and gradually assimilate them to worldly views and modes of life. That it happens comparatively rarely among the missionaries in the far severer strain to which they are subjected, isolated as they are from the Christian community, and surrounded by a society the very grain of which is heathen, is only another proof that they are the *elite* of Christendom. But it does happen occasionally among them, too.

A classical example of a missionary becoming thus the convert, or at least the pervert, of his catechumens, is supplied by the famous Bishop Colenso, the pioneer of the present outbreak of rationalistic Biblical criticism in England. Bishop Colenso was bred in the evangelical faith of the Low-Church party of the Church of England, and had received in his youth the essentials of the faith as held by that body of nobly-witnessing Christians, though certainly in a somewhat traditional way. When he went to Natal as a missionary, however, he had never given that deep and careful study to the elements of his faith which alone would guarantee their stability. It happened thus that his mind was first thoroughly awakened to the difficulties of his religion through the questions and objections of the "intelligent Zulu," to whom he sought to teach it. Under these objections he gave way, first discarding the fundamentals of evangelical religion, and then his belief in the Bible as the infallible Word of God; and thus became the protagonist of critical rationalism on English ground. Here is his own account of the final stage of his perversion :

"Since I have had charge of this Diocese, I have been closely occupied in the study of the Zulu tongue, and in translating the Scriptures into it. . . . In this work I have been aided by intelligent natives, . . . so as not only to avail myself of their criticisms, but to appreciate fully their objections and difficulties. Thus, however, it has happened that I have been brought again face to face with questions which caused me some uneasiness in former days, but with respect to which I was then enabled to satisfy my mind sufficiently for practical purposes, and I had fondly hoped to have laid the ghosts of them at last forever. Engrossed with parochial and other work in England, I did what, probably, many other clergymen have done under similar circumstances—I contented myself with silencing, by means of the specious explanations, which are given in most commentaries, the ordinary objections against the historical character of the early portions of the Old Testament, and settled down into a willing acquiescence in the general truth of the narratives, whatever difficulties may still hang about particular parts of it. . . . Here, however, as I have said, amidst my work in this land, I have been brought face to face with the very questions which I then put by. . . . I have had a simple-minded, but intelligent, native—one with the docility of a child, but the reasoning powers of ma-

ture age—look up and ask, 'Is all that true?' I dared not, as a servant of the God of Truth, urge my brother man to believe that which I did not myself believe, which I knew to be untrue, as a matter-of-fact, historical narrative. I gave him, however, such a reply as satisfied him for the time, without throwing any discredit upon the general veracity of the Bible history. But I was thus driven—against my will at first, I may truly say—to search more deeply into these questions. . . . And now I tremble at the result of my inquiries." [The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D. D., &c. . . . New York, 1863. Pp. 4-7.]

The circumstances of this wonderful conversion to disbelief in the Christian Scriptures are no doubt capable of being looked at from two points of view—according as our attention is engrossed with the high and noble honesty of heart which considered not the humbleness of the questioner, or with the previous neglect of duty which left the questioned the prey of the first restless spirit which should attack him. Bishop Colenso's sympathetic biographer, Sir G. W. Cox, contemplates it from the first point of view, and this is his account of it :

"There can be but little doubt, rather there is none, that the choice of Mr. Colenso for missionary work in a heathen land, was a blessing not only to the heathen to whom he was sent, but to his countrymen, to the cause of truth, to the Church of England, and to the Church of God. Up to this time, his moral sense and spiritual instincts lacked free play; and, had he remained in England, those circumstances probably would never have arisen, which were made the means of evoking the marvellous strength of character evinced in the great battle of his life. It was just that appeal of the honest heart which was needed to call into action the slumbering fires. That appeal, and his instantaneous obedience to that appeal, were sneered at as stupid, childish and contemptible; but the questions of the 'intelligent Zulu' became for him questions like those which led Luther to nail his theses on the church door at Wittenberg, and enabled him to break with the force of a Samson the theological and traditional withes by which he had thus far been bound." [The Life of John William Colenso, D. D., Bishop of Natal. By the Rev. Sir George W. Cox, Bart., M. A., &c. London. 1888. Pp. 50. Vol. I.

Our own Dr. W. H. Green, in his trenchant review of Bishop Colenso's first book on the Pentateuch, contemplates it from the other point of view, and this is the way he puts it :

"The difficulty is in the whole attitude which he occupies. He has

picked out a few superficial difficulties in the sacred record, not now adduced for the first time, nor first discovered by himself. They seem, however, to have recently dawned upon his view. He was aware, long before, of certain difficulties in the scriptural account of the creation and deluge; and instead of satisfactorily and thoroughly investigating these, he was content, he tells us, to push them off, or thrust them aside, satisfying himself with the moral lessons, and trusting vaguely, and, as he owns, not very honestly, (p. 4) that there was some way of explaining them (pp. 4, 5). The other difficulties, which have since oppressed him, he then had no notion of; in fact, so late as the time when he published or prepared his Commentary on the Romans, (p. 215) he had no idea of ever holding his present views. As there is nothing brought out in his book which unbelievers had not flaunted and believing expositors set themselves to explain long since, we are left to suppose that his theological training as a minister and a bishop, and his preparation as a commentator, could not have been very exact or thorough. . . . His mission to the Zulus, however, fortunately or unfortunately, as the case may be, broke the spell. He went out to teach the Zulus Christianity, and now at length he is obliged to study the Bible on which that religion is based."—[The Pentateuch, Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso. By William Henry Green, &c. New York. 1863. Pp. 112].

I have been thus lengthy in exhibiting the fundamental elements of the case of Bishop Colenso, because I desired to bring out the source from which the danger to which he succumbed arose. Clearly its roots were set in this: he became a teacher before he was himself taught. The remedy is that missionaries should not fancy that a zeal for God and a love for Christ is all the furnishing they need to enable them to win the world to Christ; if they do, they may haply find themselves like Bishop Colenso, rather won to the world. Those who expect to go forth as missionaries can read themselves the lesson. As certainly as men go, mentally unprepared for their task and its dangers, so certainly will they expose themselves to unnecessary peril and their work to unnecessary likelihood of failure.

It is the same lesson that is read us by the somewhat parallel case of Francis W. Newman, whose autobiography detailing the changes in his belief, published under the title of "Phases of Faith," created quite a sensation half a century ago. He was the brother of John Henry Newman, equally

or more highly gifted, and, like him and Colenso, was bred in the evangelical faith. It is perfectly evident, however, to the reader of his own account of his religious life, that he never gave that labor and thought to the faith which he professed which were its due, and by which alone it could be firmly anchored in his soul. In one of the phases of his faith he joined Mr. Groves (in 1830) in his mission at Bagdad, and it is plain that he was led to give up the doctrine of the Trinity—one of the earlier stages of his drift away from the truth—by the pressure of Mohammedan objection. He felt uneasy from the first, as with his foundations in Christian thinking, one fancies he well might feel uneasy, whenever the thought crossed his mind: "What if we, like Henry Martyn, were charged with Polytheism by Mohammedans, and were forced to defend ourselves by explaining in detail our doctrine of the Trinity" (p. 32). Then he discovered that religion was not the peculium of Christianity. There is a vividly drawn scene in a carpenter's shop in Aleppo which, one feels, must have had a significant place in his development.

"While at Aleppo," he tells us, "I one day got into a religious discussion with a Mohammedan carpenter, which left on me a lasting impression. Among other matters, I was peculiarly desirous of disabusing him of the current notion of his people, that our Gospels are spurious narratives, of late date. I found great difficulty of expression, but the man listened to me with much attention, and I was encouraged to exert myself. He waited patiently till I had done, and then spoke to the following effect: 'I will tell you, sir, how the case stands. God has given you English a great many good gifts. You make fine ships, and sharp pen-knives, and good cloth and cotton; you have rich nobles and brave soldiers; you write and print many learned books (dictionaries and grammars); all this is of God. But there is one thing that God has withheld from you and has revealed to us, and that is, the knowledge of the true religion, by which one may be saved.' When he had thus ignored my argument (which was probably unintelligible to him) and delivered his simple protest, I was silenced, and at the same time amused. But the more I thought it over the more instruction I saw in the case." [Phases of Faith. By Francis William Newman, &c. London. 1870. P. 52].

The instruction he got out of the case was that, as the possession of a deep religious experience was not depend-

ent on the possession of any one form of religious teaching, therefore all forms of religious teaching are alike useless or worse, and the religion of the individual's own consciousness is the only true religion. He was in other words converted to heathenism by the discovery that man has universally a religious nature.

Something of the same kind seems to have happened to Mr. James Macdonald, a missionary of the Free Church of Scotland, to Africa, and author of a readable book called "Light in Africa." He has more recently published a more pretentious and really very instructive volume called "Religion and Myth" (London, 1893), from which it appears that he has been deeply moved by the discovery that even the lowest savages may have a religious consciousness, exercise religious faith, and enjoy religious certitude. By this discovery he has been led, theoretically at least—let us hope it is wholly unassimilated theory with him—to confound all religions together as being higher or lower stages of the development of man's religious capacities and insight, dependent not on objective revelation but on growing intelligence and the progressive working of human thought upon religious material. Pressed to its legitimate meaning this is pure naturalism, elevated heathenism. Here is the conception of the origin of Christianity to which Mr. Macdonald has been brought: Religion began in reverence for a human king, to whom men looked for good, issuing in the conception that the king controlled natural forces; then from habit they still looked to the king for help after he had died, and hence arose a doctrine of souls; thence sprang a conception of personal and separate divinities, slowly gravitating towards the idea of one Supreme God; after awhile the conception arose that this one Supreme God became incarnate in time, by the substitution of the idea of a single incarnation revealing the will of God for the multitude of prophets—from rain-doctors up—who claim to hold converse with the unseen. Students of the literature of the

subject will easily recognize this sketch. To us it seems that instead of converting the Africans to Christianity, Mr. Macdonald has himself been converted to a form of scientific heathenism.

The lesson of all these instances is obviously the same. The missionary is not prepared for his work until he has been forced to face all those problems raised by modern criticism and by modern thought—problems of comparative religion, of critical analysis, of philosophical unbelief; has faced them at home, worked through them, and mastered them. Unprepared by this mental discipline, he goes forth at his peril. There is danger in the foreign field for a man who has been too indolent at home to meet the difficulties of unbelief prevalent at home, fairly and squarely, and reason himself through them. He may quiet the doubts that rise in his own soul, but the heathen are not amenable to his lazy Peace! peace!—they will press these doubts upon him. If he parries them, they will justly despise him and he loses all fruit of his work. If he entertains them he is unprepared to deal with them, and—well, some men have lost their faith by that road. We would better prepare ourselves earnestly before we go.

If we fancy that so extreme a peril as that we have been picturing must be rare, let us glance at an analogous danger which necessarily attends all mission work, and which is at bottom only a less acute form of the same evil we have been discussing, though it often grows out of a different root—the danger namely that in striving to commend Christianity to the heathen and to remove their stubborn and abounding difficulties in accepting it we really accommodate Christianity to heathen thought—in a word we simply explain Christianity away. This too is an evil which is by no means confined to missionaries. It may properly be called the deepest danger of pastoral life. Few of us escape it altogether. It is the root of the concessive habit of stating truth, which is the bane of all Christian society. It

is distressingly easy to fall into it, as a measure of charity—seeking to be all things to all men that we may gain the more. But what is it in effect but corrupting the truth? It is as if an army set to protect the frontier against an invading host, should suddenly wheel and place itself, with flags flying and bands playing, and drum majors in full regalia performing, in front of the opposing ranks, and proudly lead them over the land—evidently conquering because now leading! This concessive habit is in other words only an expedient by which we can make it seem as if we had gained others to our side, when we have really placed ourselves at their side. It saves appearances at the cost of realities. It is therefore as I say, only a less acute and obvious form of conversion from Christianity wherever it shows itself—among pastors or among missionaries. For it does show itself occasionally even among those select warriors of the cross, the missionaries. I have met more than one missionary from Mohammedan lands, for example, who had learned to state the doctrine of the Trinity, “so genially and so winningly,” (as they expressed it) that it roused little or no opposition in the Mohammedan mind. And when I heard how they stated it, I did not wonder; they had so stated it as to leave the idea of the Trinity out—much as Dr. James Morris Whiton, in his recent attempts to show how Unitarians and Trinitarians can unite on a common formula, certainly succeeds in providing an explanation of the Trinity to which no Unitarian should object. You may see his efforts in a recent paper in “The New World,” and in his little book called *Gloria Patri*. The trouble is you look in vain in the explanations for a Trinity.

Without pausing to illustrate this very common danger, let us glance next at another danger attending the missionary in his work, analogous to this, from its opposite side. The method of conversion by concession is really, at bottom, an attempt to deceive men into a profession of Christianity; to make them believe that Christianity is not

what it appears to be, and does not involve in its profession all that it seems; that it is much "easier to take" than men have been accustomed to think. Now there is another way of attempting to deceive men into professing Christianity which sometimes presents temptations to missionaries, especially those working among the simpler and less advanced races. We are accustomed to think of dubious miracles as the specialty of the more corrupt ages and localities of Romanism. It may behoove us to have a care, lest we fall victims to what may differ from appeals to dubious miracles by a very narrow ethical line indeed. There is a distinct temptation confronting the missionary at times to make use of his superior intelligence or superior acquirements to impress the ignorant with the divine character of his religion; a distinct temptation to over-reach his less well-informed brother men by an exhibition of the marvels which learning and science have put within his reach, as if these marvels were something more than proofs of advanced science, and were somewhat of the nature of signs from heaven of the justness of his claims and the validity of his apostleship; sometimes at least a willingness to permit the heathen to deceive themselves as to the purport of what to them are marvels. Take a passage like the following, from one of the noblest, purest, most Christ-like missionaries which the Church has yet produced. I should be far from criticising the motives or methods of such a man of God. I should not like to be understood as suggesting that the limit of the permissible were passed in this particular incident. But are they not at least so nearly approached that the incident may stand as a warning to us of how easy it may become, in somewhat like situations, to pass beyond the limits and attempt to deceive men into accepting the truth? I quote from one of the most thrilling narratives of missionary work our day has produced:

"But I must here record the story of the Sinking of the Well, which

broke the back of heathenism on Aniwa. Being a flat coral island with no hills to attract the clouds, rain is scarce there as compared with the adjoining mountainous islands; and even when it does fall heavily, with tropical profusion, it disappears . . . through the light soil and porous rock, and drains itself directly into the sea . . . At certain seasons the natives drank very unwholesome water. . . . My household felt sadly the want of fresh water. I prepared two large casks to be filled when the rain came. But when we attempted to do so at the water hole near the village, the natives forbade us, fearing that our large casks would carry all the water away, and leave none for them with their so much smaller cocoanut bottles. The public water-hole was on the ground of two Sacred Men, who claimed the power of emptying and filling it by rain at will. The superstitious natives gave them presents to bring the rain. If it came soon, they took all the credit for it. If not, they demanded larger gifts to satisfy their gods. Even our Aneityumese teachers said to me, when I protested that surely they could not believe such things:

"It is hard to know, Missi. The water does come and go quickly. If you paid them well, they might bring the rain and let us fill our casks!"

I told them that, as followers of Jehovah, we must despise all heathen mummeries, and trust in him and in the laws of his creation to help us.

Aniwa having, therefore, no permanent supply of fresh water, in spring, or stream, or lake, I resolved, by the help of God, to sink a well, near the Mission premises, hoping that a wisdom, higher than my own, would guide me to the source of some blessed spring. . . . One morning I said to the old Chief and his fellow Chief, both now earnestly inquiring about the religion of Jehovah and of Jesus:

"I am going to sink a deep well down into the earth, to see if our God will send us fresh water up from below."

They looked at me with astonishment [and spoke] in a sort of sympathy approaching pity. . . .

I started upon my hazardous job. . . . The old Chief and his best men . . . remonstrated with me very gravely . . . I toiled on from day to day, my heart almost sinking sometimes with the sinking of the well, till we reached a depth of about thirty feet. And the phrase, 'living water,' 'living water,' kept chiming through my soul like music from God, as I dug and hammered away. At this depth the earth and coral began to be soaked with damp. I felt that we were nearing water. My soul had a faith that God would open a spring for us; but side by side with this faith, was a strange terror that the water would be salt. . . . One evening I said to the old Chief:

"I think that Jehovah God will give us water to-morrow from that hole!"

The Chief said, 'No, Missi.' . . . I still answered, 'Come to-morrow. I hope and believe that Jehovah God will send you the rain

up through the earth.' At the moment I knew I was risking much, and probably incurring sorrowful consequences, had no water been given....

Next morning, I went down again at daybreak and sank a narrow hole in the centre about two feet deep. The perspiration broke over me with uncontrollable excitement, and I trembled through every limb, when the water rushed up and began to fill the hole. Muddy though it was, I eagerly tasted it, and the little 'tinny' dropped from my hand with sheer joy. . . . It was water! It was fresh water! It was living water from Jehovah's well. . . . The Chiefs had assembled with their men, near by. They waited on in eager expectancy. It was a rehearsal, in a small way, of the Israelites coming round, while Moses struck the rock and called for water. By and by, when I had praised the Lord, and my excitement was a little calmed, the mud being also greatly settled, I filled a jug which I had taken down empty in the sight of them all, and ascending to the top, called for them to come and see the rain which Jehovah God had given us through the well. They closed around me in haste and gazed on it in superstitious fear. The old Chief shook it to see if it would spill, and then touched it to see if it felt like water. At last he tasted it, and rolling it in his mouth with joy, for a moment, he swallowed it, and shouted, 'Rain! Rain! Yes it is rain! But how did you get it?' I repeated, 'Jehovah my God gave it out of his own earth in answer to our labors and prayers. Go and see it springing up for yourselves.'"¹

Graphically told, is it not? The scene is brought vividly before us. What I ask is, if you would have been, in such a situation, superior to the temptation—I do not say of announcing the well as a miracle from God—but of permitting those poor superstitious folk to take it for a miracle. But surely, surely, the proclaimers of the gospel of truth must not in even so slight a degree sink to the level of those medicine men, who, "if the rain comes, take all the credit for it."

Oddly enough in that stirring romance of missionary adventures which Mr. Rider Haggard has given us, he makes his missionary hero first catch the attention of the people by an incident precisely similar in its import with this which Dr. Paton describes. The Rev. Thomas Owen has given himself with entire faith and devotion to an exceedingly hazardous piece of missionary work. The chief med-

¹John G. Paton, &c. An Autobiography. Edited by his brother. Second part. London. 1890. pp. 176-8.

icine man of the tribe among which he is laboring has prepared for him a fatal trap; having administered a deadly poison to the king for which there is but one antidote, he contrives that all of Owen's credit and his life itself shall be staked upon his power to recover the monarch. Owen, meanwhile, has become possessed (in a supernatural way, as Mr. Haggard would have us think,) of the secret of the poison and its antidote, and has taken care to provide himself with the latter. Called to the king's side in the presence of all the people, he prepares the curing draught, and "this done, he clasped his hands, and, lifting his eyes to Heaven, he prayed aloud in the language of the Amasuka. 'O God,' he prayed, "upon whose business I am here, grant, I beseech Thee, that by Thy Grace power may be given to me to work this miracle in the face these people, to the end that I may win them to cease their iniquities, to believe Thee, the only true God, and to save their souls alive. Amen.'" So he administered the draught and reaped the natural effect.¹ Can we condemn the novelist for so representing the practices of missionaries, when missionaries so represent their own practices? But the oddest thing is yet to say. Mr. Rider Haggard feels the unworthiness of the part he has made his missionary to play. He does not betray consciousness of it here, indeed. But later in the story he makes him refuse to avail himself of a like transaction. "But I say that I will not use it," are the words that he puts in his mouth. "Are we witch-doctors, that we should take refuge in tricks? No, let faith be our shield; and if it fail us, then let us die."¹ It is strange to turn to Mr. Haggard for a lesson in missionary morals. But as we read his pages and blush to think that authentic missionary annals may justify him in attributing deceit of this grave kind to a missionary, we may rejoice that missionary faithfulness has also suggested to him that a good missionary would

¹The Wizard. By H. Rider Haggard. New York and London. 1896. P. 77.

¹Dilto. P. 119.

refuse such a temptation; and in any event we may learn that missionaries must not be like the witch-doctors, and take refuge in tricks.

And is there not yet another form of moral danger to which the missionary may be exposed, suggested to us here—a danger lest in his zeal for propogating Christianity, he may be misled into the use of doubtful means of obtaining access to the heathen? Those who are acquainted with heathen lands, or even those who have a tolerable knowledge of missionary history, will understand at once what an ever present temptation stands before the messenger of glad tidings to obtain an opportunity to make them known by some act of *finesse*, which may all too easily pass into an act of deceit. Sometimes the country is closed to the open proclamation of the Gospel, and the temptation arises to obtain access to its population under color of some other profession. One may at least go as teacher or physician, and while pretending to impart only secular learning, convey also that knowledge which is unto salvation; while pretending to no more than heal the body, minister, also, to the diseases of the soul. There is no one of us, doubtless, who would contend that the messenger of Christ is bound by human law in matters of this kind; it is for us, too, in this late day, to say with all boldness, "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5:29). But we must see to it that we do obey God, and must not cast aside his great law of truth, in order to carry the truth to others. The point is not whether we shall boldly proclaim the Gospel in the face of all adverse force, or quietly propagate it in defiance of all adverse human enactments; but the point is whether we shall teach it under color of doing something else, under an implied or even express promise not to teach it. A missionary, we will say, has long tried to gain entrance into a land closed to the Gospel; an offer comes to him to take charge of a Royal University, we will say, with the express provision that if he takes charge of it

he obligates himself not to make his position a means of Christian propagandism. Ought he to accept such an offer? That is *prima facie* itself a serious question. How far does it involve an open renunciation of his Christian duty? But the point now is, if he does accept it, can he permit himself still to teach Christianity? A more subtle form of the same danger faces multitudes of missionaries. Take the case of Korea a few years ago:

"It should be premised here," says Mr. George W. Gilmore, in his bright work on "Korea From Its Capital" (Presbyterian Board. 1893. p. 294), "that every one of the ministers from the United States to the Court of Korea has construed the treaty between the two countries to mean that the work of teaching and preaching Christianity is not allowed. It provides that men may live in the capital for the purpose of studying the language, and it is under cover of this provision that missionaries are now resident in the country."

That is an ominous and disagreeable word: "Under cover of." And the narrative runs on to point out that the first Presbyterian missionary to Korea "was not known at first as a missionary," but "went ostensibly to practice his profession as a physician;" that his standing as a missionary was unknown even to the United States minister, under whom he served as physician to the American legation; that it was by his "shrewdness" and the "discretion" of his immediate successors that a beginning of Christian missions was made—and so on. I have no intention of passing a condemnation on these brethren. One would better, before doing such a thing as that, examine all the circumstances on the ground. But is there not an unpleasant flavor in the mouth as we read such an account? Do we not feel that it would require great discretion indeed—possibly more than you or I possess—to preserve our integrity as servants of the God of Truth, in such trying circumstances? No wonder that the narrator calls it "a hard position in which to be placed." Its hardness consists, however, not in the choice whether we will break the law of the land in order to preach Christianity, but whether we will keep the law of Christ in preaching it.

Take the situation in Japan. For traveling in the interior, passports have been necessary—to be secured from the central government.

“A very uncomfortable thing about these passports,” writes the Rev. M. L. Gordon, M. D., in his “An American Missionary in Japan” (p. 88), “is that they are granted only ‘for health or scientific purposes.’ Because of this fact, some missionaries are unwilling to use them for evangelistic touring, and so confine themselves to the vicinity of the open ports.”

All honor, we say, to such missionaries. A keen and high sense of honor is itself an evangelizing endowment. We condemn no one. But if you and I were there, might we not find ourselves in danger of “doing an evil that a good might come?” And may we not be sure that God will smile on those who seek to serve Him, though even to the apparent hurt of the cause they love?

I must bring these desultory remarks to a close. I have no intention to seek to mention all the dangers to which missionaries are exposed. It may even be truly said that missionaries are no more exposed to the dangers that I have mentioned than to others which are precisely opposite to them. A missionary may be so hard and dry in his mode of proclaiming the truth that so far from being in danger of letting go the distinctive principles of Christ, he is in danger of forgetting to place those principles within the reach of his hearers. He may be so very careful of his own personal integrity that he fails to enter open doors, and prevents the spread of true Christianity by his litigious persistence in pressing petty points of no moral value—“losing his life” by his own attempts to “save” it. But all this only the more emphasizes the multiplicity of the dangers amid which he walks, and shows us in increased clearness how circumspectly a missionary needs to walk if he is to adorn, as well as proclaim, the Gospel of the Grace of God. It also increases our admiration for our missionaries who, amid so many and such subtle dangers, do walk so circumspectly as to adorn the Gospel. We do not think we could do it.

But that they do it, even those least in sympathy with them seem forced to admit. I have lately read, for example, a somewhat flippant book which gives an account of the ordinary mode of life among the British residents in Calcutta, from the point of view of a woman of the world. In it a missionary appears. Here is the description of him :

“The missionary padre receives his slender stipend from the S. P. G., or from some obscure source in America. It is arranged upon a scale to promote self-denial, and it is very successful. He usually lives where the drains are thickest and the smells most unmanageable, and when we of the broad river and the great Maidan happen to hear of his address, we invariably ejaculate, ‘What a frightfully long way off.’ The ticca-garry is not an expensive conveyance, but the missionary padre finds himself better commended by his conscience if he walks and pays the cost of his transportation in energy and vitality, which must be heavy in the hot weather and the rains. For the rest, he lives largely upon second-class beef and his ideals, though they don’t keep very well either in this climate. . . . Those who are married are usually married to missionary ladies of similar size and complexion, laboring in the same cause. . . . The official padre’s wife looks like any other memsahib ; the missionary padre’s wife looks like the missionary padre. I believe that chaplains sometimes ask missionary padres to dinner ‘quietly,’ and always make a point of giving them plenty to eat. And I remember meeting a married pair of them. . . . It was in the hot weather and they spoke appreciatively of the punkah. They had no punkah, it seemed, either day or night ; but the little wife had been very clever and had made muslin bags for their heads and hands to keep off the mosquitoes while they were asleep. We couldn’t ascertain that either of them had been really well since they came out, and they said they had simply made up their minds to have sickness in the house during the whole of the rains. . . . They knew little of the Red Road or the Eden Gardens, where the band plays in the evenings ; they talked of strange places—Khengua Pattoo’s Lane—Coolestollah. [The wife] told us that her great difficulty in the zenanas lay in getting the ladies to talk. . . . and [the husband] had been down in the Sunderbunds, far down in the Sunderbunds, where the miasmas are thickest, and where he had slept every night for a week on a bench in the same small room with two baboos and the ague. . . . He was more emaciated than clever,” etc. (*The Simple Adventures of a Mem sahib*. By Sara Jeannette Duncan. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1895. pp. 238).

Not an attractive picture, you will say ? That depends, however, on your point of view. From the world’s point

of view it is a very unattractive picture—though we cannot help fancying that even the authoress intended it partly as a compliment to missionaries. From God's point of view I should think it would be very attractive—for after all what "is required in stewards is that a man be found faithful." (1 Cor. 4:27.) A caricature, no doubt it is, but a caricature which would not have been possible were not the average missionary both strenuous and faithful.

And bearing such a description of his ways in mind, perhaps we may say in conclusion, that the greatest danger to which the missionary is exposed is that, in the zeal for souls that burns in his bones like a fire, and in his yearning desire to reap the fruits of his labors, he may forget the weakness of the human frame and wear himself out in toils that are too abundant, or cast himself away through sicknesses that are avoidable. The conditions of life in most mission fields are so different from those to which the missionary is accustomed at home, that a serious strain upon his physical system is unavoidable. It will be well if he does not unduly increase the strain and thus unduly decrease his usefulness by assuming burdens which no flesh can bear. Here, too, the rule is applicable that our zeal for God requires tempering with knowledge. Not that the missionary should not hold himself ready to give his life, if need be, for the cause to which he has devoted it; for here, too, is it true that he who would save his life shall lose it, and he who would lose his life for Christ's sake shall gain it. But that he should never be ready to throw away so valuable a life as his, through impatience with the limitations of human powers. In this matter, too, let us listen to the traditional saying of our Lord, which Dr. Westcott has adopted as his motto in life: "Be ye good money-changers." Let the missionary set high store on his life and strength—barter with them, sell them dearly—see to it that when they go down under the accumulated labors that will fall upon

them, they bring a great price—the greatest price procurable—in souls. They have been given him not to be flung away as things of little value; they are his capital—let him put them out at long interest, that they may earn great gains to present the Householder when He comes and asks for an account of his stewardship.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

Princeton.

II. THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION AND CATECHISMS.

In every age men are confronted by the question, Is religion rational or ritual? Is it a matter of faith or of form? On one side of that question the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments takes its stand, and over against it is arrayed every other religion known to man. We need not stop to inquire whether this was the original attitude of all forms of faith beside the Jewish and the Christian, or whether in some instances it has been brought about through the perversion of their primitive character and intent. The fact is obvious that among the religious systems of the world to-day the Scripture alone maintains that religion is not ritual but rational, is not a matter of form but of faith. Character is more than conduct. Motive gives quality to action. Religion has its seat in the mind and heart, and the soul of religion is faith. Faith has two elements, belief, the faith of the mind; trust, the faith of the heart. Faith is not reason, but faith is rational. Scripture appeals to reason, must be received, interpreted and applied by reason. Truth must be apprehended by the understanding before it can touch the heart or shape the life. John Locke said truly that to decry reason in the interest of faith is to put out the eyes in order to look through a telescope. The wise man applies the glass of faith to the eye of reason. "Come, now, and let us reason together," is the word of the Old Testament; "Come and see" is the word of the New. The Bible is a plain book for plain men. "All things in Scripture," says the Confession (I. 7), "are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or

other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in the due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them." The Scripture has no hidden shrines, no veiled divinities, no mysteries but such as spring from the laws of our nature and the limitations of our powers. The truth lies open before us like the heavens, where no bounds are set to vision but those which the eye itself imposes. However it may be, then, with other systems, theology, creed, confession are the inevitable outgrowth of Scripture. A rational religion invites logical statement. Theology is related to the Word as science to the works of God. In the study of his works and of his Word alike it is the prerogative of reason, as Kepler said, to think God's thoughts after him. We cannot live out of doors in the realm of thought, and we fashion a creed as instinctively as we build a home.

Two hundred and fifty years ago the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church were framed, the Confession and the Catechisms, and they remain substantially unaltered to this day, not as a venerable relic, a historical monument, but as the living exponent of the faith of one of the largest bodies of Christians on the globe. It becomes us to inquire what are the qualities that have given them this permanence and vitality. Great revolutions have taken place in Church and State, the face of the world has been changed, yet these symbols of faith remain almost untouched by the finger of time and the progress of the age.

The most striking and important characteristic of the Confession is that it is Scriptural throughout. It proposes and endeavors to draw its material from the Word of God alone without intrusion of human philosophy or speculation. God reveals himself in many ways, but the truth conveyed in every other mode of revelation is comprehended and interpreted in his Word. The Scripture, therefore, is the sole and sufficient source from which our theology may be drawn. Nature and providence may confirm

and illustrate the truth of the Word; they have nothing to add or to detract. The Confession is not perfect, it is not free from all taint of speculation; but it is an honest, and in the main, successful attempt to set forth the teaching of the Scripture, and that alone. Even those who believe that the Westminster divines have often erred in their interpretation will yet rejoice that they have put such abundant honor upon the Word of God.

Moreover the Confession aims not only to expound in logical order the teaching of the Scripture, and that alone; but to comprehend the whole range of Scripture truth, what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. Observe how clearly and comprehensively the great truths of the Word are marshalled, with what logical skill and completeness the system is wrought out and compacted. First, the Scripture is treated, the authoritative source from which our knowledge of God and his relation to man is derived. Then God is declared, as he has made himself known in his Word, Almighty Maker and Ruler of heaven and earth, subsisting in the form of the Trinity, three Persons in One Nature. Next is set forth his eternal decree, the program of the universe, of which all the events of time and eternity are the orderly unfolding, "Through the ages one increasing purpose runs." In the mighty sweep of that purpose all things are comprehended, to it all creatures are subservient, as it marches on in the strength of omnipotence to its eternal consummation. Then follow the works of creation and providence, in which God executes his decree. Man is introduced as the glory and crown of the creation, and the story of his origin, his fall, his punishment is told. The promise of salvation followed hard upon the sin, and the covenant of redemption, with the Son of God as the Redeemer, is unfolded. The part of God in the work of redemption is shown—effectual calling, which lays the foundation of man's hope not in himself but in God; justification, adoption, sanctification. Then

man's part is declared, saving faith, repentance unto life, good works, perseverance, assurance. Then the new life thus described in its general character is treated in various particulars—the law of God, Christian liberty and liberty of conscience, religious worship and the Sabbath day, lawful oaths and vows, the civil magistrate, marriage and divorce, the Church, the communion of saints, the sacraments, church censures, Synods and Councils. Thus the Christian life is set forth first in its own nature, then as it is related to the law of the State; and as it is organized in the Church. And the survey is closed with the vision of the world to come, death, the resurrection, the judgment, life and death eternal. Thus the Confession essays to trace in broad outline the sweep of the divine decree from its birth in the counsels of eternity to its fulfillment in the unending triumph of the kingdom of God.

Observe again the breadth of the Confession. It is broad because it is Scriptural. It is constantly affirmed, indeed, that the Confession is harsh, narrow, illiberal. On the contrary, it may be shown that in most important respects the Confession exhibits a breadth of view and a spirit of charity which reflect the largeness of the Word of God.

(a) Its recognition and defense of the right of private judgment. "The authority of the Holy Scripture dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God." (I. 4.) "The only infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." (I. 9.) "The Supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of Councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." (I. 10.) "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 doc-

trines 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." (XX. 2.) Civil magistrates may not interfere in matters of faith, and all denominations of Christians should stand upon an equal footing before the law. (XXIII. 3.) The decrees of Synods and Councils are to be received with reverence and submission, if consonant to the Word of God. (XXX. 2.) "All Synods or Councils since the Apostles' time, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred ; therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both." (XXXI. 3.) To these broad assertions of Christian liberty the progress of two hundred and fifty years has little to add.

(b) Its conception of the visible Church. "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the Gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children." (XXXV. 2.) No hard, exclusive, *jure divino* Presbyterianism is maintained. "We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by Congregational, Presbyterial and Synodical Assemblies. In full consistency with this belief, we embrace in the spirit of charity those Christians who differ from us in opinion, or in practice, on these subjects." (Form of Govt. VIII. 1.) The remains of Erastianism were erased when the Confession was brought across the sea, and the noble breadth and simplicity of this conception of the Church is one of the chief glories of our faith. It is easy to believe that the men who framed it cherished the hope of the reunion of Protestant Christendom. To our standards our practice is conformed, and in every man who accepts the gospel which Paul preached, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures ;

and that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures, we recognize a brother in the Lord.

(c) Its freedom from the polemic spirit. Creeds are generated by controversy. The Church is driven to define its position by the assaults of heresy, and the truth under God owes much to its enemies. Certainly the Westminster Confession is not devoid of the controversial temper. But error is refuted by the exhibition of truth. Heresy is overthrown, but no anathemas are launched against the heretic. To this rule there is a single unhappy exception, in the case of the Church and the Pope of Rome. Here the Confession is at fault, and has transgressed the principle of strict adherence to the Scripture to follow what is at best a doubtful interpretation of obscure passages of the Word. Apart from this the Confession is notably free from the polemic spirit. Contrast it in this regard with the so-called Athanasian creed, still in use in the services of the Church of England, with its fine-drawn definitions, its subtle distinctions, its labored attempt to compass the mystery of the Godhead, and its declaration that he who does not keep this faith whole and undefiled without doubt shall perish everlastingly; he that will be saved must think thus of the Trinity; "this is the Catholic faith; which, except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved."

It is worthy of special remark that the Confession contains no polemic against Arminianism, though the echoes of the Synod of Dort had not yet died away upon the troubled air. The truth, as the Westminster divines conceived it, was set forth with matchless clearness and precision, and left to bear its own witness. The kingdom of God is not promoted by the maledictions of the Church.

It is important to emphasize this aspect of our standards because they are often misrepresented. We are prone to magnify our differences, but the main value and highest glory of the Confession is not that it furnishes to one branch of the Christian Church an arsenal of controversial weapons,

but that it draws out and sets in order with masterly skill and completeness those great truths of Scripture which form the common faith of Christendom. For the larger part of the doctrinal contents of the Confession we hold in common with all branches of the Evangelical Church. Let us accustom ourselves to think of the Confession not merely as a barrier, but rather as a bond.

It becomes us to recognize this characteristic of our standards because there is no prospect that the Christian world will be united in the faith of Calvin. Centuries of conflict have brought the questions at issue between Calvinist and Arminian no nearer a decision. The battle has been fought in the cabinets of kings, in the halls of learning, with all the resources of scholarship. The strong arm of the civil power has been invoked. There are no reserves on either side ; there is no heavier artillery than that which is already engaged. Substantially all has been said that can be said on either side. The relative emphasis laid upon divine sovereignty and human freedom is largely determined by the inborn disposition of men, and the difference between Calvinist and Arminian is as deeply rooted in temperament as in theology. So long as both systems give birth to saintly and heroic souls, and bear fruit in holy living and good works, both will endure. Calvinism and Arminianism are not circles tangent at a single point, but circles described from a common centre, though they embrace different areas of truth. The relation between them ought to be one not of antagonism, nor even of an armed truce, but of cordial and brotherly alliance in the service of Jesus Christ.

This is not to say that the questions at issue are of no importance. They have an important bearing upon theology and life. Calvinism pursues at once the bolder and the more logical course. When propositions are submitted which appear contradictory, but which are both attested by sufficient evidence, it is the part of reason to accept

them both, even though we cannot reduce them to harmony. That is the attitude of Calvinism toward the doctrines of the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man. It can hardly be denied that upon the face of Scripture both appear, and that to eliminate either is, if not to do violence to the words of Scripture, at least to turn them from their natural and obvious meaning. There are three possible positions that may be assumed. 1. Fatalism. God's sovereignty denies man's freedom. Hyper-Calvinism approaches the faith of Islam. 2. Arminianism. Man's freedom abridges God's sovereignty. 3. Calvinism. God's purpose respects man's freedom, man's freedom fulfils God's purpose. God is sovereign, man is free. Without entering upon the vexed question of the nature and limits of the freedom of the human will, or rather of the human soul, of which the will is only a single faculty, it is sufficient for our purpose to observe that the Calvinist goes with the Arminian in carrying the freedom of man to the point of moral responsibility. It is further true, indeed, that Calvinism recognizes the freedom of man, emphasizes the sovereignty of God. That it does not undertake to reconcile these apparently discordant doctrines is a weakness, if such it be, that Calvinism must be content to share with the Word of God.

But while these questions are important, they are not vital either to religion or to theology, the science of religion. The essential truths of the Gospel are few and simple, and in them the Church of Christ must find its unity. The greater number of the branches into which the Church is divided can show no sufficient reason for existence. There are possible only a very few distinct forms of polity. All besides are only modifications of one or other of these original types. There are simply not enough points of doctrine or of polity to go round, unless we accept the mathematical definition of a point, as that which has no magnitude. Set the Confession over against any other evangeli-

cal creed, even those which diverge most widely from the system which it embodies, and the points of agreement are far more numerous and weighty than the points of difference. To the greater part of the teaching of our Confession the staunchest Arminian will respond with a hearty Amen.

Time will not suffer me to speak of the Catechisms, which present the same system of doctrine in the form of question and answer. The definitions which they furnish of such conceptions as God, sin, effectual calling, faith, repentance, justification, adoption, sanctification, sacrament, baptism, the Lord's Supper, prayer, are models of accuracy, clearness and precision. He who has mastered them is in possession of a theological equipment of the highest value. And it must be remarked that the catechetical method of instruction has been approved and employed by the wisest teachers of all time and of every people, and is commended by universal experience. To train our children in the Catechism is to set them in the way of clear thinking and holy living.

The Confession is not a polemic tractate. In spirit and intent it is not merely or mainly controversial. If that had been its character, it might long since have been remanded to that historical museum where so many pieces of theological ordinance are stored away, that have fought their battles, and are consigned to silence and oblivion. Because it is more than a controversial pamphlet, because it is a compact, logical, complete exposition of that system of doctrine which was taught by Calvin, by Augustine, by Paul, inwrought as we believe with the whole texture of Scripture truth, however it may be modified in detail, in its essential features it will remain unshaken while the world stands, to magnify the wisdom and the grace of God.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Baltimore, Md.

III. LANIER AS A POET.

Poetry in the South since the Civil War has been almost a neglected field of literature. Prose writers such as Joel Chandler Harris, George W. Cable, James Lane Allen, Richard Malcolm Johnston, Thomas Nelson Page and others of less note have flourished and seem to have absorbed the entire interest of the reading public. But of poetry there has been a dearth. Of the few poets who have warbled forth their songs only two or three have risen to anything like a conspicuous place in American literature.

Whether Poe's conviction that there was no equal chance for the native Southern poets be the true explanation of this fact or not, it would be idle here to discuss. The fact remains that since the Civil War there has been but one poet of renown in the South, and that poet was Sidney Lanier. Perhaps the ardent admirers of Timrod and of Paul Hamilton Hayne, "the poet laureate of the South," as his enthusiastic devotees, with more zeal than knowledge, are pleased to style him, would not permit this statement to pass unchallenged. Timrod's claim may be dismissed with the remark that he cannot properly be considered, as his premature death in 1867 closed his brief but promising career almost synchronously with the war. Of Hayne it may be said that he is not known outside of his own country and not very widely known even in America. It is significant to note here that when a few years ago Mr. Edmund Gosse, an eminent English critic and literateur, contributed to the *Forum* an essay upon the somewhat invidious question, "Has America produced a poet?" he made no mention whatsoever of Hayne (or of Timrod either, for the matter of that), but he did consider Lanier's claim to the distinction of being a poet.

It is the purpose of the present paper to consider Sidney Lanier as a poet.

Lanier was born at Macon, Georgia, on the third of February, 1842. From his parents he inherited his passion for music and poetry, for both on father's and mother's side the love of these two kindred arts dates so far back in the families as to amount to a traditional characteristic. So pronounced was Sidney's love for music that when only a child, his biographer tells us, "he learned to play almost without instruction, on every kind of instrument he could find; and while yet a boy he played the flute, organ, piano, violin, guitar and banjo, especially devoting himself to the flute in deference to his father, who feared for him the powerful fascination of the violin. For it was the violin-voice that, above all others, commanded his soul. He has related that during his college days, it would sometimes so exalt him in rapture that presently he would sink from his solitary music-worship into a deep trance, thence to awaken, alone, on the floor of his room, sorely shaken in nerve." It is not, therefore, surprising that Lanier followed music as his profession in life, since his love for it even from childhood amounted to a passion. The effect, too, of his all-absorbing passion for music upon his poetry is quite pronounced. Whether he would have devoted himself wholly to music or to poetry, had he found some Maecenas to provide for his material wants, it would be impossible to say. Certain it is that his *res augusta domi* prevented the full fruition of his passionate love of either music or poetry, by degrading the products of his genius to the sordid level of their commercial value, in order to enable him to eke out a living for himself and his family. Alas, too often has nature imposed so severe a condition of existence upon her sons of genius.

Even in his college days he felt the drawing influence of the two kindred arts of music and poetry upon his soul; and concerning his vocation in life he says in his college

note-book : "The point I wish to settle is merely, by what method shall I ascertain what I am fit for, as preliminary to ascertaining God's will with reference to me ; or what my inclinations are as preliminary to ascertaining what my capacities are ; that is, what I am fit for. I am more than all perplexed by this fact, that the prime inclination, that is, natural bent (which I have checked, though) of my nature is to music ; and for that I have the greatest talent ; indeed, not boasting, for God gave it me, I have an extraordinary musical talent and feel it within me plainly that I could rise as high as any composer. But I cannot bring myself to believe that I was intended for a musician, because it seems so small a business in comparison with other things which, it seems to me, I might do."

I think it was Lanier's weakness, if that is not too strong a word to use, that he could not definitely make up his mind whether he was intended for a musician or a poet. He felt both passions in his soul struggling for utterance. Or, as Stedman has beautifully expressed it, "in him the sister-spirits of Music and Poesy contended with a rivalry as strong as that between 'twin daughters of one race,' both loving and both worshipped by one whom death too soon removed while he strove to perfect their reconciliation." Had he been able to determine in his early life, once for all, that nature intended him for a musician, like Paganini, he might have moved vast audiences to rapturous delight by the soul-stirring music of his violin. But then we should have been deprived of much fine, graceful poetry which adorns and enriches American literature. On the other hand, if he had followed, untrammelled, his literary bent and poetic taste, he would probably have produced more copious and spontaneous verses and of a supernal beauty. In short, had he been less of a musician, he would probably have been more of a poet. Even as it was, he has left us much poetry that is destined to something more than a fugitive existence, yea to an immortality as endur-

ing as the republic of American letters, and has won for himself a place among the first poets of America. He is not, then, of that class of poets who, as Wordsworth said with keen poetic insight, "ne'er have penned their inspiration."

But Lanier was not permitted to devote himself, uninterrupted, to his chosen pursuits. From cultivating the Muse he was called by his duty to his country to enlist in the Confederate army, and with his company from his native Georgia, he was sent to do service, brave soldier that he was, upon the battle-scarred soil of Virginia. But the life of a soldier was not to his taste, just as it has not been to the taste of many another literary man from the days of the genial Horace down to the present. In "Tiger Lilies," a novel he wrote the year after the close of the war, he has given us a picture of his experiences in Point Lookout prison, where he was kept in close confinement for five months during the latter part of his career as a soldier. Even during his imprisonment he had with him his indispensable flute, which he had concealed under his sleeve when he entered the prison. On his release he made his way, on foot, back to his home in Georgia, only to be prostrated, upon his arrival, by a desperate illness, from which he recovered with shattered health. It was during the war that he felt the premonitions of that fell disease consumption, with which the rest of his life was a pathetic struggle, and to which, like the poet 'whose name was writ in water,' he was in the end to succumb.

To provide for the material needs of himself and his little family, he addressed himself successively to teaching and the practice of law. But neither of these professions, though they may have yielded him bread enough for his wife and babes, satisfied the poet-spirit in the man. His artistic nature was starving, and the keen pangs of that hunger were torturing his sensitive soul. It was during this period that he wrote to his friend, Bayard Taylor,

those pathetic lines, "I could never describe to you what a mere drought and famine my life has been. . . . Perhaps you know that, with us of the younger generation in the South, since the war, pretty much the whole of life has been merely not dying." He resolved to seek a more congenial atmosphere where his feeling for art might expand and develop. Accordingly, in December, 1873, he moved to Baltimore and procured for himself an engagement as first flute for the Peabody Symphony Concerts. It was several years after this that he was appointed lecturer on English literature in the Johns-Hopkins University.

"With his settlement in Baltimore," says Ward, in his memorial essay, "begins a story of as brave and sad a struggle as the history of genius records. On the one hand was the opportunity for study, and the full consciousness of power, and a will never subdued; and on the other a body wasting with consumption, that must be forced to task beyond its strength not merely to express the thoughts of beauty which strove for utterance, but from the necessity of providing bread for his babes."

To his father who desired him to return to Georgia and settle with him and share his income, the poet wrote: "My dear father, think how, for twenty years, through poverty, through pain, through weariness, through sickness, through the uncongenial atmosphere of a farcical college and of a bare army and then of an exacting business life, through all the discouragement of being wholly unacquainted with literary people and literary ways—I say, think how, in spite of all these depressing circumstances, and of a thousand more which I could enumerate, these two figures of music and poetry have steadily kept in my heart so that I could not banish them. Does it not seem to you as to me, that I begin to have the right to enroll myself among the devotees of these two sublime arts, after having followed them so long and so humbly, and through so much bitterness?"

But Lanier had faith in his mission; and it was this in-

domitable, never-failing faith in his own mission that inspired his heart amid all the sufferings he endured for the present and nerved that heart against the ominous future his frequently recurring hemorrhages boded. Under the inspiration of this implicit confidence in his mission he wrote to his wife, after one of his hemorrhages, "Were it not for some circumstances which make such a proposition seem absurd in the highest degree, I would think that I am shortly to die, and that my spirit hath been singing its swan-song before dissolution. All day my soul hath been cutting swiftly into the great space of the subtle, unspeakable deep, driven by wind after wind of heavenly melody." And again, to comfort his wife and dispel a lurking suspicion she entertained that he had, after all, perhaps made a mistake in devoting his life to literature, he wrote :

"Know, then, that disappointments were inevitable, and will still come until I have fought the battle which every great artist has had to fight since time began. This—dimly felt while I was doubtful of my own vocation and powers—is clear as the sun to me now that I *know*, through the fiercest tests of life, that I am in soul, and shall be in life and utterance, a great poet.

"Now this is written because I sit here in my room daily, and picture *thee* picturing *me* worn, and troubled, or disheartened; and because I do not wish thee to think up any groundless sorrow in thy soul. Of course I have my keen sorrows, momentarily more keen than I would like any one to know; but I thank God that in a knowledge of Him and of myself which cometh to me daily in fresh revelations, I have a steadfast firmament of blue, in which all clouds soon dissolve. I have wanted to say this several times of late, but it is not easy to bring one's self to talk so of one's self, even to one's dearer self.

"Have, then no fears nor anxieties in my behalf; look upon all my disappointments as mere witnesses that art has no enemy so unrelenting as cleverness, and as rough

weather that seasons timber. It is of little consequence whether *I* fail; the *I* in the matter is a small business: '*Que mon nom soit fletri, que la France soit libre !*' quoth Danton; which is to say, interpreted by my environment, Let my name perish—the poetry is good poetry and the music is good music, and beauty dieth not, and the heart that needs it will find it."

Here, then, we have Lanier's confession of his own conviction that he was a poet, nay a great poet—a conviction that grew with his years. Perhaps it is time for us to inquire, was Lanier a great poet? The unbiased answer to this question must, in my humble judgment, be in the negative if by a great poet is meant one who is entitled to rank with the world's great poets, such as Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Byron and Tennyson, to mention only moderns. But while he is not entitled to rank with these world-poets, so to say, nor even with such lesser lights as Shelley or Keats, he is yet a poet whose work has in it elements of permanency and will bear comparison with the best poetic product that America has produced. Let us, then, if we may, review his poetic output and examine more in detail its quality.

The first poem of Lanier which won for him the admiring attention of the reading public was "Corn," written in 1874. Most of his work prior to this time was not above mediocrity, and therefore hardly need be passed in review. It was the prestige that this poem gave its author that subsequently won for him the distinction of being invited to write the Centennial Cantata. (That poem, however, did not enhance his reputation.) The theme of "Corn" is, in its nature, prosaic enough; and yet the author invested this commonplace subject with a poetic air and coloring, weighing the respective claims of both corn and cotton upon the attention of the farmer and pointing out the disastrous results of speculation. Lanier could hardly resist the temptation which his theme offered of pointing a moral.

Here, as so frequently in his poems, like Wordsworth when not at his best, he lapses into didacticism, apparently oblivious of the fact that didacticism is a relentless foe to poetry of the first water. Lanier was not, however, the first to write upon such a theme as corn. The path had been blazed out before by Whittier. But it is to be said to Lanier's credit that he surpassed his predecessor in poetic conception and technical execution.

"Corn" was quickly followed by "The Symphony," a poem no less unique than beautiful, in which the author expresses through the musical instruments as speakers his own feelings and sentiments. Here he portrays, under the guise of a dialogue between the instruments, the deadening effect of the trade-spirit upon the human heart and affections and suggests as the remedy for the heartlessness of trade more love for humanity. Indeed, the key-note of the poem is love, which is struck by the violins in the very first couplet:

"O Trade! O Trade! would thou wert dead!
The Time needs heart—'tis tired of head."

Love is the specific for all the ills of trade. It is this point that reconciles the poor even to their contracted and narrow life, as they long for a broader, a fuller life. It is this that brings man in closer touch with nature and puts him also in harmony with nature's God. It is this that leads to purity, not only in woman but also in man, and beckons and allures both man and woman to a higher and nobler life. In a word, the poem is an attempt to put in graceful, poetic form the second great commandment of the Gospel, "Love thy neighbor as thyself;" and the musician-poet closes it with that beautiful line,

"Music is love in search of a word."

Lanier felt, and felt keenly, the sentiment he expressed in "The Symphony." In a letter to Judge Bleckley he says concerning the trade-spirit: "Trade has now had posses-

sion of the civilized world for four hundred years ; it controls all things, it interprets the Bible, it guides our national and almost all our individual life with its maxims ; and its oppressions upon the moral existence of man have come to be ten thousand times more grievous than the worst tyrannies of the feudal system ever were. Thus, in the reversal of time, it is now the *gentleman* who must rise and overthrow Trade. That chivalry which every man has, in some degree, in his heart ; which does not depend upon birth, but which is a revelation from God of justice, of fair dealing, of scorn of mean advantages ; which contemns the selling of stock which one *knows* is going to fall to a man who *believes* it is going to rise, as much as it would condemn any other form of rascality, or of injustice, or of meanness ; it is this which must in these latter days organize its insurrections and burn up every one of the cunning moral castles from which Trade sends out its forays upon the conscience of modern society."

In his "Song of the Chattahoochee," published in 1877, the poet showed his mastery of an art as beautiful as it is rare. The charming lilt and melody of this song place it second only to Tennyson's "Brook," and its music haunts the memory almost as powerfully as Poe's "Ululume." In the last stanza is seen an example of the poet's intense moral earnestness :

"But oh, not the hills of Habersham,
And oh, not the valleys of Hall
Avail: I am fain for to water the plain.
Downward the voices of Duty call—
Downward, to toil and be mixed with the main,
The dry fields burn, and the mills are to turn,
And a myriad flowers mortally yearn,
And the lordly main from beyond the plain
Calls over the hills of Habersham,
Calls through the valleys of Hall."

In the "Revenge of Hamish," published a year after the "Song of the Chattahoochee," Lanier essayed a new field of poetic art, that of the ballad ; and in this new venture he

achieved, by the vividness of the conception and the musical flow of the language, such high success as to challenge comparison with the very finest ballads in English literature. But it was in the "Marshes of Glynn" that he produced his most original poem, at least in conception. The theme itself is surely unpoetic enough—a dreary marsh such as one may see in Southern Georgia—and yet the poet, by his glowing imagination and sympathetic love of nature, has idealized it, and out of this vast dreary waste of water has built up an inspiring poem upon the illimitable greatness of God.

"As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God :
I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies
In the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh and the skies,
By so many roots as the marsh-grass sends in the sod
I will heartily lay me ahold on the greatness of God :
Oh, like to the greatness of God is the greatness within
The range of the marshes, the liberal marshes of Glynn."

Another poem which is indebted for its inspiration to the same source as the "Marshes of Glynn" is "Sunrise," a wonderful poem if we consider the circumstances of its composition, written when the author's fever temperature registered one hundred and four degrees and he was nearing the end of his brief life. "Sunrise" shows to a still more astonishing extent even than the "Marshes of Glynn" the poet's mastery of the technical beauties of rhythm and his unflinching love of nature, which amounted almost to a passion. In the concluding stanza of this poem Lanier gives expression to his unswerving devotion to art :

"And ever my heart through the night shall with knowledge abide thee,
And ever by day shall my spirit, as one that hath tried thee,
Labor, at leisure, in art—till yonder beside thee
My soul shall float, friend Sun,
The day being done."

He saw that sun with a clear vision, undimmed by the mists and damps of his hard-cast life, when his day was done. And that sun to him was God, just as it was to

Turner, the great English landscape painter, who, as he lay dying and beheld the sun through the London mists, exclaimed, "The sun is God."

One of Lanier's most exquisitely beautiful and delicate poems is that to his wife's eyes, "My Springs." Indeed, there is scarcely a finer poem of its kind in the whole range of English literature. It is too long to quote in its entirety, and to give simply a selection would be to mutilate it. Another snatch of song, written in his early days, is the "Betrayal," which I will venture to quote :

"The sun has kissed the violet sea,
 And burned the violet to a rose.
 O Sea ! Would'st thou not better be
 Mere violet still ? Who knows ? who knows ?
 Well hides the violet in the wood ;
 The dead leaf wrinkles her a hood,
 And winter's ill is violet's good ;
 But the bold glory of the rose,
 It quickly comes and quickly goes—
 Red petals whirling in white snows,
 Ah, me !

"The sun has burnt the rose-red sea :
 The rose is turned to ashes gray.
 O Sea, O Sea, mightst thou but be
 The violet thou hast been to-day !
 The sun is brave, the sun is bright,
 The sun is lord of love and light ;
 But after him it cometh night.
 Dim anguish of the lonesome dark !
 Once a girl's body, stiff and stark,
 Was laid in a tomb without a mark,
 Ah, me !"

Lanier's poetry was inspired by the muse of Christendom. Not that it breathes an introspective or mystical air, which, as Heyne thought, tended to chill and ultimately to freeze the Homeric gods ; nor that it is what is technically called religious poetry, such as the work of Watts or Wesley. Lanier drew his inspiration from the New Testament ; his poetry teaches an evangel of love. His entire work is so shot through with this sentiment as to render selections for

illustration quite unnecessary. It furnishes the *motif* of his poem, "How Love Looked for Hell," and occurs in "Absence," where he says that love is the redeeming quality of life that makes it worth living.

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

Endowed with so noble a gift of heart, he ever strove to inculcate a broader and more catholic love and a larger tolerance on the part of Christians. Witness here his "Remonstrance." He has left us his own ennobling conception of Christ in the "Crystal." Nor was he content to preach this gospel of love simply. He also practiced it and lived it before others. It colored his very conception of beauty and art. Nay, he regarded love as inseparably linked with these. Probably no artist ever invested his calling with more sacredness than did he. Like the Hebrew seer of old, his soul was kindled to ecstatic enthusiasm by the "beauty of holiness ;" and he loved these words, his biographer tells us, and liked to reverse the phrase and speak of the "holiness of beauty." In his glowing admiration of this sentiment he reminds us of Milton and Ruskin. Lecturing before the students of the Johns-Hopkins University, he said :

"So far from dreading that your moral purpose will interfere with your beautiful creation, go forward in the clear conviction that unless you are suffused—soul and body, one might say—with that moral purpose which finds its largest expression in love ; that is, the love of all things in their proper relation ; unless you are suffused with this love, do not dare to meddle with beauty ; unless you are suffused with beauty, do not dare to meddle with love ; unless you are suffused with truth, do not dare to meddle with goodness ; in a word, unless you are suffused with truth, wisdom, goodness and love, abandon the hope that the ages will accept you as an artist."

After a careful review of Lanier's poetry the conviction is irresistible that he was intensely in earnest. He was no

'idle singer of an empty day,' to use Morris' phrase—a poet, by the way, with whose conception of the poetic mission Lanier had little sympathy. He looked upon the mission of a poet as sacred a thing as the office of an ancient Hebrew prophet. In answer to the question, What avails a poet? he replies:

"He beareth starry stuff about his wings
To pollen thee and sting thee fertile."

It was no doubt the man's intense earnestness of purpose that led Stedman to tax him with magnifying his office as poet. But he took equally as serious a view of the life of an artist. In the intensity of the moral purpose of his message to mankind he reminds us of the nature-intoxicated Lucretius, whom he studied and ardently admired, or better still, perhaps, of the ancient Hebrew prophet, Isaiah. For, as Callaway has said, Lanier was something of a Hebrew in his love of righteousness and something of a Hellene in his love of beauty.

Such, then, was Lanier the poet. Not a great poet, assuredly, in the sense that any poem of his is entitled to rank with that class of literature which Goethe called "*welt litteratur*," and yet a poet who interpreted life truly as far as he did interpret it, as far as his range extended. He possessed some of the elements of a great poet. He had a love of music as passionate as Milton's. But his genius, alas! was too much trammelled by the sad circumstances of his outward life, and this prevented him from becoming a great poet in utterance. Nevertheless, he is entitled to be classed with the very first American poets and is eminently worthy of a permanent place in the heart and affection of the American people.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

Ashland, Va.

IV. "THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS,
COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR :"¹ CONSID-
ERED AS A TYPE.

Notices of this book seem to have been slow in finding their way to the public. The very complete bibliography provided in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* mentions the book itself, but that is all. This looks as if the usually careful compiler of that bibliography had not met with any formal and extended criticisms of Dr. Smith's book. Certainly no such criticisms have fallen under the eye of the present writer. Indeed, I can, at the moment, recall but two notices of the book. One of these appeared in the *Expository Times*, the other in the *Christian Observer*. The former was sufficiently appreciative, but not judicious or discriminating. The latter was judicious, but not specially appreciative. For lack of space neither was at all adequate to the real merits, and still less to the real importance of the book. Of its merits I shall have occasion to speak later. Apart from all other considerations, its importance lies in the fact that from its title page to its last paragraph the book is typical. It reflects, as in a mirror, all the leading characteristics, the excellencies, and, one must add, the defects also of the school to which its author belongs.

The typical character of the book reveals itself in its very title. Let the reader refer to it again. He will find that it is not called by any such staid name as "A Commentary on the Minor Prophets." It is not a Com-

¹THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS, COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR. By George Adam Smith, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. IN TWO VOLUMES, Vol. II. Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, i.-viii., "Malachi," Joel, "Zechariah," ix.-xiv., and Jonah, with Historical and Critical Introductions.

mentary. It is not called, "An Exposition of the Minor Prophets." And, notwithstanding the fact that it is one of the series known as the "Expositor's Bible," it is not an exposition. The title reads, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Commonly Called the Minor," (here follow the names of such of the Minor Prophets as are treated in this volume) "with Historical and Critical Introductions." Now this title is not only sufficiently unconventional to have a literary flavor and individuality of its own, but it has an additional charm, viz. : it conforms strictly to reality. And, just here, it may not be amiss to add that, while Dr. Smith has succeeded in being unconventional throughout, sometimes even laboriously so, he has not been equally successful in imparting to all of his statements that peculiar charm that comes only from being conformed to reality. In his title, however, the combination of these two qualities, freshness and reality, is almost perfect and altogether happy. If one will be at the pains to read the title, he will have only himself to blame, if, on reading the book, he feels defrauded or disappointed. It contains comments, grammatical and otherwise, and many of them of an illuminating character ; it contains expositions, and some very fine ones ; but, as already stated, it is neither commentary nor exposition. It is for the most part a series of translations prefaced by historical and critical introductions. Dr. Smith's title then could hardly have been improved upon.

The freshness and force which characterize the title characterize the book. They characterize both its literary form and its thought. Dr. Smith will put more thought upon the wording of a phrase than many writers will put upon that of a whole paragraph. He will put more thought into a phrase than some will put into many paragraphs. The result justifies his expenditure of energy. Men will read what he writes. And as they read they cannot but become aware that they have come into contact with an automobile

mind. They perceive unmistakable evidences of a real mind, really wrestling with a real problem. They may sometimes feel that the processes of this mind are erratic, and that the positions to which these processes lead are worse than erratic, but, if they think at all, they are compelled to experience a certain sympathy with and admiration for the wrestling mind as it addresses itself with skill and energy to the mastery of its problem. Dr. Smith is no mere manipulator of other men's thoughts. He thinks. Everywhere his thought shows that it has been forged at his own furnace and stamped with his own image and super-scription. And because he does think, his readers will be apt to forgive him much—far too much. Carried forward upon the full, free-flowing tide of his learning, charmed by the chaste beauty and vigor of his style, mastered by the energy of his mental action, only too many of his readers will be apt to overlook the preposterousness of certain of his pre-suppositions, the perversity of his logic, the impossibility of his methods and the inconcinnities which mar his conclusions.

I call attention to these points of excellence in Dr. Smith's book for the special benefit of my younger brethren. They have golden opportunities to do valiant service for the truth. Let them remember that it was of the sword of Goliath, the Philistine, that David said, "There is none like that; give it me."

It is no mean compliment to the school to which Dr. Smith belongs to say that, in its literary merits, his book is typical.

In what has been said of the title I have already indicated that for reasons satisfactory to himself Dr. Smith has largely delegated to others the task of expounding the prophecies that fall within the compass of this volume, and has devoted himself to the problems of criticism and of the historical development of prophecy which they present. Such a procedure, however, is sufficiently remarkable to

demand something of the nature of explanation or justification. And here it will be only fair to permit Dr. Smith to speak for himself. He says : "The necessity of including in one volume so many prophets, scattered over more than three centuries, and each of them requiring a separate introduction, has reduced the space available for a practical application of their teaching to modern life. But this is the less to be regretted, that the contents of the nine books before us are not so applicable to our own day as we have found their greater predecessors to be. On the other hand, however, they form a more varied introduction to Old Testament criticism, while, by the long range of time which they cover, and the many stages of religion to which they belong, they afford a wider view of the development of prophecy."

Speaking of the first of these points Dr. Smith says : "To Old Testament criticism these books furnish valuable introduction—some of them, like Obadiah, Joel and 'Zechariah,' ix.-xiv., by the great variety of opinion that has prevailed as to their dates or their relation to the other prophets with whom they have passages in common ; some, like Zechariah and 'Malachi,' by their relation to the Law, in the light of modern theories of the origin of the latter ; and some, like Joel and Jonah, by the question whether we are to regard them as history, or as allegories of history, or as Apocalypse."

On the second of the two points mentioned above, he says : "But the critical and textual value of our nine books is far exceeded by the historical. Each exhibits a development of prophecy of the greatest value. From this point of view, indeed, the volume might be entitled, 'The Passing of the Prophet.' For throughout our nine books we see the spirit and style of the classic prophecy of Israel gradually dissolved into other forms of religious thought and feeling. The clear start from the facts of the prophet's day, the ancient truths about Jevohah and Israel, and the

direct appeal to the prophet's contemporaries, are not always given, or when given are mingled, colored and warped by other religious interests, both present and future, which are even powerful enough to shake the ethical absolutism of the older prophets." But I cannot quote farther.

Whether or not Dr. Smith has justified himself in substituting criticism of the prophets for expository comments, and that in a book published and sold under the title of "The Expositor's Bible," is a question about which I feel little interest or concern. The fact that he does make such substitution of criticism for expository comment is significant. Here again we have the characteristic of the entire school to which Dr. Smith belongs. Take, for instance, the series known as "The International Commentary," and it will be found that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, a proportionately small space is taken up in making plain what the Biblical author has said. Page after page is devoted to elaborating some theory of the so-called commentator in reference to double, triple, quadruple or quintuple authorship; or in showing up some absurdity or incongruity in the Biblical writer which the so-called commentator has, I dislike exceedingly to say it, himself devised.

In this connection, I may be permitted to add two remarks. The first is, that, when properly employed, there can be no exception taken to the validity of the methods and principles of historical criticism. With these, in the abstract, conservatives have no contention. It may fall in very well with the excellent opinions which "we moderns" entertain of ourselves and our achievements to represent the methods and principles of historical criticism as a recent discovery. Such boasts, however, must make the Muse of History blush. For she knows that there is merely enough truth in them to mislead the careless. The fact is that all the legitimate processes of the higher criticism, like the processes of logic, have their basis in the

very constitution of our minds. Their employment, to some degree or other, is scarcely optional. They come into play *sua sponte*, when the mind is confronted with the problems of higher criticism. What "we moderns" have done, and it is no mean service, is to give definite statement to these principles and methods; to bring them into formal relation one to another; and to apply them with a fuller consciousness of the fact that we are applying them, and so with greater chances of applying them consistently and successfully. Further, it ought not to be forgotten that these methods and principles are not the property of any one school. Nor does the use of them necessarily guarantee the correctness of the results reached. One's conclusion may be formally sound and yet his ratiocination as a whole fearfully rotten. In order to sound conclusions, sound methods and principles must be sanely used. Much, however, that in our day calls itself "historical criticism" is the very insanity of fancy prostituted to furnish plausible premises for foregone conclusions.

The other remark that ought to be made in order to prevent misconception is simply this: No language is too strong to express my appreciation of the laborious patience of the minute investigation instituted by writers, like Dr. Smith, in order to secure scientific accuracy in their results. They esteem no toil too great, no scrutiny too searching, no detail of form, phrase or thought, too minute to demand their consideration, if only they can get clearly before them all the factors that enter into the complex problem with which they undertake to deal. Nor can too great admiration be expressed for the amplitude of the learning which they bring to bear upon these problems. The evidence of such learning meets us on almost every page of Dr. Smith's book. And here lies the secret of the confidence which the general public seems disposed to repose in these men, and the homage it accords them. However it may hold in the forum of reason, or in that of conscience, no indictment

framed against them is likely to hold at the bar of the general public except as it is drawn by those who show themselves their peers in the respects I have indicated. Hence the folly and sin of the church, if she fails to raise up for God a body of men, not only of competent but of commanding scholarship. Such scholarship was never more demanded of her ministry than it is to-day.

Passing by other features of Dr. Smith's book which are typical, the remainder of this paper must be devoted to a somewhat fuller illustration of a single such feature. I refer to the tone and attitude which Dr. Smith assumes towards the Scripture writings and writers. The practical importance of this point must be obvious to all. The question has often been asked, What will be the effect upon the authority of Scripture, should the principles of Dr. Smith's school prevail? Dr. Smith's book furnishes the answer. And this answer, if less reassuring, seems more conclusive and convincing than some that have been given by the advocates of that school. Canon Cheyne, for instance, has written a volume entitled, "Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism." In it, he has undertaken to show that the legitimate result of the critical findings of his school is to increase our reverence for Scripture, and its value for edification. Dr. Driver has also given very comfortable assurances along the same line. But a greater than either has said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." (Would it be considered ungracious, should I recall the fact that he also said, "Beware of false prophets which come unto you in sheep's clothing?") I propose making a practical application of this test to the case in hand. In other words, I propose exhibiting in Dr. Smith's own words the effects of the principles of his school in his his own case. Surely this is fair. If these principles could be safe and wholesome in the hands of anyone, then, I may frankly say, I would have expected them to be found so in the case of Dr. Smith. Never did any reader come to

the perusal of a book with kindlier sentiments of confidence and regard for its author than were brought by the present writer to the perusal of Dr. Smith's book. And if I have been disappointed, I am compelled to believe that the fault is with Dr. Smith's critical principles rather than with Dr. Smith himself. But be that as it may, the fact is, that in this particular, as in others, Dr. Smith is a type. And it is fair to add that he is an exponent of the best element in his school.

What then is his tone, and what his attitude towards the Scripture writings and writers? The following quotations will sufficiently show. Let us begin, so to speak, with the minima. Here is what Dr. Smith has to say in regard to the style of Zechariah—he is speaking of the Visions—“Here the style is involved and redundant—the formulas ‘thus saith’ and ‘saying’ are repeated to weariness.” Dr. Smith admits that some of the defects in style to which he has referred may be traceable to corruptions of the text. But he adds, “There must of course have been a certain amount of redundancy in the original to provoke such aggravations of it, and of obscurity or tortuousness of style to cause them to be deemed necessary.” He is careful, however, to make this excuse for the prophet, “Of course the involved and and misty subjects of the latter (that is the Visions) naturally forced upon the description of them a laboriousness of art to which there was no provocation in directly exhorting the people to a pure life.” Again, in another place, he refers to the “strained art and obscure truths of the Visions.” That Dr. Smith cannot wholly excuse the prophet, however, appears from the fact that after having made every allowance possible he feels constrained to say, “The problem, therefore, remains—how one who had gift of speech, so straight and clear, came to torture and tangle his style.”

Dr. Smith adopts the same tone in speaking of the style of Haggai. He says, “The sneers of modern writers have

not been spared upon a style that is crabbed and jejune, and they have esteemed this to be a collapse of the prophetic spirit." Then follows the usual generous partial apology. It concludes as follows, "What God's people themselves could do for themselves—that was what needed telling at the moment; and if Haggai told it with a meagre and starved style, this also was in harmony with the occasion. One does not expect it otherwise when hungry men speak to each other of their duty." I cite these passages not because of any special importance that attaches to the matter of style, looked at in itself, but partly because they exhibit the force and finish of the style of which Dr. Smith is himself master, and partly because they will prepare the reader for what is to follow. They notify us that Dr. Smith, while disposed to deal generously with Scripture writers, can nevertheless, when occasion demands, deal with them with the utmost, most unflinching, unreserved faithfulness. Whether at times both his generosity and his severity are not overdone, even wholly misplaced, will of course be a question by itself. It is, however, a question upon which we need not stop. We are concerned rather with ascertaining and setting forth what are Dr. Smith's tone and attitude towards the Scripture writers, rather than with determining whether or not these are what they should be.

Let us pass on to notice Dr. Smith's estimate of the mental grasp of certain of the prophets. Speaking of prophecy during the Persian period, he says: "We miss, too, the clear outlook of the earlier prophets upon the history of the world, and their calm rational grasp of its forces. The world is still seen, and even to further distance than before. The people abate no whit of their ideal to be the teachers of mankind. But it is all through another medium. The lurid air of Apocalypse envelopes the future, and in their weakness to grapple either politically or philosophically with the problems which history offers, the prophets

resort to the expectation of physical catastrophes and of the intervention of supernatural armies. Such an atmosphere is not the native air of prophecy, and prophecy yields its supreme office in Israel to other forms of religious development. On one side the ecclesiastic comes to the front—the legalist, the organizer of ritual, the priest; on the other, the teacher, the moralist, the thinker and the speculator. At the same time personal religion is perhaps more deeply cultivated than at any other stage of the people's history." I hope that I shall be pardoned for adding that last sentence to my quotation. Of course it is not strictly relevant to the main purpose for which the quotation is made. It will, however, at least serve to show that Dr. Smith is dimly conscious of a problem which his school have conjured up for themselves, but with which they have made no serious effort to grapple. I refer to the fact that they would have us believe that from the same religious fountain there were going forth at one and the same time sweet waters and bitter. They are shut up to maintaining that the spent religious forces of the nation were at one and the same time going to seed in the ritualism and formalism of the Law (Dr. Smith himself pays this venerable relic of the religious past the graceful tribute of spelling it with a capital—"Law"), and striking root downward and bearing fruit upward in the splendid spirituality of the Psalms. But, like Dr. Smith, I can only glance at this interesting problem and pass it by. Our present business is with other elements in Dr. Smith's vivid, if somewhat startling and uncompromising portrait of prophecy during this critical period of Israel's history. Let the reader run his eye over it again. If he is in the habit of thinking at all he will be apt to find that it breeds many questions in his mind. I cannot go into them, nor even glance at them. I shall not call into question his "lurid" description of Apocalypse, nor ask by what authority Dr. Smith characterizes God's accredited messengers in the

way he does. I shall not ask what he does with Apocalypse in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. In reference to all such matters, it is, perhaps, sufficient simply to remind one's self that to the "*sic volo, sic jubeo*" type of criticism "nothing is impossible." It is a law unto itself. What I do desire to do is simply to arrest attention upon the fact that the prophets of this period, if they were men of ordinary self-respect, could not but feel—mortified, shall I say? or indignant, at the portrait which this gifted literary artist has drawn of them. Happily, the prophets are long dead; and those long dead, of course, have no sensibilities to be wounded. Hence, doubtless, it is that criticism feels that there is no occasion for mincing her words when speaking of them. It does not fall within the province of this paper to inquire whether criticism has any need to consider that the God who commissioned these prophets, and spoke by them is still the living God, and so may be a factor worth reckoning with. The practical question is, What is likely to be the effect of this sort of "criticism" upon the living, the men and women of to-day, who are here with the problem of their own destiny actually upon their hands, and who have been inclined to look to the "more sure word of prophecy" for guidance and comfort? Let us look at Dr. Smith's account of the matter again. Here it is, very simple and intelligible—mental impotence confronted with the dark problems of history brought forth Apocalypse; and Apocalypse, that is revelation, revealed—mental impotence. Now let this scholarly conception of Dr. Smith penetrate the thick heads and permeate the thinking of the slow brains of us ordinary Anglo-Saxons; let us once become firmly seized of the idea that the darkness that characterizes Apocalypse does not truly represent or represent at all the clouds and darkness which serve at one and the same time to herald the coming of Jehovah and to hide his movements; let us become fully convinced that this darkness is occasioned by the dust which has been cast up by

discomforted prophecy to hide its impotence—I say, let this idea once become firmly lodged in men's minds and what will be its effect upon their reverence for Scripture? We Anglo-Saxons have our faults and our follies, but, so far as my observation goes, homage for exposed, impudent impotence masquerading in the terrors of deity has not been one of them. Dr. Smith may, indeed, continue to write prophecy with a capital "P," and so express his personal reverence for departed greatness, but will that be sufficient to inspire a similar reverence in others?

Having glanced at Dr. Smith's conception of Apocalypse, and gotten his view of the mental measure, and the methods of the prophets of the Persian period, let us next hear what he has to say of other prophets and their prophecies. "Criticism" has made us acquainted with a prophet nowhere explicitly mentioned in Scripture—I refer to him who is commonly known as the "Second Isaiah." It has said many very gracious things of him. Dr. Driver has assured us that he uttered genuine predictions, real disclosures of what would be the course of events in the future; not in the distant future, to be sure, but still sufficiently distant to give us all the assurance that we need that the prophet spoke from the mouth of God.

It sounds a little strange, therefore, and not wholly encouraging to hear Dr. Smith say, "We must remember that Haggai and Zechariah were addressing a people to whom (whatever view we take of the transactions under Cyrus) the favor of Cyrus had been one vast disillusion in the light of the predictions of the Second Isaiah." (219.)

From this it would appear that the "Second Isaiah" of "Criticism" was so unfortunate as to awaken expectations that were not to be realized in the sphere of history. I do not mean, of course, merely that he was misinterpreted, nor does Dr. Smith. The latter would doubtless scorn such a subterfuge. I mean that, according to Dr. Smith, those

who understood his words best, and trusted to them most implicitly fared worst. Those who walked in the light of his promises, in the end awoke to the realization of the bitter truth that they had been following up an *ignis fatuus*.

And what was true of the "Second Isaiah" was true, according to Dr. Smith, of Haggai. We read in the latter, "And the word of Jehovah came a second time to Haggai on the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, saying: Speak to Zerubbabel, Satrap of Judah, saying: I am about to shake the heavens and the earth, and I will overturn the thrones of kingdoms, and will shatter the power of the kingdoms of the Gentiles, and will overturn chariots and their riders, and horses and their riders will come down every man by the sword of his brother. In that day—oracle of Jehovah of Hosts—I will take Zerubbabel, the son of She'alti'el, My servant—oracle of Jehovah—and will make him like a signet ring; for thee have I chosen—oracle of Jehovah of Hosts."

Now upon these words Dr. Smith has the following interesting series of comments: "The wars and mutual destructions of the Gentiles of which Haggai speaks, are doubtless those revolts of races and provinces, which threatened to disrupt the Persian Empire upon the accession of Darius, 521. In four years Darius quelled them all and reorganized his empire before the Jews finished their Temple. Like all the Syrian governors, Zerubbabel remained his poor lieutenant and submissive tributary. History rolled westward into Europe. The signet-ring of Jehovah was not acknowledged by the world—does not even seem to have challenged its briefest attention. But Haggai had at least succeeded in asserting the Messianic hope of Israel, always baffled, never quenched, in this reopening of her life. He had delivered the ancient heritage of Israel to the care of the new Judaism."

I ask the reader to give both the prophecy and Dr. Smith's comment his most thoughtful attention. In regard

to the former, let him ask himself whether the prophet could have spoken with greater authority or with greater assurance? Would it have been possible for him to give in words a more vivid impression of his own conviction that he was speaking directly from the mouth of God? Could he, if he had tried, more fully have committed that God, for whom he professed to speak, to the effecting of the event predicted? And now let him ask himself whether the prophet who spoke these words could read Dr. Smith's comment without, I will not say chagrin and profound mortification, but without resentment? And why with resentment? Surely, not merely because, as a critic, Dr. Smith has felt obliged to tell the truth regardless of whose feelings may be wounded; nor merely because Dr. Smith has been pleased to assume that the words of the prophet will bear no other interpretation than one that brings them into direct and palpable conflict with the facts of history. I think that the prophet might possibly have read with a grim smile the blunt words of which the Scotch Professor makes use a little further on: "Four months had elapsed since Haggai promised that in a little while God would shake the world. But the world was not shaken." But I cannot avoid the feeling that, if the prophet possessed the slightest particle of self-respect, his indignation would have flamed out hot as he read these fine sentences—and they are very fine—in which Dr. Smith is at pains to attempt elaborately to prove that his prophecy—despite its thrice repeated "oracle of Jehovah"—was a miserable and even ridiculous fiasco.

Some one, however, may insist that while the Scotch Professor has been possibly unnecessarily elaborate in making obvious the untowardness of the prophet's utterance in this particular instance, his offence after all amounts only to a little over-indulgence in fine writing. I am aware, of course, of the fact that by his ordination vows, as well as by his occupancy of a chair in one of the Theological

Seminaries of the Free Church, Dr. Smith is committed to the position that the book of Haggai, including this oracle, is a part of the Word of God written. I am aware that, in the paragraph immediately following the one above quoted, Dr. Smith undertakes to defend Haggai against some who are disposed "to depress his value as a prophet almost to a vanishing point." Hence should Dr. Smith claim that these facts are of themselves sufficient evidence that he does entertain a due respect for the prophet, I trust that I should be the last to avail myself of his own critical methods to impeach his veracity; though anyone at all acquainted with those methods can easily see how this could be done, not only with poetic justice, but without any of the violence that characterizes Dr. Smith's application of the same methods to a writer, like the author of the book of Ezra. Admitting, then, that Dr. Smith does, doubtless, believe himself to have some sort of respect, such as it is, for Haggai, I should feel amply warranted in insisting that the manner in which he has expressed it is not at all calculated to inspire a similar sentiment in others. To stultify the prophet, and prove that the "Word of Jehovah" in his lips was but an empty phrase synonymous with the desire, and as the event proved the delusion of his own heart may not in the least interfere with Dr. Smith's reverence for the "Word of Jehovah," or his respect for the prophet who uttered it; but certainly if the above be a just exposition of the "Word of Jehovah" by Haggai, then, many will feel that they had just as well go to, let us say, Dr. Smith himself, or any of the "prophets" of his school for the "Word of Jehovah" as to Isaiah, or the "Second Isaiah," or Haggai. And he may feel quite sure that, if ever things should come to such a pass, at least one of the predictions of the "Second Zechariah" will not lack fulfillment: "And it shall come to pass, if any man prophecy again, then shall his father and mother who begat him say to him, Thou shalt not live, for thou speakest falsehood in the name of Jehovah; and his

father and his mother shall stab him for his prophecying. And it shall be in that day that the prophets shall be ashamed of their visions when they prophecy, and they shall not wear the leather cloak in order to lie." But I must pass on.

Without stopping to comment upon them individually, I shall next group together several statements from the Glasgow Professor which will throw light upon an important aspect of the matter under consideration. I mean the tone which Dr. Smith permits himself to assume towards the writers of Scripture.

Speaking of Nahum, he says, "Such is the sheer religion of the Proem to the Book of Nahum—thoroughly Oriental in its sense of God's method and resources of destruction; very Jewish, and very natural to that age of Jewish history, in the bursting of its long pent hopes of revenge. We of the West might express these hopes differently. We should not attribute so much personal passion to the Avenger. With our keener sense of law, we should emphasize the slowness of the process, and select for its illustration the forces of decay rather than those of sudden ruin. But we must remember the crashing times in which the Jews lived." (92).

Again speaking of Obadiah he indulges in this vein, "Brave, hot heart! It shall be as thou sayest; it shall be for a brief season. But in exile thy people and thou have first to learn many more things about the heathen than you can now feel. Mix with them on that far-off coast, from which thou criest. Learn what the world is, and that more beautiful and more possible than the narrow rule which thou hast promised to Israel over her neighbors shall be that world-wide service of man, of which, in fifty years, all the best of thy people shall be dreaming." (183).

Commenting upon Haggai's opening oracle, he says, "For ourselves, Haggai's appeal to the barren seasons and

poverty of the people as a proof of God's anger with their selfishness, must raise questions." (239).

Referring to Zechariah xiv, 17ff, he expresses himself thus, "But such a punishment for such a neglect shows how completely prophecy has become subject to the Law. One is tempted to think what Amos, or Jeremiah, or even 'Malachi' would have thought of this. Verily all the writers of the prophetic books did not stand upon the same level." (489).

This last, though not quite up to Dr. Smith's high grade of literary excellence, is in its way unsurpassed by anything in his book. It relieves the tension on the feelings caused by some of Dr. Smith's preceding pronouncements, and provokes a smile, not only because of the naive way in which it reveals what Dr. Smith thinks of Zechariah, but because it compels us to consider what Zechariah, or "even 'Malachi'" would think of Dr. Smith. One hardly knows which to admire more in the preceding excerpts, Dr. Smith's frank expression of appreciation of whatever of excellence he may have discerned "even in 'Malachi'"; the steadiness and steadfastness with which he asserts and maintains his own critical independence; or the very delicate but thorough way in which he performs the difficult and disagreeable task of preventing his readers from suffering damage from the mistaken notions of the prophets. And yet, much as I admire the brilliance of the Glasgow Professor, I can but question whether he is quite wise to bring himself into such painfully pointed contrast even with "Malachi." For should the poor confused people of God ever find themselves compelled to forsake "Malachi" *et id omne genus*, and take up the distressed cry, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" I can but question whether a single voice from heaven or upon the earth would be heard to reply: "To George Adam Smith."

I come next to consider a yet more important element in the prophetic writings, as it appears in the light of Dr.

Smith's criticism. I refer to the ethical temper of the prophets and the ethical content of their productions. The reader is of course cognizant of the fact that "Criticism" has assured us that even after the Scriptures, viewed as histories, have been relegated by it to the waste basket, the world will take them from there for the sake of the "grand religious stories" which they unquestionably contain. Hence it is the more discouraging to hear Dr. Smith say :

"With Nahum and Obadaiah the ethical is entirely missed in the presence of the claims—and we cannot deny that they are natural claims—of the long-suffering nation's hour of revenge upon her heathen tyrants."

And again :

"In the Greek period, the oracles now numbered from the ninth to the fourteenth chapters of the Book of Zechariah repeat to aggravation the exulting revenge of Nahum and Obadiah, without the strong style or the hold upon history which the former exhibits, and show us prophecy still further enwrapped in apocalypse."

Nor is there much to encourage in such a portrait as this :

"For this (i. e. the punishments of "the incorrigible people of Jehovah") Nahum has no thought. His heart, for all its bigness, holds room only for the bitter memories, the baffled hopes and the unappeased hatreds of a hundred years. . . . Nahum's book is one great At Last !" (90).

"And, therefore, while Nahum is a worse prophet than Zephaniah, with less conscience and less insight, he is a greater poet, pouring fourth the exultation of a people long enslaved, who see their tyrant ready for destruction." (91).

And quite unique, at least in Anglo-Saxon religious literature is the following :

"About 1030 David, about 130 the Hasmonians, were equally at war with Edom ; and few are the prophets between those distant dates who do not cry for vengeance

against him or exult in his overthrow. The Book of Obadiah is singular in this, that it contains nothing else than such feelings and such cries. It brings no spiritual message. It speaks no word of sin, or of righteousness, or of mercy, but only doom upon Edom in bitter resentment at his cruelties and in exultation that, as he has helped to disinherit Israel, Israel shall disinherit him. Such a book among the prophets surprises us. It seems but a dark surge staining the stream of revelation, as if to exhibit through what a muddy channel these sacred waters have been poured upon the world. Is the book only an outbreak of Israel's selfish patriotism? This is the question we have to discuss in the present chapter." (178).

"It is, therefore, no mere passion for revenge, which inspires the few hot verses of Obadiah. No doubt, bitter memories rankle in his heart. He eagerly repeats the voices of a day when Israel matched Edom in cruelty and was cruel for the sake of gold, when Judah's kings coveted Esau's treasures and were foiled. No doubt there is exultation in the news he hears, that these treasures have been rifled by others; that all the cleverness of this proud people has not availed against its treacherous allies; and that it has been sent packing to its border. But beneath such savage tempers there beats a heart which has fought and suffered for the highest things, and now in its martyrdom sees them baffled and mocked by a people without vision and without feeling. Justice, mercy and truth; the education of humanity in the law of God, the establishment of His will upon earth—these things, it is true, are not mentioned in the book of Obadiah, but it is for the sake of some dim instinct of them that its wrath is poured upon those foes whose treachery and malice seek to make them impossible by destroying the one people on earth who then believed them and lived for them." (182, 3).

Let the reader remember that this last is designed by Dr. Smith to be a defense of the prophet. He follows it up

with the feeling apostrophe, "Brave, hot heart!" which we have already read. Now let us imagine the prophet Obadiah coming across it with this title, "*Apologia Pro Vita Prophetæ Abdiaë,*" and ask ourselves what would probably be the prophet's feelings. These feelings would of course be no criteria as to the justice of Dr. Smith's portrait, but they will, at least, serve to bring before us the effect that the prophet would expect it to have upon his reputation wherever it found acceptance as true to life. His only consolation would be that beneath his "savage tempers," and the "dark surge" with which he stained "the sacred waters of revelation," Dr. Smith has confessed that even he could discern "some dim instinct" of the fact that, in the prophet's mind, Israel somehow stood for "Justice, mercy and truth, the education of humanity in the law of God, and the establishment of His will upon earth." I fear, however, that to many of us moderns Dr. Smith will appear to have gone beyond the bounds of a wise magnanimity in finding in this "dim instinct" a paliation, if not a justification, of the prophet in emptying upon Edom the full viols of his poisonous, personal hate.

I come now to the last point to be considered in this paper. I refer to the cavalier way in which Dr. Smith brings into suspicion, or brushes aside the veracity of the statements made by one and another of the Scripture writers. The position of critical independence which he assumes towards the statements of the Book of Kings, and the critical freedom that he employs in referring to them appears in the following passages :

"Jerusalem was delivered in 701, and the Assyrians kept away from Palestine for twenty-three years. Judah had peace, and Hezekiah was free to devote his latter days to the work of purifying the worship of his people. What he exactly achieved is uncertain. The historian imputes to him the removal of the high places, the destruction of the Maceboth and Asheras and of the brazen serpent. (5.)

“The Book of Deuteronomy forms a problem by itself. The legislation which composes the bulk of it appears to have been found among the Temple archives at the end of our period and presented to Josiah as an old and forgotten work. There is no reason to charge with fraud those who made the presentation by affirming that they really invented the book. They were priests of Jerusalem, but the book was written by members of the prophetic party, and ostensibly in the interests of the priests of the country.” (10.)

What Hezekiah really did, in the present state of his information, Dr. Smith does not care positively to say. He deems it sufficient and safest to indicate that “the historian *imputes*” certain changes to him. And so as to the real purpose of the members of “the prophetic party” in writing Deuteronomy, Dr. Smith leaves it to his readers to surmise, if they can, what this purpose was. He contents himself by throwing out, as it were, a note of warning, to the effect that it was written “*ostensibly* in the interests of the country priests,” that is, the country priests as opposed to the priests of Jerusalem.

Those at all familiar with the trend of current criticism will be prepared for Dr. Smith’s critical reserve in reference to the Chronicler. It comes out not obscurely in such language as this :

“What grounds the Chronicler had for such a statement are quite unknown to us. He introduces Manasseh’s captivity as the consequence of idolatry, and asserts that on his restoration Manasseh abolished in Judah all worship save that of Jehovah, but if this happened (and the Book of Kings has no trace of it) it was without result.” (11.)

His estimate of the historicity of portions of the matter found in Ezra may be gathered from the following : “This last assertion, which of course was false, may have been due either to a misunderstanding of the Jewish elders by the reporting Satrap, or else to the Jews themselves, anxious to make their case as strong as possible. The

latter is a more probable alternative." No one, I think, should object to a spade's being called a spade. Hence it would be mere squeamishness to stumble at Dr. Smith's word "false," seeing that the "assertion" to which it is applied is unquestionably false. But I must confess that I cannot regard it as generous in Dr. Smith first gratuitously to construct the words of the record into a falsehood, and then gratuitously to put this falsehood into the mouths of the elders of the Jews. It will be observed that his reasoning is something like this: "This statement, as I have now found it, may very well be a deliberate falsehood, rather than a mere misunderstanding, hence it is, under all the circumstances, probable that it is a falsehood." It was this sort of "judicial" impartiality which gave to the "bloody Jeffries" his great distinction among Jurists. If such criticism does not secure for Dr. Smith a similar distinction among critics, it will only be because it is his misfortune to be exercising his function at a time when this style of criticism, so far from being exceptional, is quite the rule.

The following will be found to be in the same vein: "On these grounds, therefore, we must hold that the attempt to discredit the tradition of an important return of exiles under Cyrus has not been successful; that such a return remains the more probable solution of an obscure and difficult problem, and that therefore the Jews who with Zerubbabel and Joshua are represented in Haggai and Zechariah as building the Temple in the second year of Darius, 520, had come up from Babylon about 537. *Such a conclusion, of course, need not commit us to the various data offered by the Chronicler in his story of the Return, such as the Edict of Cyrus, nor to all his details.* (The italics are mine.)

It will be observed here that Dr. Smith distinctly refuses to commit himself to "the various data offered by the Chronicler in his story of the Return, such as the Edict of Cyrus," and "to all of his details." Of course every man's

first duty is to his own reputation. Hence no one can blame a person occupying Professor Smith's high position for having a care how he lends the influence of his name to loose and unhistorical statements from whatever source they may proceed—even though that source be the author of one of the books of the Bible. And yet, it must be obvious to all that just in proportion as Dr. Smith gains credit for discrimination by this off-hand, matter of course disclaimer, just in that proportion must the credit of the Chronicler suffer. It is much to be regretted that Dr. Smith felt compelled to assume such a position. It looks like a claim either to superior information or to superior morals. Of course, if Dr. Smith has detected the Chronicler in falsifying the truth of history, then he is rather to be praised than blamed for having had the love of truth that inclined him to investigate the case, the candor that enabled him to admit the weight of the evidence, and the courage that sustained him in announcing his conclusion. But, even then, it would have added immeasurably to the moral weight of his judgment could Professor Smith have seen his way clear to surrender a commission that requires him to teach that the Book of Chronicles is the Word of God, to say nothing of the stipend that is usually supposed to attach to the faithful discharge of this commission. The Scotch Professor can hardly be ignorant of the fact that when one appears in court to discredit the statements of even the humblest of his fellow-citizens, it is of prime importance to the full effect of his testimony that the jury should have no grounds to suspect that his own mind is at all beclouded as to the binding obligation of an oath.

This, however, is only one aspect of the case. There is another which even a man of Professor Smith's courage would have done well to consider, if for no other reason, at least out of regard for the interests of the truth, which he holds so dear, though it has cost him so little. The consideration referred to connects itself with the phrase "of

course" which falls so lightly and easily from the Glasgow Professor's pen. It is possible to conceive of a really loyal son whose love of truth would enable him, rising superior to all merely natural, filial instincts, sorrowfully but faithfully and unflinchingly to sift the evidence that was to impeach the chastity of the mother that nurtured him at her breasts, and whose courageous candor would enable him to admit its weight even though it broke his heart. But a son who had been pursuing such investigations, and who, moved by the love of truth, meditated giving his conclusions to the public, would act in a very ill-advised manner should he do it in any such terms as these: "That my honored mother was a woman of substantial chastity, I am prepared to maintain against all gainsayers, though, of course, she had her occasional lapses and liaisons." For, as is only too obvious, the brutal callousness of such an "of course" would be more damning to the fair name of the son than of the mother—even though she were an harlot.

Such, then, is the attitude and such the tone which Dr. Smith, a Professor, be it observed, in the Free Church College, Glasgow, permits himself, and is permitted by his ecclesiastical superiors to assume towards the Scripture writers and writings. He does not hesitate, as we have seen, to describe the prophets of the entire Persian period as a set of mental incompetents, but with enough of a certain immoral shrewdness to attempt to hide their incapacity by enveloping the future in what he is pleased to characterize as "the lurid air of Apocalypse." He does not hesitate to picture Isaiah, Haggai, and others of the prophets as using the solemn formula, "oracle of Jehovah" as a means of securing currency and credit for what were in reality oracles out of the desire and delusion, if not the positive and impudent deceit of their own hearts. While crediting Obadiah, and others of the prophets, with "some dim instinct" of the fact that somehow or somehow his people were no less than the hinge of destiny, he does not hesitate to make

it appear that the real inspiration under which the language of his "oracle of Jehovah" was framed was that of a bitter personal hate, and—last, lowest, bitterest depth of the prophet's humiliation—he does not hesitate to apostrophize him, to applaud him, "damning with faint praise," and ostentatiously to patronize him, making even for his book a place in these goodly "oracles of God." He does not hesitate gratuitously to impugn the veracity of Scripture persons, and to bring the taint of an unjust suspicion upon the veracity of the Scripture writers themselves.

It is not my purpose to indulge in any useless lamentations over this state of things. I have no unavailing protest to make against handling God's holy Word with profane hands. The Master whom we serve, when told on a certain occasion that the Pharisees were criticising his words, experienced no spasm of weak fear, but said with a certain dignified and properly understood, even awful composure: "Let them alone. They be blind leaders of the blind." And again, when these same Pharisees had asked with incredulous contempt: "Are we also blind?" answered: "If ye were blind, ye would have no sin; but now ye say: We see; your sin remaineth." We cannot do more wisely than to note these words of our Master and shape by them our attitude towards those who professing to be "critics," that is, judges, of the written Word, shape their procedure by precedents borrowed from the Courts of Caiaphas, Herod and Pontius Pilate—judges, who, having a case to prove, wisely manipulated some evidence, and manufactured more, and who between them managed to heap upon the Incarnate Word the incongruous indignities, if indignities can be incongruous, of undisguised rejection of his claims, mock reverence for his claims, and misplaced condescension towards the real excellencies of his much misunderstood and misrepresented character, which condescending, weak defense availed as little to deliver Christ from the malice of his enemies as it has availed to deliver

him who uttered it from the condemnation and contempt of posterity.

I say again that I have neither complaint nor protest to make against these "reverent Christian scholars" who now stand to the front. I note their procedure, by which is meant their manner of applying certain methods and principles to concrete cases, merely to say that intelligent students of God's Word, who are able to restrain a certain righteous, fiery indignation and push through a volume like this, will find themselves repaid by laying it down with a deeper sense of the reality of Scripture persons and their experiences, and with a livelier sense also of the preciousness of Scripture, and—of the long-suffering of God.

Columbia, S. C.

W. M. MCPHEETERS.

V. HOW TO MAKE OUR BRIEF COURSE IN CHURCH HISTORY MOST PROFITABLE.

It is not demanded of me that I vindicate the wisdom of those who placed Church History in the Seminary curriculum. Their wisdom needs no vindication. Next to the Bible and the immediate aids to its interpretation, Church History at once suggests itself as a proper study for those who have consecrated their lives to the service of Christ in building up and extending the borders of the Church. It is an account of their predecessors in the same sphere of service, showing how they wrought, with what success, with what failure and failings. There can be no question as to the propriety of making Church History a part of the course of study for training ministers. The only question open to discussion is, how may we teach it so as to secure for the students the maximum profit? It is a broad, practically a boundless field. In time, covering nineteen centuries; in space, covering nearly the whole earth. It is interwoven with all other history. Very early in the Christian centuries, the Church entered into alliance with the State, and very soon, and for a long period, throughout the wide extent of Christendom, it dominated all other history. It entered into and largely moulded the political, social and family life of the people. It built up for itself a unique empire, and extended its sway over every department thought and enterprise. It carried on wars both foreign and domestic, founded schools, prosecuted missions and added tribe after tribe, and nation after nation, to its ever-widening domain. The history of the Church, then, in its broadest sense, means the history of all that occurred throughout a large part of the world during a long succession of centuries.

Selection becomes imperative. Immeasurably more must be omitted than can be taught. Only the leading ob-

jects of so vast a landscape can be introduced in the picture. Anything like minuteness of detail is out of the question. Further still, abridge the history as we may, if enough is retained to form a connected narrative, we shall have too much for complete mastery. Yet the question presses, What shall we emphasize? Where shall we lay the stress? On what phases shall we concentrate attention? Manifestly we could spend our time on the mint, anise and cummin to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law. Here is the point demanding a wise discrimination on the part of the teacher. He should be able to distinguish between the great and the small, between matters of mere curious interest and matters of permanent practical importance. Amidst the manifold issues which were raised and decided, the manifold movements which started into life and made their impress, he should be able to fix on those that touched the vital life of the Church, and left their indelible mark, the effects of which continued through all changes, and still abide. It would be sinning against the interests of the students for the teacher to linger a weary time over the frivolous jangling of the logic-chopping schoolmen, and then skim hurriedly over the strenuous conflicts between the champions of truth and error, in which were involved issues of everlasting value.

Can we lay down any specific ends, more important than all others, toward which Church History should conduct us? Can we specify any benefits, more valuable than all others which this study should be expected to confer? In attempting an answer to these questions, I shall perhaps best meet the demands of this occasion.

1. It is obvious to remark that we should enter the field of Church History through the portals of the Bible. We are not prepared to follow the fortunes of the Church until we have learned from God's Word what the Church is. We get our preparation for any intelligent view of the subject by sitting at the feet of the inspired writers, espe-

cially Christ and His Apostles. It is in the light of their teachings alone that we can form any clear conceptions of the great spiritual principles on which the Church is based, and the far-reaching designs for which it was planned. The history of the Church is a history of conflict, of deadly strife between good and evil, truth and error. We cannot study this contest to any purpose, cannot look upon the struggling adversaries with sympathies properly guided, cannot measure victory and defeat without some standard of truth by which to frame our judgements. This standard must be something more trustworthy than our own moral instincts, more trustworthy than even our own cultivated and enlightened religious consciousness. The only reliable standard is God's infallible word. By that we must judge the combatants; by that we must measure the progress of truth, and detect the invasions of error. From that we must learn what the Church was when it left the moulding hand of inspired workmen. Otherwise, as we witness its progress through the centuries, we cannot tell whether it is preserving its divine beauty of form, or being marred by the rough assaults of enemies, or forsooth, by the well-meaning, but misguided zeal of its friends. We must know the nature and limits of the mission on which it was launched. Otherwise we cannot tell whether it is gloriously fulfilling that mission, or whether its energies are being diverted into other channels. We must know the methods ordained by its divine founder for accomplishing its mission. Otherwise we can not tell whether its adherents are loyal to those methods, or whether they are discrediting the wisdom of the divine founder by discarding his methods, and resorting to others of their own devising. It is evident that our view-point is all important. Church History will mean one thing to him who looks upon its battle fields from the serene heights to which the Bible lifts him, and studies its multifarious conflicts in the light which the Bible throws upon them. It will mean a totally differ-

ent thing, if it yield any meaning at all, to him who looks upon its battle fields from the low plain of uninspired reason, and with no light shining on its conflicts save the dim, confusing light of his own speculative opinions. It will mean one thing to the Protestant who tests the Church by the Bible; and another thing to the Romanist who exalts the Church above the Bible.

2. Studying Church History with the Bible for our guide, should not this history be to us a continuous revelation of God? Among the last words of Christ was the promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." As we look upon the ever-shifting panorama of history, with its mingling of light and shade, we have the key to its interpretation in the Book which Christ placed in our hands, and by the use of this we can assure ourselves of his presence. It is interesting to note that God's chosen method of revealing himself has been through the history of his Church. Not only did he make it the depository of his inspired word, but through his dealings with his people, and his own interpretation of these dealings, he has revealed his character and designs. In connection with the history, and as the controlling element of the history he has unfolded his purpose. There was no necessity, so far as we can see, that God should have chosen this method of self revelation. He might have spoken in the audience of the people, not the ten words only, but the whole body of his precepts and promises, so that from an early period the world should have had all that he ever purposed to make known. But it seemed good in his sight to separate a chosen seed and make them the channel through which, during the long stretch of their history, he should acquaint mankind with himself and his redeeming grace. Each generation furnished the occasion for an additional chapter. Did this process of divine manifestation cease with the last inspired apostle? It is not reasonable to think so. True, these

manifestations were no longer committed to record by an infallible penman. The close of the Bible marks the end of what we call sacred history. But we do not intend by this term to make a contrast between history under the guiding and controlling hand of God, and history which lacks this divine element. There is merely a difference in character of record. The course of Church history flowed on without a break when the last writer passed away who wrote only as moved by the Holy Ghost. The Church continues the same, the history, in all essentials the same, only the method of recording it has changed. It contains the same divine factor, in the same dominant proportion. He who was with the Church in the wilderness, was with the Church in its conquest of the Roman Empire. He has never set it adrift, nor removed from it. He was with it in the pillar of cloud; then in the Man of Galilee, and ever since in the person of the indwelling Spirit. We no more hear his voice from the mountain top, nor through prophets' lips; we no more see him in startling theophanies, nor in miraculous incident, nor wearing the veil of flesh. But all that blessed past belongs to us in forms that never grow old, and in values that never diminish. He need speak no more, we carry his word with us. He need appear no more; he has taught us how to discern his invisible presence. We can keep track of him amid the clash of contending sectaries, the confusion and disorder of warring factions, the darkness resulting from decay of piety and learning. At no period has he left himself without a witness. It rests with the teacher at every stage of historic progress to discern and lift into prominence that which comes from God, which has upon it the mark of Christ, which embodies and manifests the ever active spirit. The history should be used to illustrate the fact that God ever reigns and that he hath made Christ to be perpetual head over all things to the Church, which is his body.

3. Studied thus, may not the history become the sus-

tainer and nourisher of both our faith and our hope? The fortunes of the Church have not been what we might easily have persuaded ourselves they would be. Starting with promise that the Church is Christ's blood-bought possession, as dear to him as the apple of his eye, and that it carries with it the pledge of his unintermitted presence and the assurance of his limitless power for its defense, we might quickly pass to the conclusion that its career would be one of perennial prosperity, of unbroken conquest. How different its actual history! Scarcely had its warfare begun before its enemies were decimating its ranks. Its shrines were soon stained with the blood of its noblest children, and its haughty oppressors wrought their cruel will without restraint. Worse, still, its unity was broken by internal dissensions, error ran riot within its sacred pale, and its purity was soiled by those entrusted with its honor. It soon entered into unholy wedlock with the world which crucified its Master, and in course of time by pollutions inexpressible and crimes of crimson hue effaced almost every trace of the divine image. The picture is a revolting one, and in its nature fitted to produce despair. How can such an outcome be the logical sequence of that inspiring commission. "All power in heaven and earth is given unto me. Go ye, therefore, and lo, I am with you alway." We have but to turn on the dark scene the search-light of the Bible, and at once the presence of Christ is disclosed. Ever he is the suffering Saviour, both in his head and in his members; ever he passes to glory through death, conquers the crown by means of the cross. His words come to us through the gloom. "These things have I spoken unto ye that ye should not be made to stumble. They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God a service." With the Bible in our hands we are prepared for the word that may come, for the violence of the world without, and the traitor's kiss within. Grievous as is the spectacle of a Church

over-run with evil, alarming as is the picture of growing apostasy, we find our faith not only unshaken by it, but rather confirmed. It matches exactly the picture which we carry with us: "The Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field; but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat." The corruptions of the Church, no less than its victories in behalf of righteousness, proclaim its identity with the Church of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Church of Judges and Kings, the Church of ever recurring declensions and apostasies, as well as revivals and reformations. It is ever presided over by the same Providence and conducted to its goal by the same methods.

But hope is cheered no less than faith, for ever the last word of our guide book is the promise of ultimate and complete victory. When the battle seems to be going against us, we reflect that we see only in part, and remember that when that which is in part is done away then that which is perfect shall come. The golden age of the Church is not behind us. It was not the period when the pillar of cloud made God visible as Leader and Defender; nor the period when the incarnate Son taught and wrought divinely in the sight of men. This was progress from good to better, but the best was still in the bosom of the future. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come, but if I go I will send him unto you." Has not God been ever coming down into closer and more influential and more helpful relations to the Church? Studying its history in the light of his promises we dare not become pessimistic. He is in it, and over it, and through it he is bringing on the long-looked-for glory. Amid the shadows, hope rejoices and abides his time.

4. Will not such a method of study duly exalt and honor the inspired word, and render it increasingly dear to us? Grant that there is no break in the flow of history, no essential change in God's relation to it, yet the revelation

embodied and embalmed in the Bible is the test by which succeeding revelation is to be judged. The two parts of the one continuous history are not coordinate. We would not suffer ourselves for one moment to be classed with those who discount the Bible on the ground that God still dwells in his Church, and still gives, through it, a knowledge of his will. The Church of Rome is not alone in asserting that we have an incessant divine revelation of equal authority with the Sacred Scriptures. There be many who make a Pope out of the Christian consciousness. There be some who teach that by a process of evolution, we have attained an attitude from which we can see certain truths even more clearly than those who gave us the Bible, and who, tho' inspired in a certain sense, were nevertheless largely under the dominion of the crude and superstitious ideas of their unenlightened age. We repeat with emphasis that Sacred History and Church History are not coordinate revelations of God. The former is the light by which the latter is to be interpreted, and the arbiter by which all its questions are to be decided. The Bible is a "light shining in a dark place," and rather to be trusted as a revelation of the divine will than even the voice "from the excellent brightness" which fell on the ears of the disciples who were with Christ in the Holy Mount. When we bid farewell to John on his lonely isle, we hear no other voice like his; we cross no other seer with vision so penetrating; we come on no other man so filled with God as to awe us into silence when he speaks, and into obedience when he commands. From that time forth all other men are recognized at once as compassed about by the same limitations with ourselves. We dare to question their statements, to contest their arguments, to reject their conclusions. The more intimate we become with them the more their weakness grows on us, and the wider grows the gap between them and the fishermen on whom Christ breathed. The descent is not gradual from Apostles to

Apostolic fathers, and then to Church fathers. The drop is sudden, and the distance immeasurable. If we would augment our estimate of Peter, we have only to read the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, his cotemporary and fourth successor, according to Eusebius, in the see of Rome. Clemens commits himself unreservedly to the fable of the Phœnix, and uses the story of its rising from its ashes as an illustration of the resurrection. If we could have our admiration for Paul increased, this would certainly result from the perusal of the general epistle ascribed to his companion Barnabas. They seem not unequally yoked together in the history, but Barnabas, the author, indulges his fancy in the wildest and most puerile allegorizing of Old Testament History. Do we need to inspire our hearts with a more tender veneration for the Apostle John? We have but to read the writings of Ignatius, who is supposed to have heard the word from John's lips, and compare his fanatical craving for martyrdom with John's calm and majestic, but silent resignation. Surely no candid mind can pass from the canonical writings to the writings of those who were either partly cotemporary with the apostles, or removed from them by the space of only a single generation, without a deepening conviction of the prodigious significance of that *theopneustos* of which Paul speaks.

5. This method of studying the history enables us to test the claims of all modern branches of the Church. We refuse to be awed by the appeal to authority. We are not careful to settle the question as to whom the fathers belong. Let them belong to whomsoever they may; they are of no value to us, except as they echo the voice of Scripture. What need to follow the echo, when we have the voice itself. In proportion as a church seeks a basis for its claims in the teachings of the fathers in that proportion does it forfeit its title to our respect. They have "forsaken the fountain of living waters and hewn them out cisterns,

broken cisterns, that can hold no water." The "historic episcopate" becomes for us a chimera as we trace it back through the darkness of the middle ages and try to catch glimpses of it amid the flickering lights of the early fathers. What a hopeless undertaking to track an invisible and intangible line through the confusion of eighteen warring centuries and link it to the apostles. The Church that has nothing more than this imaginary line to offer us as the foundation of our hopes cannot make a very strong appeal to our faith. We carry our foundation with us, the immutable rock of Scripture, and we refuse to exchange it for the quagmire and the quicksand. Not the Church of history, no matter how far it can trace its marks, but the Church of the Bible is entitled to our confidence. After sitting in council with bishops claiming apostolic lineage, and witnessing their spirit and methods, and comparing their voice with that of Christ, their excommunications and anathemas have no terrors. We become more and more enamored of the famous maxim of Chillingworth, "the Bible and the Bible alone the religion of Protestants." The church that can trace its fundamental principles no further back than the fathers, has no divine warrant for its existence. Whatever in any church does not reach back of them should be "cast out and trodden under foot of men." There is no need, however, that a church form a connection with the Bible through the medium of history. Why grope through history for the Bible and the apostles when we have them with us? History can lend no dignity to them; can impart no authority to them. Why follow the winding stream when we are already at the fountain? The ever-living Christ and His ever-abiding word belong to no time, but to all time. Is it to be supposed that there is only one point of juncture with them? Only one way of reaching them? That they are to be approached only through the tortuous channel of history that becomes more difficult to follow the further we trace it? How preposterous! The

Bible is not dependent on history, but history on the Bible. Does any church judge us by history and make it the arbiter of our claims? "It is a very small thing that we should be judged of man's judgment." We lift the Bible into the seat of judgment, and cite all pretensions to appear before it for final sentence. When Christ taught in Galilee he swept away with his own authoritative voice "that which had been said by them of old time." He blighted with scathing rebuke those who were lading men with the heavy burden of ecclesiasticism, and making void the commandments of God by their traditions. His words still have for us the same commanding power. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Having tested the sweets of this freedom, surely we shall "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

6. This method of study enables us to set a proper estimate upon religious novelties. We form the habit of applying to all innovations the touchstone of the Bible, and we are not carried away by the momentary success of new movements which are cried up as the great desideratum of the age. Human nature has not waited till the nineteenth century to devise new expedients for hastening on the triumphs of the Gospel. It has been equally busy in all other centuries. The history of the Church is largely a history of expedients devised by those who were impatient of God's slow methods; and the disastrous consequences resulting from these expedients add force to the presumption that no proper agency for rendering the truth effective was overlooked by Christ and his apostles. We hesitate to believe that any age, no matter how great its intellectual activities, nor how wonderful its triumphs of genius, can improve on the simple devices of the Gospel. Preaching and praying and holy living are the regenerating forces still as in Apostolic times. It is doubtful whether any multiplications of organizations, any additional machinery,

any thrusting of women and young people forward can render them any more efficacious.

We become equally suspicious of doctrinal novelties. It has not remained for this late day to discover defects in accepted symbols of faith, and offer something better in lieu of them. This has been the custom from the beginning. Heresy is as old as orthodoxy, and it is about as difficult to invent something new in the one line as the other. It is no more a sign of originality to be a follower of Arius than to be a follower of Athanasius. Pelagius framed a new theology as much in advance of Calvinism as any that New England seems capable of excogitating in our day. The charge of traditionalism does not affright us. It is largely a choice of traditions, in so far as that term means the association of present creeds with past names. Obviously it is no easy thing to get entirely out of line with all the forty generations of past thinkers. The claim to have done so carries with it no strong presumption in favor of such claimant's views. The more we study the history of doctrine, with the light of the Bible shining on it, the less shall we be inclined to run after reconstructed theologies. They usually mean reconstructed heresies of a former age. The teaching of history is that all true progress in the development of theological doctrines has been in discovering the logical relation and correct interpretation of the statements of Scripture. When we consider how clear and simple and oft-repeated are these statements touching all fundamentals; how they were designed for the common mind of the race, we naturally conclude that nineteen centuries is long enough for devout minds to find a trustworthy exposition of their meaning. Hence the dissenter from evangelical orthodoxy may well be suspected of handling the Word of God deceitfully.

7. This method of studying the history will result, or should result, in a healthy abhorrence of all lies, and especially those embodied in Romanism. Our age has grown

too tolerant. It seems to be losing the capacity for hating. It is learning to look with complacency upon all creeds, Calvinism perhaps excepted; and takes great credit to itself for its broad catholicity of spirit. Dogmatism is sternly denounced, and comprehension is the order of the day. "The Parliament of Religions" was a visible embodiment of the age's indiscriminating indulgence. Above all things, Christianity must be considerate and courteous. It must hunt for the truths that are common to all religions and use these as the ground of compliment, while politely blind, or at most charitably lenient to everything that cannot be commended. The world is to be converted, if indeed it needs conversion by the language of "sweet reasonableness," and not by stern denunciatory phrases.

Is not the study of history, with the Bible to regulate our judgments, fitted to arouse us from this complacent attitude toward error? As we follow the growth of the Papacy and see what desolations it made in the earth, how that degeneracy of morals kept pace with the invention of falsehoods, can we remain indifferent to the dissemination of lies? For many years Church History is mainly concerned with recording the abominations of a growing apostasy from the faith of the Bible. Even before Christ vanished from the eyes of his disciples, they were contending for positions of supremacy. This was ominous, suggesting that nothing but abounding grace could suppress unholy ambitions in those chosen to official rank in the Church. Pentecost did the work for the apostles, and the rich effusions of the Holy Spirit on the primitive Church expelled for a time the lust and pride of power. But when the flame of devotion died down, which it did all too soon, the contention for supremacy revived and grew apace. After the Church became wedded to the State, the Emperor began to purchase the favors of influential ecclesiastics by conferring wealth and honor on them, and by enlarging their priestly prerogatives. He encouraged bishops to live in luxury

and to surround themselves with pomp and splendor, because he found that through them and their ghostly power he could better manage the ignorant and superstitious hordes that were ever threatening the throne with disaster. More and more worldly ambition dominated those who claimed to stand nearest to Christ. The bloody contests of Pagan Rome in the days when Sylla and Marius contended for supremacy were repeated in the contests of rival bishops for the See of Peter. Councils, composed of those boasting apostolic lineage, displayed the fierce passions and the hasty violence of undisciplined mobs. At an early period laws must be passed to restrain the clergy from such sins as drunkenness, simony, concubinage and perjury. Deeper and deeper prelates and priests sank into moral pollution until they became adepts in the practice of every villainy. At length the Papal chair, "the pivot," as a Roman Catholic writer expresses it, "on which the whole Catholic Church turns," became a prize which a succession of women, steeped in the lowest vice, conferred on their paramours and bastard offspring. For some centuries the highest position in the Church, where we would reasonably look for the most exalted types of religious character, was filled by those who, to lives of constant profligacy, added frequently the crimes of murder and secret assassination. And these are the men, be it remembered, who handed down the apostolic succession, so much prized by our modern high-Churchmen. Pollution spread from the heart to the extremities; and through long periods of her history the Romish Church took knowledge of no sin save the preaching of God's pure gospel, and the bearing of testimony against mendacity and iniquity. She knew no heresy, save the doctrines taught by Christ and his apostles. But truth and purity were offenses not to be endured, and fire and sword and treachery and torture were the instruments used to avenge herself on those who dared to lift the word of God against the huge structure of lies which she had so diligently framed.

The strongest argument against Rome is the history which she has made, and surely no one can follow this history step by step without having the feelings of righteous anger and of holy abhorrence stirred within him. If not, then his moral intuitions are not in a healthy condition. But why use this history to stir into life and nourish a present aversion? For the simple reason that Rome has never repudiated her past. She has tried by a perversion of history to cover up the darkest stains, but has deliberately endorsed and embalmed as her lasting possession the hideous doctrines and vicious principles that constitute the basis of all her sins. The decrees of the council of Trent are the ripe harvest of all previous sowing, the rich results of long centuries of labour in the service of the father of lies. Those decrees were confirmed by Pope Pius IV, and the disobedient were threatened with the wrath of Almighty God. Pius the Fourth has since been declared infallible. This gives to those decrees an immutable character. They must stand forever as a true exposition of what Romanism is in belief and spirit. We have a right to assume, that what Rome was when she armed the Inquisition against all who claimed the liberty to speak the truth, that she is to-day and will continue to be. She is only true to herself when she denies the right of private judgment, and exerts her power to rob man of all that constitutes the glory of manhood. She has fixed her immovable anathemas upon all who reject her monstrous dogmas, and refuse to take part in her idolatrous worship. Can we be true to God and not detest Romanism? It robs him of his glory by making him the puny puppet of a wicked Priest, who traffics in redeeming grace to gratify his greed. "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." Was anything more characteristic of Christ than his vigorous hatred of religious fraud? How fiercely his wrath flamed against those who buried the truth under a mass of tradition, and substituted a sanctimonious formalism for "a broken and contrite heart."

We want to be as broad in our sympathies and benevolent activities as Christ was. We want to be as narrow as he was in his hatred of lies, and equally intolerant with him in warning against all who oppose the truth.

It is hardly necessary for me to confess a sense of incompetency. It is enough to say that it would never have occurred to me to suggest myself for this position. The fact that your choice fell on me indicates, I am constrained to believe, a woeful lack in our ministry of men properly furnished for this work. Church History is not a favorite study. It does not occupy a co-ordinate place with other departments of learning that bear no more closely on the minister's duties. Is this absence of interest due to the necessary dryness of the subject? I am unwilling to think so. I prefer to think that it is possible for Church History to be so taught as to kindle a measure of enthusiasm, and awaken a permanent interest in the minds of the students. Of course, students for the ministry, like all other students have their peculiar aptitudes and tastes, and there will always be some to whom history, however taught, will be irksome. But surely for devout minds that love to think God's thoughts after him, Church History opens a field in which they ought to find matter of absorbing attraction. It is wanting in no element adapted to arrest and enchain attention. It carries us over battle fields, resounding with the clash of arms, points us to the pivotal events on which from time to time God has turned the destiny of nations, and decided the future of the race; it leads us to the quiet seclusion of the scholar, shocks us with tragedies vast and diabolical, displays before us examples of heroic consecration, pleases the fancy with bits of romance, furnishes food for reflection in its myths and legends; it acquaints us with the beginnings of things, showing us the cradle in which was nourished the feeble infancy of all those institutions, sciences, arts, literatures, which in their development and maturity give us our pres-

ent civilization. Surely the materials of Church History are not wanting in interest. If as a study they are not made interesting, the fault must be in the treatment. I cannot promise myself any large measure of success, but I propose to keep this end before me as a possible attainment, to take the study of Church History out of the category of the dull and irksome, and place it where it properly belongs in the category of the pleasing and inspiring.

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C., May 9th, 1899.

[Inaugural Address. Columbia Seminary.]

1VI. THE ATTITUDE OF THE PRESBYTRIAN CHURCH, SOUTH, TOWARD MODERN "REGENERATED" THEOLOGY.

In the year 1810, Frederick William III, of Prussia, founded the University of Berlin. Whether the King had been influenced by his political troubles and reverses, or had been subdued by the sorrowful death of the universally beloved Queen, which occurred that year, it is certain that he had come to the conclusion that if a government would permanently prosper it must have its foundation, not merely in military power, but in the intellectual, moral, and religious culture of its people. The old University of Leipsic, established in 1409, had just passed its four hundredth anniversary; the University of Bonn, founded by the Maximilian Frederick, had not yet attained its quarter of a century mile-post, and was to be greatly enlarged by Frederick William III. in 1818. The new University of Berlin at once took its stand prominently along side its older competitors, the youngest, freshest, and, in some respects, the strongest of the three. Into it swept the waters of philosophical and religious thought which had their springs in writers of the centuries of the past, especially of the preceeding two hundred years; out of it emerged the streams, bold but by no means clear, which to this day are mingling with the Revelation of God, with

¹The article embodies the substance of an address delivered before the Alumni Association of Columbia Theological Seminary, who adopted the following resolution: "Having heard with sincere pleasure the able, instructive and entertaining address of the Rev. Dr. Eugene Daniel, 'Resolved, That we hereby express to Dr. Daniel our high appreciation of and sincere thanks for this timely address, and that we request him to furnish a copy of the same to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for publication.'" The address was delivered before it was written. It is given for substance.

obscuring and contaminating power. The University of Berlin became at once a reservoir and a fountain. As preliminary to the matter of this article, it will be interesting to recall to memory some of the writers whose thoughts this university has attracted; and then, some whose peculiar views it has originated, developed and sent forth into the Theological world of the nineteenth century. This simple process will give conclusive suggestion as to the origin of that which Professor Dorner has called "Regenerated" Theology.

I. INTRODUCTORY.

For the purpose of this article, our preliminary survey need extend no further backward than to the fourth decade of the seventeenth century.

In the year 1632, at Amsterdam, began a life which was to have the brief duration of only forty-five years, the influence of which will probably live as long as thought lives. Spinoza was a Jew. His people excommunicated and anathematized him. Poor, he polished lenses and wrote books. Exiled from Amsterdam, he fled to The Hague, studied on and wrote on, until he became so eminent that he had the honor of declining the Professorship of Philosophy at Heidelberg. His study was to him the world, and he gave time, health and possible wealth, for the privacy of his chamber and the luxury of uninterrupted, severe thought. As a Jew, his philosophical speculation could not move in the atmosphere of Traditional Revelation. Spinoza could not write philosophy and fail to write of religion. He wrote both and joined them in wedlock.

There were three things in Spinoza's system which took mighty sweep.

First, he made religion to be essentially feeling, the love of God; while doctrines belong to Philosophy. Second, he held that the facts of the Bible are highly colored by its writers and that it is of first importance to distinguish

between the fact and its coloring ; or, as the modern critic develops the thought, that the Bible must be read with great "discrimination." Third, the heart and soul of Spinoza's Philosophical and Religious System was Pantheism. Of course it is not affirmed that this most fascinating of all erroneous forms of belief, found in Spinoza an originator. It is more than probable that Pantheism in one or another of its Protean shapes, arises spontaneously in the human soul, the shadowy distortion of truths made ghosts by sin and sin's darkening of the understanding; entering into every false religion on the globe. Even within the Christian Church, the plausible error found unmistakable expression in Scotus Erigena as early as the ninth century. But whilst all this is true, it is certain that Spinoza's mystical mind and patiently-brooding thought gave to Pantheism its widest and most powerful exhibition. With these three things in his hand, namely: (1) Feeling in Religion; (2) A Bible of Suspected Historicity, and (3) Pantheism, Spinoza will one day knock at the door of the University of Berlin. We shall see who will bid him enter.

Meanwhile, passing over a period of nearly fifty years from the death of Spinoza, we find ourselves at the birth-date of another philosopher whose genius and learning have left their impress upon nearly all the systems of the succeeding years. This was "the Sage of Konigsberg."

Immanuel Kant was born in 1724. It is said that during his long life of nearly eighty years, he never travelled farther than forty miles from his native city of Konigsberg. His father of Scotch descent and his mother German, he inherited the strict morality of the former and the simple frugality and thrift of the latter. Of slight and frail physique, one shoulder carried higher than the other, he stood while lecturing in the University of Konigsberg as one transfixed, his gaze fastened upon some one student, and his utterance sometimes, especially when discoursing of the sublimity of the "Categorical Imperative," vehement

and inspired. The "Critique of Pure Reason" was published in 1781; that of the "Practical Reason," in 1788. The literary atmosphere was then full of skeptical poison. Berkeley had published in 1710 his "Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge." Hume's "Natural History of Religion" had been issued in 1757. Gibbon had sent the first volume of his "Decline and Fall" to Hume about the year 1776. Voltaire had spent the years between 1750 and 1753 in Berlin, enjoying royal favor as the companion of the King. Paine's "Age of Reason" was to come forth in 1795. Kant wrote avowedly under the stimulus of a keen desire to confute the fallacies of Hume. It is well known that his "Pure Reason" but intensified the alarm it was intended to allay. The "Practical Reason" in large measure restored the confidence which Rationalistic negation had so much weakened. But from first to last, Christianity to Kant was but a system of transcendental moralism. Out of inborn faith in Duty, sprang faith in God, by whom devotion to duty must be rewarded. Original sin was accounted for by the hypothesis of an anti-mundane existence. The sole punishment of sin is that of its natural consequences. To be saved, we must undergo a "total revolution" which, however, need not be the fruit of any supernatural grace. Christ in his person symbolizes a reconciliation between man and God, effected through repentance, and Christ, in the Scriptures, represents "the agony of repentance."

Out of all this speculation of Kant, three things may be noted and borne in mind: (1) His contention that the essence of the Christian religion lies in rationalistic moralism; (2) his vague and peculiar allegorizing about Christ as being "the agony of repentance;" (3) his Soteriology, found in a reconciliation, of which penitence is the sole and exclusive basis. These things we shall meet, with modification, at another stage of this discussion.

Kant died just six years before the University of Berlin

was opened. But his philosophy had already been expounded in that city, and all the leading minds of Germany were acknowledging its power. No writer, either of metaphysics or of ethics, or of theology, can afford to ignore Immanuel Kant.

One of Kant's personal acquaintances and devoted adherents was Fichte, who died in Berlin in 1814. As is so often the case, the disciple went beyond the master, for Fichte pushed some of Kant's principles to extreme results. Says Dr. Noah Porter :

"Fichte accepted literally the principle of Kant that the forces of the concept are the products of the understanding, and applied it with logical rigor to its appropriate consequences, viz.: that *all the so-called forms of knowledge*, as contrasted with its matter, are furnished by the mind's own creative activity. * * Fichte would make the individual dependent upon the concept, at least for its form. Upon this theory the whole question respecting the relation of the concept to the individual object becomes entirely changed. Individual objects are themselves individualized concepts. Real things are the creations of the mind. The concept itself becomes an entity," etc.

Another writer describes the salient feature of Fichte's philosophy as follows :

"What Fichte attempts to prove is simply this: that between objects as they appear to human conception and as they actually are, there is no real difference since the forms of human cognition are identical with the action of the absolute intellect: that objects are the limit set by the absolute within itself in order to arrive at self-consciousness: that the absolute is at the same time subject and object, the ideal and the real. Reduced to plainer language all this would mean that God (the absolute subject, the great active and creative 'I') and nature (the 'Not I,' the aggregate of objects) are united in a similar manner as soul and body; that the absolute intellect pervades all and

everything, and that the human mind is an integral part of the absolute intellect."

These quotations will show that Fichte, in the development of the thought of the time, should have no mean position. In him the theories of Spinoza and of Kant plainly converge and unite. The result is a sort of rationalistic and mystical pantheism.

It needs only to be added that Fichte was made professor in the University of Berlin immediately upon its establishment in 1810.

The next potent personality to be noticed in these introductory references is Schelling, who was born in 1775 and lived until 1854. Before this man was twenty years old, whilst he was yet a student at Tübingen, his power of thought began to attract the attention of learned men. His earlier writings established for him a reputation for mystical pantheism, which his subsequent modifications of them failed to remove. Not dwelling upon these, nor pausing to call more than passing attention to his well-known doctrines of indifference and identity, of immediate and intuitive cognition of the absolute, it is more important to fix in memory that in Schelling begins to emerge that doctrine of Christ which his contemporaries and successors are to modify, partially reject, and yet largely develop. If Principal Fairbairn properly presents Schelling, the similarity of the views of that philosopher to the teaching of many modern theologians is too striking to escape attention :

"The eternal Son of God, born from the essence of the Father of all things, is the finite itself as it exists in the eternal intuition of God, appearing as a suffering God, subjected to the fatalities of time ; and this God, in the moment of his appearance in Christ, ends the world of finitude and opens that of infinitude, or of the dominion of the Spirit. The universalism of this truth is confirmed by the presence of the idea in religions before and without the

Christian, yet in forms that may be termed immanent as really present though imperfectly realized and prophetic, as looking towards a more perfect realization. And as universal, it is eternal, and so independent of all questions as to whether certain books be genuine or spurious, or certain histories are real or imagined. Christianity, as speculative and transcendental, must never be confounded with a series of empirical facts."

That sounds familiar! And the following also:

"The Spirit has its Iliad, its tale of struggle with brutal and natural forces, and then its Odyssey, when out of its painful wanderings, it returns to the Infinite. This is accomplished by a double act: on the one side, of revelation—God shows his heart, which is love; on the other side, of discovery—man sees it and surrenders freely his particular to the universal will. But in order to this, a Mediator in human form is necessary, 'For only the personal can heal the personal, and God must become man in order that man may come again to God.' He becomes man in the Archetypal Divine Man, who as in the beginning with God, is by his nature the highest peak or apex of the Divine Revelation. By this man, nature is transfigured to Spirit and God becomes a personal and intelligent Being. But who is this archetypal man? It can only be Christ but Christ conceived not as an individual, but as universal, ideal man; what is true only of collective humanity cannot be limited to the historical individual, though without this individual, the truth could not have come to be known. To conceive and embrace the ideal principle is to be incorporated with Christ, to be of his community, realizing his unity of nature and Spirit, participant, as it were, in his incarnation. His history thus ceases to be single and empirical, and becomes universal, the history of a Divine Spirit so incorporating itself with humanity as to organize it into a great body whose head is Christ. History conceived from this point becomes in con-

sequence of Christ, as it were, *the progressive incarnation of God.*" (Italics mine.)

Let the reader study this quotation. If in it Professor Fairbairn accurately sets forth the views of Schelling, it is very plain that this philosopher stands amongst the first who have "regenerated" the new Theology. Schelling was a Professor in the University of Berlin with royal favor and with renown in 1841, having written his "Philosophy and Religion" in 1804.

As in the case of Schelling, so in respect to Hegel, it is unnecessary that these passing references should dwell at all upon that which is best known as fundamental in his system—his Pantheism. The difference between Spinoza and Hegel is one of particulars. Spinoza made prominent one substance, with its two attributes of extension and thought, out of which, respectively, grew materialistic and intellectual Pantheism. Hegel made prominent this one substance as subject, and gave us a Pantheism more definitely spiritualized. But Pantheism was the basis of the philosophy of both. And with this so generally known, we may with Hegel, as with Schelling, pass to a specific development of Pantheism bearing directly upon the Christian religion.

Hegel put emphasis upon the theory that God, in order to self-consciousness, must objectify himself; must be eternally sinking his infinite in the finite, and then returning into himself again, as in an endless process. Out of this grew Hegel's thought of the Incarnation thus described by Dorner :

"Hegel, like Schelling, recognizes the idea of the Divine incarnation as the central point of Christianity; but this incarnation is conceived as an eternal incarnation, so that, as an eternal occurrence and occurring, it nevertheless expresses nothing but the eternal metaphysical relation between God and humanity, which is conceived as a unity of essence; only that *there exists a difference in the stages*

of the consciousness of this ever-existing and eternally similar unity of essence in God and man. With the historic side of Christianity and with the Person of Christ himself, this whole standpoint so endeavors to square accounts that it strives to trace lines of connection between the empire of eternal truths and the historic Christ, *in order to unite the two somehow in our consciousness or faith.* (Italics mine.) * * * His is the first man in whom the consciousness has arisen of the actually existent unity of essence between God and man, and at the same time the consciousness of Divine relationship or Sonship, unmistakably combined with a power which kindles the same consciousness in humanity, and awakens within it *consciousness of its real nature.*" (Italics mine).

This, according to Dorner, is Hegel, and the Later Pantheistic Soteriology. Hegel was in the University of Berlin, first for eleven years as Professor of Philosophy and for two years as Rector of the University. He died suddenly of cholera in 1831.

Spinoza, Kant, Schelling and Hegel (not to mention Jacobi) have thus poured into the young university the streams of mingled Pantheism, Rationalism, Moralism, Transcendentalism, and Mysticism.

Let us next treat this reservoir as a fountain of Theological Doctrine. What teachers and what teaching has it sent forth?

Obviously, a beginning must be made with the first Professor of Theology that the University ever knew. This was Schleiermacher.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to disparage the greatness of this wonderful man. His varied talents were tried in many directions, and failed in none. Born the son of a Reformed minister (a chaplain), at fifteen years of age he was placed in a Moravian school; at seventeen, in a Moravian college, and at nineteen he entered the University of Halle, where he completed a two

years' course. His twenty-first year found him with no fixed religious opinions; but at twenty-six he took orders, and at twenty-eight he became chaplain of the Charity Hospital in Berlin, serving in that position for six years. At the age of thirty-six, he became Professor of Philosophy and Theology in the University of Halle; and at forty-two we find him pastor of Trinity church and Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Both these positions he continued to hold until his death, twenty-four years afterward.

At an early age, Schleiermacher studied, unto thorough assimilation, Spinoza, Kant and Fichte. He absorbed Plato whom he translated so well as to acquire for himself an extensive reputation as a master of Greek. He attached himself to what was called the Romantic School of Poetry.

Slight in form, stooping and even hump-backed, his eye was magnetic, his countenance was noble and full of intellectuality and benignity, and his movements were quick, as his manner was polished and winning. His power as a writer is said to have been even surpassed by his fluency and eloquence as a speaker. There must have been in him much that was lovable as to personal character and devout as to Christian spirit. Dr. Charles Hodge writes of him:

“When in Berlin the writer often attended Schleiermacher's church. The hymns to be sung were printed on slips of paper and distributed at the doors. They were always evangelical and spiritual in an eminent degree, filled with praise and gratitude to our Redeemer. Tholuck said that Schleiermacher, when sitting in the evening would often say: ‘Hush, children, let us sing a hymn of praise to Christ.’”

This man, so superbly educated, so lovable in personality, so devout in his “passion for Christ,” is now in the very center of philosophical speculations. Deism and atheism and all the fine-spun theories and sophistries of

the opening nineteenth century crowd around the chair of the Professor of Theology in this most conspicuous and potent place in all Germany. What shall be his message to a waiting world in the hour of its great spiritual birth-throes? Others have spoken as philosophers. What shall Schleiermacher speak as a theological interpreter of the Revelation of God?

The sad fact is that this man, with this splendid opportunity, yielded at once to rationalistic assaults upon the Bible. He refused to demand for that Book recognition as the inspired Word of God. The line was sharply drawn between human speculation and the Scriptures. Schleiermacher consented that the Scriptures had gone down.

Next, groping for an extra-Scriptural revelation, our theologian accepted one furnished him by the speculations of Idealism which he had so thoroughly absorbed. This revelation was human consciousness in general, but, specifically, Christian consciousness.

Schleiermacher did not reason to God from the contents of consciousness as to the intellect. Religion, to him, had nothing to do with doctrine. Nor did he follow Kant in emphasizing the moral consciousness as demanding that there must be a God. For Schleiermacher, religion was a matter of feeling—the universally conscious feeling of dependence upon God. "It was the immediate consciousness of the being of everything finite in the infinite, and through the infinite; of everything temporal in the eternal and through the eternal: it was to feel amid all action and suffering our very life as life only as it was in and through God." This feeling was both personal and collective; and so there was a personal consciousness and a collective consciousness.

Specifically, Christianity in all necessary aspects was not a Bible, not a doctrine, not a cultus, but a life, attested to by a specific consciousness of which Christ's consciousness was the archetype and God the Creator. In religion, the

all-important thing is the Christian consciousness. In the Saviour, the all-important matter is not what he has done, but what he is. The life infused into men by a creative act as to Christ develops itself by a natural process "which is to end in the full actualization of the Divine life in the form of humanity."

This is sufficient to show (1) that Schleiermacher's Theology, while earnestly seeking originality, is largely composite, the Theologian breathing unconsciously the very vital air of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte and Schelling; (2) that here is a source sufficiently large and full and bold to send out many streams of the "Regenerated" Theology.

It may seem not gracious, in any tracing of the literary development of the Regenerated Theology, to assign any prominent place to David Friedrich Strauss. The simple fact is, however, that one, at least, of the very ablest advocates of this Theology has given him such a position. This is Principal Fairbairn. This able author of "Christ in Modern Theology," whilst not approving Strauss in general, acknowledges to some extent his contribution to the new Theology.

And the debt to Strauss is far larger than even Principal Fairbairn would be disposed to admit. Through him, Berlin began to pour forth the waters of "Criticism."

It must not be forgotten that Strauss commenced life as a theologian. He was, in fact, educated at Tübingen. When scarcely twenty-three years of age, he went to Berlin to sit at the feet of Hegel and Schleiermacher. Soon afterward Hegel died, but not without giving an impress and impulse to the keen young student which developed into the lectures in the Hegelian Philosophy, afterward delivered in the University of Tübingen. But whether Strauss owed more to Hegel or to Schleiermacher may be questioned. The lectures of the latter aroused an interest and a semi-opposing activity which found result in "The Life of Jesus."

All things considered, one cannot be surprised that Strauss treated the Bible with so little respect. Had not the Masters of Philosophy done it? Had not the most able and prominent theologian admitted that he found little use for it? Had not the cry been "Back to Christ," but, not through the Word? "To Christ," indeed, but through a pantheistic philosophy, through an almost Deified, immanent Christ-consciousness: a mystical life-force, an energizing incarnation. It is a positive relief to find at last that somebody has some use for at least some part of the Bible.

The method of Strauss was simple and direct. Like those who had gone before him, he took the liberty of cogitating his own plan. Substantially, there were but four steps: 1. Frame a hypothesis. 2. Adapt the Bible to it. 3. Annihilate all the Bible that cannot be adapted. 4. Use as your weapon radical, destructive criticism.

Unconsciously, it may be, but not the less certainly, the general progress of the higher criticism has been along those four steps. The hypotheses may not be the same in all cases. The methods of adaptation or of destruction may be diversified. The extent and freedom of the critical spirit may differ in different writers. But the four steps indicated are solidly built into the fabric of the higher criticism, and the regenerated theology is a compound of the philosophy of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, the theology of Schleiermacher and the essential principles of the destructive criticism of Strauss.

Other writers to be embraced in these literary references are so near to us that they may be dismissed with brief but significant mention in a single paragraph.

Baur was an admirer first of Schleiermacher and then of Hegel. His relation to Strauss was at one time that of teacher to pupil. His theory as father of the Tubingen school is known to all. Dr. Charles Hodge studied at Berlin when he was about thirty years of age. He had

then served in the Seminary at Princeton as instructor for two years and as professor for four years. His theological grounding was already complete. He met error only to give it the strong refutation found in his superb systematic theology. Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield (Congregational) College at Oxford, Gifford Lecturer in the University of Aberdeen and Late Muir Lecturer in the University of Edinburgh, was also a student in the University of Berlin. His "Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History" was published in 1876. His "Christ in Modern Theology," issued in 1890, will be treated in this article as the most thorough and articulate statement of the new theology that this school has produced within the writer's knowledge. Fairbairn's influence upon Bruce is apparent in Bruce's Apologetics. Professor Charles A. Briggs and Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke were both students at Berlin, each at the age of about twenty-five. References to the writings of Dr. Van Dyke will be made further in this article.

With the aid of these writers, let us now see if we can determine what the "Regenerated" Theology is.

II. THE REGENERATED THEOLOGY.

The term "Regenerated," as applied to Theology, is Dorner's. Dr. Hodge says that Dorner uses it in such a connection as to show that he means that Theology has been regenerated by Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher. Its broad distinctiveness is found in its claim that it is Christo-Centric. With great insistence, its advocates tell us that everything must be tested and determined by the consciousness of Christ. To the very natural question, as to how the Christ-consciousness is to be ascertained, the reply is vague and confused. It seems to be settled that the sayings of Christ are to be regarded as of paramount authority; yet, as to the genuineness even of these as reported in the Gospels, there is room for large difference of opinion and for the exercise of much critical discrim-

ination ; for, as Professor Bruce candidly tells us, modern scholarship has pretty generally settled that some of the Evangelists marvelously "idealize" and very "freely report" the sayings of Christ. This necessarily leaves us in a state of confusion and indecision as to what the "mind of the Master" really is. If we ask, where can the Christ-consciousness be found ? we are told, in the Christ-teaching. If we ask, how can the teaching be tested ? the reply is, by its fidelity to the Christ-consciousness. And so we seem to go round the circle.

Upon one thing, however, there is essential agreement, namely : that if genuine, the teaching of Christ is of far greater value and authority than any that the Holy Ghost may give us through any of the inspired writers of the Bible. The extent to which this comparison is made and this disparagement carried is simply shocking. Professor Fairbairn says :

"One thing is now beginning to stand out with a perfectly new distinctness, viz., the degree in which the mind of the Master transcends the minds of the disciples ; not the way they develop his teaching, but how they fail to do it ; the elements they miss, or ignore, forget, or do not see."

The apostles are represented as exhibiting a "falling off ;" as having a "more outward, less intimate," conception of God ; of "having lost, also, in some measure at least, the idea of the kingdom with all it implies to the human brotherhood, which expresses the Divine Sonship."

Similarly, in his Apologetics, writes Dr. Bruce : "It is the business of Theology to determine the affinities between the Galilean and the Pauline Gospel, but it is the privilege of religious faith to enter into life by the door which Jesus has opened, without stopping to try whether Paul's key fits the lock. The words of Jesus are words of eternal life, and no truth not spoken by him can be essential to salvation, however upbuilding to faith. His teaching contains in the smallest measure a local and temporary element."

And so Dr. Van Dyke: "How often Jesus quoted from the Old Testament to show that it was already old and insufficient: that its forms of spirit and rules of conduct were like the husk of the seed which must be shattered by the emergence of the living germ."

But Dr. Watson (Ian Maclaren) is "very bold." He calls the destruction of the Canaanites at God's command a "massacre." He says that the "Ten Words are only eclipsed by the Law of Love." He compares the words of Jesus with the writings of St. Paul and says "it must surely strike any one that the Apostle is less than his Master: that Paul's style is at times overwrought by feeling; that his illustrations are forced; that his doctrine is often Rabbinical rather than Christian, his ascetical treatment of certain subjects somewhat wanting in sweetness."

But now, with nearly all the Bible closed against us, except the sayings of Christ, and many of these sayings under dispute and doubt, we ask these modern writers to tell us: what is the Theology that this consciousness of Christ, so dubiously discovered, has so clearly revealed to them?

1. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to the Bible?

How confused is the reply! Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher who, according to Dorner, are the fathers of the regeneration, say that the Bible is wholly unnecessary. Philosophy or a Christian consciousness, a collective religious experience, can give us all we need. Wherefore then serveth the Bible? But the Higher Criticism modifies this sweeping all-destructiveness. It is error to hold that all the Bible must go. It is equal mistake to claim that all the Bible may stay. "Inspiration" is a term of very broad significance. Inspired men, in greater or less degree, may be found wherever the "immanent" "God-human" Christ may be found, everywhere, at sundry times.

As to the Books of the Old Testament, Jesus gave them

no comprehensive and authoritative approval as God's Word. He denounced some of them with vigor. The whole Levitical code was to him detestable Rabbinical Pharisaism. As Professor Bruce puts the matter, Jesus taught us to read the Old Testament with "discrimination"—that is, with suspicion, ending often in rejection. Dorner teaches that the Bible is historically accurate, only in so far as may be necessary to protect the essential revelation, the writer being liable to error in minor matters of fact. Professor Marcus Dods, of the Free Church College in Edinburgh, in the first chapter of his work on Genesis, takes even more freedom. Professor George Adam Smith, of the Free Church College, Glasgow, in his delightful and in many respects most instructive and suggestive work in Isaiah—a work written in fine style and with fascinating interest—tells us in no uncertain way what he and his school believe as to Prophetical inspiration. He says :

"To Isaiah, inspiration was neither more nor less than the possession of certain strong moral and religious convictions, which he felt he owed to the Spirit of God, and according to which he interpreted, and even dared foretell the history of his people, and of the world," * * "Isaiah prophesied and predicted all he did from loyalty to two simple truths, which he tells us he received from God himself : that sin must be punished and that the people of God must be saved. This simple faith, acting along with a wonderful knowledge of human nature and ceaseless vigilance of affairs, constituted inspiration for Isaiah. * * Judah shall be punished, Israel shall continue to exist. These were the certainties deduced from the laws. But for the exact conditions and forms, both of the punishment and of its relief, the prophets depended upon their knowledge of the world, of which, as these pages testify, they were the keenest and largest hearted observers that ever appeared."

These modern Theologians are thus shown to have for the Bible an exceedingly attenuated inspiration. Their

canonicity is entirely unsettled. The results of Radical Criticism are accepted with more or less general consent as the returns from the latest discoveries are made. Their Bible is appropriately in polychromic printing, its historicity doubted, its ethical integrity openly impugned by themselves; the very method by which its alleged composite authorship has been produced is admitted to be the product of men and times and processes of crude morality." It is simple justice to say that the Regenerated Theology has no definite Bible at all. The whole relation of the unsystematic system to the Scriptures is an illustration of the law which Dr. Van Dyke lays down for Theological guidance: "Definition is dangerous."

2. What does the Regenerated Theology teach as to God? The answer to this question must lead us to uncover that which is urged as the regulative principle of the whole system. This, as is well known, is the Divine Fatherhood. However slightly Professor Watts may speak of Professor Fairbairn's elaboration of this theory, it is certain that the book, "Christ in Modern Theology," is written with subtle and fascinating power, and is an able and well wrought presentation of the doctrine under consideration.

The strength of the whole theory lies in a plausible and forceful speculation as to the God-head. The consciousness of Christ shows us Fatherhood and Sonship in the God-head, and the Fatherhood of God has a far higher and more comprehensive meaning than that God is the Father of the human race. Let us follow Professor Fairbairn in the earliest points of his discussion.

First a distinction is made between God and God-head. "God is Deity conceived in relation, over against the universe; * * but the God-head is Deity conceived according to his own nature, as he is from and within himself." The doctrine of the God-head must be revealed. When revealed, it can be made the basis of a doctrine of God.

This Revelation comes through the consciousness of Christ. This shows us Fatherhood and Sonship as eternal and essential in the God-head. "Fatherhood is the essence of God, therefore Sonship is the same; and both are realized in the only forms and under the only conditions possible where God is concerned—outside or above the categories of time and space, where all distinctions of here and there, before and after, alike cease."

Again, Christ becomes the son of man because he is the Son of God. "The filial relation to man is the temporal form of the eternal relation to God." As the ideal son of man, Christ embodies humanity, which has existed before the mind and heart of God as Son from all eternity. God is thus conditioned in his own Being. It is of his essence to be related and to be conditioned by Fatherhood and Sonship. Hence, it is of his essence to love and to create and provide for sons whom he can love, and who can love him. God does not love because he creates; he creates because he loves. This love is a "passion to create happiness, active and exercised." It presupposes a moral being for its object. Nature is but God's instrument, a medium between the Father and his sons. His delight is in his children. His good-will as the eternal Father had no beginning, and will have no end.

Thus in the new Theology, God's Fatherhood and Love are everything. The Divine sovereignty is not judicial or regal but patriarchal. Divine justice is never retributive or vindictory but always remedial and disciplinary and reformatory. God's attributes of omnipotence and omniscience and omnipresence are so far secondary that in the Incarnate Son they may be temporarily laid aside. Divine holiness is but another name for Fatherly love. In the new terminology, the omnipresence of God becomes the Divine immanence. The universal and necessary Fatherhood sweeps the whole field of Divine and human being. Says Dr. Watson:

"With this single word, 'Father,' Jesus instantly defines the relation of man to God, and illuminates Theology. He transfers the Divine idea from the schools, where they discuss the sovereignty of God, to the hearth, where the little children say 'Our Father' with understanding. * * What an astounding *gaucherie* it has been to state the intimate relation between God and the soul in the language of criminal law, with bars, prisoners, sentences. * * Take it at the highest it was the spirit of Moses."

3. We next pass to an exhibition of some of the peculiar features of this Theology as it respects Christology.

The doctrine of the incarnation as held by this school is almost paramount. It is entirely probable that many amongst us have failed to note the significance of certain constantly recurring phrases, such as "A Personal Christ," the "Historic Christ," "*the* Christ." It is not difficult, however, to make this significance manifest.

According to Schleiermacher, the personal Christ was immanent as a life-force in the Church and in the world. This did not mean the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, but of the Christ in his own proper personality. And after Schleiermacher, almost every writer of the new Theology has insisted that the incarnation is, as Dr. Watson says, "not an expedient, but a consummation." The redemptive power resides distinctly in the personality. Almost the whole saving virtue is made to stand in "the human life of God." Christ is the ideal man in whom the idea of humanity is realized, and yet Christ is God because man is one of God's existence-forms. In Christ the God-consciousness is complete and men are made in Christ in such a way that his consciousness becomes their consciousness, and they become God-manifest in the flesh. This "human life of God" is the vitalizing and organizing principal of the Church.

That Dr. Van Dyke approximates this mystical view of the incarnation must be evident to all who will read his

chapter on the Human Life of God. His doctrine of the Kenosis represents the Eternal Logos as divesting himself of his essential fulness that he may as God be less than God while living a human life. In the view of the author of "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt," almost any theory as to the "Method of the Divine humiliation" will suffice, so the end of the actual lowering of the essential Divinity of Christ is attained. It is a matter of indifference whether one hold that the Eternal Word entered into life without omniscience, or omnipotence, or omnipresence; or that having been born under deprivation of his Divine mode of being, he received more and more of conscious Divinity; whether we agree with Muller or Godet or Gore or Fairbairn or Crosby, "Life is now the regnant idea: personality its most potent expressiou. It is in the facts of life * * that we must seek our comparisons for the Incarnation and the very search will bring us face to face with the conviction that life in all its manifestations transcends analysis without ceasing to be the object of knowledge."

All this, if it means anything definite, in a book in which it is distinctly stated that "definitions are dangerous," simply means what Schleiermacher meant; that the Incarnate Christ is a life-force in process of development, but how we cannot tell. After all this vagueness as to the matter and manner of the Incarnation would not a little sober and sound "definition" be stripped of its tenor, and might we not hear, well pleased, the old Shorter Catechism ring out:

"Christ the eternal Son of God, became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and born of her, yet without sin; and thus He was, and continueth to be, God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person, forever."

4. Passing from the Incarnation, we next glance at the new Soteriology. The fundamental matter here is sin. What are we to think of it?

The new Theology does not view sin so much as an attitude towards law. The sovereign and inimitable righteousness of God and the infinite divine holiness are studiously not made prominent. The scriptures bearing upon God's relation to man as moral governor are ignored, or interpreted unnaturally, or altogether rejected. Even the "Ten Words" are disparaged, as by Dr. Watson, and the whole Levitical code is despised, as by Dr. Bruce, with a sigh over the luckless day when Ezra came back from the exile with a Rabbinical law in his hand. Sin is to be described in the terms of Fatherhood and Sonship. The nearest approach to a definition is given by Dr. Fairbairn :

"Sin is the reign of unfilial feeling in the heart that was made for filial love; and where this reigns, the created Sonship can never fulfil its end or the creative Fatherhood be satisfied with its unrealized ideal."

As the very impulse to create souls sprang from the Father's loving delight in Fatherhood and Sonship, to fail to be a son consciously in communion with the Father is "to deny to the creator the beatitude he was created expressly to give." And this is the essence of sin.

The term "Collective Sin," or "Common Sin," is preferred to "Original Sin." The race is a family, and as such is a unit, and its constituents are in a relation of "solidarity." The Collective Sin should never be thought of out of its relation to the "Collective Righteousness." The "tendencies" common to us all are "defects of nature, yet for them no man is condemned."

"This law of solidarity finds its supreme illustrations in the sphere of religion: *here creative personalities exercise their mightiest lordship.* (Italics mine). The names that in Theology embody good and evil for the race are Adam and Christ: through the one sin comes to be, through the other, righteousness. They are, because opposites, complementary and correlative." From this it is argued that the race was constituted both in Adam and in Christ, all

the subjects of the common sin share in the good as well as in the evil. Personal guilt is developed only by actual transgression. And as the essence of personal sin is a failure to have, consciously, God as our Father, and to recognize ourselves as his sons, Salvation consists in awakening our dormant consciousness of the filial relation. Such seems to be this peculiar theory. It smacks decidedly of Schleiermacher.

To the end that we may become conscious of the Divine Fatherhood, the Incarnation is held up as "a communication." The stress is constantly laid upon "the Personal Christ." The "Human Life of God" is viewed as a force, full of creative and energizing power. The mode of its working is so vaguely described as to perplex and bewilder us. Sometimes it seems to proceed by mere exemplification, as if the Personal Christ saves us by being our model, sometimes by teaching, as if the salvation is to come through the moral and philanthropic precepts of Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, out of which Watson would evolve his boasted creed; sometimes by mystical contact, a sweet friendship with the Personal Jesus: but always it is the Incarnation which is the force, the saving power, the consummation. The Cross is a form of "culture."

And let it be emphasized: this prominence given to the Personality of Christ is designedly in distinction from his official work, and inclusive of it only in the faintest way, if at all. This is explicitly avowed by Dr. Fairbairn in the following words:

"It is also characteristic that the determinative idea in the system which he (Paul) elaborated with so much dialectical passion, comes from the Personality of Jesus, *and not from the Messianic office.* (Italics mine). That idea was his filial relation, his Divine Sonship. What to him was the primary fact in the consciousness of Jesus became the constitutive factor of his own thought."

In the light of this quotation, it is obvious to what all

this insistence upon the Personality of Jesus in tending. Its full development is seen in the new Soteriology as to Christ's death.

If there is one thing which the new Theology seems to view with aversion even unto detestation it is the essential idea involved in expiatory sacrifice and in a satisfaction-rendering priesthood. Wherever sacrifice is referred to, it is spoken of simply in its sense of self-denial. The parts of the Bible which speak of justice as demanding satisfaction, and of Priesthood rendering it, are treated as if they were suspected of poison. An atonement made to satisfy Divine justice is spoken of as "Juridical," and every Scripture which proclaims that Christ's blood must be shed in satisfaction for human guilt, is either perverted, or, like the Levitical code, treated as a blundering and pernicious mistake. The death of Christ is held up as a mere illustration, an exhibition of the "passible" Father who makes the real sacrifice in order to show how unhappy he is because his children will not love him. Jesus died for us, not vicariously, but sympathetically: taking our place and standing in our stead, not really, but by a vividness of imagination, a conceptualistic imposition upon himself. The strongest presentation of this sympathetic theory of the atonement is made by Professor Dörner:

"In such deep compassion and sympathy, he feels their sin and guilt more than his own suffering. Nay, sorrow for them, this sympathy with not merely their wretchedness, but for their guilt and penal desert is, through his self forgetting devotion, his deepest suffering, the heart of that suffering." * * "He enters into this condemnation of theirs in feeling, sorrowfully acknowledging it to be just in his deepest soul, and so far subjecting himself to the Divine condemnation which he recognizes." * * "He is, therefore, a High Priest in sympathy."

From all this it is perfectly plain that the passion of Christ is viewed as a culmination of the Incarnation; and

that its effect upon us is moral and subjective, as its aspect toward God is that of a climax to the Kenosis, the "self-beggary" of the passible God-head.

5. The new Theology has no settled view as to the doctrine of endless punishment. Professor Bruce says that the Christ consciousness represents Christianity as optimistic for time and eternity and that the Christian apologist is not called upon to dogmatize as to the final destiny of the 'un-saved.

But it cannot be denied that the general tendency of the modern Theology is toward Restorationism. It is held to be inconsistent that infinite Fatherhood should fall short of an everlasting struggle against a severance or destruction of the filial relation.

Schleiermacher's position, as Dr. Shedd shows, practically amounts to saying that "hell is abolished by becoming used to it and that remorse is of the nature of virtue" which must ultimately relieve. Dorner concludes that the whole matter is involved in unfathomable mystery but hints at possible annihilation or an entire change into some other form of being. Dr. Fairbarin holds that if "at any point of space or moment of eternity God were to say certain sinners must, in order to vindictive and exemplary punishment, remain sinners forever," then he would, as it were, "concede a recognized place and function for sin." His conclusion is that if evil never ceases, the conflict of righteousness with sin "must go on forever." The very necessity that Regal Paternity should be merciless to sin "prevents penalty ever becoming merely retributive or retaliatory." And as the new Theology's hope is very long, so it is exceedingly broad.

Says Dr. Watson :

"It is surely a narrow mind and more—a narrow heart—that would belittle the noble sayings that fell from the lips of outside saints or discredit the virtues of their character. Is it not more respectful to God, the Father of mankind,

and more in keeping with the teachings of the Son of Man, to believe that everywhere and in all ages can be found not only the prophecies and broken gleams, but also the very Kingdom," such as Mogul Emperor Akbar, "Moslem Saints," Marcus Aurelius, and those whose "fine charity" is embodied in the legends of Abou-Ben-Adhem and the renunciation of Buddha.

III. THE ATTITUDE OF OUR CHURCH TOWARD THE MODERN THEOLOGY.

1. Our attitude is not one of ignorance. Of course the large proportion of our ministers cannot be regarded as making the new Theology a matter of special study. Our pulpits are kept free from the speculations of philosophy and the advanced notions of Higher Critics. This is as it should be. But it is also true that many of our ministers have a very definite conception of what the new Theology is. The books of these writers who belong to this school are not unfrequently found in the libraries of our pastors, and much in them is appreciated for general suggestiveness. And then, our religious papers are conducted by men of active minds, who know what the Theological world is doing. Our *Outlook* and QUARTERLY are not wanting in information as to developments in this line of thought, our Professors in our Theological Seminaries are abreast of the age, and the personal contact of our ministers with the Theological institutions abroad is not inconsiderable.

2. The attitude is not one of indifference. We comprehend that it would be unwise to let these movements awaken in us no interest. We know that far more is involved in these discussions than could be included in any agitations affecting only our denomination. These matters belong, not merely to Calvinism, but to the universal Christian faith. Questions affecting the Being of God, the Incarnation and Redemptive work of Christ, the integrity and trustworthi-

ness of the Bible, the Plan of Salvation, and the issues of eternal destiny, belong to every church in the world. We carry our share of interest in these vital matters.

3. This attitude is not one of arrogant intolerance or of uncharitable malice. With us, legitimate freedom of thought and of speech is fundamental. The church does not permit disapproved teaching in her name and by her authority; she makes no effort to prohibit any man from teaching in his own name, or by authority of his own church, whatever he believes to be the truth. The Christian lovableness of many who belong to this school of theological thought we fully appreciate; and whatever they have written that seems to us uplifting and true, we heartily enjoy. That there is much of this, we fully admit.

4. This attitude is not one of opposition to sanctified scholarship. The Southern Presbyterian Church has always upheld the standard of ministerial qualification and has always demanded that her teachers shall be able to teach others also. Criticism within proper limits is not interdicted. This by no means prevents us from being aware that critics, like ourselves, are not infallible.

5. This attitude is not one of stolid narrowness. It is true, we seriously object to much that is often implied in the word "broad." But we most highly value genuine catholicity. For this reason, we are slow to part company with our dead who died in the old faith: with the best element in the old Catholic Church; with the Reformers; with the creeds of Christendom; with our dear old Westminster Confession. The Bible is so good for us that we feel that we want it as broad and as long as we can keep it.

6. The attitude of our Church toward the Regenerated Theology is that of thoughtful, intelligent, positive, and, I believe, unanimous, rejection and antagonism. To a concise exhibition of the grounds of this opposition, attention is next invited.

1. The consciousness of Christ, as ascertained by the new Theology, is too narrow and too uncertain to serve as a basis of theological construction. There is not a shadow of evidence that the Revelation through the Bible should be thus limited. To refuse to hear God's Word through Paul out of alleged reverence for Christ, is but to imagine a conflict between the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity; or, since Christ was full of the Spirit that inspired Paul, to make the Spirit antagonize himself. The Bible to us must ever be not only the Word actually uttered by Christ, but also the Word which the Holy Ghost teacheth, by whomsoever uttered. To determine what this inspired word is, we are steadfast in maintaining, that the old commonsense way is the true way. The genuineness and authenticity of the Bible must be examined. Its testimony for itself must be heard and the value of that testimony weighed by the rules of evidence. Above all, the organic unity of the Scriptures the excellency of their matter, their fitness to be food for the soul, their efficacy in producing noble lives, their power to sustain in sorrow and in death, and their faithfulness in guiding to heaven, all must be considered. And having intelligently done this, we deny that the Bible is to be limited to the sayings of Christ, many even of these being disputed.

2. But now, coming to the actual teaching of Jesus, we differ most widely with our honored brethren as to the content of the mind of the Master. This difference emerges at every point along the whole line of investigation.

(1). When we ask Christ about the Bible, he does not say what these brethren represent him as saying. It is not a fact that he disparaged or condemned any part of the Old Testament. Christ honored the Bible as his Bible. He referred to it under its well-known divisions. He encouraged the people to search these Scriptures. He quoted them when living, when suffering, when dying. He cleared

their enactments of Pharisaic glosses, and reaffirmed them in their true meaning, correcting the traditional abuse and giving anew the genuine law.

Even Wendt, who denies the Pre-existence of Christ—substantially a Unitarian, but significantly in great favor with this school—admits without hesitation that the common impressions of the Jewish people concerning the Scriptures in Christ's time, were Christ's own impressions and belief, and boldly says that neither they nor he knew what they were talking about. Is it not astonishing that such high praise, with no warning, can be given to such a work as Wendt's "Teaching of Jesus," and this by Professors in chairs of Theology! These brethren, too, seem strangely silent as to what Christ had to say respecting the Revelation in the New Testament. Did the promises in the upper room amount to nothing as exhibiting the mind of the Master? Is it true that a Juridical, Rabbinical, ascetic celibate of a St. Paul could have so disastrously misled the Church after Christ had said: "He will guide you into all truth." "He will bring all things to your remembrance." With the Holy Ghost thus promised for this specific purpose, could John have "idealized" and suffered in his writing from "personal idiosyncrasy," from "environment," so that the verisimilitude of Christ's sayings flickers in ghostly uncertainty on the borders of belief and doubt, of truth and error? "We have not so learned Christ" or heard his testimony to the Bible, just as it was, as it was to be, and as it is. We are firmly persuaded with Dr. Storrs that this Jesus lays a hand of approval upon each of the Testaments, standing midway between the two, "predicted of the one, attested of the other, and the sure Witness of both."

(2) Again: when we go to Christ and ask him "what is God?" His reply seems to us far broader than is represented. At Samaria's well, he said "God is a Spirit" to be worshipped in spirit and truth. He made God the "Lord of

Heaven and earth," the awful Revealer, Concealer, Disposer. His favorite phrase was "the Kingdom of God," found on his lips not less than thirty or forty times in the Gospels. He put naked Divine condemnation over against human hypocrisy; and if against this, why not against other sin? It is true, he called God his Father, for so he was. It is true, also, that he taught that God is a Providential Father to men as men, and a Gracious Father to Christians. These truths are not denied. Why should they be? But, on the other hand, it is not true that God to Christ was Father and nothing besides. God to Christ was just what he is to himself and to all, and that is—God!

When we write our equation with God as its first member, the only appropriate second member is just God. "I am that I am." The universal, all-transfusing, all-surrounding element of God's Being was the same in Christ's conception as in all the Scriptures: and that was and is his awful Holiness. This gives character to every personality in the Godhead, to every relation and condition amongst the Persons, to every attribute in God, and to every act of God. It pervades the Divine essence. It glorifies every thought, feeling, and volition. The Father is the "Holy Father." The Son is the "Holy Child." The Spirit is the "Holy Ghost." If we may with any degree of propriety speak of anything as conditioning God in every conceivable relationship, attribute, affection, in his law, in his Gospel, in his Word, in his works, for all time and for all eternity, it is that of which the Cherubim chanted as they flew through the temple, covering face and feet, and crying so that the very posts on the threshold trembled: "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts." God's own awful oath is made upon his own Being *and Holiness*.

(3) In the next place, we cannot admit the new Theology's doctrine of the Incarnation to be an unfolding of the consciousness of Christ. Our primary reason is that it is no definite doctrine for us to accept. It may safely be pro-

nounced as not even clearly conceivable, and it is sure that no lucid expression of it has ever been made in human speech. Such a phrase as "the human life of God" simply obscures thought. If the Incarnation in Christ's representation of it is the "consummation" of Revelation, and apparently of all saving force and life, right here the thought should be the clearest, so that a man running might read it.

But here everything is in a bewildering, Pantheistic, Kenoistic mist and shadow simply impenetrable. These writers are wont to dwell upon the "simplicity" of Christ's teaching, with "silver iterance." Can any mortal discover the faintest trace of this characteristic in this mysticism? Now it is admitted that the Incarnation is mysterious. But the ordinary doctrine of it can be expressed in intelligible terms. Dr. Charles Hodge can be understood. So can the Shorter Catechism. The fact is a mystery, but the revelation of it is plain. Christ has two natures in one personality. Whatever can be affirmed of either nature can be affirmed of the person. The mystery here is in the thing; but there is not fatal obscurity in the expression of it. What Christ taught, we can easily know. He said, "I and my Father are one." "Before Abraham was, I am." "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father"; and again, "The son of man hath not where to lay his head." "I thirst." "This is my body." We can know what all this means. It means that Christ was God; that Christ was man; and there was just one Christ. This personality was unique. The fact that Christ was man, did not operate to take the human race unto Deity; or that he was God, to make God Pantheistically immanent in humanity. Christ's teaching is clear. But is Schleiermacher's? Is Dörner's? Can we find anywhere in Christ's teaching any warrant for Dörner's theory that when he was born as man, his Divinity as Logos was dormant or absent; that more and more of it was poured into him as he grew; that at last the human soul, receiving more and more of God's perfections, be-

come completely Divine? Did Christ reveal to Principal Fairbairn through his sayings, or by any other instrumentality, that when his Divinity underwent the Kenosis, the external or physical attributes of Deity, as Fairbairn calls them, such as omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence, were "veiled," or "restrained" by his moral attributes, resulting in "the limitation of God by the God-head." Remember, all this comes from men who are shouting "Back to Christ;" to Christ's simplicity. Where in Christ's consciousness did Dr. Fairbairn find authority for these following sentences occurring in his discussion of the Incarnation: "Schelling's Absolute Identity and Hegel's Absolute Idealism meant the same thing; and it has passed into current thought, philosophical and religious, as the Doctrine of the Divine immanence" * * God is, as it were, the eternal possibility of being incarnated; man, the permanent (why did he not say eternal?) capability of incarnation?" Now, in all seriousness, the only possible ground on which this speculation might be offered as a Revelation through the Christ-Consciousness would be, that, through some racial union, Christ's consciousness was Schelling's and Hegel's consciousness!

(4). Passing now from the Incarnation, we next remark that this Union of Speculative Philosophy and Straussian Criticism, two relatives of blood kin, is seen to yield its most unhealthy offspring when we come to view its Soteriology. It vitiates the cardinal Gospel truth that is the heart of the Scriptural plan of Salvation.

Priesthood is regnant in all religious history. The soul of man, conscious of sin, echoes God's call for expiatory sacrifice, universally and everlastingly. Scientific speculation through John Fiske may sport with this deep deliverance of human consciousness as the product of ignorance and fear in the human mind not yet sufficiently revolutionized to cast off the fetters of superstitious dread and awe of the uncomprehended forces of destructive nature. But the

dominant fact of history, which is sin, gives concurrent testimony along with the dominant fact of religious consciousness as expressed in all worship through all time, and absolutely martyrizs the human race for the truth that guilt is universal and demands a priesthood with a sacrifice that shall satisfy the holiness of God. All the legions of the new Theology are hurled in avowed and most bitter assault upon the vicarious priestly offering of Jesus Christ as satisfaction to God's Justice, which is simply God's Holiness in relative expression and operation. Principal Fairbairn having quoted "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law," most strongly says:

"Certainly; but this was the law which the Jew loved, and which was thus forever abolished, not the universal law of God. He became 'a curse for us;' certainly, but under the same law, for by it he was 'hanged upon a tree.' But the law that thus judged him condemned itself: by cursing him it became accursed. His death was not the vindication, but the condemnation of the law. And this is the characteristic attitude of the New Testament writers."

Amazing exegesis! That law which the Apostle was writing about was older than Abraham, whose obedience to it, the Apostle expressly says, could not justify.

In this opposition to a sacrifice that satisfies justice is imbedded inveterate bitterness against the whole Levitical code. Says Bruce:

"Judaism (Leviticalism) cured that ["moral religious license"] by hedging the people in on every side by positive law, and the evil now to be apprehended was that the cure would breed a new and worse disease—dead, rotten-hearted legalism. 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."

Dr. Watson speaks of "The Culture of the Cross." He says that "Jesus did not describe his cross as a satisfaction to God." "He always spoke of it as a regeneration of

man." "The Gospels do not represent the cross as a judicial transaction between Jesus and God, on which he throws not the slightest light, but as a new force which Jesus has introduced into life." "The cross may be made into a doctrine, it was prepared by Jesus as a discipline." Dr. Van Dyke makes "the whole value of the atonement," in its "reconciling influence on the heart of man," and in its "exhibition of the heart of God," "depend on the actuality of the Incarnation." And so we are ever brought back to the dominant Soteriology of this whole School. The "Gospel for an Age of Doubt" has, as its distinctive element, "a Person." Fairbairn boldly adds in words what is involved in the teaching of all the others, "*and not the Messianic office.*" Whereas Paul said: "We preach Jesus Christ and him crucified," these Theologians would say: "We preach Jesus Christ" and "a life-force;" "culture;" salvation through a natural process of personal magnetism or a development of a race-incarnation.

This superficial combination of rationalism and sentimental mysticism can never supplant the sublime and common-sense truth as to the Priesthood of Jesus Christ. Beside Thornwell's magnificent sermon, it is simply puerile. Every solitary utterance of Jesus condemns it. "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and *drink his blood*, there is no life in you." The agony of Gethsemane, with the shuddering horror of its bitter cup, its sorrowfulness unto death, rebukes these theories in awfulness of spoken and unutterable woe. The "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," shows that the "final idea of God" according to Christ, is God and nothing less. To God, as God, Jesus offers himself on the cross in a sublimity of worship that rocked the earth, darkened the heavens, rent the temple's vail, startled the dead and amazed the living in earth and heaven. The specific form of this worship was sacrifice. And the innermost heart of sacrifice as worship is, not merely scenic exhibition, not conceptualistic substitution by sympathy

working through phantasy, not disciplining exemplification, not a force-furnishing Kenosis; but expiatory satisfaction for guilt by the vicarious suffering of the substitute for the principal, the former, standing in the very law-place of the latter and bearing the suffering as just penalty: the whole transaction a voluntary homage to the majesty of law, to the inimitability of righteousness, to the Holiness of God, and to the amazing grace which provides in God's Son the willing victim, the adoring Priest, and the sanctifying Altar to be sworn by in covenant forever.

This is the Soteriological foundation of human hope as revealed in the Bible, from beginning to end. There is one God and one Mediator * * who "gave himself a ransom for all." He bore our sins. Our iniquity was laid upon him. God made his soul an offering for sin. He died for us, the just for the unjust. Though an Eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God. He is the Propitiation for our sins. Abel's Lamb, Abraham's Lamb, Isaiah's Lamb, John the Baptist's Lamb, Calvary's Lamb; through all time and though all eternity, the redeemed of his blood must behold him as the Lamb in the midst of the Throne, and must cry: "*Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood.*" Touch that truth and, as we see the matter, you have put the coldness of ice through the Gospel's heart. This is the "Gospel for an Age of Doubt." And our time is ominously warning that the less of this very Gospel there be, the wider and deeper, darker and deadlier, will be the doubt. The Sampson that tugs at these pillars which uphold the temple at the place where mercy and holiness meet, may pull down the edifice upon those he deems his theological foes; but deepest under the ruin will be his own theological self.

(5). Finally: the "Regenerated" Eschatology seems to us full of perilous uncertainty. In the minds of many of the writers there appears to be no eschatological conclusion at all. To affirm that death ends probation and fixes the

state eternally, their theologians will not: to deny absolutely, they cannot. Would it not have been wiser and safer to be silent?

But here very bold speculation rushes in where angels fear to tread. The Fatherhood of God is represented as so possessed of love as to make it impossible to say that any moral chasm between God and the soul can be a "great gulf fixed." Now, between God and his child by grace, justified, adopted, born of the Spirit, there is a bond that neither death nor life can destroy. Forever blessed be his Name!

But can this be affirmed with any degree of confidence of that creative and providential Fatherhood which the fall and sin have so awfully transformed as to justify the loving Christ in saying to sinful men, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do?" "If God were your Father, ye would love me." Whose son did Jesus say Judas was? "The son of perdition." And what did Jesus say was his fate? "Lost!" What is the fearful import of a Divine utterance to the effect that "it had been better that he had never been born?" What did Christ mean by a loss of soul whose descriptive adjunct was "cast away?" By a "fire that is not quenched?" By "where the worm dieth not?" By "depart from me?" By "and the door was shut?" By "whither I go ye can not come?" By "it shall not be forgiven to him, neither in this world nor in the world to come?" By an everlastingness binding heaven and hell in an equal duration? The only conceivable way of breaking the force of these "Logia" is by applying, to each and all the quotations, the peremptory short-cut so often used by Wendt: "Clearly a gloss of the redacting Evangelist."

Christ says enough to warn us away from these speculations based upon personal relationships. He tells us of a relation closer than human fatherhood; for whose sacredness a man may forsake his father and mother and cleave to his

wife, and they be one. But between these two Jesus says that sin may dig a pit that in Christ's own judgment either party might be right in never attempting to cross. And that chasm might be, in depth and breadth, in exact proportion to the purity of the character or the intensity of the love in the party sinned against—the very purity of the love and the very love of purity burying the old relationship in a grave of moral ruin beyond possibility of resurrection; as when the noble Arthur, in knightly chastity, yearned over the golden haired queen saying: "Let no man dream I love thee not," but under a moral necessity rode away from her forever. I do not offer this as argument. It is offered as an illustration of a truth that obtains on earth and may obtain in heaven. And it is that (as amongst relationships) no man on earth can speculatively judge *how far sin may go in the awful work of moral divulsion*. If as dynamite, it can shatter the union that typifies Christ and his church; if as moral and spiritual earthquake, it can open a bottomless pit between God and some of his earliest sons, the angels who kept not their first estate, wiser will it be for us to cling to the faithful, the severe, but the loving and the true words of Christ, and dismiss all speculation as to what, *a priori*, so fearful an element in the moral universe cannot do. And with this, we bring the discussion to an end.

CONCLUDING INFERENCE.

If the foregoing pages have truthfully shown the literary origin of the Regenerated Theology, its composite form, its main characteristics and the real attitude toward it of the Presbyterian Church, South, then the discussion yields one inevitable inference: it could never advance the welfare of our Church, or the interests of peaceful Christian communion, for that Church to put herself in a position of responsibility for doctrines which, while she must disapprove, she would be powerless to control. If it should appear that her inner spirit toward the Regenerated

Theology is unique, her outward organism must be conformed and adapted to her real inward convictions.

That these "progressive" views are progressing, must be admitted. In consistently denouncing Systematic Theology, the Progressionists jointly in Europe and America are bending every energy and exhausting every resource of scholarship to build up a Systematic Theology! A Polychrome Bible, an Expositor's Bible, an International Critical Commentary, an Exhaustive Bible Dictionary, an International and Inter-Confessional Theological Library, all are in process of development under a motto set forth in the first sentence in the "Editor's Preface," to-wit: "Theology has made great and rapid advances in recent years." The prevalence of these views over Germany is well known. Their extensive existence in England under Canon Driver's scholarly influence is fully recognized. In Scotland, their advancement has been steady since the Free Church in 1881 pronounced that it was "neither safe nor advantageous" that Professor Robertson Smith should teach in the College of Aberdeen. In 1882 Professor Bruce's "End of Revelation" came up on complaint in the General Assembly. Principal Rainy moved that no action was necessary or expedient, and the motion was adopted.

Again in 1890, the teachings both of Professor Dods and Professor Bruce arose for consideration in the Assembly. That body "recognized the existence of causes for profound anxiety" in Professor Dod's writings but not for instituting process, and then adopted a paper elaborately affirming *its own* orthodoxy, which had not been called in question. About the same thing was done with regard to the teaching of Professor Bruce; only, the criticism was somewhat more severe and the warning a little more positive. This amounted to saying to these teachers: You are not sound but *we* are, and you can go on teaching in our name. And they went on.

In 1891, overtures asking for more definite expression

concerning both these Professors come up to the Assembly. The reply was that the Assembly did not deem it necessary to take any further action in reference to the matters referred to in the overtures.

In 1893 the Rev. Walter C. Smith, of Edinburgh, Moderator of the Free Church Assembly, in his address closing the sessions, said that the "Method of scientific criticism had already got a footing in the Church and had established a right to be there without injury to their belief in Christ or to their reliance in the sacred records."

In 1895, Dr. Drummond was reported to the Assembly. No action was deemed necessary, Principal Rainy declaring that ministers and elders were not equipped for the scientific questions raised and liberty must be allowed. And so, we suppose, endeth the chapter. Results: one teacher was silenced; two were admonished, but not silenced; the last was not admonished: and then came "liberty." But the Assembly had saved its own orthodoxy by declaring for itself that it believed what nobody had said it did not believe, and what its most prominent teachers in its Theological Colleges say is not true.

It is not my purpose to suggest a parallel to this history of ineffectual opposition farther than as an American Presbyterian possibility. The analogy in the course of proceedings as thus far advanced is striking. This article will close with no prophecy, but with a palpable fact. Whatever arguments of the past have held the Presbyterian Church in the South to her distinct organic existence, all of which remain in undiminished vigor, the overwhelming consideration to-day is fully expressed in the words that one of our prominent ministers, who has studied in seminaries, both at home and abroad, gave utterance to when he wrote: "Point strongly the moral that our church should bide as she is, for her doctrinal life may be at stake."

EUGENE DANIEL.

Raleigh, N. C.

VII. THE FIRST PRESBYTERY.

I. The first Presbytery which met in America convened in the early part of the year 1705, in the village of Philadelphia, in the colony of William Penn. It is true that four years before this date William Penn had dignified the settlement with the title of city, at which time its population all told, would not number as many people as ordinarily congregate at this day in a frontier village to attend a popular circus. The reader will understand that the craze for calling every railroad crossing and every cross-road settlement a city is not a modern craze. All our boasted civilization and modern progress has made but little advance along this line. The quaint and dignified old Quaker with his religious sanctity and court intrigues, moved the previous question on modern civilization, and in 1701, before there were any railroads, signed a charter and made his little settlement on the Delaware river at the mouth of the Schuylskill, a city. Nevertheless, it was a village of log houses and shanties squatted in the fork of the two rivers and barely reaching down to the water's edge of either. In this village and in a "log meeting house" the first court of the Presbyterian Church in America opened up business for the spread of the Gospel and the evangelization of the new world along the line of the Scripture form of Church government, which is that of Presbytery.

This Presbytery had no legal standing, no distinctive or descriptive title, no corporate life, although it claimed to have a constitution, which was never printed, or if so, no copy has ever come down to us. It was simply a Presbytery. It met annually in the city of Philadelphia till the organization of a Synod, with the exception of two meetings, which were held in New Castle. The exact date 1705

is a presumption. But it goes without contradiction, and is strengthened by the fact that the first accessible records upon which the presumption is based, bear date 1706, with strong indication of and allusions to, a previous meeting, which had assigned certain parts of trial to a candidate for the ministry. The first and second pages, missing the third page, open: "*De regimine ecclesiæ*—which being heard, was approved of and continued." The record proceeds: "He gave in also his *theis* to be considered of against the next *sederunt*." The next *sederunt*, 2d, 10brs. 27. "*Post preces sederunt*, Mr. Francis McKemie Moderator, Messrs. Jedediah Andrews and John Hampton ministers." The latin quotations here are literal as they stand in the records, and may without any breach of propriety be pronounced as the fathers pronounced them, after the English method, by which the reader will be able to trace the signification by the sound of the words and understand that *sederunt* of the primitave American Presbytery corresponds to the sittings of the Presbytery of modern times.

"Mr. John Boyd performed the other parts of his trial, viz: preached a popular sermon on John 1: 12, defended his thesis, gave satisfaction as to his skill in the languages and answered to extemporary questions, all of which were approved of and sustained." It was further "appointed that his ordination be on the next Lord's day, the 29th, which was accordingly performed in the public meeting house of this place before a numerous assembly. The next day he had a certificate of ordination."

From these records it appears that Mr. John Boyd was the first minister licensed and ordained by the Presbyterian Church in America. His licensure and ordination took place at the same meeting of Presbytery. But it was no hurried up affair. No extraordinary case. His examination appears to have been thorough, full and exact. Mr. Boyd was assigned to service on several committees, and to "supply Woodbridge every third Sabbath if the people

desired it." He was finally settled in Freehold, N. J. The records of the year 1709 have this entry: "The Rev. Mr. Boyd being dead, what relates to him ceases." This is the first death mentioned in the record. There is no memorial page set apart; no committee appointed to draft and bring in a minute—just simply one entry, terse and significant as any we find in the Old Testament concerning the patriarchs. There is no mention in the records concerning the death of Rev. Francis Makemie, the first moderator. But in a letter addressed by the Presbytery, in May 1709, to Sir Edward Harrison, at London, we read: "The negotiations begun and encouraged by a friend in the time when our worthy friend, Mr. Makemie, (now deceased) was with you for evangelizing these colonies was a beginning exceedingly acceptable to a multitude of people, and was likely to be of great service if continued, which makes us much grieved that so valuable a design was so soon after its beginning laid aside." The point of the "much grieved" here is not that Mr. Makemie is "now deceased," but that the enterprise of evangelizing the colonies was so soon cut off.

The youngest, first licensed, first ordained is "dead." The oldest first moderator, most able, distinguished and efficient is "deceased," and the mention of the last fact placed in brackets.

Although but three names appear on the pages of the records as present at the first recorded meeting, their number very soon increased to seven, as appears from the sixth page of the "Preliminary Sketch" of the Presbyterian Church, published by the board of publication in 1841. Their names are Francis Makemie, John Hampton, George McNish and Samuel Davis. These were all emigrated from Ireland and exercised their ministerial gifts on the Eastern shore of Maryland. In addition to these Nathaniel Taylor, a Scotchman, settled in Marlborough; John Wilson, likewise a Scotchman, settled in New Castle; and Mr. Jeddiah Andrews, a Boston Yankee, settled in Philadelphia, completed the seven.

The same dissatisfaction which prevails to-day about church conveniences and the multiplicity of preaching places cropped out very early in the history of Presbyterianism in America. To-day almost every little town which is incorporated into a city with charter privileges, has those in it who want to divide that element, which might if properly managed, make one strong Presbyterian Church, into two or three feeble bands calling themselves by pompous titles. They go begging all through the community for money to help them on in their disintegrating work—starving out two or three good preachers by their divisive actions when by combined effort they might give one man a decent support and make themselves felt a power for good in the community. Before this Presbytery had held its third meeting two counter petitions came before the body. The record runs after this fashion: "This day was read before the Presbytery a letter sent by the people of and about White Clay Creek, in New Castle County, importing their desire and petition to the Presbytery to have the ordinances of the gospel administered with more convenience and nearness to the place of their abode for the greater advantage and ease to their several families, promising with all due encouragement the minister that shall be thus appointed to supply them." Over against this on the same page and the same day we read, "This day was also read a letter from several persons in the town of New Castle wherein they crave that the people of White Clay Creek may not be suffered to set up a meeting house in the country, that their meeting house and congregation in New Castle may not be damaged by this rupture of their fellow members of White Clay Creek." After due deliberation the Presbytery took the following action: "Ordered that the people of New Castle and the country shall not be divided by setting up two separate meetings." This action was preeminently wise, and the wording is perfect—it is inhibitory, the right of rule and

authority is asserted. The Presbytery exercised that Episcopal function which belongs to and is inherent in the body. The end for which the action was taken is clearly set out: "Shall not be divided." That is generally the effect produced, it divides the Presbyterian Church in any and every community where it is attempted, however loud the protestations may be to the contrary. Any one who has ever been on the ground knows that the distance between White Clay Creek and New Castle is so short that an active and energetic boy could, in the summer time, have left home after an early breakfast, on Sunday morning, gone down to the creek, with good tackle and the right sort of bait, and caught a fine mess of fish and got back home before his mother could have returned from the meeting house where she had gone to hear Mr. John Wilson preach his sermons by order of Presbytery. Or that same mother could have sat on her front porch, any quiet summer evening during the week, and heard distinctly the deep bass notes of the green-headed bull frogs which in those days infested the waters of White Clay Creek. Still at that early day with bad roads and inconvenience of travel, and many other considerations there might have been found some plausible excuse for wanting two meeting houses in sight and sound of each other. But in this day with all sorts of conveyance from the "fly" to the "trap" or the "spider" and the "drag" for fashionable Christians, with the street cars for those in more modern circumstances, bicycles for the young folks and stick horses for the children, there is absolutely no real and necessary demand for dividing the congregations by setting up separate meeting houses in so many of our large towns and smaller cities.

Our Presbyteries should follow the policy thus laid down by our fathers and assert their authority in unifying the strength of the church and consolidating its forces. No movement in any town or city should be encouraged, much less aided by the "committee of Home Missions," until it can be shown that a church is strong enough numerically and

financially to support itself, and also aid the out-going colony with substantial help. Then let them multiply as fast as these conditions will justify the multiplication, but not any faster. Otherwise the cause is injured, notwithstanding the talk about a mission in every ward, and a little church in every bailiwick. The real need and most pressing demand of to-day is for the grouping of weak churches in the smaller towns and country places and putting one minister over a number of them, that all may have the benefits of the gospel ordinances once a month, or oftener. Or, sending the man who wants to plant churches to the frontier and destitute parts where there is no preaching at all, and thus build for God and the church.

"The Home Mission Committee" should not be asked, by any Presbytery, to take the money given by the church for "Home Missions" to start, or maintain, any and every feeble little effort which may be attempted in towns or small cities where already the means of grace are found in a church organized and a pastor settled. It is the part of wisdom and prudence, as well as a duty, to take care of the country churches and destitute places. And when we remember that the larger cities are drawing from the country to keep up, and increase, their growing and business population we can readily understand that the most economical and best use which can be made of the men and the money is to put both in the smaller towns where we have no churches, and from which our cities are making constant drafts.

Another matter arrested the attention of this first Presbytery and received that prompt action which should characterize every church court under similar circumstances. Upon information that David Evan, a lay person, had taken upon himself to publicly teach or preach among the Welch settlements, in what was then called the "Great Valley," in Chester county, the Presbytery proceeded to take up the matter and issue it in the following words: "It was unanimously agreed that the said David Evan had done very ill

and irregularly in thus invading the work of the ministry, and was thereupon censured." The record does not show whether Mr. David Evan had been teaching a singing school, and being popular with the young ladies and their mothers, was thus fitted for and called to the independent work of the ministry. Nor does it carry any recorded evidence that he was a commercial traveler, and knew the ways of the traveling men, and boys about town, and had that special qualification and call to the ministry, or that he was a reformed gambler and drunkard, and for that reason the very man of all others for the place. The presumption is rather the other way, for there is no evidence that Mr. Evan became obstreperous and sneered at the authority of the courts of the Lord's house, and rushed frantically into the ministry as a great lay evangelist. Nor did he tramp about over the country with a little reed organ and a dapper little side-whiskered singer, invading the churches and forcing pastors to tolerate and approve him and his methods under an implied threat that if they offered any opposition he would get a rickety old tent, or rent a dingy old hall, and begin at once dividing their congregations and unsettling their pastorates.

Having unanimously agreed that Mr. Evan had done "very ill," and further having "censured him" for doing so, it was finally "Agreed, that the most proper method of advancing David Evan in necessary literature to prepare him for the work of the ministry, is that he lay aside all other business for twelve months and apply himself closely to learning and study, under the direction of Mr. Andrews, with the assistance of Mr. Wilson and Mr. Anderson, and that it be left to the discretion of these said ministers when to put Mr. Evan on trial and license him publicly to teach or preach." Here is the first instance on record of the Presbyterian Church in America appointing a commission with authority to license a candidate to preach. This commission consisted of three ministers but no ruling. Here is the first instance of the

Presbyterian Church in America recommending that a candidate for the ministry study for a given period of time "under some approved divine." Both of these principles had since been embodied in the organic law of our church. To all of the action the people of the "Great Valley" and Mr. David Evan submitted themselves in the fear of the Lord, feeling that the Presbytery had the authority to act in the premises. In the subsequent record we read: "A unanimous call from the people of West Tract to Mr. David Evan being presented to us and approved, we offered it to him which he accepted, whereupon it was appointed as follows, viz.: Messrs. Jeddiah Andrews, Jones, Anderson, Gillispie and Wortherspoon solemnly ordain him to the work and office of the ministry after having been satisfied with his ministerial abilities in any pieces of trial they should think fit to appoint him." There was no ruling elder there. The high estimate set by these fathers upon the value and efficiency of the Church courts may be more clearly seen and better understood by a few extracts from the records:

"Ordered that no members of this Presbytery upon any whatsoever pretence, do depart or leave the Presbytery without the meeting be broke up, or at least leave be asked and had from the Presbytery." (Page 16.) Again: "This day a letter by Mr. Samuel Davis was presented to them, it being moved by one of the members that the letter might be read it was accordingly read, and Mr. Davis his reasons for excusing his absence from this and the preceeding meeting were *not* sustained by the Presbytery." The "not" was italized. It was further "Ordered, that a letter be written and sent to Mr. Samuel Davis, in the name of the Presbytery, by Master John Watson, requiring him to be present at our next meeting in this place." (Page 1.) In the case of Mr. Hehry: "His letter to excuse his not coming to Presbytery read, and his excuse sustained. *Ordered*, that the Moderator write to him and signify that his excuse was

sustained with difficulty." (Records, page 21.) "In the case of Mr. Morgan and Mr. Van Vleck, who were absent and no excuse given or sent: Ordered, that Mr. Andrews write to them and *reprehend* them for their absence." (Records, page 21.) There was little disposition to accept any excuse or sustain any reason offered by any delinquent. "Mr. Andrews was defective in not delivering his Presbyterial exercise and was censured for his defect and appointed to deliver it next meeting." (Records, page 22.) "Mr. George McNish not having his Presbyterial exercise ready and excusing himself on account of sickness for a month past was blamed for not preparing it sooner, and ordered to prepare and deliver it by the next Presbytery." Records, page 32.) "Mr. Evan's absence from Mr. Con's ordination was ill taken by the Presbytery." (Record, page 44.) Mr. Robert Wortherspoon having been appointed to prepare a Presbyterial exercise, and not having complied, it was ordered "that the Moderator should Presbyterially admonishing him to be more careful for time coming, which was accordingly done." (Record, page 44.)

This Presbytery early established a rule for defraying the expenses of representatives to the meetings of the same, which principle has since been embodied in the organic law of our Church. "Mr. Henry, representative of the congregation, being absent, and his reason for not coming being inquired into, he said the present condition of his people made it necessary that there should be a particular collection made by the congregation for defraying the charges of the representative to the Presbytery and it was allowed that there should." This became the rule in the subsequent meeting of Presbytery.

The question of settled pastors and the payment of the salary promised, received the attention of the Presbytery as will be indicated by some facts in the record. The people of Snow Hill sent their representative to Presbytery asking the permission and concurrence of that body in presenting

a call to Mr. John Hampton to become their pastor which was agreed to and Mr. Hampton was settled as their proper and permanent minister and pastor. At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery we find this significant entry: "Ordered by Presbytery that there be a letter sent to the people of Snow Hill requiring their faithful care in collecting the tobacco promised by subscription to Mr. Hampton." (Records, page 11.) Another entry during that same session of Presbytery reads in these words: "Ordered that Mr. Taylor write to the people of Monikin and Wycomico exciting them to the duty to pay what they promise to Mr. McNish." (Records, page 13.) At a subsequent meeting of Presbytery the following action was had: "Ordered that the ministers and elders come prepared for the future to give a true and impartial account how matters are mutually betwix them both in regard to spirituals and temporals." (Records, page 18.) Four years after this it was enacted by Presbytery that "For the better establishment and settling of congregations it was ordered and appointed that in every congregation there be a sufficient number of assistants chosen to aid the minister in the management of congregational affairs and that there be a book of records to this effect and that the same be annually brought here to be revised by the Presbytery." (Records, page 37.) Just what particular status these "assistants" occupied in relation to the elders and deacons is not known, for in that particular the records do not say. And whether that "book" was sent up as a part of the session is not known. Sometime before this action was taken we find that, "Inquiry was made of the several ministers touching the state of their congregation and of themselves with relation thereto; and also of the several elders not only of the measures taken to support the ministry but of the life, conversation and doctrine of their several ministers, and report was given to satisfaction for this time." (Records, page 22.) This evidently corresponded to what is now called, in many

of our Presbyteries, a free conversation on the state of religion within their bounds. It was also, "Agreed that none should be allowed to vote for the calling of a minister but those that shall contribute for the maintainance of him and that the major vote of those shall be determinative." (Records, page 24.)

II. Two cases of discipline engaged the attention of the fathers of this first Presbytery. The one pertained to the church at Woodbridge, the early beginning of which appears to be wrapped in considerable mystery for the records are not clear on that particular point. Indications point to the fact that four congregational ministers in Connecticut, viz., Davenport, Webb, Shove and Buckenham, co-operating with Dr. Cotton Mather, of Boston, had been instrumental, through the agency of Jediah Anfrews, in settling over the people in Woodbridge a Rev. Nathiel Wade, himself perhaps from Boston. Whether there was any suspicion of Mr. Wade on applying to Presbytery for admission, or whether it was that rigid supervision which the Presbytery felt itself called upon to exercise in all matters, we cannot tell. But from the time of the application of Mr. Wade for his reception there appears to have been an apprehension that all would not go well. We read, "The Rev. Mr. Nathiel Wade made application to the Presbytery to be admitted a member thereof, upon which we deliberately debated and made a narrow scrutiny into matters as they appeared to us, and found by his certificate that his ordination was good and valid according to Scripture rules, and also a call and subscription even from some of yourselves (Woodbridge Church) with several other recommendations from persons whose integrity we could not suspect. And nothing appearing to his disadvantage, sufficiently attested, we judge it unjust to deny his desire which seemed to us to flow from sincere intentions of being more useful and doing greater good, he having freely and fully submitted himself to the judgment and discipline of

the Church, according to Presbytery." But Mr. Wade appears to have been one of those impulsive individuals whose emotional nature, governed almost entirely by the circumstances surrounding him, frequently got the better of his judgment. So his statements at different times, and sundry places, contradicted each other, and the actual facts in the case, by a big majority. When Mr. Wade was at the meeting of Presbytery he was a Presbyterian, "and with tears in his eyes and uplifted hand," declared himself ready to abide the action of Presbytery and "submitted himself willingly to its constitution," saying, "that he by the consent of the Presbytery would cheerfully demit and resign up all pastoral relation to the whole people of Woodbridge." But on returning home from Presbytery there was a reaction and he again became a Congregationalist, and told "the people, with ostentation, that he was more firmly fixed than he was ever before" in his pastoral relation, which Presbytery had dissolved. This action upon his part the fathers of this first Presbytery called "fallaciously and falsely pretending." When Mr. Wade thus kicked out of the traces, and began to buck in good fashion style against Presbyterial power and influence, the Presbytery stripped off his ministerial harness, divested him of his pastoral relation, and hastened to write a letter to Dr. Cotton Mather notifying him of what they had done, and asking that he use his influence in quieting the disturbance between this obstreperous divine and the good people of Woodbridge.

Coming from a less grave and dignified body, this letter might be construed as sarcastic irony. For they stated in very plain terms that they were aware of the fact that Mr. Wade had recently been to Boston consulting with Dr. Cotton Mather, and had returned with a letter giving encouragement to the divisive element. We have no information as to whether this ancient and eminent mind-reader and interpreter of satanic purposes in the brains of foolish and

superstitious old women, and silly and credulous young girls ever responded to this letter, or exerted himself, to any great extent, to passify matters in this triangler conflict. But we have a shrend suspicion that if the old fellow had delivered himself it would have been to the effect that all parties had been "bewitched" by Satan in his "most nefarious" efforts to prevent the planting of congregational principles in the courts of the Presbyterian Church.

The other case of discipline was that of the Rev. Paulus Van Vleck, a Holland Dutchman, well up on the doctrines of the Synod of Dort, and sound on the Heidleburg Catechism. The charge against him, therefore, was not that of heresy in doctrine or insubordination to the Presbytery in the matter of government. It was a charge of immorality in life and conduct. The Rev. Paulus Van Vleck was suspected of having two living wives at one and the same time—one spouse left behind him in Holland, and one, as a living reality and present witness, here in America. The charge was at first that of bigamy, to which was afterward added that "of lying also." As the investigation proceeded a suspicion arose and grew that the Rev. Paulus Van Vleck had "committed some forgeries." In this way "common fame" volunteered her services to the prosecution, and helped on with the conviction. Her specification under the general indictment was, "that there was a letter at New York from the said Mr. Van Vleck's mother that contradicted those which he had produced."

Mr. Van Vleck was somewhat handicapped from the very start, for the issue was not joined upon the common law principle, that if not proven guilty, the accused must go free, but rather upon the condition, that, one side or the other had to make out the case, and if the prosecution could not prove guilt, the accused must be able to establish his innocence. And such was the verdict in this grave matter of bigamy, falsehood and forgery. The case was first brought to the attention of Presbytery when the character of its

ministers and people, was being looked into, the Presbytery having established "The order for inquiring into the mutual condition of ministers and people." The cause pending, it was concluded that, "After the Presbytery had examined the several evidences brought in relation to the crime of bigamy, alleged against Mr. Paulus Van Vleck, as also the exceptions offered by the said Van Vleck against the evidence and in vindication of himself, the Presbytery not finding the evidence clear and positive enough to prove the crime against him, and yet Mr. Van Vleck's vindication not sufficient to take off the scandal wholly, do therefore, till such time as Rev. Van Vleck brings satisfactory proof of his first wife's death, for the honor of the gospel, advise that he do not officiate as a minister of the gospel. To which he does willingly agree."

It was upon the whole "ordered that a letter be writ to the people to whom Mr. Van Vleck did use to preach" which being done, "by the moderator, (Jeddiah Andrews) and Mr. Hampton;" a postscript is added in these words: "The reason of this advice for his not preaching was this, that the Presbytery could not find proof clear and positive enough to prove the crime against him, yet Mr. Van Vleck's vindication did not appear sufficient."

The case was reopened when Mr. Van Vleck brought in certain papers immediately after the breaking up of Presbytery to clear himself of the crime charged upon him. No order was made to examine the validity of these papers, but they were referred to a commission consisting of Andrews, McNish, and Hampton, who after examining the validity of the papers, adjudged "that he was guilty." And Mr. Van Vleck being absent and nothing appearing for his vindication, it was adjudged that his suspension should continue, and the judgment was made final.

Such was the solemn, grave, and conscientious judgment of the court of Christ's house, the first Presbytery set up in America. And if the reader is ready to raise both hands

and hold his breath in amazement, we can tell him that this case has been paralleled many a time since that day in the Presbyterian Church courts by Christian gentlemen sitting as judges and acting on their consciences. Several of which we have in mind, but do not care to specify, because that is no part of the object for which this article was written.

III. The dignity, consequence and importance of the Ruling Elder in the courts of the church since that day has increased in about the same proportion that the attendance of these officers upon the courts has diminished. We fail to find in the records that the Ruling Elder was considered an essential part of Presbytery. The appointment of committees and commissions, the organization of churches, the instalation of ministers and the dissolution of pastoral relation were all effected without the presence of the ruling elder. The Presbytery of 1706 at Philadelphia, and in 1713 at New Castle, were open, transacted all business, and "broke up without the presence of a single ruling elder. Therefore, it is evident, that the ruling elder was not considered an essential factor in the make up of a Presbytery. In 1716 the question was gravely put and voted upon whether an elder "should act here as a representative, notwithstanding the minister's absence." And yet accepting the two instances mentioned, the ruling elders attended the annual meetings in such numbers that a very large majority of the churches were represented by ruling elders in each meeting. As the Presbyterian Church in America formed no distinctive constitution for either its guidance or government till 1787, the presumption is that this first Presbytery was governed in a general way only by the form of government set on foot by the Westminster Assembly. In the debates of that Assembly it was decided that "the office of ruling elder was of divine institution." "But, it remained to define in what this office consisted, and this gave rise to another and very animated debate, and after a very learned and animated discussion, the opinion of the Assembly being

nearly balanced, was laid aside for a time without any definite conclusion." (Hetherington, pages 142-143.) The ruling elder has been buffeted about a good deal by his friends in trying to give him a locus and a status in the church courts. There is no difficulty and all are agreed, on the point, that the ruling elders are the immediate representatives of the people, and chosen by them, that, in conjunction with the pastor or ministers, they may exercise government and discipline, and take the over-sight of the spiritual interest of the particular church which elects them and in which they are ordained to exercise the functions of the office. But when we get above the session and the particular congregation, the atmosphere begins to get a little hazy. The teaching elders who are to "labor in the word and doctrine," possess an office which is declared to be "the first in the church for dignity and usefulness." They take their place in the courts of the church above the session, by virtue of their ordination, to exercise functions which are inherent in the office to which they are set apart by ordination. And these are double, or two fold. The Presbyterian system makes a bold cut across every teaching elder and divides him into a teacher and a ruler. But the system makes no such cut across the ruling elder. He takes his place in the courts of the church, above the session, not by virtue of his ordination alone but by appointment, also, as a representative chosen by the members of another court. And with many the question is still an open one, whether he represents the session, which appoints him, or the congregation which does not appoint him. But, however that may be, he is never and nowhere a teacher as well as a ruler. Therefore, by the genius of the system, whatever may be the declarations of the Book of Church Order, he cannot possess the "same authority in the courts of the church as the minister of the word." He cannot teach there, or anywhere else, as an elder. The power to rule comes by virtue of ordination, but it does not go beyond that, with the ruling elder, he is not ordained to teach.

The courts of the church are not only bodies which have the power to rule, but they have additional powers to interpret and to teach. The last two belong alone to the teaching elder and cannot by him be relegated to any one, neither can they be usurped by any. Here the equation is broken on the one side. The constitution of the church is incoherent and very much tangled up at this point. It claims that the ruling elder possesses "the same authority in the courts of the church as a minister of the word." Yet, in the same clause in which this sweeping declaration is made we find a proviso: That "any official duty devolving upon him (the ruling elder) the performance of which requires the functions pertaining only to the teaching elder, shall be remitted by him for its execution to such minister of the word, being a member of the court, as he may select." (Form Gov. ch. IV. sec. 2-43.) This *proviso*, which was intended to cover the abuse of the principle in making a ruling elder a Moderator, has done much violence to the whole system. For the very genius of the Presbyterian system of courts requires that he who presides over these courts shall have power to exercise the functions of expounding and teaching that law which is to guide their actions and deliberations. For the interpretation of the law is as much a teaching function as the expounding of the Gospel in preaching an opening sermon. In assuming that the ruling elder can do the one, and making provision for an escape from doing the other, is an abuse of the principle and a flagrant violation of the logic of the system. Another hitch comes when the constitution defines what shall constitute a quorum of Presbytery. "Any three ministers belonging to the Presbytery with at least one ruling elder being met at the time and place shall be a quorum competent to proceed to business." (Form, Gov. ch. V. Sec. IV.-74.)

The office of the teaching elder is declared to be "the first in the Church both for dignity and usefulness." Dignity

means elevation of rank—a degree of excellence. But one ruling elder, whose office must be of a lower degree, if the teaching elder is of the first degree, possesses, within himself, the authority in the courts of the Church to upset, and knock out, three degrees of first-class dignity with one degree of second-class dignity. Here the equation is broken on the other side. It may be that right here we have a constitutional explanation of a fact which has so much perplexed and worried the Church in the last few years—why so few ruling elders attend upon the meetings of the higher courts of the Church—as one is to three, so are a very few ruling elders to a great many ministers of the Word. To secure a renewal of attendance, upon the part of this delinquent class, the Church began to cajole, and coax, and coddle, and wheedle, with many promises not warranted by the genius of the Presbyterian system. Knowing that man loves a “little brief authority,” and not forgetting the American’s propensity for office, many overtures were sent up, profound arguments, beat out in long and heavy newspapers and review articles, were set on foot and the thing was accomplished. The mountain labored and the mouse came forth. It was actually engrafted into the organic law of the Church that a ruling elder could, would, and should, be elected Moderator, notwithstanding it is an office many of whose functions he cannot perform.

We have experimented one time in making a very excellent ruling elder and Christian gentleman Moderator of the General Assembly. To be consistent, we ought not to stop with that one experiment. Some time in the future we ought to try it again. It may be that some over sensitive, or over nervous, brother would be shocked at seeing matters go in the courts of the Lord’s house as they might go in a court of common pleas, or legislative hall, or political convention, as the ruling elder chosen might be an eminent civil judge or distinguished legislator, or a successful manipulator of State conventions, each governing by

the rules which prevail in the province of his chosen field of action. Having made it lawful is the Church now reaching the conviction that it is not expedient?

It will not be many years before the Church will be forced either to abandon the very genius of the Presbyterian system or to re-write the Book of Church Order. For about every change, or amendment, made since the book was first adopted in 1879, differentiates it from the genius of the Presbyterian system.

At first (1561) the Church of Scotland put the deacon and the ruling elder on the same footing. "The affairs of each congregation were managed by the ministers, elders and deacons who constituted the kirk session." (Hethington Church, Scotland, page 551.) So the deacon, no more nor less, than the elder, was a part of the session. The second Book of Discipline (1578) divided the whole polity of the Church into three divisions—doctrine, discipline, distribution—according to this arrangement there arose a three-fold sort of officer bearer in the Church—minister, ruling elder, deacon—all these were "call it beane generall waird ministers of the kirk." The deacon held his office in the session on an equal footing with the ruling elder, until 1645, when the Church of Scotland adopted the Westminster Form of Government. It was this Westminster Assembly which cut the deacon loose from his place in the session. This Westminster Assembly settled for the Church the fact that the "office of ruling elder was of divine institution." But "it remained to define in what that office consisted." That question was never settled by that Assembly. And it remains to this day an unsettled question.

IV. In addition to the record books of the Presbytery it was (1709) "Ordered, That every letter sent by Presbytery be inserted in a book appointed by the Presbytery for that purpose and this be done by Mr. Andrews." From this letter book we get a great many valuable facts and much

general information which would otherwise be entirely lost. We get an insight, through some of these letters, into the difficulties with which these fathers had to contend. And we also learn that they wrote and talked in a tone much more authoritative and consequential than might, with perfect safety to the Church, be indulged in at this day. We submit a few samples of the ore to give our readers some idea of the quality and grade of the metal." The Christian people of New Castle had tangled matters up between themselves and their pastor until there was a "misunderstanding" which had gradually spread to the congregation in the country. For the reader must know that the congregation in the country, like the minister in the town, were Irish in the quality and tone of their piety as well as their national temperament. And learning that there was something like a "row" in the church in town there is nothing more natural than that they should "jist go down and take a leetle bit of a hand in it." Matters pretty rapidly reached that point where Presbytery had to intervene. The letter began, "Out of a Christian compassion that we have towards you, we can but commiserate your present circumstances, and are heartily sorry for the misunderstanding that is between you and Mr. Wilson; as also for the difference that is between you and our Christian friends in the country. We would be glad to fall upon a healing method to remedy these unhappy divisions. And gentlemen, you may be assured that whatever (in duty) lies within the compass of our power shall not be wanting; but after second thought, and a due sense of your condition, we fear that such changes as are set on foot among you in the present circumstances concerning a minister may prove detrimental to you and our common interest; especially when we take notice that nothing particular has been offered to us by you concerning our brother Wilson why he may not continue in his present charge and function toward you as formerly. A general

dissatisfaction is the principle (it seems) which is presented both in your letter to us and by your, and our friend, Mr. Janvier." After a few more sentences about another minister whose name is mentioned and who appears to have been too shrewd a man to want a church which would fall out with its pastor without being able to give any better reason than "a general dissatisfaction;" the letter concludes after this fashion: "And therefore we entreat, nay require, you in the Lord to concur with us." This settled the matter and Mr. Wilson continued to serve the church as its pastor. There appears to have been a kind of pious fuss at Woodbridge, in which almost all, if not all, the members felt it to be their Christian duty to engage. The matter finally came before Presbytery. That body wrote a letter to the congregation from which we make the following extracts: "Upon the whole matter and after our serious reflections thereon we cannot but with grief tell you that we fear there has been fault on all hands and that the most innocent have reason for self-condemnation; how much others then that have been the unhappy causes, fomenters and promoters of such unchristian distraction and animosities. Woe unto them by whom offenses come. Having mentioned this we cannot pass on till in the bowels of Christ we beseech and request you to look back and repent, to love and unite, in the true fear of God and the interest of his Kingdom for the future."

From these extracts the reader will understand that the fathers of this first Presbytery were not disposed to indulge in blandishments or pious taffy in dealing with recalcitrant churches and their obstreperous members.

In 1709 the Presbytery of Dublin addressed a letter to this Presbytery through the courtesy of Mr. Alexander Sinclair, a member of the Presbytery of Dublin directed to Mr. John Henry, a member of this Presbytery, expressing a desire that "a correspondent may be settled and continued from time to time." The request was also made that

“an account of the ecclesiastical affairs with a promise of all assistance they could afford or procure by interest of others.” From this correspondence we gather the following which may best be stated in the language of the letter : “As to the state of the church our interest truly is very weak and we cannot relate this matter without sorrow of heart, since it is too much owing to the neglect of ministers at home. Our late Rev. Brother Francis Makemie prevailed with some ministers of London to undertake the support of two itinerants for the space of two years and after that time to send two more upon the same conditions allowing the former after that time to settle which if accomplished had proved of more than creditable advantage to these parts considering how far scattered most of the inhabitants be. But alas, they drew back their hands and we have reason to lament their deficiency, Had our friends at home been equally watchful and diligent as the Episcopalian Society at London, our interest in most foreign plantations probably might have carried the balance. In all Virginia there is but one small congregation at Elizabeth River, and some few families favoring our way in Rappahannock and York. In Maryland only four ; in Pennsylvania five and in the Jerseys two, which bounds, with some places of New York, make up all the bounds we have any members from, and at present some of these are vacant.”

This letter indicates that the spirit of mission work was alive in the heart of these Irish Presbyterians and that they had the keenest appreciation of the work in the foreign field, for at that day America and her plantations were six times or more as far away (in point of time) from Dublin as China, Japan or Corea are from America today. Let the reader think for a little space. The letter was written in Dublin in November, 1709, and answered by Presbytery in a letter written September, 1710. Such was the tardiness with which correspondence was carried on nearly two

hundred years ago. These fathers had what we believe was the true idea of the work required to build up our Church in that day and equally so now if the Church could only see it. It might be called the Francis Makemie idea of home mission work, itinerating for the space of two years and after that to settle. If each Presbytery would require every licentiate to itinerate for two years before settling, their support being furnished by Presbytery, every county in every Presbytery would have Presbyterian churches, and settled pastors would be more numerous and more permanent. But this is not the time or place to discuss that matter. A similar correspondence was opened with the synod of Glasgow brought about by a letter from the Rev. James Brown of the synod to "some good friends" intimating that the synod was willing. The letter of the Presbytery to the synod bears date September, 1710. Among other things the letter says: "We are thankful that by the Divine Providence our endeavors and poor essays have not been altogether in vain. The number of our ministers from the respective providences is ten in all, three from Maryland, five from Pennsylvania and two from East Jersey." After setting forth the desolate condition of sundry vacant places the letter proceeds: "May it therefore please the pious and Reverend Synod in compassion to desolate souls in America perishing for want of vision to send over one or more ministers and support them for longer or shorter time. We further represent that according to the best of our judgment that forty pounds sterling, paid in Scotland to be transmitted in goods, will be a competency for the support of each minister you send, provided that of your pious and Christian benevolence you suitably fit them out."

Correspondence was likewise opened up and set on foot with certain ministers in London who expressed the greatest interest and took the deepest concern in planting the Gospel in these "American plantations." Among the most

conspicuous and prominent of these was the Rev. Thomas Reynolds, of London. Mr. Reynolds' letter bore date December 24, 1712. After promising to advance thirty pounds for the support of one or more ministers, the letter closes in these words: "I desire to hear from you as soon as may be, and would be glad to be an instrument of disappointing any that encourage no expectation from us." The answer to this letter bore date September 17, 1713. From these extracts it will appear that from Ireland, England and Scotland, the spirit of Foreign Missions was alive in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church. The Presbyterians of the kingdom of Great Britain were laying the foundations and building the Church for Christ, in the distant American colonies, more than a hundred years before Alexander Duff sailed for India, or Adoniram Judson "embarked from Salem for Calcutta;" and almost a century before William Carey, with his family, set sail for Bengal. This last meeting of this unique, original, and first Presbytery in America, was held in New Castle, in September, 1716. Provisions were there and then made for the organization of the Synod of Philadelphia. The order runs in these words, "It having pleased the Divine Providence so to increase our numbers, as that, after much deliberation, we judge it may be more serviceable to the interest of religion to divide ourselves into subordinate meetings, or Presbyteries, constituting one annually as a Synod, to meet at Philadelphia, or elsewhere, to consist of all the members of each subordinate Presbytery for this year at least; therefore, it is agreed by the Presbytery, after serious deliberation, that the first subordinate meeting, or Presbytery, to meet at Philadelphia, or elsewhere, as they shall see fit, do consist of the following men: Powell, Orr, Bradner and Morgan."

This "first subordinate meeting of Presbytery" was and is the Presbytery of Philadelphia from that day on to the present time. Like provision was made for a second and a third, with recommendations for the organization or erection

of a fourth, on Long Island. The time of the meeting of these Presbyteries was "left to their own discretion." It was "ordered that a book be kept by each of the said Presbyteries containing a record of their proceedings and that the said book be brought every year to our anniversary Synod to be revised." The record goes on to say, "Our next meeting being appointed as Synod, it is ordered that the present Moderator open the same by preaching; and that the Moderator of the last Synod open the next by preaching always for the time coming, upon the first Tuesday of our meeting, at 10 o'clock."

There is no record that this original Presbytery was ever opened or closed with prayer during the whole period of its separate and independent existence.

R. K. SMOOT.

Austin, Texas.

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

BEHIND THE PARDAH. The story of C. E. Z. M. S. Work in India. *By Irene H. Barnes.* With Preface by T. A. Gurney, M. A. Illustrated by J. D. Mackenzie and Percy R. Craft. New York.: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1897. 16mo. Pp. 264.

A thoroughly entertaining, instructive and useful piece of missionary literature. Probably the best exhibition of what woman has done and can do for woman that has been given to the public. We may adopt the language of Rev. Mr. Gurney, in the preface: "It gives glimpses of the inner life of Indian women which, for picturesqueness of detail, vividness of description, and dramatic power, would be hard to surpass. And, throughout, the style is so easy and conversational that the mind never feels wearied. It may, therefore, be cordially commended not only to missionary circles, where it will be invaluable, but also to genuine readers who desire to know something of Indian life and folklore."

We may explain the title by saying that the "Pardah" is the veil that shuts off the females of the Zenana from the rest of the house, and from the sight of all strange men. The Church of England Zenana Missionary Society has been carrying on distinct and ever growing work since 1881. They have done a work vast and wonderful in itself, that cannot be estimated by any human standard. This book is well calculated to give a clear conception of the work, its difficulties, successes, needs, possibilities and manifold activities. The workers are continually introduced to describe their experiences and observations for themselves.

The introduction gives us some account of the great organization that is doing this work. Then follows "a glance at the land," a condensed view of India, its peoples, customs, religions. Then we are taken behind this pardah and permitted to see the condition—pitiable enough!—of the female inmates of the Hindo, Parsi and Moslem establishments. The hapless lot, the "ways and woes," of Indian girlhood next occupies attention, the full consideration that it demands. The authoress then portrays the "first experiences" of the Zenana Missionary. She devotes two chapters to the important matter of village missions. Discussing native helpers, many of them by name, and enforcing the plea "India's girls for Christ," she passes to the consideration of that desperately wretched host of 23,000,000 of widows in India. The simple narrative is enough to stir the most callous. So unhappy is their lot that they do not always regard the abolition of the Sutte as a mercy. That was the short anguish of death by fire. Now it is a lifelong torment, unless indeed the woman suicides or abandons herself to a life of shame. Six hundred thousand of these widows are under nineteen, many thousands are under ten, and thousands under four.

Two chapters are given to "our suffering sisters behind the pardah,"

depicting further the sad condition of the Hindu women ; and the last chapter is devoted to "the daughters of Islam," showing the equally deplorable condition of the Mohammedan women. An Appendix of 28 pages gives a succinct history of the work of the C. E. Z. M. S., year by year, from 1881 to 1897. A sensible feature, not usually found in missionary books, is a full index.

The illustrations, some of them half-tone, are mostly good. The mechanical execution up to the mark. The author uses too many abbreviations, such as "T. Y. E." and "Z. B. M. M.," that do not explain themselves, and, therefore, puzzle the thinking reader. But that is a small blemish.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

ROBERT WHITAKER MCALL, FOUNDER OF THE MCALL MISSION, PARIS.
A Fragment by Himself ; a Souvenir by his Wife. With Portraits, Fac-similes and Illustrations. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1896. Cr. 8 vo. pp. 252.

Dr. McAll was one of the great Field-Marshalls of the Church Militant. He has been recognized on all hands as one of the colossal figures of this century, to be ranked with Livingstone, Hudson Taylor, Paton, Moody, Miller, and others who have originated and had the boldness and faith to project and execute, in spite of all obstacles, wonderful works for the salvation of men and upbuilding of God's Kingdom. When he died in 1893, three of earth's greatest nations mourned. Here is Dr. Boardman's somewhat remarkable characterization of him, as given in the Appendix of the volume before us: "Dr. McAll was an islander, but not an insular ; a Protestant, but not a propagandist ; a Catholic, but not a Romanist ; a Congregationalist, but not a denominationalist ; a missionary, but not a proselytizer ; a preacher, but not a doctrinaire ; a reformer, but not an iconoclast ; a philanthropist, but not a sentimentalist ; an enthusiast, but not a visionary ; a commander, but not an autocrat ; a practic, but not a pragmatist ; an opportunist, but not a time-server ; a conciliator, but not a compromiser ; a tactician, but not a manœuverer ; an achiever, but not a boaster : in brief, a Christian Nehemiah, rebuilding the Jerusalem of the Huguenots, and sending forth his lieutenants through the Judea of France, to reconvert it to the true Messiah."

Such is the man that the attempt is made to portray in this volume ; a great subject for an able biographical artist, certainly. Knowing this to start with and realizing it continually, as we read, the wonder ever grows that the work has been so imperfectly done. We are loath to say this ; we do hope, for the sake of the great subject of the memoir, for the sake of the great cause set forth, for the sake of the widow who pieced together the fragments and glimpses that compose the volume, that the work will have a wide circulation. But we are compelled in honesty to say that the work has been badly done. And we can scarcely divine the reason why. There was certainly no lack of material ; much

is here and it is said to be only a selection. There is certainly abounding love and admiration ; there was no need of excessive diffidence. We will do the compiler the justice to say that she disclaims any attempt to write a biography ; but this is just where she made the prime mistake. Why did she not, when she had this great obligation laid upon her ? If she really felt incompetent she should have declined and left it to abler hands. As a matter of fact, we believe the fair sex has furnished no approach to Boswell in the field of biography. Various explanations of this might be given, but we will not attempt to discuss this matter, further than to say that the explanation must lie near to that which accounts for no woman's having ever produced a great epic.

Among the points to be criticised, we note, first, the absence of objective delineation. There is a great number of picture-fragments of various shapes, sizes and colors, and the reader is left largely to his own acuteness in forming the pictures. Fragments that stand in consecutive order, sometimes without even a word of connection, frequently puzzle us to determine their relation to each other. This leads, in the second place, to lack of steady forward movement. We swing forward and backward in dates, sometimes, in a very confusing fashion ; harmony all gone, amid the jangling discord we lose the strain and are bewildered for a time—like listening to a Liszt Melody, so-called. Then, the ends of the threads also appear in the embroidery, at times, as when extracts are given from Dr. McAll's diary, mere jottings, *disjecta membra*, of no more meaning or interest than are the quotations in a commercial report, to a society belle.

Another matter for criticism is the amount of French employed. French words, phrases, sentences, letters, poems really abound. The Menu is none the more appetizing because of all this French. It makes no difference whether the reviewer was bothered by it or not ; we are sure that nine-tenths of those who would wish to read of Dr. McAll's life and work would be considerably bothered by the French. The proof-reading of the book is not good. We will not specify all. Several dates are made wrong thereby. Take this as an example of punctuation : "a wonderful copy for so young a child of an altar-tomb with recumbent figure." A child of an altar-tomb with recumbent figure is liable to do something wonderful. Perhaps the reader would like to practice himself a little on this sentence, also : "Whilst leaving the Hibel-road station, a short three minutes in the Manchester train shows us Prestbury, the mother-church of Macclesfield, with lych-gate, and the quiet village on the left bank of the little Bollin, making its unobtrusive way to the Mersey."

We refrain from further criticism. We wish that every one might be familiar with the life and work—especially that from 1871 to 1893, in Paris—of this great evangelistic hero. We only wish that Dr. George Smith would write the narrative.

Paper, type, binding and illustrations are good.
Columbia, S. C.

D. J. BRIMM.

MISSIONS AND POLITICS IN ASIA. Studies of the Spirit of the Eastern Peoples, the Present Making of History in Asia, and the Part Therein of Christian Missions. By *Robert E. Speer*, Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1898, 16 mo. Pp. 271. \$1.00.

Good and useful, thoughtful and suggestive, instructive and inspiring books on missionary themes are continually coming from the press. This is to be considered one of the peculiar blessings of our age. Most of the books issued in this field are useful or valuable or interesting from one point of view or another. The man who reads all these and whose duty it is to pronounce on them for the benefit of the public, determined always to be fair to the author and honest with the expectant reader, at the same time, needs to be supplied with an abundance of descriptive adjectives, shading almost insensibly in meaning from "fairly good" to "superb," "brilliant," "absorbing," etc., etc. We feel this more and more in writing notices or reviews and in reading those prepared by others. We often wish that the whole guild of us might adopt some system of grading or some graduated nomenclature that would enable us to put the matter down with scientific or at least commercial exactness.

To illustrate by the book under consideration: After having notified the reader that this volume contains the "Students' Lectures on Missions," five in number, delivered at Princeton in 1898, by one whom all that know much of Foreign Missions recognize as eminently competent to deliver something worth listening to or to publish something well worth reading, we might consider the fitness of the title to convey an impression of the contents, and decide that, though somewhat puzzling at first, it is in fact apt, and so we describe it as A 1. The sub-title gives the idea of the lectures a little more fully. The author acquired part of his fitness for handling this attractive subject, by an extended tour through the countries treated—Persia, Southern Asia (Turkey, Arabia and India), China, Japan and Korea, and a part by the study of the works of competent authorities. And so, secondly, we may describe the matter as "excellent." We are not too modest, while robed in our critic's ermine, to take issue with points made by the author, if we had seen any to take issue with, but we did not.

Thirdly, as to literary style, we would grade the "production" at about 90 per cent. The style is undoubtedly good and natural, but style is a somewhat variable, fluid thing, that is, according to our rigid system of marking, hard to reach perfection in, and so 90 is a *magna cum laude* mark. It leaves some room for brilliance. In the volume here considered there would be greater purity and withal perspicuity, by the less frequent omission of a narrative "that," and certainly there is no defense for the omission of a relative "that," in one case.

We commend the volume to students of present-day problems in missions, as a helpful work. The mechanical execution is up to the usual standard of neatness and durability maintained by the Revell Company.

Now that we have praised sufficiently, let us bring out the ferule a little. This book is one that a student will want to keep and refer to occasionally. In this day, when we have to read so many books and so much else, we can rarely take time to re-read a book, still less to give it a third or fourth perusal. There are few of us that can fix everything in a book in our little craniums by one headlong perusal. If an author has a right to expect to be read, the reader has a right to expect a good index for future reference. It is strange to us that an author, to save himself a little trouble or expense, will, nowadays, so commonly ignore the rights of the reader. It is strange that the publisher will not require the author to provide an index. "Missions and Politics in Asia" is defective in this respect—no index whatever. Each chapter has fifty or more pages, and any matter that calls for re-examination must be searched for, page by page, through a whole lecture of said length, if one is so fortunate as to remember the lecture in which to search. True, there is a sketch of each lecture in the table of contents. But that is of little service, for, after you have found your topic—if you are so fortunate—in these catch-words, you must still search page by page, because these catch-titles are not indicated in the body of the lecture nor in the margins. Of course we have in mind the average reader: the man who has to waste his precious time over such books a great deal acquires a certain dexterity with a table of contents or even without one. But we maintain that the purchaser and reader of a book is entitled to that much consideration, and we get indignant at such frequent violation of the right

Columbia, S. C.

D. J. BRIMM.

PERSIA. WESTERN MISSION. *By the Rev. S. G. Wilson*, author of "Persian Life and Customs." With Map and Illustrations. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1896. 16mo. Pp. 381.

This volume is in some measure a supplement to that mentioned on the title page, "Persian Life and Customs," which the author published, through the Revell Company, in 1895. It is a supplement, and yet in the main complete in itself. Certain terms employed without explanation, as *shahi*, *kran*, *toman*, and certain sects alluded to without description, as *Shiahs*, *Sunnis*, presuppose familiarity with the antecedent volume. With some hesitation we may venture the opinion that the two works overlap each other unnecessarily. Each might have been somewhat condensed and a clearer line of demarcation drawn between them. And yet, many will read only one volume, and for such it is better as it is. We would by no means give the impression that reading one will dispense with the importance of reading the other. Mr. Wilson is a good writer and thoroughly informed, and both volumes are full of matter.

Persia is an interesting country. The racial, religious and political conditions are very interesting. In the volume before us, "the history

of Christianity in Persia and the conditions of religious liberty are sketched; and the narrative of the mission work, the equipment for its persecutions and triumphs are detailed with reference to Nestorians, Armenians and Jews." So says the Preface, and our perusal leads to the judgment that it has been quite thoroughly and withal pleasingly done. The author's own work is among the Armenians at Tabriz. What a religious condition he has portrayed! How bigotry begets bigotry! And how dense ignorance fosters it all! Mussulman, Jew, Gregorian, Nestorian, Romanist and Anglican, almost equally intolerant of each other, and all intolerant of the Evangelicals or Protestants or Presbyterians. A curious picture it is, of the Anglican trying to frustrate the Presbyterian and prevent the reform of the Armenian and Nestorian, even saying that the Presbyterians are not Christians. This is the fruit of the "historic Episcopate" under the banner of which we are exhorted in this day of liberalism to unite.

But the Anglican Mission does not seem to be prospering. The Presbyterian Mission is steadily growing and enlarging its influence. We are all the more amazed that the Anglican Church should be devoting men and money to such an object—just as when we find Episcopalians trying to reconvert Sandwich Island Congregationalists while proposing to withdraw from Korea if the Russian Greek Church enters—when so many parts of the world are yet utterly waste and desolate and dark; especially so, when we read of the character of the Nestorian and Armenian priests and bishops, particularly the Gregorian—strikers, brawlers, given to wine, greedy of filthy lucre, husbands of more than one wife, assassins in some cases, densely ignorant all.

Much is said for Medical Missions and also for Bible Distribution. We were surprised in the last chapter to learn of the prevalence of intemperance among the Mohammedans of Persia, and delighted also to read of how a revival under the auspices of the Presbyterian Mission led to the emptying of so many wine-cellars and pouring the stuff into the drains.

Though the title page leads us to expect a map, our copy has none, which we hope is only a binder's blunder. The book needs a map. There is an excellent index. The illustrations are good half-tones. The book is well gotten up, in spite of some typographical errors. Good binding, paper and type.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

TATONG, THE LITTLE SLAVE. A story of Korea. *By Annie Maria Barnes*, author of "Ninito," etc. Richmond: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1899. 16 mo. pp. 252. \$1.00.

Since Mrs. Stowe published the volume that drove one part of this nation in blind and fanatical fury to try to destroy the other part, we have been chary and suspicious of fictitious portrayals, at least of social conditions. However, from what we have read, the picture is

not overdrawn in "Tatong." The author is probably known to most of our readers through others of her works, "Ninito," "Children of the Kalahari," "Izilda," "How A-chon-ho-ah Found the Light," etc. "Tatong" is a touching little story, with a neat and simple plot. It will awaken the interest of young people in the Koreans, and make them appreciate Christianity more, perhaps. The authoress seems to have made a resolution to banish the word "that," in all its uses, from the English language. What grudge has she against it? Take some specimens: "but was now so soiled and worn all whiteness had gone from it;" "but they did not have the effect upon her Mrs. Ni desired and expected;" "the former singing so it seemed they could not tell the flowers, etc.;" "a thick paste that did its part so well not a ray of light found its way to her;" "while her eyes had so intense a glow Tatong could almost feel it upon her face." Here is a sentence of another kind: "Had they been like we buy eggs, some, if not most of them, would surely have been broken." Grammar and punctuation are both bad, here.

The publishers have given us a neat, attractive, durable volume in good type and on excellent paper.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

MONTEVIDEO—MAYBANK: Some Memoirs of a Southern Christian Household in the Olden Time; or, The Family Life of the Rev. Charles Colcock Jones, D. D., of Liberty County, Ga. *By his Son-in-law, R. Q. Mallard, D. D.* Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1898. 16 mo. pp. 87. 50c.

From the facile pen of the able editor of the *Southwestern Presbyterian*, this book attracts at sight the interest of a Southern Presbyterian. It recalls the Georgia joke about the man's compliment on the dish of butter: "Very nice butter, what there is of it; ah! excuse me! Plenty of butter, such as it is." There is very considerable display of paper and pasteboard and muslin, and when we get through the perusal of an hour or so we feel that all there is might have been put in so much briefer compass. Again, as we read we wonder at the remarkable brevity of the chapters and our mind is constantly enquiring, why did not the author expend some of the energy of his useful pen in developing and elaborating the important topics chosen. We continually feel as a tethered animal must feel, as he moves off in one direction and, suddenly, before he has well started, is stopped by a sharp jerk, which shows him that he can go no further in that direction. He goes back and starts again on a new course only to meet the same experience, and so it continues.

The object of the sketch is to show a somewhat ideal Christian family, a real family and therefore imitable. Certainly a commendable object, a lofty purpose, and heads of families, in this lax age, will be benefited by a thoughtful perusal. Our chief regret is, as we have already intimated, that the author has largely cast away his opportunity

for preaching. The chapter on "Sabbath and Church" is the best because he has in it given himself most tether.

With one sentence in the book we can never agree. "The one section (the North) has honored herself by self-restraint in the hour of victory; no blood was shed by axe when the sword had been sheathed; and a million of men in blue, their task done, went back to their old occupations." All three statements are entirely too broad and sweeping. If it were possible, the North has disgraced itself more by its behavior since the war than by its uncivilized warfare during the actual conflict, and there is no use in our trying to conceal the facts for them. There are but three periods in the history of this Republic: 1. The efforts of the North to get the South down; 2. Subjugation; 3. Determined efforts to keep the South under. But we refrain. D. J. B.

[We suppose the reviewer does not consider these statements sweeping.—ED.]

LIGHTS AND SHADOWS, OR MISSION WORK IN THE FAR EAST. Having the record of observations made during a visit to the Southern Presbyterian Missions in Japan, China and Korea in the year 1897. *By S. H. Chester, D. D.*, Secretary of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 16mo. Pp. 133. 75 cents.

This is a valuable book, being the observation of a close and interested observer. The officer is the efficient Secretary of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions in the Southern Presbyterian Church. In the autumn of 1897 he visited the missions of this church in Japan, China and Korea, for the purpose of studying the fields and work from the point of view of the committee and the churches at home. On his return an account of his observations was given in a series of addresses. The interest awakened, and the impossibility of reaching more than a small section of the Church in that way, led to the preparation of this volume. Its objective, therefore, is all homes and all missionary libraries in all parts of the Church. We wonder how nearly this will be realized! The extent of its realization will depend largely on the ministry, whether or not it will bring the book to the attention of the people and the attention of the people to the book.

The work merits the widest circulation for several reasons: First, whatever accrues from the sale of it will be given to Foreign Mission work through our treasury; second, it comes from our own secretary as his careful and discriminating observations during an official tour through these three interesting countries of the Far East: third, because of its intrinsic worth. It is interesting, instructive and impressive. In style it is easy, natural and pleasant. In matter it tells of country, customs, scenery and missionary difficulties. We were especially impressed by what is said of the difficulties. That one effect of the book, if produced upon all readers as on us, would doubly repay the author, the committee and the Church for the money and time expended. Our

missionaries are so faithful and their hearts so absorbed and enwrapped in the work, that they tell us of the many good things while they speak but little of their many hardships. The information Dr. Chester brings us heightens our admiration, deepens our sympathy and quickens our interest for our honored, God-serving, self-sacrificing missionaries. There are the trials and there will be the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

We warmly commend this book to all—to pastors, to laymen, to parents, to children. Every family and every Sabbath-school should secure it. It will greatly please and profit those interested in missions, and we confidently believe will awaken interest in those not interested already.

The mechanical execution is excellent. It is printed on a fine quality of paper, embellished with thirteen full-page half-tones, and is beautifully bound. Surely all who can will at once order "Lights and Shadows, or Mission Work in the Far East."

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

THE CONVERSION OF THE MAORIS. *By the Rev. Donald MacDougall, B. D.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1899. 16 mo. —Pp. 216.

This book is the work of a tourist, not of a missionary. His object in the publication may be stated in his own prefatory note: "Profoundly convinced, by what I have seen and learned while in New Zealand of the triumph of the gospel of Christ, in the conversion of the Maoris from cannibalism to Christianity, that it is a stronger and more cogent argument for the power of the gospel than any statement I have ever read in apologetic books; and also quickened by the hope that this brief story of the wonderful conversion of these cannibals may convince others of the living power of modern missions, and hasten the coming of our Lord, I now offer this book to all who long for the conversion of the world."

There is no question that the regenerating, transforming power of Christianity, when planted among the most degraded savages as well as its elevating and ennobling effect upon the higher heathen and Mohammedan peoples is one of the most irrefutable apologetic arguments that we can employ. The Maoris furnish one of the notable examples. In this volume the author describes their early condition, their superstitions and their government and customs. He then gives some account of the efforts, finally successful, to establish missions among them and of the leading missionaries, Marsden, Selwyn, Leigh. This part is rather disjointed. Something is also told us of colonization efforts, of the present condition of the Maoris, and of religion and education in New Zealand.

The last chapter is devoted to Samoa. We don't exactly see why this is put in, as the Samoans are not Maoris, and the political situation is the main thing presented. We suspect that the larger part of this book

was written for the papers, first. There is a very large tail, or perhaps we should say ell, in the form of an appendix of 60 pages, which gives a sort of itinerary of the traveler. This would have been better left out, or condensed into about ten pages. There is all the minute circumstantiality, the tiresome particularity of a female newspaper reporter trying to fill so many columns. Certainly he has not mastered the art of interesting description. Just one out of scores or perhaps hundreds of sentences. In describing the streets of one city, he says: "The young trees are inclosed for protection within four narrow pieces of wood driven into the ground and connected near the top by four short pieces nailed on to them at right angles." There is considerable instruction in the book for one who has not read more fully elsewhere. Mechanical execution excellent. A number of good half-tones. No index. All books with as many foreign words as this work should have some pronouncing apparatus. For instance the name "Ti White," in this book, might be pronounced in four different ways, and the reader is at a loss which to adopt.

D. J. BRIMM.

Columbia, S. C.

LIFE OF MRS. SARAH A. LANKFORD PALMER. *By Rev. John A. Roche, D. D.*, with an introduction by Rev. John P. Newman, D. D., LL. D. George Hughes & Co. New York: Pp. 286. \$1.50.

Beyond all question the subject of this memoir was an earnest and devoted servant of God, and if the object of the writer had been to glorify the grace of God as exhibited in her life, and to stimulate the zeal of others by her example, he might have found an abundance of material in her long and active life. But such was not the aim of the writer. The book is intended to be a plea for the doctrine of entire and instantaneous sanctification, and was prepared at the request of Mrs. Palmer herself. In this work she is presented not only as an earnest advocate and exponent of this idea, but also as a shining example and illustration of it. Indeed the biography is only a minor and incidental feature of the work, and a very considerable part of the book is taken up with arguments, historical and exegetical, going to show that this teaching is in accord with the Word of God, the views of Wesley, and the experience of men.

It is one of the most striking peculiarities of the doctrine of entire sanctification, or perfectionism, that even its ablest advocates are unable apparently to state it in terms clear and unmistakable. Apparently there are no words in our language capable of setting it forth clearly, and the terms used are always qualified and limited to such an extent that the mind is lost in its attempt to locate itself. Take for example the following quotation from Wesley as a fair sample of the "guards" which must be thrown around the doctrine: "Certainly, in the proper

sense, it is an instantaneous deliverance from all sin, and includes an instantaneous power then given always to cleave to God. Yet this sanctification, at least in the lower degrees, does not include the power never to think a useless thought, nor ever speak a useless word.

I, myself, believe that such a perfection is inconsistent with living in a corruptible body; for this makes it impossible always to think right. While we breathe we shall more or less mistake. If, therefore, Christian perfection implies this, we must not expect it till we die.

Indeed my judgment is that, in this case particularly, to overdo is to undo, and that to set perfection too high—so high that no man that I ever heard of or read of attained—is a most effectual, because unsuspected, way of driving it out of the world. . . . Absolute or infallible perfection I never contended for. Sinless perfection I do not contend for, seeing it is not Scriptural." (P. 93.) Imperfection we know, and perfection we can comprehend, but when we are directed to something that comes between, and is neither the one nor the other, we find that the idea eludes our grasp. That the sharp line drawn between the the so-called "perfection" and a lower state is an entirely arbitrary one, and may be shifted at will, may be clearly seen in the warning given by Wesley in the passage quoted above, that we must not set the standard of perfection too high lest we drive it out of the world. The idea seems to be to look around and see how high the most earnest souls have attained and then fix that as the standard, very much as Fahrenheit fixed the zero of his thermometric scale.

In the conclusion of the work the author argues that as one single case of conversion, like that of the Apostle Paul, is sufficient proof of the existence of such a thing as conversion, so "a single case of entire holiness, attended with the Scripture evidences of its reality" should satisfy the candid mind. We readily grant it, but where is that single case to be found? Certainly not in the subject of this memoir, as her biographer thinks, for while she was eulogized after her death as one "wholly sanctified," the same writer candidly admits that she was not without her "faults," which however were only "minor defects" (p. 240).

But according to the author Mrs. Palmer was not the only instance of entire sanctification, but it is attributed to some who never claimed it for themselves, and would doubtless have repudiated such a claim in their behalf, such as Isaiah, Paul, Jonathan Edwards and his wife, Flavel, Cowper, Howe, Payson, &c.

The biographical portion of the book is interesting, but the argumentative portion of the work is neither striking nor original, and the author produces the impression that he is more anxious to show that the doctrine in question is in accord with the views of Wesley, than to show that it is the teaching of the Word of God.

T. R. ENGLISH.

Richmond, Va.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE CREW OF THE DOLPHIN. *By Hesta Stretton.* Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 15 cents.

The author of "Jessica's First Prayer" needs no introduction. This is another of his delightful English stories, illustrating the watchful care of him who "holdeth the sea in the hollow of his hand." A good book for our Sabbath-school libraries is this.

SONS OF ADVERSITY. *By L. Cope Cornford.* Boston: L. C. Page & Co. Pp. 313. \$1.25.

The scene of this tale of love and adventure is laid in England and Holland, and in the time of Elizabeth, petty intrigues with Spain forming the basis. The plot is well conceived, an unusual feature being the villany of the hero's father. There may be those who will find it to their liking, but for us it savors too much of the dime novel. Kennedy's frontispiece illustration is a happy conception.

FABIUS THE ROMAN, OR, How the Church Became Militant. *By E. F. Burr, D. D., LL. D.* Pp. 388. \$1.50. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co.

In the wake of "*Quo Vadis*," very aptly comes this thrilling narrative, almost as full of interesting matter and without the objectionable qualities of the former. Dr. Burr is an American writer of versatile genius. As the author of religious and mathematical works, he is already well known to many, but here we have one of his departures. "Fabius the Roman," is a poetical romance in prose, full of daring deeds and noble lives.

The scene is laid in Rome during the rule of Maxentius, when the blood of martyrs had sprang up as seed sown in good ground, and had brought forth an abundant ingathering into the Christian field. Though well-nigh outnumbering their persecutors, the Creed of the Church continued to be, "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter," and many chose death to offered deliverance, that they might the more readily obtain the crown. The effort to combat this spirit, and the work of turning the eyes of the Christian to a deliverer in the person of Constantine, forms the basis of the plot.

The task is committed to Fabius, the hero of the story, a man of daring courage, combined with an almost omniscient insight and unerring judgment, "a crystal sided observatory facing all the azimuths." After the most thrilling adventures, he succeeds in a desperate throw, and marches in triumph to meet the Emperor Constantine, who is at the gates of Rome. Of course a maiden is rescued, and before we leave, we

hear the inevitable "*Ubi tu Caius*," etc., without which all would be incomplete.

Particularly well drawn are the descriptions of the reeking dungeons of Rome, the spirit of the Christian martyrs, and the character of the Pontifex Maximus, upholding the worship of Jupiter and Venus against his reason, knowing that its fall is his ruin. The book closes with a spirited poem.

As a matter of history, made absorbingly interesting for youth, we can commend this work for a place in all libraries.

A DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. *By John D. Davis, Ph. D., D. D.,* Professor of Semitic Philology and Old Testament History in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. With many new and original Maps and Plans and amply illustrated. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1898. 8 vo. Pp. 802.

That which gives us what we want in the briefest time and most limited space is to us the most valuable. Certain works intrinsically meritorious are oftentimes without utility because of their extensiveness and hence cumbrousness. In this "Dictionary of the Bible it appears that we have everything to be desired in such a work. Moderate compass, wide range of subjects, adaptation to the Revised as well as the Authorized Version, uniform ability of articles and thorough, competent, accurate scholarship make it almost absolutely what it should be. It must be, therefore, eminently serviceable to all students of the Bible—to the pastor, the theological professor, the theological student, the Sunday-school teacher and the intelligent layman. We have consulted no similar work that was as satisfying. It compares favorably with "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," which has been so deservedly popular, and has the great advantage of much learning compacted solidly.

As the author says, "the book aims to be a Dictionary of the Bible, not of speculation about the Bible." The interpretation of Scripture is "sober, fair and just." Its facts may be accepted with confidence as the utmost known now of the subjects treated. Disputed questions are stated frankly from both sides, and absolute fairness obtains in all discussions. The position of the author on all questions is admirably conservative. To him the Scriptures are the rule of faith. Their declarations are accepted as true. Sacred history has with him no reconstruction. Neither is there a chafing impatience under the Old Theology, and modern speculations of the schools of the Regenerated Theology are calmly set aside. A reverent, believing, devout attitude is maintained toward the Bible.

We both congratulate and thank Mr. Davis, and bespeak for this Dictionary a wide circulation.

S. C. BYRD.

Columbia, S. C.

IONIA: LAND OF WISE MEN AND FAIR WOMEN. *By Alexander Craig.* Illustrations and cover design by J. C. Leyendecker. Chicago: E. A. Weeks Co. 1898. Pp. 301.

"Ionia" shows close kinship to two well known works, "Utopia" and "Looking Backward." It lacks, however, the originality of the former and the strength of the latter. The title and cover designs would lead the buyer to suppose that he might look forward to a feast of wisdom, wit, pathos and passion, but all such expectations are disappointed.

The hero, Alexander Musgrove, who by the way is not much of a hero, is a young Englishman, the son of a wealthy and benevolent widow lady. He determines to devote his fortune to the cause of suffering humanity, and proposes, with two million pounds, to "abolish all the London slums and make tens of thousands of people happy." While in this laudable work he meets with a Mr. Delphian, a citizen of Ionia, who invites the young philanthropist to visit his country and observe their marvelous advancement and study their wonderful achievements. The rest of the book records Alexander's experience and observations while in this "other world."

The book is not worth reading. There is nothing new in it, and the old is not presented in a manner especially attractive. As in some other cases we are forced to wonder why the book was written. The edition is very attractive, and the mechanical work is good: the paper, printing and designs being especially good.

THE CHAPEL HYMNAL. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work. 1998. 8 vo.

The Northern Presbyterian Church has felt the need of a suitable hymn-book perhaps quite as much as our own Church is feeling that need to-day. Its Committee has already prepared a "Hymnal," which is intended to be a complete manual of praise covering every character of church service. The "Chapel Hymnal" before us is a second book, in smaller compass, designed for use in prayer-meeting and social service. A third book in the series is yet to be issued and will be one specially fitted for Sunday Schools.

The "Chapel Hymnal" embraces three hundred and seventy hymns, with tunes appropriate to them. These are taken mainly from the "Hymnal," though a few not published in that collection are given here, as some of the popular "Gospel Hymns." The topics covered are many and varied, and a very full index is given, adding greatly to the facility of choosing hymns appropriate to occasion or topic. Fifty-two pages of the book are devoted to a selection from the Psalter, for use in responsive readings. The selections are from the version used by the American Bible Society. In the case of many hymns, the arrangement of the page is such that a choice of tunes may be made. The Indices are full and helpful. The collection embraces the more widely popular and well established hymns and tunes. The devotional element is predominant, and a much smaller proportion than usual is given of the objectionable modern jingles and rhymes. In clearness of type, for both music and words, and in binding and size, the book is a model.

EDITORIAL.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

THE SOUTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in Richmond, Va., Thursday, May 18th, at 11 a. m., and was opened with a sermon by the retiring Moderator, Rev. E. M. Green, D. D., on the words of Christ found in Matt. 10: 34. "I came not to send peace, but a sword." The First Church is a typical Presbyterian building, solid and massive, and with one or two rooms secured outside furnished ample accommodations for the Assembly's need. Richmond was an ideal place of meeting for the Assembly, rich in historic interest, associated with such names as those of Patrick Henry, Washington, Marshal, Robert Ould, Jefferson Davis and Robt. E. Lee in the sphere of the State and with John Holt Rice, William S. Plummer and Moses D. Hoge in Presbyterian Church circles; containing such monuments as the bronze effigy of A. P. Hill, the pyramid of granite in Hollywood, marking the graves of 30,000 Confederate soldiers, the equestrian statues of Washington and Lee and the bronze figures of Jackson, The Howitzer, and the Private Confederate Soldier; and such noted buildings as the Capitol, the State Library, the Davis Mansion, the Confederate Museum, the Soldiers' Home and Union Seminary Buildings—the city presented many attractions to the sight-seers. The city is beautifully situated, located on fine hills and plateaus at the falls of the James River. There are now ten active and vigorous Presbyterian Churches in the city and the suburbs, and the honor of entertaining the commissioners was shared by several. The hospitality of the city was unstinted and the general air of kindly feeling which distinguished the As-

sembly was traced by one of the speakers to the atmosphere of refinement and Christian courtesy which were found in the homes from which the commissioners came to their work. At the opening service, the congregation filled the church and overflowed into the galleries. On the platform with Dr. Green were seated Rev. R. P. Kerr, pastor of the First Church, Rev. Jas. Woodrow, D. D., Rev. E. P. Palmer D. D., and Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D. D. After the invocation the congregation sang, "Before Jehovah's Awful Throne." Dr. Woodrow read the tenth chapter of Matthew. Dr. Palmer made the intercessory prayer, and Dr. Green preached the admirable sermon, which was printed in our Church papers and favorably commented on at the North.

After the sermon the Assembly proceeded to the election of a Moderator. Rev. Roger Martin, D. D., moved that the Assembly elect by ballot without nomination, after a prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit. This was amended so that after the second ballot it should be understood that the Assembly had been guided to one of the three names receiving the highest number of votes. Rev. John F. Cannon, D. D., from St. Louis, Mo., was elected on the second ballot and made one of the best presiding officers the distinguished body has ever had. With a thorough knowledge of parliamentary law and a clear head, possessed of unfailing courtesy and tact, neither rushing the business through precipitately nor allowing it to be unduly retarded, he also made the Assembly proud of its choice when called upon, as he frequently was, to represent the Assembly in public address. But we feel that a protest should be made against the method of electing without nomination. It savors of Quakerism. There is no reason why the Holy Spirit should not guide a commissioner in making a nominating speech, nor why a voter should not be better guided after receiving information as to the qualifications for the Moderator's chair which the different

nominees possess. If it is once understood that no nominations are to be made, the eloquence which has been formerly bottled up for the use on the floor of the Assembly, will leak out in buttonhole electioneering, caucusing on the trains, or even nominations by newspapers—from all of which may the Southern Church be delivered.

One of the first acts of the Assembly was the adoption of a minute on the death of Rev. W. U. Murkland, D. D., who had been elected a commissioner. The Moderator was fortunate in the appointment of different committees. The Chairmen of the most important ones were: of Bills and Overtures, E. M. Green, D. D.; Judicial, Jas. Woodrow, D. D.; Foreign Missions, Russel Cecil, D. D.; Home Missions, W. M. Scott, D. D.; Publication, J. B. Shearer, D. D.; Education, Geo. Summey, D. D.; Colored Evangelization, R. F. Campbell, D. D.; Foreign Correspondence, J. H. McNeilly, D. D. There were fewer overtures presented than usually afflict an Assembly. Those that were received were given a fair and impartial hearing. The new Stated Clerk and his temporary assistants, Rev. Alexander Sprunt, D. D., and Rev. T. H. Law, D. D., were most efficient in the services they rendered. The venerable Dr. Farris was as accurate in method and as strong of voice as he has been for a generation of Assemblies, but we missed the figure that was so long a time his companion and friend, Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, one of whose principal claims to remembrance was his ability to veto an overture by his method of reading it, accompanied by an expression of countenance which said to the Assembly with comical emphasis, "What on earth was meant by sending such an overture to the Assembly?"

There were several outings and special entertainments which the Assembly enjoyed, and it received several invitations which it was compelled to decline. On the first afternoon of the Assembly the Ladies' Auxiliary of the First Church took the whole body on an excursion down the James River in the steamer "Pocahontas." It was an exceptional op-

portunity for the commissioners to renew old acquaintanceships and to form new ones among themselves. The reception given by Union Seminary on Monday afternoon was of much interest and profit. Dr. Johnson made an address of welcome, which was of the sledge-hammer variety in its heartiness. He said that he was glad to welcome the Assembly, because its members were Christians, were Presbyterians, and were Southern Presbyterians. Only one Church in America could sympathize with the Southern Presbyterian Church in its devotion to the crown rights of Jesus Christ, and he sympathized with that minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, who "thanked God that his Church had never hung the rags of political expediency on the Cross of Christ." Moreover the Moderator and one-half of the Commissioners to the Assembly were Union men. Dr. Cannon's reply was most happy. He had words of hearty congratulation to the Seminary and its students for their beautiful buildings; he had words of commiseration also on the loss of those rural experiences which made the life of old Hampden-Sidney unique. His heart framed the wish that the Union Seminary in future should keep the spirit and genius of the Union Seminary of the past. There were two factors in the individuality of the old Seminary: First, the character of the Professors. They were simple in manners, spiritual in life, scriptural in thought. The second was the attention given to the spiritual life of the students. Dr. Dabney once brought to the students a message from the death bed of the sainted Dr. Ramsay: "Tell them from me, as from a dying man, not to allow their intellectual acquaintance with the word of God to outstrip their experience of its sanctifying power"; I hand the message on to you.

The reception given by the Covenanters, an organization peculiar to the Southern Church, and which promises by its business methods, its excellent constitution and its adaptation to the nature of the *genus puer* to spread widely, made a profound impression on the Assembly.

Saturday night the First Church was filled with interested spectators and auditors and the boys of the Richmond companies marched in with their banners, a white St. Andrews cross on a blue ground. They sang as they marched,

“Onward, Christian Soldiers.”

It was good to see boys, not young men and not babies, just boys, singing with all their hearts the old church hymns, having evidently long passed the stage of boyish diffidence. Their pride in the order and enthusiasm for their work was contagious. One little fellow with an air of business that would have done credit to a banker read the treasurer's report of Company I, from which we gleaned the fact that out of \$200 collected the sum of \$183 had been contributed to Home and Foreign Missions. The excellence of the organization was shown by the fact that reports were sent to their “rally” from every company that has been enrolled.

The Assembly's Communion was celebrated on Friday evening. Rev. J. H. McNeily, D. D., preached an earnest and impressive sermon, and Dr. Cannon and Dr. Green officiated in the distribution of the elements. One of the best missionary meetings ever held was that in which brief messages from three continents by five of our missionaries at home on a furlough were heard. Frank Price, the beloved, presided. Rev. Samuel Phillips Verner brought a message from Dombi, the great-hearted King of the Beni Bakenga, asking the great white chiefs of America to send him not men to take away their land and their liberty, but men to preach the Gospel and to build churches and schools. Rev. W. C. Buchanan spoke of the failure of civilization in Japan to save the people for Christ. Out of forty-two million of people only 900,000 had ever heard the Gospel. Rev. M. B. Grier, who came to us from the A. R. P. Church, gave a clear account of the complications and perhaps international difficulties on account of the political influence

of the French Catholic Priests and their persecution of the Protestant natives. Rev. Geo. Henderlite spoke of Brazil as a part of "the neglected continent." He was on the eve of sailing, and rejoiced to know that he would soon meet the little band of believers who had gathered together under his ministry. Rev. Frank Price closed with a glowing and eloquent appeal for Foreign Missions. There was also a popular meeting in the interest of Assembly's Home Missions, at which interesting addresses were made by representatives of our Home Mission work, from Florida and the Southwest. The speakers were Rev. J. L. D. Houston, from northwestern Arkansas, Rev. Jno. D. McCall, from the western frontier of Texas, Rev. R. M. Hall, of San Antonio, who was thoroughly acquainted with the Mexican work, Rev. W. J. B. Lloyd, who gave an account of the Indian work in the Territory, and Rev. W. S. Milne who spoke of the needs of Florida. And there was another meeting in the interest of Foreign Missions at which Dr. Chester gave one of his spicy and instructive addresses, reciting the facts that came under his own observation in traveling in the East.

Judging from the time occupied and the interest excited, the adoption of the report on Parochial Schools was the most important act of the Assembly. Dr. Kerr, the chairman of the committee, read the report and made a brief but lucid explanation. The following are the resolutions :

"In furtherance of this cause of Church and Christian Education your committee would recommend the Assembly to approve and adopt the following plan of organization for systematic effort throughout the Church, which plan substantially has been in operation for some years in the four Synods of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, and has been productive of excellent results in many places, to-wit :

1. That the General Assembly appoint a Committee on Church and Christian Education, and urge the Synods and

Presbyteries throughout the Church to appoint similar committees, the duty of all of which committees shall be to gather and disseminate information and excite interest in Church and Christian Education as best they may, and make annual reports to their respective bodies on this subject. These committees ought to be organized as permanent committees similar to those which have charge of other departments of Christian work.

2. The chairman of the Assembly's Committee shall be the organ of communication with the chairmen of the several Synodical and Presbyterial Committees.

3. The Assembly urges upon the ministers under its charge to preach and instruct the people on the duty and necessity of providing as far as possible, for the education of our sons and daughters, giving special emphasis to the cause of female education.

4. That the Synods, Presbyteries, Sessions, Officers and private members of the Church be exhorted and encouraged to provide, in every possible way, for schools, both primary and preparatory, in which the Bible shall be a text book.

5. That the Presbyteries are urged to prepare and circulate pastoral letters on this subject, to all our people.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

ROBERT P. KERR, Ch'm.,

J. B. SHEARER,

S. E. SPENCER,

JOHN E. WHARTON,

Committee."

For this Dr. Walden offered the following substitute :

"Recognizing and lamenting the modern tendency towards the secularization of education, and believing that true education cannot ignore the moral or spiritual nature, this General Assembly hereby enjoins upon the ministers and members of our great communion in an individual and associated way to lend their influence, personal and financial, to the establishment and maintenance of schools and

colleges under Church and Presbyterian influence, and it also affectionately urges the families of our various churches and communities to give their patronage to such schools and colleges; and this not only for the safe and true education of their own children, but as a measure promoting true religion in this land."

Dr. Woodrow led the debate against the report of the committee, preferring the substitute yet denying that education was the Church's business at all. He admitted the force of the precedents that have been set by other Churches and by sections of our own Church, but declared that the Southern Church was not to be governed by precedents. There are three divine institutions, the Family, the Church and the State, with distinct and independent functions. The State has police power and that only. The principle was socialistic that the State had the right to educate; it had just as much right to feed and clothe its citizens. The Church on the other hand had the right to educate its ministers or teachers. When that education should begin, must be determined by the state of society. The education of ministers, however, is only a means to an end. The mission of the Church is the preaching of the Gospel.

But the Family, like the State in the Federal Government, has all the powers reserved to itself that are not expressly given to Church or State. This scheme of Church education is a usurpation of the rights of the head of the family to whom it is left to say how and where his children should be educated.

Dr. Shearer replied to Dr. Woodrow, declaring that education was a spiritual function and not a secular. There are studies that are neutral so far as religion is concerned, but when those studies which are distinctly religious are blended with these, the resultant is a Christian education. The objection to the substitute is that there will be no uniformity of effort and no permanence of administration

without Church control. Some Christian schools, as they were originally founded, have gone far from the intention of their founders, and become anti-theistic. The danger of bringing Church politics into Church courts is nullified by putting the whole administration of the schools into the hands of a board of trustees, while the Church retains control at the pivotal point by electing the board. Dr. Shearer then read the action of the Assembly of 1871, and continued the argument with an exhaustive history of the parochial school system in Scotland, and of the earliest educational institutions in America.

Judge James took the floor in support of the substitute. He was in favor of Church institutions in localities where they were needed, and thought it best for the Assembly to keep its hands off the matter and allow these institutions to be established as had already been done wherever they could be supported. Where the State has already been doing the work of education well there was no need for the Church to establish its own schools. Dr. Walden's plea was for the spirituality of the Church. Dr. Shearer's distinction between ecclesiastical administration and ecclesiastical control, was itself an apology. It was admitted that ecclesiastical administration would be fatal, but ecclesiastical control involved the same principle, and it would be impossible to keep serious differences in the Board of Trustees out of the Church courts that elect the board. The common school system is an example of the evil tendency of paternalism in the State, and Church education is an example of ecclesiastical paternalism, the tendency of which is only evil.

Dr. Kerr summed the case for the parochial school. Dr. Thornwell in 1871 had advocated a great Presbyterian University under the care of the General Assembly. A letter from Dr. Dabney, written a few months before his death said, "I would like to see a system of parochial education as universal as that of John Knox."

The debate was closed by a brief rejoinder from Dr. Woodrow, in which he pierced the armour of his antagonists without convincing the Assembly that his principles were correct. Both he and Dr. Walden weakened their case by admitting that their principles demolished the public schools, as well as the Church schools and left all education to private enterprise, while the other side did not bring out with sufficient clearness the central fact that Church education is religious propagandism. Presbyterian education will undoubtedly make good Presbyterians.

In carrying out the scheme which was adopted by a large majority, three things should be carefully guarded, the liberty of the head of the family to direct the education of his children without interference by the cry of Church loyalty; the establishment of Church schools only where they can be adequately supported; and the pre-eminence of direct missionary enterprises over educational work.

The change in the baptismal formula from "into the name" to "in the name" was effected without debate, a large number uttering their protests simply by their vote. The second change in the Book of Church Order, giving the elder authority to charge the people in installation services, provoked some debate. One important principle was settled by the Moderator's ruling, which was accepted without appeal, viz., that the Assembly had the right to veto a change in our Constitution, even after a majority of the Presbyteries had voted for the change. There were three parties in the Assembly on this question of the ruling elder and the charge. Rev. P. D. Stevenson, D. D., representing the party which held that the charge was a function of the minister's office, moved that the question be referred to the next Assembly and an *ad interim* committee be appointed who should study the whole question of the relation between the ruling elder and the minister of the Word. This motion was defeated, then the ayes and noes were called

and several gave their reasons for their votes. Those who sided with Dr. Stevenson voted "no," while those who held to the other extreme that there should be no discrimination against the elder, but that he should be allowed to deliver the charge to the pastor, also likewise voted "no." Those who voted "aye" believed that the delivery of the charge pertained to the governmental functions, and therefore could be performed by an elder. Many of these believed that the elder should be allowed to charge the pastor also. There were some who voted "aye" who believed that the Assembly was bound by the action of the Presbyteries. The question was settled by a vote of 77 ayes to 43 noes, and is still as unsettled as a question can well be.

Some of the important overtures that were answered by the Assembly was one from the Presbytery of Athens touching the observance of Christmas and Easter as religious days. Answer: that there is no warrant in the scriptures for the observance of these days as holy days, but on the contrary that such observance is contrary to the principles of the Reformed Faith, conducive to will worship and not in harmony with the simplicity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. In answer to the overture from the Presbytery of Albemarle as to principals and alternates in a Church court, the Assembly declared that the alternate may be substituted for the principal after the court has been constituted whenever in the judgment of the court, such a change is deemed necessary or proper. In answer to the overture of Central Texas Presbytery it was affirmed that in emergencies the Moderator of the Church court could call the regular meeting at some other time or place than the one appointed. Fayetteville Presbytery overtured the Assembly to send down a pastoral letter to the churches on the subject of worldliness, with special reference to card playing, dancing and theatre going. The Assembly granted the request, The overtures with regard to the new hymn book, one from the Presbytery of Louis-

ville asking that the action of the General Assembly at New Orleans be reconsidered, others making suggestions as to the preparation of the book, were referred to the Hymn Book Committee. The Century Co. made an admirable offer, agreeing to re-print the "Laudes Domini" for the Prayer Meeting, adding 100 hymns to it of our own selection, giving it a new name and selling at from 60 to 40 cents a copy. There was a very strong feeling that this offer should be accepted. Dr. Walden, who has been the main mover in the matter of the new hymn book, reported progress on the part of the Committee.

During the sessions of the Assembly fraternal greetings were sent to and returned by the Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of Virginia, then in session in Richmond; the Northern General Assembly, and the Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly. The elders of the Northern Presbyterian Assembly also sent a message of fraternal greeting to the elders of the Southern Assembly.

A movement inaugurated by the Presbyterian pastors of Richmond that the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions be removed to that city from Nashville, met with vigorous protest from the Nashville brethren, and was not seriously considered by the Assembly.

There was quite a spirited contest between Atlanta and Marshall, Missouri, over the place of meeting for the next Assembly. Atlanta Central Church had sent its pastor, Rev. Theron H. Rice, to present to the Assembly the attractions of Atlanta. Rev. Frank Mitchell made a vigorous appeal for the Assembly to meet at Marshall, in the centre of Missouri Presbyterianism. The vote was close, 94 to 83 in favor of Atlanta.

The work of the Church as represented by its different executive committees had a patient and careful hearing. Besides the time already given to Foreign Missions, of which we have spoken, the Standing Committee made a careful report, Rev. Russell Cecil, D. D., Chairman. The

net receipts for the year were \$144,990. This is a falling off of \$1,500 from last year, although from rigid economy the year was closed without debt, and this does not mean as in the case of the Home Mission, Invalid and Education funds that the salaries of missionaries and beneficiaries are scaled down so as to make the report "No debt." The movement was authorized to signalize the opening of the 20th Century by a special effort to raise \$200,000 for the cause of Home Missions during the present year. Cooperation with the Ecumenical Conference, representing the Protestant Missionary Societies of the World, was ordered by the Assembly, and delegates appointed to the meeting to be held in New York City, April 21st, 1900. The inauguration of the mission in Cuba was endorsed and a further prosecution of the work was urged, especially upon the young people of the Church. None of our missionary publications are paying expenses, notwithstanding the marked ability with which they are edited. Only four new missionaries were sent out during the year, but the losses from the field equalled the gain. The number of missionaries remained 155, the same as last year. Rev. S. H. Chester, D. D., was heartily and unanimously recommended and elected Secretary for the coming year.

The report of the Standing Committee on Home Missions commended the present plan for conducting this department of work and urges the Churches and Sabbath Schools to raise the sum of \$40,000 in the September and January collections. Each session is asked to appoint an elder or deacon to see after the distribution of envelopes and leaflets. The publication of a Home Missionary Magazine was not deemed advisable. It was urged that the sum of \$18,000 be raised for the Invalid Fund and the request of several overtures was granted that an *ad interim* committee be appointed who shall make a report to the next Assembly on some method of securing more adequate provision for the needs of our invalid ministers. Rev. J. N.

Craig, D. D., was re-elected Secretary and the same Executive Committee appointed, Rev. C. P. Bridewell being substituted on the committee for Dr. Barnett. It is worthy of note that while some thirty thousand dollars is reported for Assembly's Missions including the work among the Indians and Mexicans, the sum of \$105,000 was raised for Presbyterian and Synodical Missions. But the Assembly officially knows nothing about this great work and devotes its whole time to the consideration of the work in three of its Synods.

The same thing is shown in the work of the Education Committee, only a part of the funds for the education of candidates for the ministry passing through the hands of the Secretary of Education, Presbyteries and Churches acting independently whenever they please. The unification of these two causes is one of the crying needs of our Church to-day.

The Standing Committee on Publication answered all overtures in the negative looking to any changes in the publication work. The present net assets of this committee are \$117,000, and there is a small margin of profit on the business of publication, so that all the collections can be used for colportage work.

Unusual interest was excited by the report on Colored Evangelization, Rev. R. F. Campbell, D. D., Chairman. The committee approved of the conclusion reached by the Executive Committee in the matter of the Ferguson William School; tendered the thanks of the Church to Rev. R. L. Liston, of Oxford, Ala., for his donation of property, valued at \$30,000, to this cause; noted with gratification the evidences of increased prosperity in the liquidation of all debts, better provision for men in the field, the enlarged work of Stillman Institute and the rigid economy with which the work has been conducted. Both the Secretary and Superintendent set the example of self-denial in giving their services freely to the Church. An appeal was made

for a great forward movement in the work of Colored Evangelization, because of the wide range of the work, including every detail of the elevation of a race: the fearful strides of immorality and crime which the present generation of negroes is making; the peculiar adaptability of the Presbyterian Church to the negroes' needs, with an educated ministry, sober instruction, simple modes of worship and an orderly system of government and discipline; the opening of a wide door in Africa; and the crisis which our work among the colored people has reached on account of the organization of the Independent African Presbyterian Church. The sum of \$15,000 is asked for, for the prosecution of this work during the coming year.

All things considered, the Southern Church has reason to thank God and take courage for his blessing upon its work and the prospect of yet larger usefulness in the century that is almost upon us.

The Assembly adjourned on Friday night after a meeting of a little over a week. Its sessions were for the most part uninteresting, being taken up with routine work and the body was too homogeneous for many great debates. From the point of view of this Assembly there are no divisive questions in the Southern Church, and harmony prevails throughout her borders.

The closing exercises were somewhat prolonged, as many of the commissioners had a burden of gratitude to the hospitable people of Richmond, which they were obliged to roll off in a parting speech. And when some of them dropped off into war-time reminiscences, the Moderator almost broke his record for unflinching patience. At a late hour, after singing, prayer and the apostolic benediction, the Assembly was formally dissolved and passed into history, a new one elected in like manner to meet in Atlanta on the third Thursday of May, 1900. May the blessings of the Head of the Church attend all his servants, and crown their labors with enduring success!

THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The growth of the twin-cities, St. Paul and Minneapolis, are not more remarkable than the growth of Presbyterianism in them. In 1835 Rev. Thomas S. Williamson, M. D., organized the first Presbyterian Church and the first Protestant Church as well, of the Northwest, at Fort Snelling, half way between St. Paul and Minneapolis. It had twenty members—soldiers and traders. In 1852 the First Presbyterian Church of Minneapolis was organized, and it united with the former organization at Fort Snelling. Now the twenty members of 1835 have grown to a Synod of 22,000. In 1882, the population of Minneapolis having doubled in three years, Presbyterianism took on new life, and eight churches were organized in nine months. At the beginning of Dr. Sample's pastorate Westminster Church numbered 106 members, and now it numbers 1,600. This is the church that entertained the Assembly, and Dr. Sample, the former pastor, was elected Moderator, to the great delight of his people.

The sermon by Rev. Wallace Radcliffe, retiring Moderator, on Proverbs, 19:18, "Where there is no vision the people perish," was delivered to an audience of 2,000, and was well received by the members of the Assembly. The analysis of the text, however, belongs rather to the department of eisegesis than of exegesis. For example, "The vision is threefold. The vision of Christ, the Divine; the vision of Christ, the Sacrifice; the vision of Christ as King."

The first question of interest was the election of a Moderator. The Liberals nominated Dr. R. F. Coyle, of Oakland, California. The Moderates put forth Dr. Matthias L. Haynes, of Indianapolis. Dr. Robert F. Sample, of New York, representing the Conservatives, received a majority of the votes on the first ballot, the vote standing, Sample, 338; Coyle, 137; Haines, 133.

The overshadowing question before the Assembly was

the McGiffert case and it came early before the body in a communication from Dr. McGiffert from which we quote:

Waiving at this time all questions of Constitutional right and order, I have thought it proper to look upon this action (that of the last Assmby) in the light of friendly advice from Christian brethren, in which light, indeed, it would seem that it must have been looked upon by those who joined in it.

Regarded thus, the action evidently requires no response from me, nor did the Assembly intimate in any way that the response was either expected or desired. But it is my wish to be governed entirely by the spirit of Christian courtesy. and I therefore take this opportunity of informing the brethren, gathered in the first General Assembly since the action was taken, what I have felt my duty to be in view of the fraternal counsel offered me.

The action of the Assembly as well as the overture from the Presbytery of Pittsburg, upon which the action was based, make it evident that many of my positions, together with the spirit and purpose of my book as a whole, have been seriously misapprehended. Such misapprehension I sincerely regret, and I wish here emphatically to repudiate the false constructions that have been placed upon my book in many quarters. So far as my views are concerned, they have been and remain, as I believe, in accord with the faith of the Presbyterian Church and of the Evangelical Christendom in all vital and essential matters, and I, therefore, cannot feel that it is my duty, or even my right, in justice to myself and to my brethren, and to the Church of our Divine Lord and Master, in which I am an office-bearer, to withdraw from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. In taking this position, to which I am constrained by a profound sense of duty, I desire to say that I recognize gratefully the spirit of Christian kindness which animated those who joined in the action of the last Assembly, and appreciate the devotion to the truth and the concern for the welfare of the Church which prompted their action. I desire to say also that I yield to no one in my devotion to the truth and in my concern for the welfare of the Church.

Praying for the blessing of God upon the Church universal, and especially upon that branch of it within which I was born and bred, and whose interests I have most deeply at heart, I am respectfully and fraternally yours,

A. C. MCGIFFERT.

The letter was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, together with the several overtures from the Presbyteries on the subject. Thursday of the second week was appointed for taking up the case. The committee was unanimous in the preamble to the resolutions, consisting mainly of a strong declaration of faith in these as funda-

mental doctrines : The Inspiration of the Scriptures ; The Divinity of Christ ; The Historical Institution of the Lord's Supper, and Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness. It was a feat of generalship on the part of the committee that this part of the report was adopted unanimously, though all connected with the history of the case know that Dr. McGiffert's book at least seems to impugn all of these doctrines. The committee divided on the question of procedure. The minority, headed by a Southern man, Rev. B. L. Hobson, D.D., held out for instructing the Presbytery of New York virtually to proceed with the trial. Eight out of twenty signed this report :

"The General Assembly, while deploring the controversy occasioned by Dr. McGiffert's writings, hereby direct the Presbytery of New York, of which he is a member, to appoint a committee to confer with him ; and if it should appear to the Presbytery that Dr. McGiffert fails to modify his views so as to conform them to the standards of the Church, the Presbytery is directed to use every means to induce Dr. McGiffert to withdraw peaceably from the Presbyterian ministry. But if he should refuse to do so, then the Presbytery is directed, as the last resort, to proceed with the case in accordance with the provisions of the constitution of the Church. And in all these proceedings the Presbytery is to maintain the spirit of Christian kindness and love, as well as fidelity to the truth."

The majority of twelve signed the following report :

"We recommend that the whole matter of the teachings of the book of Rev. A. C. McGiffert, D. D., entitled, 'A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age,' be referred to the Presbytery of New York, to which belongs the primary constitutional responsibility for such disposition as in its judgment the peace of the churches and the purity of doctrine may require."

Dr. Wallace Radcliffe, the Chairman of the Committee, made an impassioned speech in behalf of the majority report and captured the Assembly. He was ably seconded by the appeal of Dr. Balcolm Shaw, who appealed to the Assembly from the point of view of the troubles of New York Presbyterianism. It seems to us that there is a little too much consideration shown to the sensitiveness of the New York churches. It ill becomes the dignity of the

Church of Christ to be deferring to the tastes of one city lest there should be forthwith a larger exodus into the Episcopal Church. The minority report was ably defended by Dr. Hobson, and he and his colleagues by their steadfastness at least accomplished the adoption of the majority report, without dissent from the Liberals. There is really little essential difference between the reports. Both refer the matter to New York Presbytery, where it belongs, and where it should have been sent a year ago, on the advice of another Southern man, Dr. W. S. Plumer Bryan. The Presbytery of New York has since met, appointed a committee to take up the case, and the committee has already had one conference with Dr. McGiffert. So in spite of the parallel which Dr. Daniel draws for us in his article on the Regenerated Theology, we can predict that Dr. McGiffert will either withdraw from the Church before the next Assembly meets, or will be put out by the Assembly itself. When the lines have been drawn the Northern Church has heretofore proved itself as sound as could be desired.

The Board of Freedmen, the only Board that reported a debt to this Assembly, made a vitriolic report on Southern outrages, the plan appearing to be to make so much cash out of the sympathy excited in behalf of the oppressed and martyred negroes. But the making of the negro criminal a hero was almost too much, and the report was recommitted and toned down to the resolve to redeem the negro from his sufferings and from his sins. Both theologically and historically the sins should have been put first. An extraordinary effort was made to lift this, the only debt of the Church to its benevolent causes.

The Board of Home Missions reported the goodly sum of \$856,000, and that of Foreign Missions the sum of \$785,000 contributed to these great causes, the latter being administered at the cost of four and three-fourths per cent.

One of the youngest of the Boards is the Board of Aid

for Schools and Colleges, answering to the Committee on Church and Christian Education of the Southern Church. This Board has already accomplished wonderful things, and asks for \$150,000 for the coming year. The plan for reducing the representation of the Presbyteries in the Assembly met with crushing defeat.

The Assembly took strong action on the Mormon Congressional case, and set forth its views anent the Peace Conference, besides sending a telegram of congratulation to Queen Victoria. But there were fewer political questions up than usual.

In spite of the overtures from sixty Presbyteries on the subject of Organic Union, the Committee recommended no action this year, and after a few words of explanation to the effect that they were waiting for some motion from the Southern Church, the report was unanimously adopted.

The *Assembly Herald*, a publication run by the Assembly in the interests of its benevolent work, was a troublesome matter, as it has succeeded in piling up a debt of \$5,000 in four months. But it was resolved to continue the experiment.

After one of the briefest sessions on record, the Assembly adjourned on the ninth day, Saturday, to meet in the Compton Avenue Church, St. Louis, on the third Thursday of May, 1900.

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN.

The Forty-first General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church met in Philadelphia the last week in May. There has been a slight falling off in membership during the year and a large decrease in the number of additions to the church. The sum of \$283,000 was contributed by 126,000 members for the benevolences of the Church.

THE LUTHERAN GENERAL SYNOD.

The Thirty-ninth Biennial Convention of this body met at York, Penn., May 4. There were 238 lay and clerical

delegates and a large concourse of visitors. The Church is prospering in all its departments of work. Debts have been reduced and the contributions of the Church increased. The utmost fraternal feelings were expressed toward the Lutheran Council, with which a union will soon be effected. A movement was set on foot to establish a Church paper under the control of the Church, this step being taken on account of the partisanship and personalities of the present editors of the denominational papers.

GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

The ninety-second session of this orthodox and aggressive Presbyterian body was held at Catskill, N. Y., beginning June 4. Rev. George S. Bishop, of New Jersey, was elected president. The Foreign Mission Board received \$115,000 for the prosecution of its work, and the Board of Domestic Missions \$83,000. A mission in Oklahoma excited especial interest. Rev. Ferdinand S. Schench, D. D., of New York, was elected Professor of Pastoral Theology in the New Brunswick Seminary, and a young man, Rev. J. H. Haven, Professor of Hebrew and the cognate languages. An energetic effort is being made to increase the endowment of this institution \$250,000. Strong papers were adopted against the evils of polygamy and divorce, the former taking the form of a petition to Congress as to the expulsion of Roberts.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly met this year in Denver, where five years ago it did not have a congregation. This Church has Foreign Mission work in China, Japan and Mexico, and four new missionaries have been sent out. The new theological seminary is doing satisfactory work. The work of establishing parochial schools was entered upon with great unanimity and heartiness.

CANADIAN PRESBYTERIAN.

The Canadian General Assembly convened in the city of Hamilton, Ontario, on the 14th of June. Dr. Renfrew, a country pastor, was elected Moderator. It was unanimously resolved to raise a million dollar twentieth century fund. The Canadian Assembly is about the size of the Southern Presbyterian. It gave last year to Foreign Missions \$175,000, a good increase over last year, and for Home Missions 177,000. There is an interesting Home Mission work conducted among the French Canadians of Quebec. This missionary spirit of the Church is most commendable.

The constitutional question as to the eligibility of an elder to the Moderator's chair was earnestly debated and then referred to an *ad interim* committee. There was also a discussion as to the disposal of the Mission College in India, and it was decided to take it from the control of the Presbytery in India and put it into the hands of the Foreign Mission Committee. The proposal was favorably received to cut down the representation in the Assembly, and it was also suggested to appoint an Executive Committee to represent the Assembly between the meetings of that body.

The next Assembly will meet in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

REFORMED (GERMAN) SYNOD.

The Reformed (German) Synod met in triennial session at Tiffin, Ohio, on May 23. The work of the Church was reported in flourishing condition. A new mission was ordered opened in China and the sum of \$40,000 apportioned among the Churches for that purpose. The Home Mission Board has 142 Home Mission fields under its care. The report of the Committee on the State of Religion showed steady progress on the part of the Church.

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION.

This body met this year in Louisville, Ky., and its central location and the interest excited by the Whitsett case, made the representation an exceedingly large one. Dr.

Whitsett, president of the Louisville Baptist Seminary, made some independent investigations into early English and American Baptist history, and found that the facts were not as Baptist tradition held them. It would seem that this was a very unimportant matter. But when Dr. Whitsett's researches were published in his own name they aroused a storm of opposition to his teachings, to him personally, and finally to the seminary of which he was the head. Twice the Board of Trustees stood by him, and the convention at Wilmington and at Norfolk endorsed the action of the Board. But the debate became so bitter that Dr. Whitsett yielded to the pressure and offered his resignation. By a vote of twenty-two to twenty the resignation was accepted. So the Landmark party among the Baptists receives at least the encouragement that continual and disagreeable agitation will accomplish what they want. They are the apostolical successionists of the Baptist Church, and their historical claims are childish and ridiculous. Education is the only hope of a cure, but in the meantime a worthy and scholarly professor has been sacrificed to popular clamor. The episode is one to be ashamed of.

Ex-Governor W. J. Northen was unanimously chosen president of the convention.

The Board of Foreign Missions reports \$108,716 received during the year, which, considering the size of the body represented by the convention, is a small sum, according to Presbyterian standards of measurement. The sum of \$61,794 was contributed for Home Missions.

Before the adjournment of the convention the Board of Trustees of the Seminary elected Dr. John P. Greene president of William Jewell College, Missouri, to the presidency. Later the news came that he declined the honor.

The report of the statistical secretary showed that there are in the South 1,586,000 white Baptists, and 1,563,000 colored Baptists. The Southern Baptists raised for all purposes the sum of \$2,857,000.

The next convention will meet at Hot Springs, Ark.

EPISCOPAL.

The only event that has stirred American Episcopacy during the quarter was the admission of Professor Briggs into the priesthood. This event occurred on Sunday, May 14, in the Pro-Cathedral on Stanton Street, New York. There had been the promise of public opposition, but it failed of fulfillment. Dr. DaCosta and Dr. Clendennin were vigorous in their protest against the ordination. But Bishop Potter published an open letter to a layman who had written protesting against the appointed ceremony, and the opposition was silenced for awhile. It is understood, however, that there is going on a quiet organization against Dr. Briggs, and the end is not yet, though the Professor has been preaching about Holy Church in a way that left nothing to be desired.

The agitation in England still continues over the lawlessness of the priests and their persistent use of the Romish ritual.

NOTE.—Except for Missionary literature, our Review Department is lacking this quarter. We earnestly ask the help of our friends to bring this valuable department up to the highest standard. Sometimes, when a book is wanted for review, we can secure it from the publisher, and will gladly turn it over to the reviewer for his trouble.

UNION Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS LAST WEDNESDAY IN SEPTEMBER.

SESSION CLOSES LAST WEDNESDAY IN MAY.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, rooms, etc.,
apply to—

Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty and Intendant,
Richmond, Va.

OCTOBER, 1899.

THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIII.

CONTENTS.

No. 4.

- I. WHY DO WE PUNISH CRIME. Herrick Johnson.
- II. ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF WOMAN. Emma G. Wilbur.
- III. MORMONISM. Thomas C. Johnson.
- IV. THE CONDITION OF BRITAIN AT THE DATE OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY. J. C. Malloy.
- V. SALIENT FEATURES OF PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE. Francis R. Beattie.
- VI. THE WOMAN QUESTION. P. D. Stephenson.
- VII. EDITORIAL.
- VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

CHARLOTTE, N. C.

PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 A YEAR. - - - - 75 CENTS A COPY.
IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to A. J. MCKELWAY, Editor, Charlotte, N. C.

THE
Presbyterian Quarterly :

A Theological, Philosophical and Literary Review, conducted by
an Association composed of the following Ministers :

GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., LL. D.	C. W. HUMPHREYS, D. D.
W. M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.	W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.
D. J. BRIMM, D. D.	B. M. PALMER, D. D., LL. D.
JOHN F. CANNON, D. D.	ROBERT PRICE, D. D.
WM. C. CLARK, D. D.	J. B. SHEARER, D. D.
J. N. CRAIG, D. D.	SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.
A. B. CURRY, D. D.	R. K. SMOOT, D. D., LL. D.
C. R. HEMPHILL, D. D., LL. D.	C. C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.
T. W. HOOPER, D. D.	ROBERT A. WEBB, D. D.

A. J. MCKELWAY, EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS : G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., GEO. SUMMEY, D. D. ;
F. R. BEATTIE, D. D. ; S. C. BYRD, A. M.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. :

THE PRESBYTERIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.

\$3.00 Per Annum.

75 Cents Per Single Number.

Address all communications and make all remittances to

A. J. MCKELWAY, Charlotte, N. C.

☞ Subscriptions are discontinued only upon written request of subscribers and
settlement of account to date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES
I. WHY DO WE PUNISH CRIME. HERRICK JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.	573-588
II. ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF WOMAN. EMMA G. WILBUR.....	589-607
III. MORMONISM. THOS. C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.....	608-636
IV. SKETCH OF THE RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL CONDITION OF GREAT BRITAIN WHEN THE WESTMINSTER AS- SEMBLY WAS CONVENED. J. C. MALLOY, D. D.....	637-652
V. SOME SALIENT FEATURES OF PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE. F. R. BEATTIE, D. D., LL. D.....	653-684
VI. THE WOMAN QUESTION. P. D. STEPHENSON, D. D.....	685-724
VII. EDITORIAL—THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.....	725-737
VIII. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS. JAMES A. QUARLES, D. D., J. W. LAFFERTY, J. R. BRIDGES.....	738-759

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 50--OCTOBER, 1899.

I. WHY DO WE PUNISH CRIME ?

Vacationing at Saratoga one summer, I saw bulletined for a hearing at one of the sessions of the American Social Science Association, there holding its annual meeting, this topic: "The punishment of crime. Is it for reformation or retribution?" I dropped in to hear the discussion. The paper was by a New York lawyer of repute, and it was an enthusiastic advocacy of the reformatory idea in the administration of law. The topic has had wide attention in recent years. The right understanding of it is of vital concern to good government and public weal. The principles involved concern all government, human and divine. Why do we punish anywhere? Why does a parent punish in the family, or an officer in the State? And if God punishes, why does he punish?

Let us first define some terms, common to this discussion. Justice, in the exact formula of the ancients, is *suum cuique*—to each his own. The figure representing it is the scales held in perfect balance. It is exact requital of desert.

Law, in brief and apart from a mode of procedure, is command imposed by authority. Essential to the idea of law is sanction. Without penalty, or punishment for disobedience, law sinks to the level of mere advice. It is no longer law, but counsel.

Punishment is inflicted for the violation of law ; penalty, pain, penal sanction. Grotius defines it, "the evil of suffering, inflicted on account of the evil of doing." It is the desert of wrong-doing.

Crime is an offence against human law. A criminal is a breaker of human law. The difference between crime and sin is this : while each is a violation of law, crime is a violation of human law and sin is a violation of divine law. It may easily come to pass therefore, that what is a sin in a given case is no crime, and what is a crime is no sin.

With these definitions in mind, let us consider the end of punishment, or the reason for its infliction.

There are three views that have had more or less of public advocacy, viz: the retributive, the protective and the reformative.

The retributive is the oldest, looking chiefly to the crime.

The protective is the second born, looking to the safety of society.

The reformative is the latest, looking to the criminal, and seeking solely his reformation.

Taking the liberty of reversing this historic order, let us give the last theory our first attention. By this theory, the prison becomes a reformatory and the prisoners are classed as lunatics and idiots are, i. e., as wards of government. The paper heard at Saratoga in advocacy of reformation as the end of punishment, distinctly and explicitly held that, "by the true psychology of crime the prisoner demands governmental care and treatment, on the same grounds with the lunatic, the idiot, the blind and the dumb." (Journal of Science, January 1894, p. 79). And further, that "prison discipline" must be therapeutic ; that "cure" must set the limit to the duration of imprisonment, and that "the incurable must be confined for life."

That this writer is not extreme in putting forth the reformatory theory, will be perfectly apparent from other

and leading advocates. Prof. Collin, of Cornell University, says: (Address before Massachusetts Prison Association, December 10, 1893) "The true conception of the functions of a prison is that it shall be a hospital for the treatment of depraved bodies and diseased souls."

Sanford M. Even, late Judge of Supreme and Criminal Courts of Michigan, in his work on "Crime" states that he was accustomed while on the bench to "advise jurors that they were summoned as a council of physicians to diagnose the prisoner's case as one alleged to be morally diseased; and if such was proven to be his condition, the proper treatment ought to be administered for his cure upon the same principle in all respects as in the case of an insane person." The report of a Committee on Prisons, 1881, to the Legislature of California, says: "All persons convicted of crime shall be deemed wards of the State and committed to a Board of Guardians." And the Michigan State Board of Corrections and Charities in their fifth biennial report, 1879-80, commenting on the fact that eight convicts were sent to prison in one year in that State for assault with intent to commit murder, 1 for 45 years, 1 for 25, 1 for 15, 1 for 9, 1 for 6, 1 for 5, 1 for 2 and 1 for 1, say, "If there were high courts or commissions in lunacy, and they were to commit eight maniacs, who had attempted murder, to an insane hospital for terms varying from 1 to 45 years, it would be at once apparent to all that the high court itself was wildly insane. If on the contrary, the would-be murderers were sent to a hospital until wholly restored to reason, the conduct would appear to be reasonable."

Clearly, therefore, the reformatory theory has this as its fundamental idea, that the criminal is a person morally diseased, whether by heredity or environment, who is to be placed in hospital or asylum for therapeutic treatment and kept there until he is cured.

This theory is certainly open to some very serious and damaging objections.

In the first place it not only plays havoc with accepted terminology, but revolutionizes some fundamental convictions, and even challenges some of our primary beliefs.

Our courts are no longer courts of justice, but courts of inquiry or commissions in moral lunacy. Juries are councils of physicians. Prisons are hospitals. Prisoners are patients. Nay, more than this: there can be no crimes and no criminals, for there is no law. There can be no law, for there is no punishment. Law is mere opinion until a penalty is attached for its violation. There can be no punishment, for "by the true psychology of crime (although there can be no crime, for crime implies responsible violation of law) the criminal (so called) demands governmental care and treatment, on the same grounds with the lunatic and the idiot." We do not inflict penalties on lunatics and idiots. We put them under restraint, so that they may not do harm. And then we treat them, but we do not punish them.

Thus the theory degrades human nature. For it assumes that man is not responsible for his evil action. Law and punishment recognize free agency, are based upon voluntariness, and therefore honor human nature. This curative theory makes man a victim of circumstances, environment, heredity; and robs him of his peculiar glory, viz: the endowment of free will—the self-election of the right and the wrong. If immorality is a mere disease to be cured in hospital by physical and mental discipline, then human freedom is a delusion. But that theory flies right in the face of the conscience of the race. It is guilt we punish, not misfortune. "The thief doth fear each bush an officer." "Conscience doth make cowards of us all." "It mutinies in a man's bosom." "Out damned spot." "What, will these hand's ne'er be clean?" "Here's the smell of blood still. All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand." "Which way I fly is hell. Myself am hell."

These whips and stings of conscience prove that the trouble is too deep for hygienic treatment.

The reformatory theory is also in contravention of the deep-rooted belief of man, that there are degrees of guilt. This theory recognizes no gradation of offences. Its provided discipline, both as to its nature and its duration, is wholly independent of the character of the crime. Cure determines when release shall be given. And cure is to be effected by physical training, healthful diet, a work shop and a school. This is the one sovereign panacea for "depraved bodies and diseased souls." And it is applied in every case, in utter disregard of the magnitude of the crime. Hobbes says of the Stoics, "They held it as great a crime to kill a hen as to kill a father." But their blotting out all gradation of offences came from their condemning so immeasurably all wrong doing. This modern theory of reformation blots out all gradation of offences because in treating criminality as a disease it really condemns no wrong doing. A man commits a petty theft, and he is to go to a prison hospital until he reforms; a man commits a brutal murder, and he is to go to a prison hospital until he reforms! The prescription is exactly the same. But therapeutic treatment like this is sheer quackery. Blackstone well says, "It is a kind of quackery in government to apply the same universal remedy to every case." (iv: 17). And he further impressively says, "When men see no distinction made in the nature and gradation of punishment, the generality will be led to conclude there is no distinction in guilt." (iv: 17). Let that doctrine prevail and life will be cheap indeed.

If it be said the unlawful taking of human life is an exception to the reformatory rule, then the theory breaks down with homicide. And it breaks down just at the point where it is most needed; for if any man on earth needs this moral therapeutic, this process of treatment for reformation, before he goes to judgment (if there be any judgment) it is the man whose hands are reddened with his brother's blood.

But another objection to the theory is that it abandons its fundamental principle in the very administration of the theory.

Let it be borne in mind that the theory is opposed to the retributive—it regards the criminal as diseased—it puts him in hospital, not as a punishment, but that he may be treated, and on exactly the same ground that the insane and the idiotic are treated; he belonging to one of the “defective, abnormal classes” which are “the wards of government.” But just so soon as he gets inside the reformatory prison, *presto*, what a change! He is placed under rigid law, with exact and severe penalties, and if he breaks a prison rule he is at once and inexorably punished to the full and the severe extent of the prison law. That I may not do injustice to the advocates of this theory, let me quote from Prof. Collin, one of the Directors of the American Social Science Association. Speaking of the criminal in the Prison Reformatory, he says, “First, last and all the time, he must obey the prison regulations. . . . must be broken to harness, and this usually means severe physical compulsion—scientifically administered corporal punishment. Physical compulsion in prisons must be. I believe in making it short, sharp and effective.” And a report of the National Prison Association’s Standing Committee on Prison Discipline, read at Chicago some years ago, says, “Penalties must fall upon infractions of prison rules invariably;” “disciplinary treatment consisting in the scrupulous exactitude of absolute obedience.” And the very severity of this punishment in the Elmira Reformatory of New York was made the occasion of a terrific assault on that institution. Thus the reformatory theory is obliged to abandon its fundamental idea in the very process of carrying it out. Outside the Reformatory the criminal is a victim of heredity and evil circumstances, and not, therefore, a subject of punishment, but of curative treatment. But once inside the Reformatory, if he break law, woe betide him.

Heredity cuts no figure now. The theory is whistled down the wind. His punishment must be instant, inexorable, severe. The Reformatory is established to avoid the infliction of punishment, and then punishment is inflicted to keep up the Reformatory ! And out of this anomalous and contradictory state of things, there grows an inevitable tendency to what, if possible, is a greater wrong, viz : a tendency to make the punishment out of all proportion to the offence. A slight infraction of prison reformatory rule is punished with fearful severity. This was the root of the trouble at Elmira. The revolt was against brutal punishment for what might be scarcely more than an indiscretion.

And this tendency to excessive severity is the direct outgrowth of the mischievous theory. The theory is reformatory and not retributive. It claims that justice has no place as a factor in determining what shall be done with an offender. And when you have taken justice away as a base of procedure, what is there to prevent the most outrageous tyranny and brutality in the interests of this process of cure ? The prison reformatory has nothing to keep it from becoming a relentless despotism, for its punishment is scaled to suit the theory and not at all to suit the offence. It has no ground in justice ; only in the exigencies of a theory. Therefore, in the long run, nothing is kinder than justice. Justice is never "seasoned" by mercy, Portia to the contrary, notwithstanding. Justice is right just as it is, for it is rightness, and can be improved by nothing. Any change from rightness is, so far, wrongness. Just so far as kindness is at the expense of justice, it is a blow at government, a blow at law, a blow at social order, a blow at every sanctity of home and altar. Consistent with justice, there may be mercy with God and man ; but never counter to justice.

There is one other grave objection to the reformatory theory. Let it be remembered, the prison discipline is to be "therapeutic ;" cure is "to set the limit of imprisonment ;"

imprisonment is to "continue until it becomes safe for the community that a convict be released." But to determine when cure has been effected; this is the transcendent difficulty. See the complications: Reformation means such a change in the criminal that he no longer has the inclination to repeat offences. The top root of crime is deeper than the body—deeper than the mind. Diet and education, work and school, cannot kill it; may not even touch it. It has struck through and through the man's moral nature. Where is the mental necromancer who can tell when that is changed? Who can certainly know all the subjective and psychological elements involved in determining when prisoners are so far reformed as to make their discharge safe to society? The Fifth Biennial Report of the Michigan State Board of Corrections, already referred to, anticipates this objection, and replies to it by saying, "It cannot be certainly known, but it can be known at least equally well in this case as in the case of insanity." *Mirabile dictu!* As if insane people were as conscious of their insanity as criminals are of their crimes, and sane enough to conceal their insanity as criminals are sane enough to conceal their criminal disposition; and as if both could be equally and mightily influenced to deception by the prospect of freedom!

Let "cure" set the limit of imprisonment, and the biggest rascals would often be the first to take the easy doses of reform, and to exhibit the magic transformations of the prison panacea.

"When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be.
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he."

It is said the devil can "clothe himself as an angel of light." If there be doubt as to the personality of the devil, no one will deny that the devilish can effect that change of apparel. And if men will "steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil (or the devilish) in," they will certainly be willing to don that livery to get out of prison.

And thus we might easily, we would almost inevitably, be faced with this strange travesty of justice: a petty thief imprisoned for life, and a damnable villain, guilty of some brutal crime, out of jail in a twelve-month. The mighty words of Blackstone may well be heard again: "It is indeed a kind of quackery in government to apply the same universal remedy to every case."

Let us now briefly consider what we have termed the protective theory, which makes the end of punishment the protection of society.

Here we shall be obliged to make some large concessions. That the protection of society is very closely connected with our laws, and their penalties cannot be a matter of question. We are ready to affirm that the legal prohibition of any act whatever is solely on the ground of its evil effects upon society, and not at all on the ground of the inherent evil of the act itself. Public law does indeed make a distinction between the things it prohibits, classifying them as evils in themselves (*mala in se*) and evils prohibited (*mala prohibita*): but the ground of their prohibition is exactly the same. Ten thousand things are wrong in themselves that the law never touches, and never ought to touch; while things right and innocent in themselves, the law often prohibits. The law does not prohibit my swearing to a lie with my hand on a Bible when I am on the street, but it thunders prohibition against my doing that same thing on the witness stand in a court of justice. Why? Because government must have a place where truth shall be told. Swearing falsely is just as much a wrong *per se*, in one place as in another. But it is prohibited in a court of justice, solely to protect society. The law will punish me if I attempt homicide. In most states the law will not punish me if I attempt suicide. Yet each is *malum in se*. The law prohibits my destroying my house by fire, but not by pick and crowbar. Yet neither is *malum in se*. In a densely populated city driving a horse over six

miles an hour is a crime ; building frame houses in the fire district is a crime ; following some useful, but offensively odorous trade, is a crime. Why all this ? There is but one answer. The protection of society ; and not at all the inherent rightness or wrongfulness of the thing prohibited.

But conceding this to be the ground of all prohibition by human law, when it comes to the adjustment of the penalty in connection with the crime, is it still exclusively the protection of society that is had in view ? It is at this point that the theory is inadequate as a full statement of the truth. Punishment that is regulated with no reference to inherent guilt, but with sole reference to supposed public advantage, has lost its basis of justice, and become a matter of expediency.

Hence the multiplication of capital crimes. When Blackstone wrote, there were upwards of a hundred and fifty actions declared by Act of Parliament to be worthy of instant death. Offences against property were expiated by human life. And the statutes weighed out a man's blood against dollars and cents. As if the public good could ever be promoted by such an outrage on justice. When any act made punishable by law is inherently and flagrantly wrong, what is the swift judgment of one witnessing the wrong act ? Why, that the guilty doer ought to be punished ; and this without any reference whatever to the good effect of the punishment, either on the criminal or on society. Such judgment is instinctive, founded in the very constitution of the human mind. The criminal who is made to suffer the penalty solely for the public good is made thereby what any inanimate thing is when put to good use. He is punished for the sake of others as a matter of expediency, and not because it is just and right that he should be punished. The reason for his punishment is found wholly outside of himself ; and this is treating him not as a responsible being guilty of voluntary wrong, but as a dog might be treated—that for the benefit of society. The oft quoted remark of

the English judge to the horse-thief, "You are not hung because you have stolen a horse, but that horses may not be stolen," instead of involving a sound principle of law, involves a two-fold absurdity; for in one breath it makes nothing of horse stealing, and yet makes a horse of more value than a man. It belittles the crime, yet hangs the criminal. The improvement of the criminal classes is not along that road.

There is hardly need of an extended discussion of the third, or Retributive theory, as indicating the reason for punishment; for already and necessarily it has had our thought, in considering objections to the Reformative and Protective theories. Some further word, however, seems important in order to a full presentation of the case, and especially do some of the objections urged against it deserve reply.

The principle that underlies and pervades this theory is justice, the demand for which is "mortised into the moral constitution of man," as shown by the prevailing sense of guilt and of fear where wrong has been done. Justice Lilly, out of a wide experience of criminal magistracy, says, "Resentment at wrong, and desire of retribution upon the wrong doer are primordial principles, as deeply implanted in our nature as pity, or the desire of self-preservation." Just because Socrates was right in saying, "the greatest of evils is for a guilty man to escape punishment"—for that very reason, the greatest good that can be rendered to the unjust is justice. The first and vital step in any true reformation is for the criminal to see and admit that his punishment is deserved. How can punishment have any beneficial effect whatever, either on the criminal or on society, except the punishment be just and right in itself.

In society and under government, the personal redress is transferred to the State. Personal revenge is forbidden. But the very end of government is justice. It is organized

to protect and vindicate rights. He who planted in the human bosom the instinct of self-preservation, and its corollary, resentment at wrong, in setting the solitary in families and constituting society and government, ordained expressly that the sense of justice in all men should find its expression through rulers and law, making the powers that be "an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." So that that sagacious, far-sighted statesman, Alexander Hamilton, was in harmony with the power that makes for righteousness, when he said, "Justice is the end of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued, until it is obtained, or until liberty be had in the pursuit." But how is justice possible, how is government possible, with no punishment for crime? It can neither be founded nor administered, unless the power to punish crime is conceded. The actual infliction of punishment, therefore, has its root in justice, and is retributive.

Moreover, it is the most effective restraint upon crime. Fear is a potent element in preserving the peace and good order of social and civic life. Multitudes are kept obedient to law through fear of its penalty. The oft quoted sneer about making people good by law, as if morality and decency were a matter of thumb-screws and the lash, loses all its sting here, because of the utter irrelevancy of its application. Men are not made good by law, but they are restrained by law from letting a good deal of their badness out upon others. What imagination can conceive the horrors we should be plunged into, if once it came to be understood that rulers were no longer to execute wrath upon evil doers, but only to seek reformation. We must have short memories if we have forgotten the long hush that came upon lawlessness when we hanged the anarchists at Chicago. Let it be once made clear that no retribution waits these fellows, and who dare predict how soon they would be at our throats?

It is objected that the retributive system breeds crim-

inals. But this is a fault of administration, not of system itself. That there are glaring evils connected with our management of criminals goes without saying. The herding them together without careful classification, the leaving them in confinement without occupation, the discharge of them with no preparation whatever for their freedom, are inconceivably bad, and cry aloud for remedy. But those are incidents and attendants, not vital to the system in any way. They could, and they should, all be swept away, and yet the retributive element be left intact, making the prisoner still feel the weight of the vindication of the majesty of law, and facing him still with the fact that he is punished for his violation of law, and that his punishment is just.

But it is further objected that this retributive theory hawks crime at a price. The New York lawyer, in his paper at Saratoga, said, "If a crime can be expiated by suffering the prescribed penalty, that penalty marks the cost price of the crime." And he further said, "that the penal code presents a price list of crimes, and that, so far as the State is concerned, one can commit any crime, the fixed penalty for which he is willing to pay." But clearly, this is a misapprehension of the province of penalty. Penalty does not pay debts. Penalty shows an outstanding obligation. It does not discharge it. Penalty is pain. If I recklessly break my limb, the pain of it does not mend the break. If I am criminally wronged by another, the wrong is not righted by his suffering a penalty for it. The State, in the punishment of the criminal, expresses its sense of the injury done by the crime, but this does not repair the injury. Nothing can repair it in human jurisprudence. The *quid pro quo* is impossible. The reasoning that would make penalty a warrant for crime, would make hell a warrant for sin.

Instances of injustice are cited, as another objection to the retributive theory. A man steals a watch. If the

watch is worth only \$24, the crime is petit larceny, and the penalty is imprisonment for not more than one year. But if the watch is worth \$26, the penalty is imprisonment for not less than five, nor more than ten years. Well, of course, this presents a difficulty—just as fixing an age when a minor may vote, presents a difficulty. It works hard on some minors, who can vote more intelligently at eighteen or twenty than others can at any age. Shall we therefore seek no equitable adjustment of the right of suffrage? Because justice cannot be properly administered, is certainly no reason for not trying to administer it. Rigorous and exact justice, owing to the subtleties of motive, the influence of environment, the possibilities of deception and concealment, is impossible in human jurisprudence, but its approximation is nevertheless to be sought.

Nor need it be denied that the three ideas, viz., the reformative, the protective and the retributive, may each have their place in the treatment of the criminal. Certainly the protection of society should be kept in view. And to be indifferent to reformation in the criminal, would be to have a prison discipline through which a prisoner might pass without any care on the part of society and the State, whether he grew human or beastly, divine or devilish, in the process. The consequence of prison discipline should be the making, if possible, invariably a better man. His better nature should be constantly appealed to. Inducements should be held out for fidelity. Severity of treatment might be relaxed in view of desert. Classification of criminals should be a *sine qua non* in every prison. Provision should in some way be made, so that the prisoner's discharge would not be an open and almost overwhelming temptation to new crime. But all this and all else beside, of civil expediency and social utility, is not the purpose of punishment or retribution. Let justice be done though the heavens fall. The heavens will not fall. They will be all the more stable for the justice done.

Now, if we carry these changeless and vital principles of government over into the realm of divine government, we shall be able thereby to correct some very prevalent and pernicious notions.

Justice is not changed by the transfer. It remains immutably the same: "to each his own." Law is also immutably the same: "command imposed by authority, and necessarily involving punishment for disobediences." And punishment is still what it is everywhere and always: "penalty, penal sanction, the desert of wrong doing." The sinner is a breaker of law, and sin is lawlessness.

Hell, therefore, cannot be a reformatory. Whether a place, or a condition, or both, it is punishment. And punishment never reforms. It may restrain from wrong doing, but there is nothing in it or of it, to change the wrong doer, and put him in love with righteousness.

But neither is hell a dead level of penalty for sin—an equal amount and desert of suffering for any and every kind of wrong doing. This would be characterizing God's moral government as an infinite quackery. Surely there are different heights of heaven, and just as surely there are different depths of hell. This the Scriptures do most plainly declare. There is "an abundant entrance" into heaven, and a being "saved so as by fire." Paul and the dying thief passed "through the gates" alike free from sin, but in capacity for joy, and sources of joy, what a difference! "Thy pound hath gained ten pounds; have thou authority over ten cities." "Thy pouud hath gained five pounds; have thou authority over five cities."

Equally clear is the Word of God as to the other of the two eternal conditions: "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law." (Rom. 2:2).

'The servant that knew his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not his Lord's will and did unworthy things, shall be beaten with

few stripes." (Luke 12:47). And what tremendous emphasis Christ himself gives to this principle of gradation in guilt and punishment, by his words to privileged Capernaum: "It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." (Matt. 11:24).

Is there no mercy with God? There is infinite mercy. But it is not the mercy that is counter to justice. This would be injustice. It is not the mercy represented by the yarn and tow and wish-wash of sickly sentimentalism. This would be lawless license. It is the mercy whose sublime and culminating exhibition is seen at the Cross of Christ. That remedial agency, with its measureless wealth of pathos and entreaty, of tenderness and tears, is from the innermost heart of God. But the pillars of divine government do not tremble—they are made firmer by its exhibition. The tables of the commandments lean against the cross. Beneath the mercy seat God places his holy law. And the sinner knows as he looks up into the face of the crucified that there is a divine *ὀργή* as well as a divine *ἀγάπη*, and that this remedial and reformatory agency is consistent with law, and maintains the sovereignty and the majesty, as well as the tenderness, of love; and instead of issuing a license of lawlessness and making the gospel an eternal lullaby, it gives a deeper meaning to that most terrific thing of Scripture, "the wrath of the Lamb."

HERRICK JOHNSON.

Chicago, Illinois.

II. ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF WOMAN.

Of the many misconceptions of St. Paul's views, the strangest is that currently spoken of as his low estimate of woman. The power of his intellect, the reach and insight of his spiritual vision and the breadth of his sympathies are generally acknowledged. But that he held a high view of Christian womanhood, and that principles to promote its advancement are a feature in his foundation work for the church are not so readily discerned. And yet a spirit of fair investigation must so judge him out of his own mouth. This is a vital issue if he is to hold the unquestioned place in the church of the future that he has held in the church of the past. The changed position of woman historically re-opens the discussion of the subject. The outcome must be a better interpretation of his words, an interpretation in harmony with his character. And his real conception of woman's worth and her place must give a wider, deeper, higher comprehension of God's word to the world through the Apostle to the Gentiles.

The more we consider the man the greater he becomes. To study his personal life is to be roused by his courage, moved by his humility, and fired by his love. His energies are too great to find scope in one flock, one nation, one country. "Who is offended" throughout Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, Rome, or the islands of the sea, "and I burn not?" When he expresses the measureless reach of his feelings, his vehement words are not exaggerations but the poverty and inadequacy of language to set forth his passion of soul which covets for the sake of blessing others, the divine cup of self-sacrifice. "I would even be accursed for my people." And the fires last. Their glow and fervor show what refining is going on in his own large nature. The care of his churches weighs him down, but his wisdom, faith and

patience, rise the higher. Perils, sufferings, loss, chains and impending martyrdom face him, and all the while his undaunted spirit beholds visions of triumph. The "course" he laid out for himself under his Lord and Master, he is able, to his great joy, to finish. Where has that course its boundaries? And who is left out from his thoughts, his plans? He is concerned for all people, and considers all classes. He writes general and personal epistles. His long-suffering patience turns back from the rapt joys of the third heaven, and the contemplating of mysteries that the angels desire to look into, to guide as a "father," uncontrolled and well nigh uncontrollable Gentile converts addicted to coarse vices. He enters different grades of society; he meets each human being on individual ground, with tact and charity becoming all things to all men, if by any means he may win some to what he loves to call his gospel.

Could this man disesteem women? Would this large-hearted benefactor lavish inexhaustible riches of feeling and thought upon one half of the human race and hold the other half in contempt? Does this apostle whose love is surpassed only by that of the Master, frame church codes and rules for civil and even for domestic life in harsher forms than are known in the lines of caste? Nay, but on the contrary, he exalts woman. And because of the fact that he knows and realizes her true worth in the eyes of her Maker, he spares no pains to teach the whole truth; to show her the way, the peculiar highway, marked out by Unerring Wisdom for her feet, and so direct her into it that, walking therein, she shall comprehend the meaning of her lot.

His exalted view of womanhood did not grow up moulded and made beautiful by happy circumstances in his own experience. When we look to see his ties as a man and what part woman as an individual played in his personal life, we find her influence markedly absent. His converts are his "beloved sons, begotten through the gospel." To

this gospel he is wedded. He calls Phœbe, the servant of the church at Cenchrea, "sister," and the mother of Rufus he calls "mine." Neither mother, nor sister, nor woman beloved, comes into any of the pictures to be immortalized because she belongs there with him. Our gaze following him finds him surrounded by a little group of men or alone.

How notably different in this respect is the earthly life of his Lord ! In the circle which received Jesus at his birth, the atmosphere is radiant with woman's love and incense-laden with her prayers and praise. Earth breaks into song in ante-natal joy at his coming, and the two inspired hymns are each from the lips of a woman. When Mary presents her Divine Child in the temple she is there met by the prophetess who blesses him. From first to last holy women attend his footsteps. In the close circle of his chosen friends, women follow him to minister to him as he goes preaching through the villages. Aye, and sinful women, too, follow the Sinless One, and wash his feet with penitential tears. The sisters at Bethany, whom he loved, as he loved Lazarus, their brother, serve to the uttermost when he shares their home. With word and deed they worship and annoint Him, the Resurrection and the Life. Women of all classes are drawn to him in whom dwelt grace and truth. Looking into his face the Samaritan woman as she gave him water to drink from Jacob's well, felt the falseness of her old life and forsook it when the Lord gave her to drink of the water of Life. Speeding away after that interview she stirred the city with her glad news that the Christ is come, and had talked with her. At his call a little girl comes back from the dead. In the throng a suffering woman's trembling touch draws healing from his garment's hem. From afar women who are strangers believe on him and come to seek him, and with rewarded faith go on their way rejoicing. Mothers gain his touch to bless their children. At the last, in his trial, a Roman woman pleads for his acquittal. Along the Via Dolorosa rises the

sound of Jewish women's voices in weeping and lamentation. Nearer him and faithful to share his shame, as they had shared the day of his glory, follow Mary Magdalene and the other women, and Mary, who is now become the mother of sorrows. At the cross, at the burial, at the tomb, they watch and wait, and their long dumb agony of grief calls out the heartening words of sympathizing angels. Earth keeps silence till the dawn of the Lord's Day, when the early stillness is broken by Mary Magdalene's wondering, rejoicing cry, "My Master!" She and the other women who first see the Lord are his swift messengers answering the command, "Tell that he is risen."

Woman's soul is an altar for love, and she gave her all to her Master. But she gave no gift to her Master's greatest apostle. "Devout and honorable women" at Pisidian Antioch, joined in a persecution which drove Paul and Barnabas out of their coasts. The one woman whose kindness we know of from another source than the apostle himself, is Lydia, and her grateful, noble hospitality is the one womanly deed signal enough to get itself mentioned. St. Luke's expression regarding her, "whose heart the Lord opened," might suggest that the heart of the women with her that Sabbath by the riverside, were not open by kindly nature, nor by grace. We wonder whether Euodias and Syntiche, whom St. Paul mentions, were there that day. The sooth-saying girl of Philippi is the cause of Paul and Silas being thrown into prison. And yet women could not but be moved and converted by the power and truth of his gospel. Thessalonica in her multitude of believers counted "chief women not a few." Scripture-reading Berea, too, had her believing "honorable women." In Athens one woman heard him and believed. At Corinth he abode with Priscilla and her husband, and when he left for Syria he took them with him. But it is St. Paul's own three-fold mention of Priscilla that makes us longingly wish that modern discovery had found out something more

about her than just her house. We honor her as benefactress of the church; we look up to her as teacher of Apollos, but when we hear from St. Paul that she was ready to lay down her life for his, we love her because she loved him. The "Acts" once more mentions women. They mingle in the little Tyrian company, bidding the Apostle good-bye at the close of that week's visit while the ship unloaded at Tyre, whence he is going up to Jerusalem. It is good to leave the women and children there in that group around him kneeling on the sea-shore while he prays.

According to the record St. Paul's long life singularly lacked woman's love. The facts show little more than such attention, regard and hospitality as might be accorded any great religious teacher. No woman ever did aught against the Master, but St. Paul suffered at the hands of women. His sister's son speaks and saves the apostle's life, but the sister herself is silent.

If his mother were living and had cast him off, this would account for the violence in his speech indicative of deep feeling when he tells how he had suffered the loss of "my all" for Christ. Whether she did so reject him and he got by inheritance from her his spirit of persecuting for conscience sake, or whether being long dead she never knew of his defection from the faith of his fathers, to which in the hour of his birth he was set apart, is a question. But other strict and honorable Jewesses persecuted him. Some of the Christian women vexed his soul and occasioned much trouble in his churches. And in the crisis of his life Drusilla, the Jewish wife of the Roman Felix, and Bernice, Agrippa's queen, when they heard him in his pleading, lifted no finger to save his life.

In view of all this it becomes interesting to note his manner of speech regarding individual women. Many are named in his salutations. Euodias and Syntiche, in open discord in the Philippian church, are the only ones reproved. And could reproof be gentler? "I beseech Euodias; I

beseech Syntiche, to be reconciled in a Christian spirit. True yoke-fellow, help these women to be reconciled, for together they labored in the gospel with me." To the Romans, he tenderly commends Phoebe, and writes, "Help her, for she helped many and myself also." He greets Priscilla with Aquila, and tells of their love, for which he gives his thanks and the thanks of all the Gentile churches. Mary is to be greeted, and Tryphena and Tryphosa, (the dainty ones) who "labor in the Lord," and "the beloved Persio," and the sister of Nereus, and the mother of Rufus, and Julia. In the first Corinthian letter he speaks of Chloe, that distinguished woman whose household bore him messages and information of the church. And Priscilla is again mentioned. In the second letter to Timothy he greets Prisca, as he calls her, and her husband a third time, and twice he puts her name before Aquila's. This, his last letter, written when he was "ready to be offered," opens with a remembrance that gleams out and pictures a home such as he himself never had—a home wherein abode Christian womanhood's grace and goodness, the saintly grandmother Lois, and the sweet mother Eunice, teaching the Scriptures to the young child Timothy. The very last name he traces is a woman's, that of Claudia.

This remembering by name which is counted so tender a trait in our blessed Lord, does not lose its significance in St. Paul. It shows that he did not forget to individualize women in any service they rendered to him or to the church.

St. Paul's whole life and character, high, noble, and "kindly affectioned," show regard for women. And since in him the man and the teacher are singularly blended, this fact indicates that he would not and did not in his teaching discriminate against woman. Without the influence of a Monica, a Beatrice, or a Vittoria Colonna to inspire him, he drew the outlines of an ideal which they in their lives filled in, and their beauty of character witnesses that he taught

the truth. As he in his day saw women throughout the world, they as a class made no great claim upon his respect, and yet we see that he treated them in individual life with general consideration. Moreover his view of woman is a triumph over his education. Unlike the other apostles, he himself had been a Rabbi. Reared a Hebrew of the Hebrews, though in Tarsus, a city famous for Grecian influence, literature and philosophy, he had been taught in Jerusalem, at the feet of the great Gamaliel, the rival doctrines of the schools of Judaism. Familiar with their opinions regarding woman and marriage and the "unsavory question of divorce," which the Rabbinic law allowed "on almost any ground," (*Edersheim*) it would scarcely be surprising if Rabbinical notions sometimes cropped out in his writings. But if St. Paul abolished the Law itself much more the Talmud. And so far does he go beyond the tenets and conclusions of the Rabbis that his estimate of woman's duties and her privileges re-iterate Old Testament ideas at their best. So fully does he found his ethics here on the eternal principles of God as enunciated by the Lord Jesus, that his view of woman and her rights, her God-given place and its obligations, won acceptance in the church universal, and to-day convicts modern society of folly as well as hardness of heart, and looseness of doctrine, and lack of vision to see the meaning of the mystery of marriage.

St. Paul's great contest for Christian liberty raised women out of the place she had in the Gentile world. He declared freedom in Christ from the three kinds of bondage then universal: Race distinction, slavery, and the servitude of woman. He proclaimed, "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female." Mistaken notions as to what this freedom implied were common enough, among the men as well as the women. "There was an unmistakeable disposition attendant on the new faith, to break with the existing rule of

life." (*Weizsacher.*) St. Paul is obliged to say again and again that moral freedom does not level down outward distinctions. He shows that "equality by no means signifies identity in position." He argues with the Thessalonians who had quit work. He tells the Romans to pay their (exorbitant) taxes, and to render due respect to men in authority. He commands slaves not to seek civil liberty on the ground of their being the Lord's free-men. But there was no rising of the Christians who were in slavery. Even if men here and there were dissatisfied, there was no organized attempt to blot out class and race distinctions, and political subjection. It was the "advanced women" of Corinth who made the bold stand against man's headship. Their veils were cast aside, that significant part of their dress taken by the bride as the sign of her subordination to one man. Evidently they argued: If a woman is man's equal before God she should be recognized as his equal in the eyes of men. They consider that putting themselves on the same footing with man they are giving sufficient proof that he is not her head. How much easier to assert equality than to manifest it! Corinth was the leading church, and the women had their champions, men who thought themselves prophets and "spiritual," and who wanted no test of facts. They permitted women to address the congregation, and each ask her questions aloud.

St. Paul being orally informed of these new customs as well as the other and greater troubles in the church which caused him such anguish of heart, wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians. His words are remarkably patient for a man so quick to see the relations of things, and who would give place to no error, not even from an apostle, "no, not for an hour." The whole letter, so conclusive in reasoning, so noble in sentiments, shows intensest feeling. He tells afterward how it was written in tears. With his remarkable mobility of feeling he takes up one by one the matters that call for counsel and correction. And among others, the

new behavior of the women. He had but just written on another page, "Who maketh thee to differ?" His wonderfully clear-eyed faith saw his God everywhere manifest as the Creator. Therefore all the distinctions which obtain in the world must be there by God's will. Moreover his God was present in the world as the Governor. Therefore the divine plan would work out "all things" for good to his children. Furthermore, he realized that to live for Christ takes the sting out of any existing subjection. He could even understand a certain kind of loyalty which would make a man want to keep the position he had when he became the Lord's; and as he writes, "Let each man wherein he was called, therein abide with God." It is characteristic of his teaching that he always refers minor points to great principles. And yet he does not stop with this general teaching; he instructs directly. As to the case in hand, the veil and the headship are related. The women's irreverence is treated separately in the place it belongs. In what he has to say he but amplifies and explicitly states what his Master's teaching implies and takes for granted. When the Lord calls himself the Bridegroom nothing could more honor marriage, nor more plainly teach his headship, and the subjection of the bride, his church, whose glory is her union with him, and who by partaking of his life, becomes spotless and beautiful. St. Paul's appeal is clear, and as often, it carries two arguments, neither of which can be gainsaid: God's teaching in nature, and in the Scriptures. 'Judge for yourselves,' he reasons with them, 'Nature veils woman and does not veil man.' Is it seemly to disregard distinctions which inhere in the very constitution of things? And what God indicates in nature he expressly states in His Word, wherein from the beginning, woman is made subordinate to man for service. This subjection does not touch the question of equality. Christ (who instead of counting his equality with God a prize to be held, emptied himself and became a servant) is

the head of the man, and the head of Christ is God. Man is the image and glory of God, but the woman is man's glory, framed out of him and created for him, (the type of the church in relation to Christ). Nevertheless, in mutual dependence and unity, "in the Lord it holds good that the man without the woman is as imperfect as the woman without the man." (*Weizsacherr.*) St. Paul is more moved when he comes to consider the women's irreverence, their speaking out in the church's holiest conference, in the meeting which existed for the manifestation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. When the Spirit poured out gifts of tongues and prophesying the brethren needed self-control in the exercise of these gifts lest there should be a scene of confusion. He gives them wise and explicit directions on this subject. He does not say that women are to try to keep silent if the miraculous gifts should be poured out on them. When they are moved to ecstatic prayer or prophesying they must be guided by the same rules he has given the brethren, and adds only one other direction, and that is to be womanly and keep their heads covered. But when they are not so moved by the Holy Spirit he says, and says it emphatically, that they shall keep silence. And that they shall ask their questions at home. And for their champions he has the quick, keen sarcasm, "What! Are you the beginning and the end of the gospel? If any one of you really was what he thinks himself, a prophet and spiritual, he would know and acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the Lord's commandments."

Regarding the office of public teaching, "Paul the aged," in a letter written to Timothy, says, "I suffer not a woman to teach." This with a swift touch of argument he carried after his usual method straight to nature and back to the beginning, the typical woman and her Creator. In these rapid, abridged expressions of his thoughts, the one man writing in private to the other shows his sympathetic heart by a hopefully confident reference to woman's peculiar

danger and sorrow. As to the facts out of which St. Paul speaks with the knowledge that Timothy knew them as well as himself, they are very plainly to be discerned. St. Paul esteemed public teaching Christ's gift on his ascension, for the edifying of the church, his body. Neither in the Scriptures, nor by the Lord's example, nor by special revelation was there any authority whatever for a female order in the ministry. God never introduced a dispensation by a woman. There were no Jewish priestesses under the Old Covenant, and no women apostles under the New. The Lord Jesus never indicated that woman is or is to become the representative of God. Among the seventy he sent out no woman. The Holy Spirit never said to the church, "Separate me this woman and this for the work whereunto I have called them." St. Paul had need of no further direction to guide him. Except by direct Divine command he would not put together offices that God had kept asunder.

In arguing, some say that St. Paul counselled observances to suit the time, and that in his views of matrimony he spoke of marriage as he found it. But the position of Gentile women, though interesting in itself and for the historic light it throws on the conditions he had to meet, is of no moment as touching the only question of importance. The real point is: whether his words are for times and conditions, or for human nature. Did he speak as a man whose circumstances and disposition called forth decisions which naturally give place to modern opinions and the changed position of woman historically, or did he speak as a prophet and apostle who set forth God's wish and will? Was the truth revealed to him concerning the daughters of God, or was his revelation singularly defective in that the matter on which he laid so much stress was in form and fashion to pass away?

It is true that we have no such full expression of his mind on this subject as we have on the vital doctrines of

the Christian life. He never lifts any secondary principle to a place of first importance. He answers only the few questions that are put to him and he makes comparatively few references to marriage, and yet being a thinker spontaneous and powerful, he is able to pack an occasion with far-reaching conclusions. A teacher who "needeth not to be ashamed," he gives abundantly more than is asked, or can at once be comprehended. Startling those unchaste Corinthians by declaring that the bodies of believers are the temples of the Holy Spirit, he proceeds to take up their question on marriage. These inquiries deal with the subject altogether from the sensuous side, for they grow out of disputes and fanaticism, the Jew trained to regard marriage as obligatory, the Gentile either on the one extreme of heathen license or on the other of contending that the body itself was impure. St. Paul's answers become an added self-revelation, for as a man he speaks his own opinions. There is evidence enough to show that he had thought deeply upon the whole subject of woman's position and her destiny. Being a man of prayer he undoubtedly went to God with this problem which had such important practical bearings. As he cried unto God when called upon to decide questions that involved issues touching the lives of many, he was answered. He received wisdom from the "One who giveth liberally." And when the Holy Spirit illuminates the mind and soul what a flood of clear light is thrown upon dark and perplexing things! He who has such private revelation will by word or deed make it known. Every experience of this nature is so real that oftentimes it gets lifted into undue prominence. But how guarded St. Paul is against putting any conviction of his along side of God's open Word. "I speak by permission," he says, "I have no commandment of the Lord on this. I give my own judgment. I speak for your profit, not to bind you."

It is not to be wondered at that St. Paul should have

called virgin chastity "good," in writing to men who called themselves Christians but whose spiritual perceptions were of so low an order that they could not discern the evil in their own ways and much less rise to the conception of God's thoughts, wise and holy, when he gave the woman to be a helpmeet of man. And yet in all the apostle says how prudent he is, and how free from asceticism! He who talked so strenuously of the subjection by which in all things he kept his own body under, knew the special temptations and dangers of marriage, and that for them who married there must be long disciplinary warfare and dearly bought victory before the fruits of the Spirit abound, and he would save them. Distress and perils were present and to be looked for, and he would have them "free from cares." "The time is short," he exclaims; and no earthly tie, circumstance, or business seemed to him of very much moment in view of the profound changes he felt to be imminent. He knew by experience that a believer who had the "gift" of absolute devotion to Christ in inward and outward life could do more for his Master's cause if single. Hence he elevates virginity, and gives the individual the right to decline marriage for the sake of higher motives. It is a little touch but significant and a part of the whole that St. Paul thinking of the ordinary and not the exceptional marriages, should assume it as natural and so right, that the husband's chief thinking will be how he may please his wife, and her care how she may please her husband. "But if you marry you have not sinned," he says, and the widow is "at liberty to marry whom she will in the Lord." To Christians who are married he states with double emphasis the inviolability of the marriage-bond as opposed to divorce. "I give charge, yea, not I, but the Lord." As to marriage where one had become a Christian and not the other, he will not have the believer break the bond, but the unbeliever breaking it is allowed to go in peace. And then comes one of those bursts of feeling

when his heart breaks out in a holy exclamation of high incentive or sweet, constraining motive, "O wife, how do you know but that it is possible by binding your husband afresh in the earthly tie, to knit him into the heavenly, and because of your union with him save him? O man, how do you know whether you shall not thus save your wife?"

To the voluptuous Corinthians he recommends voluntary celibacy. Throughout the other epistles his directions and references accept the Christian rite of marriage as the normal state, and put honor on the home, incomparable as the birthplace of Christian culture. To Timothy he classes forbidding to marry as one of the doctrines of demons. His ethical thought underlying the comparison and arguments in Galatians and Romans on the difference between the son of Abraham's marriage with Sarah and his son by the bondwoman, shows that St. Paul knew of a perfection of marriage beyond the barely literal and legal. And in Ephesians, that ripe, profound and spiritual epistle, he plainly states the mystical meaning of marriage, true and honorable marriage, based upon the mind's choice, a union in unity maintained by mutual love. His words sound like an echo repeating the word of the Lord Jesus, who called himself the bridegroom: "The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. Husbands love your wives, every one of you in particular nourishing and cherishing as the Lord nourishes and cherishes the church."

St. Paul's whole view of marriage thus set forth in his letters is as spiritual and beautiful as it is high and profound. Moreover, he divined what it is, after all, that woman wants and needs. It is not the desire of the eyes, nor the pride of life. In the Ephesian letter summarizing it, he did not say to the husband, "Give her—," "Put her—," he said, "Love her," and he gave an infinite measure for that love.

In that Corinthian letter St. Paul twice referred to his own unmarried state. He felt that in all the facts of his

personal life he was made an example. And we can see even better than he did how more things than one were in a figure transferred to him for the sake of many who should believe through him. The great temporal blessings promised God's people under the Old Covenant of which marriage was one, had to be cut off until the fulness of the spiritual blessings had manifestly come in. St. Paul himself is such a living lesson of this that at first blush it looks as though poverty, persecution, and every form of suffering and self-denial are to constitute the rule of the Christian life. Yet he guards against this limited interpretation, preaching trust "in the living God who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." And apostle for liberty that he is, he waived his rights of personal comfort not because he lacked power and freedom, but to make himself an example. "I am free to have a wife." Since he was so appreciative of the few kindnesses he did receive from women, we may have some conception of what would have been his joy and gratitude if he had known the ministering attentions of a wife whose affections were centered in him, the love of a woman whose powers of devotion were equal to his own. We know the affections of this man who could and did so attach men to his person as to bring about that scene at Miletus. Possibly it is in these very questions concerning woman and marriage, together with the circumstances of his experience, that we have a means of measuring the height and depth of his love for Christ, whereby he was dead to the world. By no Confessions does any man lay his heart more bare than does St. Paul. We see in his youth his ascetic purity, and in his middle and later life the light burning within is kept by more than vows in that white steady flame. He did not underate the sweet family ties which he believed to be God's gift to man. 'Twas the higher love constrained him.

Studying all that St. Paul says concerning woman, we find that his conceptions form the outline of one view.

From first to last they are parts that consist together in one completed whole. Early and late we hear him calling woman unto her home. Tenderly if he may, sternly if he must, he directs her into the rights and honors and duties she has at God's hand. While St. Paul lays great stress upon the submission of women as becometh them "who profess godliness," his cautions and rebukes are not given without the holding up of an ideal. The Ephesian women belong to the Christians who are "in the heavenly places," and so to them he can reveal the mystery of marriage and high, spiritual love. To the women of Corinth, ambitious of a place in the eyes of the world, he presents the grand conception of man and woman contemplating each the life of the other. To the woman Timothy had to deal with, neither spiritual nor intellectual, he gives the word "home." Their misdirected energies are to be guided into "good works," learning with their children "first to show kindness at home." Evidently they considered any other place better than home. What St. Paul has to say regarding their behavior is in tones of righteous severity. But over and above the manifest need for rebuke, some facts as to the writing must be taken into account. He is writing to a young preacher, and his apostolic directions naturally take an authoritative form. And then he is not addressing the women directly by a message. The picture in his mind is his "own son," their pastor and bishop who was grieved and troubled by their faults and follies, and especially tried by the young widows in his flock who made selfish gain out of the church. It is easy to see that Timothy was a gentle, shrinking, studious man, who neither in disposition nor years was able to manage such women, vain and extravagant of dress, spending hours doing their hair in the multitudinous little braids then the fashion, and going about doing harm. Moreover, it is Paul the aged who is writing, and these pastoral epistles are somewhat different from the general epistles in their plainness of speech and their

charges on details of conduct. He puts especial emphasis upon godliness, a term not used by him before. He exhorts and commands that all, bishops and elders and deacons, men and women and the children, should be taught the practice of reverence, adoring reverence. The exercise of this attitude of soul toward God would naturally lead to such conduct in daily life as he rules for all. So urgent is he that he might say, "This one thing I write: Be reverent." His words are the frankness of an old man privileged in advice. And all that he says make for the reign of this spirit of reverence. Read thus, the seeming harshness disappears and there is only the candor of the wise and holy apostle. To Titus also he gives a like direction, counselling him to speak the doctrines which would draw the women of his flock to the ideal home. "The aged women that they be in behavior as becometh holy women, teachers of good things. The young women wise, discreet, chaste, workers at home, loving their husbands, loving their children." The very words suggest the picture of Lois and Eunice, and above all of Elizabeth and Mary.

St. Luke who so tenderly mentions women and children, and to whom we owe our knowledge of the Virgin's thoughts and words, wrote his gospel while he was living in the companionship and under the influence of the apostle Paul. And it may be that St. Paul's own view of woman was unified by what he knew of Mary herself, she who in her heavenly meekness submitted to judgment. If Adam "is the figure of him that was to come," it is suggestive also to contrast Eve the mother of natural life and Mary the mother of him who is Spiritual life. To one the devil comes; to the other the angel. One being deceived, falls; the other, kept by the Holy Spirit, is raised to blessing and honor. As disobedience is the sin of the one, obedience is the grace of the other. Eve stands as the type of a kind of beauty fascinating to the natural mind, and even Christian women 'snared by their liberty' oftentimes confound the

two kinds of womanhood; that of the first Eve seeking her own pleasure and doing her own will, with a show of liberty, tendeth to bondage; that of the second Eve humbling herself to the will of God and accepting and rejoicing in her appointed place, is made free indeed and forever exalted.

These two types of womanhood seem to lie in St. Paul's mind. He carries his questions about women back to that first one, who in her transgression brought sin into the world, and death. His ideal of Christian womanhood is met in the "Handmaid of the Lord," by whom in the flesh came the Resurrection and the Life. The second Adam gave back to woman the place she lost, and raised her again into the rights accorded her by the Creator in the beginning. St. Paul shows womankind the pathway to take in order to enter into possession of that restored gift. All his instructions and mandates are explained by his high view of the will of God concerning women. He spared not the scrutinizing frown and severity of the wise teacher. He gave rules to cover the points of social, civil, and public religious life wherein woman is distinguished from man. Where these distinctions do not hold, he never draws the discriminating line. He puts woman on precisely the same level with man in all the highest matters, and preaches alike to both the glorious truths he himself lived for. St. Paul honored woman by setting her in her true place, and showing the meaning of her position. He held up the possibility of moral purity and its objection. He made the marriage-tie inviolable. It is by the spread of that gospel he loved to call his, that woman owes her changed position historically. The ideal for all time is his Hymn of Love. Christian men and women with noblest efforts can never go beyond his command to vie with one another in manifesting each a glory whose meaning is incomplete without the other, the glory of headship and the glory of service. And no more beautiful words ever entered into the heart of man

to conceive as a guide in married life than, "As the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands. And husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the Church."

EMMA G. WILBUR.

Chicago, Illinois.

III. MORMONISM.¹

On the 22d day of September, in the year of our Lord 1805, Joseph Smith was born at Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, of poor, ignorant, thriftless and not over honest parents. Along with them he removed, ten years later, to a poor farm in the western part of the State of New York, where he reproduced the shiftlessness, ignorance, meanness and dishonesty of his parents in his own character. For years in his youth and early manhood he spent much of the time in befooling men and defrauding them, by pretending that through the aid of a marvelous stone which he possessed he could discover hidden treasures, gold mines and the like. For such practices he was brought before a justice of the peace in Bainbridge, Chenango County, New York, on the 20th day of March, 1826, and adjudged guilty of being a disorderly person and an impostor.

Meanwhile the region in which he lived had been visited by a religious revival when he was about fifteen years of age, and his own mind had been wildly agitated.

Under the influence of this religious excitement several members of the Smith family joined the Presbyterian Church. But Joseph was more inclined to the Methodists. He tells us that he prayed much to be guided aright; that he was greatly perplexed by the numbers and varieties of the sects; and that he saw none that seemed to be correct. He would have us believe that like Mohammed, whom he more nearly resembled in the ethical features of his teaching than any other with whom we could compare him, he was dissatisfied with any form of Christianity which he knew, on the one hand, and equally dissatisfied on the other with Judaism as he saw it.

¹This paper was read before the student body of Union Theological Seminary in the month of March, last. There have been several requests for its publication.

He tells us, also, that he began to see visions from this time on, and that in one of these visions, which occurred on the night of the 21st of September, 1823, the angel Moroni appeared to him three times, and told him that the Bible of the Western Continent, the supplement to the New Testament, was buried near the adjacent town of Manchester, and that thither in 1827, after the necessary disciplinary probation, he went and received from the Lord a stone box, in which was a volume six inches thick, made of thin gold plates 8 inches by 7, and fastened together by three rings; that the plates were covered with small writing in the "reformed Egyptian" tongue, and that there was with them a pair of supernatural spectacles, in the shape of two crystals set in a silver bow, and called "Urim and Thummim." As the illiterate Smith could write with difficulty he employed as amanuensis Oliver Cowdery, to whom from behind a curtain he dictated, as he claimed, a translation of the unsealed contents of the plates. With the aid of a farmer of some means, Martin Harris, the copy thus produced by Oliver Cowdery was printed and published in 1830 under the title of "The Book of Mormon."

It was prefaced by the sworn statement of Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer and Martin Harris, that an angel of God had shown them the plates of which the book was a translation.

This book—the so-called "Book of Mormon"—in which Joseph Smith is declared to be God's prophet, with all power, and entitled to all obedience, tells us that certain Hebrews settled in America in 600 B. C.; that they subsequently divided over a question of leadership, and that the victorious party, which was also the party of insubordination to God, suffered the darkening of their skins as a curse for their insubordination and became the red Indians of America. It tells us that subsequently the party of the servants of the Lord became still smaller through apostasy and that finally it was destroyed by the Indian Hebrews in

the year 384, A. D.; but that among the few who escaped destruction were Mormon and his son Moroni; that Mormon collected the sixteen books of records, kept by successive kings and priests, into one volume, and that Moroni supplemented the work of Mormon by some personal reminiscences and then hid the volume in the hill of Cumorah, being assured of its going, one day, to be discovered by God's chosen prophet.

Such is the account of the water-wizzard, the cheat and the fraud, Joseph Smith, as to the origin of the "Book of Mormon." In a part of this account he was at first supported by the sworn statement of his three friends, Cowdery, Whitmer and Harris. But some years later, all three of these renounced Mormonism and denounced their oaths as false.

There is little reason for believing that Joseph Smith ever was as profoundly agitated on the subject of religion as he professed; there is still less reason for believing that he made an intelligent study of either Christianity or Judaism and thus intelligently rejected them as insufficient. There is the best evidence for believing that the "Book of Mormon" came not through angelic ministrations, but in quite a different way.

The most of this book was written by an invalid and crack-brained Presbyterian preacher, Solomon Spalding, by name, to while away the tedious hours of his invalid years. He had been accustomed to maintain that the Indians of America were descendants of some of the Israelitish tribes, and in a period of infirm health he wrote a romance to support his views. He called his work the "Manuscript Found," and tried, but in vain, to find a publisher. This work fell into the hands of Smith, and after some slight manipulations, came out the "Book of Mormon."

That Spalding's romance was the original of the "Book of Mormon" was the confident affirmation of contemporaries of Joseph Smith, who had examined both books. And

these men not only asserted such a relation between the "Manuscript Found" and the "Book of Mormon," but they proved it by pointing to numerous and distinctive names, phrases and characters in Spalding's manuscript which re-appear as distinctive features in Smith's work. And so strong do they make their case that Gentile historians of Mormonism generally, and perhaps universally, agree in taking this view of the origin of the so-called "Book of Mormon."

Joseph Smith gave his people not only the "Book of Mormon." In 1830 he claimed to have received another revelation proclaiming him "seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ, and elder of the Church." The revelations thus begun continued to his death, in 1844. They include that which sanctions polygamy and which was privately given in the year 1843 to pacify his lawful wife and to silence the objections of the saints to his living with a number of women whom he had persuaded to worse than polygamous relations. For reasons of policy this revelation was not published abroad for ten years, until 1853. These revelations to Smith, together with one to Brigham Young, written and published by him at "Winter Quarters," in the year 1847, to inspire and guide the saints in their projected western pilgrimage through the wilderness, were collected and published under the title of the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants."

Ah, suppose an up-to-date "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" would to-day include one or two other revelations, as for instance, one which, while still justifying polygamy as ethically proper, advised its cessation as a condition necessary in order to the admission of Utah to the Statehood!

These are the two distinctive books of the Mormons.

They comprise their "inspired writings," which as "modern revelations," they place alongside the ancient scriptures "properly translated," contained in the Old and

New Testaments. In theory the Mormons hold the Bible "properly translated" the Christian Bible, and the "Book of Mormon" and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to be the God-given scriptures of authority and direction. They hold that the Old Testament was addressed particularly to the Jewish Church; that the New Testament was similarly addressed to the Judaic and European Christian Church; the "Book of Mormon" to the American Christian Church, and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.¹

We must not, however, think of their canon as being as important to them as ours to us. They believe that continuous revelation is necessary; that "without new revelation their officers never could be qualified to perform the various duties of their calling." There is no other people more completely under the domination of their priesthood. It is unlike Christianity in this respect.

In theory, nevertheless, Mormonism is Christianity perfected. It is the theory and the boast of Mormons that, as Christianity surpasses the religion of the Jewish Dispensation, so Mormonism surpasses Christianity. And as a matter of fact Mormon teachers are constantly making false appeals to the Christian Scriptures in order to establish Mormonism, as Paul indubitably proved the truth of Christianity from the Old Testament. Mormon propagandist literature is chock full of references to the Old and New Testament, illustrating with indefinite fulness the pregnant saying, "In religion, what damned error but some sober brow will bless it and approve it with a text?" Not one of the college of the apostles quoted scripture with greater show of unction. But this Mormon unction is the unction of the deceived, of the ignoramus, or the hypocrite; and

¹With this historical sketch of Smith and the books, compare the account of Bishop Daniel S. Tuttle on "Mormons" in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, the article in the Encyclopedia Britanica, and especially Orson Pratt's Works, Tract No. 6, "Remarkable Visions."

the theory of Mormonism that it is a legitimate development of Christianity is false. The distinctive teachings of Mormonism are in direct and absolute antagonism to those of Christianity.

Let us examine them briefly: In the first place, the Mormon notion of God is of an immense material substance, di-personal in a pre-eminent sense and in a more remote sense many-personal. Naive materialism, tritheism with two out of the three gods personal, only, and progressively increasing polytheism are scrouged into their notion of God or Gods. But let Mormonism speak for itself:

In "an epitome of the faith of the Latter Day Saints" prepared by Joseph Smith himself, the first article reads, "We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost." This article in the Mormon mouth means something very different from what it does when pronounced by a Christian. Orson Pratt, perhaps the most eloquent and able of the expounders of Mormonism, an apostle, and claiming inspiration, if we understand him aright, says, "The Godhead consists of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father is a material being. The substance of which he is composed is wholly material. It is a substance widely different in some respects from the various substances with which we are more immediately acquainted. In other respects it is precisely like all other materials. The substance of his person like other matter, cannot be in two places at the same instant. It also requires time for him to transport himself from place to place. It matters not how great the velocity of his movements, time is an essential ingredient to all motion, whether rapid or slow. It differs from other matter in the superiority of its powers, being intelligent, all-wise, and possessing the power of self-motion to a far greater extent than the coarser materials of nature. "God is a Spirit," but that does not make him an "immaterial being"—a being that has no properties in common with matter.

The expression, "an immaterial being" is a contradiction in terms. Immateriality is only another name for nothing. It is the negative of all existence. A "spirit" is as much matter as oxygen or hydrogen. It has many properties in common with matter. . . . He is not a being "without parts," as modern idolaters teach; for every whole is made up of parts. The whole person of the Father consists of innumerable parts; and each part is so situated as to bear certain relations of distance to every other part. There must also be, to a certain degree, a freedom of motion among those parts, which is an essential condition to the movement of his limbs, without which he could only move as a whole.

"All the foregoing statements in relation to the person of the Father, are equally applicable to the person of the Son.

"The Holy Spirit being one part of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and properties in many respects, as the Spirits of the Father and the Son. It exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connection with all material worlds. This is called God in the Scriptures, as well as the Father and the Son, God the Father and God the Son cannot be everywhere present; indeed they cannot be even in two places at the same instant; but God the Holy Spirit is omnipotent—it stands through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one atom of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. It must exist in inexhaustible quantities, which is the only possible way for any substance to be omnipresent. All the innumerable phenomena of universal nature are produced in their origin by the actual presence of this intelligent, all-wise and all-powerful material substance called the Holy Spirit. It is the most active matter in the universe, producing all its operations according to fixed and definite laws enacted by itself, in conjunction with the Father and Son. What are called the laws of nature are nothing more nor less than

the fixed method by which this spiritual matter operates. Each atom of the Holy Spirit is intelligent, and like all other matter, has solidity, form and size, and occupies space. Two atoms of this Spirit cannot occupy the same space at the same time ; neither can one atom, as before stated, occupy two separate spaces at the same time. . . . If several of the atoms of this Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then the person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity as the other two persons of the Godhead, that is, it could not be everywhere present. No finite number of atoms can be omnipresent ; an infinite number of atoms is required to be everywhere in infinite space. Two persons receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, do not each receive at the same time the same identical particles, though they each receive a substance exactly similar in kind. It would be as impossible for each to receive the same identical atoms, as it would be for two men at the same time to drink the same identical pint of water.”¹

In his treatise, “The Kingdom of God,” Part IV., p. 15, the “inspired apostle,” Pratt, gives a summary of his doctrine of God. He says : “We have endeavored to point out the nature and character of the great supreme governing power of the universe, consisting of the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost. The person of the Father consists of a most glorious substance, called spirit, which we have shown must have extension and parts, and consequently must be material. Without these qualities no substance could exist.

The Son is the express image of the Father, and is also a material being. The same material body that was crucified and laid in the tomb, rose again. The same flesh, the same bones, were reanimated by the same material spirit. This glorious compound of flesh and bones, and spirit—all

¹Orson Pratt: “Kingdom of God:” Part I. Pp. 49. In Series of Pamphlets. Liverpool. 1857.

material, ascended into heaven to dwell in the presence of the glorious personage of the Father, of whose express image and likeness he was the most perfect pattern. Therefore from the description given of Jesus we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that both he and the Father must appear, so far as relates to form and size, very much like man. If then both these glorious personages are about the size of man, they must, like man, occupy a finite space of but a few cubic feet in dimension; and according to the admitted truths of philosophy, no substance can be in two or more places at the same time, therefore neither the Father nor Son can, consistently with those truths, be in two places at once. Revealed truths never will contradict any other truths. The revealed truths contained in the Bible inform us that God is everywhere, sustaining and upholding all things, and that in him we live and move and have our being. How can those important truths of divine revelation be reconciled with other admitted truths of philosophy which are equally certain? They can be reconciled in no way except by admitting the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit. This all-powerful substance extends throughout the material universe, uniting and mingling with all other matter in a greater or less degree, not absolutely filling all space, for then there would be no room for other matter, but like the rays of light or heat, existing in different degrees of density in different parts of space. By it all things are governed in the most perfect order and wisdom, according to the will of the Father and the Son. This view of the subject does not necessarily do away with a personal spirit, acting in conjunction with the other two persons of the Godhead; for myriads of personal spirits could be organized out of the inexhaustible quantities which exist, and still an abundance would be left to govern and control the various departments of the universe where those personages could not always be present."

In another passage the great expounder of Mormonism

exclaims at an enemy for not seeing that the Holy Spirit, if a person, could not be omnipotent.¹

Similarly in a so-called "Revelation" to Joseph Smith, dated December 27th, 1852, the omnipresence of God by his Spirit universally diffused, is taught. There is no shadow of ground for doubt that Pratt expounded the Mormon doctrine of God in harmony with Smith's teaching.

Thus we have in this beggar's basket of a doctrine of God the assertion of absolute materiality, on the supposition that matter is the only substance. We have two personal Gods—God the Father and God the Son—stripped of the attribute of omnipresence and by implication and logic of every divine attribute. Personality is denied the Spirit on the ground that to make him personal would be to make him finite. He is turned into It.

What a hotch-potch! An infinite, material, personal God—a sort of material soul of the world—two material, finite, personal Gods, making materialism, tritheism, practical atheism.

But this Mormon theology—these bizarre, confused and conflicting representations of God become still more grotesque, absurd and contradictory when Brigham Young, the "Prophet of the Lord" who succeeded Joseph Smith, publicly taught as he did on the 9th of April, 1852. These are his words: "When our father Adam came into the Garden of Eden, he came into it with a celestial body, and brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days, about whom holy men have written and spoken. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do."² Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse, in her thrilling work, "Tell It All," or "The Story of a Life's Experience in Mormonism," after quoting these

¹Orson Pratt: "Absurdities of Immaterialism:" P. 25. In a Series of Pamphlets. Liverpool. 1857.

²Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" Pp. 299-300.

words of Brigham Young's, says: "This public declaration gave great offense and led to the apostasy of many. Nevertheless, Brigham Young thinks that just as Adam came down to Eden and subsequently became a God, in like manner he also himself will attain to the Godhead. Heber C. Kimball, zealous to go a step further, declared that Brigham was God, 'and that he (Kimball) stood towards him in the same relation as the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity does toward the First.'"¹

Dr. Sheldon Jackson, ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church North, who "was for twenty years a missionary among the Mormons," says of Mormonism: "God [God the Father] is none other than Adam the first man. Adam married many wives here and begot many children. He died, went to heaven and was made God of Earth because of his many wives and children. He has many wives in heaven and begets many children there still. Every man after death is God over a world, the magnitude of which is proportioned to the number of wives and children he has here. If he has many wives and children here he will be a god over a large kingdom hereafter."² Thus gods of smaller size than the Father and the Son are growing daily.

Mrs. Stenhouse says, and truly: "The Confession of Faith published by Joseph Smith during his life time, would certainly deceive an uninitiated person; and it was in consequence of the ambiguity of that very document, that so many unsuspecting persons were from the beginning of Mormonism led astray by the teachings of the missionaries. The convert was told that the Mormon faith proclaimed the existence of one true God, but he was not told that Father Adam was that deity, and that he is "like a well-to-do farmer." He was told that Christ was the Son of God, but he was not taught that the Virgin Mary was "the lawful wife of God the Father," and that he intended after the

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" P. 300.

²R. W. Jopling's Report.

resurrection to take her again as one of his own wives, to raise up immortal spirits in eternity. . . . He was taught that the saints believed in the Holy Ghost, but he was not told that "the Holy Ghost is a man, [i. e., that a personalized part of the Holy Ghost is a man] and our God. You think our Father and our God is not a lively, sociable and cheerful man. He is one of the most lively men that ever lived."¹

If Dr. Sheldon Jackson can be trusted, Mrs. Stenhouse might have gone still further. She might have said: "Though they taught men to have faith in Christ, they did not teach that the marriage in Cana of Galilee was Christ's own marriage; that the Marys and Mothers of the New Testament were wives of his, and that he begat many children and still begets children in heaven."² These esoteric teachings of Mormonism were left to be unfolded later.

Now place, if you please, alongside this mass of drivelling assumption, of discordant, rampant and warring blasphemy of materialism, bi-personality, tri-personality according to some later teaching of the tabernacle, impersonality of the Spirit according to Joseph Smith and Orson Pratt, ditheism, tritheism, polytheism, atheism, (for these gods are but man) place, if you please, alongside this compact heap of retold fancy the Christian conception of God: "God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth." "There are three persons in the Godhead: the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."

The Mormon degradation and defamation of the notion of God marks it as no development of Christianity, but a most foul and blasphemous apostasy.

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All:" P. 296.

²Private Report of Dr. Jackson's Address, by Mr. R. W. Jopling.

In the second place, the Mormon anthropology includes the doctrines of the soul's divine origin and nature, its materiality, its pre-existence, its fall which they regard as no more serious than Pelagians say, and its entire ability to save itself, once Christ has died, and to make for itself an estate of material happiness in the world to come.

Says Elder Franklin D. Richards, of Salt Lake City : "Mormonism teaches that the spirit of man is the off-spring of God and existed as a living entity before incorporation into a mortal body."¹ In "Revelation of May 6, 1833," Joseph Smith teaches that the spirits of men are the offspring of God in these words : "And now verily I say unto you, I was in the beginning with the Father and am the first born ; and all those who are together through me are partakers of the glory of the same and are the Church of the First Born. Ye were also in the beginning with the Father."² Mrs. Stenhouse says, "The soul was said to be immortal, and it had three stages of existence. The first was the purely spiritual stage—the stage of the soul before it came into this world. Spirits in that condition were not perfect. They must first take a fleshly body and pass through the trials of life before they could attain to the highest state of existence. Hence it was the solemn duty of, as well as the highest privilege of men, to practice polygamy ; their duty by this means, and this alone, the yet imperfect souls now waiting to come into this world could never hope to be admitted into the "Celestial Kingdom,"—and a privilege, as all the souls whom they thus assisted to emigrate, would form their own "kingdoms" in eternity, over which as kings and priests they would reign forever and ever.

"The second stage of the soul's existence is the mortal, with which we are all sadly acquainted. The third is the condition subsequent to the Resurrection, when they believe the flesh and bones will form the raised body, but that the

¹In Progress. No. II. Vol. III. Art., "The Mormon Church."

²Quoted "In Progress." Vol. III. No. II. P. 686.

blood will not be there; for the blood is the principle of the corrupt life, and therefore another spirit supplies its place in heaven. That Christ partook of some boiled fish and part of a honey comb is evident from Holy Scripture. The Mormons therefore teach that heaven will be very much the same as earth, only considerably improved. We shall not marry there or be given in marriage; hence it is necessary for us to marry here, and to marry as much as we can, for then in heaven the man will take the wives whom he had married on earth, or who have been sealed to him by proxy; they will be his queens and their children will be his subjects. We shall eat and drink and spend a happy time generally. We shall thenceforth never die—thence we shall ourselves be Gods!

It was in the pre-existent state, the Mormon tells us, that the work of salvation was first planned—but not after the fashion believed by all Christians. A grand celestial council was held, at which all the sons of God appeared. Michael the father of all, presided and stated that he proposed to create a new world, of which he proceeded to give some details. His first begotten then arose, and made a speech in which he proposed that Michael, his father, should go down to the world, when created, with Eve his mother, and do there much after the fashion of what is related of our first parents in the book of Genesis; he himself would descend some thousand of years subsequently, and would lead his erring brethren back, and save them from their sins. Lucifer the second son then stood forth and unfolded his plan. Jealous of the popularity of his brother, he proposed to save men in their sins.

“Great discussion ensued, in which the unnumbered family of heaven divided into three parties—one under each of the two elder sons, and the third standing neutral. After a terrible conflict Lucifer, the second son, was defeated, and with all his followers was driven out of heaven. They descended into the abyss where they founded

the imperial kingdom, of which Lucifer became the chief. He was henceforth known as the Devil. [Michael or] Adam created his world and carried out his part of the plan; and in due time the eldest son, who conquered in heaven, took upon him the form of flesh, dwelt among men and was known as their Redeemer. The spirits who stood neutral during the conflict subsequently took upon them forms of flesh, entering into the children of Ham, and were known as negroes. Therefore it is, that although the American Indians and all other races are eligible for the Mormon priesthood, the negro alone can never attain to that high dignity."¹ Such is the Mormon anthropology.

Since the time of Plato, and perhaps before, the intellectual world has been acquainted with the fancy of the pre-existence of souls and has regarded it as baseless. But the Mormons suppose all souls to have existed eternally and in an imperfect state. In the first pair on earth, their Father, God, Michael, Adam, or whatever he may be called, and his wife, the race fell further, but owing to the redemptive work of Christ no man suffers for this primeval earth's sin. They teach that men are naturally able to comply with the requirements which entitle to salvation.² They teach a view of heavenly man about as grossly sensual as the Mohammedans, but in other respects like the Pelagians.

Compare now with this puerile, superficial, absurd and palpably false, vagarious, and heathen view of man with its accompanying defamation of God, the Christian doctrine as to man's creation, fall, sinfulness, moral helplessness, salvation by grace if at all, freedom in Christ, everything through Christ: "God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge and righteousness, and holiness. When God created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him on condition of perfect obedience. Our first

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse: "Tell It All." Pp. 297-299.

²Compare Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion." P. 11.

parents, being left to the freedom of their own will, fell from the estate wherein they were created by sinning against God. The fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery. The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisted of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it. But God, having out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into an estate of salvation by a Redeemer."

Christianity teaches that man was created by God. It teaches the doctrine of *ex nihilo* creation. Mormonism teaches the eternity of matter, and regards the souls of men as a part of that eternal matter. Christianity teaches that mankind fell in Adam, our ancestral head, from an estate of holiness. Mormonism teaches that souls in an imperfect state were embodied as a necessary stage in their progress toward perfection. Christianity teaches the moral helplessness of man and the need of divine grace in order to salvation. Mormonism teaches that man can do everything necessary to salvation once the eldest son of the Michael, who became Adam, has died in the race's behalf. Mormonism looks forward to a heaven of sensuality much like that of Mohammed. Christianity looks forward to a heaven in which fleshly appetites have no scope. Mormonism is no development of Christianity. It is another gospel than that which Paul preached.

In the third place the Mormon doctrines of soteriology are equally crude and unchristian.

Joseph Smith says, in his Articles of Faith, "We believe that, through the atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. We believe that these ordinances are: First,

faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance; third, baptism by immersion for remission of sins; fourth, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost."¹

The theory of the Mormons is that the sacrifice of Christ so far does away with the effect of Adam's sin that all men suffer for their own individual sins only. Moreover the sacrificial death of Christ, they teach, so far clears the way that man can save himself. They describe faith as follows: They who believe "must believe first, in the existence of God, secondly, in his revealed law, and thirdly, in the sufferings of the Son of God"² as satisfying divine justice. They define repentance with more apparent adequacy. They teach that immersion is the only mode of baptism sanctioned by our Lord. They say also that "baptism is not, as many false teachers now affirm, 'an outward sign of an invisible grace,' but is an ordinance whereby a believing penitent obtains a forgiveness of all past sins."³ They thus teach the *ex opere operato* theory of the efficiency of the sacrament with a vengeance. They make water baptism to be essential to salvation, as well as baptism with the Holy Ghost. Joseph Smith teaches this in "Revelation" dated November 1831. He represents Christ as saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, they that believe not on your words and are not baptized in water in my name for the remission of their sins, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, shall be damned and shall not come into my father's kingdom."⁴ The Mormons also teach that after a man has believed and repented and been baptised for the remissions of sins, he must then receive the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands,⁵ and so be empowered to heal the sick and work miracles generally.

¹Articles of Faith, 3 and 4.

²Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II. Pp. 3, 4.

³Orson Pratt: "Kingdom of God." Part II. Pp. 4, 5.

⁴Quoted in Progress. Vol. III. No. 11. P. 687.

⁵Ben. E. Rich: "A Friendly Discussion." Pp. 15, 16.

Now observe that this soteriology of Mormonism is fundamentally unlike that of Christianity. The Christian system is the plan of the uncreated and independent tri-personal God for saving a creature in the absolute sense of the term creature. The Mormon system is the plan by which persons called eternal try to save other beings equally eternal and uncreated. Christianity represents the atonement as an infinite satisfaction by a person of the triune Godhead to divine justice for the sin of finite beings. Mormonism represents the atonement as satisfaction by one of two persons clothed with some of the divine attributes for the sin of being not their creatures, and also clothed with the attribute of eternity. Mormonism represents faith as purely intellectual. Christianity represents it as of the heart as well as the head. We distinguish between the mere historical faith of the intellect which even devils may have and that faith of the mind and heart and whole man which the child of God must have. Repentance in the two systems, notwithstanding any superficial likeness, is essentially unlike, since God, sin and sinner, are different things as seen by Mormons and by the teachings of Christianity. The Mormons clothe baptism with water with an efficiency which is never affirmed nor implied of it in Scriptures, and which is never taught even by any branch of nominal Christians but the most apostate and devotedly superstitious. Nay, it may be doubted whether any branch of the nominally Christian church, even the most apostate and degraded, has taught sacramentalism so fully. The Mormons are like a few Christian enthusiasts indeed, in claiming that the maraculous gifts of the apostolic age are continued in this age. But here, too, they stand in sharp contrast to the very best and noblest part of the Christian church in all ages and countries save the darkest.

But we are not yet done with the Mormon soteriology. They tell us that "the living saints may perform ordinances for the repentant dead." And as a matter of fact the dis-

covery of repentance on the part of the dead does not seem difficult. Accordingly, Queen Anne of England, George Washington, Napoleon Bonaparte, and how many others time would fail us to tell, have been baptized by proxy into the Mormon communion.

Marriage is an element in Mormon soteriology. They call it a sacrament. They say "it is solemnized for time and for eternity. It is sealed on earth by one having divine authority, and it is therefore sealed in heaven. . . . This union of the sexes is essential to perfect exaltation in the celestial world. The marriage does not take place in or after the resurrection, but in this life, when the parties are tested in their probation. Those persons who arrive at no higher conditions than that of angels, are ministering spirits unto the sons and daughters of God."¹ That is, those who are not married after the Mormon fashion shall be underlings, scullions and kitchen-maids in heaven. For woman or man, according to Mormonism, the way to the heaven of heavens is through marriage. Those who do not marry, even if they reach the celestial portals, must be hewers of wood, drawers of water, attendants and boot-blacks to the saints. [See "Tell It All." P. 257.]

We have now passed in rapid review the Mormon doctrines of God, of man, and of salvation. We have seen that instead of holding to Christian theism, they hold to materialism, tritheism in union with the impersonality of one of the gods, the other two gods being little more than indefinitely big men. We have seen that they make man an eternal material being, who existed before he was clothed with flesh, who clothed himself with flesh in order to improvement of character, and getting rid of original imperfections, but who tumbled into more trouble in the person of God the Father who became Adam, but was redeemed by his eldest son who became Christ, and hence

¹Elder F. D. Richards: "In Progress." Vol. III. No. II. P. 685. See also, "Tell It All." P. 136.

is able to work out his own salvation by obeying gospel ordinances. We have seen that they make this Christ work out a sort of an atonement ; that they then condition man's salvation on his entertaining intellectual faith,¹ on his having repented of his past and determined to live according to their teachings, on baptism by water, on receiving the miraculous powers of the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands, and on his marrying under the Mormon authorities.

This system has no kinship with Christianity. As the "Book of Mormon" uses a few phrases found frequently in our Sacred Scriptures, such as, "And it came to pass," so the Mormon system is set forth by the use of our Christian terminology in part. As we have the words God, Lord, Christ, man, sin, salvation, atonement, faith, repentance, baptism and so forth, so Mormonism has these words. But the meanings in every case are different. Mormonism is no development of Christianity, but the contrary. It is a religion as unchristian as Manichæism, or Mohammedanism. It is a true child of its founder, Joseph Smith, the cheat, the fraud, the liar and the devotee of lust.

The essentially contra-Christian character of Mormonism may be shown still more convincingly by examining some distinctive peculiarities of Mormon ethics, viz. : polygamy, and the unusual distinction between innocent and guilty blood, the blood atonement or the principle that the end justifies the means.

In 1843, in Nauvoo, Joseph Smith claimed to receive a revelation from God sanctioning a plurality of wives. The revelation is long, full of argument and assertions warranting polygamy. Paragraphs 20 to 25 read as follows :

"Verily, I say unto you, a commandment I give unto mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife. . . . Let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been

¹The uninspired elder, Ben. E. Rich, has a better view of faith.

given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those that are not pure and have said that they were pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God. . . . I give unto my servant Joseph that he may be made ruler over many things, for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to no one else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law; but if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her even as he hath said; and I will bless him, and multiply him, and give unto him a hundred fold in this world of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal world. And, again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses, and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her, and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given him, and to none else; and if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him; and they are given unto him—therefore is he justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery; she shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfill the promise which was given by my Father before the founda-

tion of the world ; and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men ; for herein is the work of my Father continued that he may be glorified.

And again, verily, verily I say unto you, if any man have a wife who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood, as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe and administer unto him, or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God ; for I will destroy her ; for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide by my law. Therefore, it shall be lawful in me, if she receive not this law, for him to receive all things whatsoever I the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him, according to my word, and she then becomes the transgressor, and he is exempt from the law of Sarah, who administered unto Abraham according to the law, when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. And now, as pertaining to this law : Verily, verily I say unto you, I will reveal more unto you hereafter ; therefore let this suffice for the present. Behold I am Alpha and Omega. Amen."

This quotation shows us how restive Emma Smith, Joseph's first and lawful wife, was under polygamy. The threats of destruction which were intended to subdue her, betray also the nervous uneasiness of the polygamous prophets. The incongruous plea that Emma shall forgive the trespasses of Joseph against her, betrays the prophet's own sense of the immorality of his polygamous relatives. But cheat, liar, fraud, libertine, coward as he was, he naturally invoked the authority of the God whom he dishonored with his every breath, in reducing the wife he ought to have protected, to the intolerable ignominy of polygamy.

This is not only anti-Christian ; it is in the teeth of the teaching of natural religion. Go to Utah. Visit the homes of polygamy. In this yard is a row of small houses, much alike, three or four, half a dozen or a dozen or more of

them, each inhabited by a polygamous wife of the same man. In an adjacent yard is a single house with a number of rooms, in every room save one, the parlor, a wife and her children, all belonging to one man. In still another yard is a cabin with one room in which a man lives with a plurality of wives. See the prevalent look of hopelessness on the women's faces, save in the cases of new-comers, temporary queens of the harems, a few fanatics, and hardened wretches. See in this land of boasted freedom these slaves. See in this vaunted civilization this sign of blackest savagery.

Ye men who hear me as well as ye women: is not this against the demands of your own highest nature? Is not conjugal love exclusive in its demands? Is it not exclusive in proportion to a man's elevation of character? Don't you count that man close akin to a beast who would be willing to live in relations of polyandry? Does not logic compel you to take a similar view of woman and polygamy? Can you think of yourself with any degree of moral complacency as living in polygamy? There is not a man here who will dare say it openly!

The Bible condemns it. The original institutions of marriage, of which we have record in Geneses 2:24, is strictly and only monogamous. Moses prohibited polygamy. Malachi rebuked it. Christ soundly condemned it, and re-established the monogamous character of marriage. His inspired apostles set a stigma of disapproval on polygamy by forbidding that any such man should be allowed to hold office in the church.

Joseph Smith did not get his revelation sanctioning polygamy from Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

The Mormon distinction between murder and the shedding of innocent blood, was in the words of Mrs. Stenhouse as follows: "Shedding innocent blood is the crime of killing a saint, which can never be forgiven but by the

death of the transgressor ; but the spilling of a Gentile's blood is of quite a different character. To murder a Gentile may sometimes be inexpedient, or perhaps even to a certain extent a wrong, but it is seldom if ever, a crime, and never an unpardonable sin."

The doctrine of the Blood Atonement is, to quote Mrs. Stenhouse again, "that the murder of an apostate is a deed of love ! If a saint sees another leave the church, or even if he only believes that his brother's faith is weakening and he will apostatize before long, he knows that the soul of his unbelieving brother will be lost if he dies in such a state, and that only by his blood being shed is there any chance of forgiveness for him ; it is therefore the kindest action that he can perform toward him to shed his blood—the doing so is a deed of truest love. The nearer, the dearer, the more tenderly loved the sinner is, the greater the affection shown by the shedders of blood. The action is no longer murder or the shedding of innocent blood, for the taint of apostacy takes away its innocence—it is making atonement, not a crime ; it is an act of mercy, therefore meritorious."¹

Brigham Young said in one of his sermons in the Salt Lake City Tabernacle, "I have known a great many men who have left this church for whom there is no chance whatever of exaltation, but if their blood had been spilled it would have been better for them.

"The wickedness and ignorance of the nations forbid this principle being in full force. But the time will come when the law of God will be in full force. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him ; if he wants salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood on the earth in order that he may be saved, spill it.

"Now, brethren and sisters, will you live your religion ? How many hundreds of times have I asked that question ? Will the Latter Day Saints live their religion?"²

¹Mrs. T. B. H. Stenhouse : "Tell It All : " P. 312.

²Quoted in "Tell It All : " P. 318.

The inculcation of those principles and the example of Mormon elders explain in considerable part the peculiarly long list of murders and other horrors in the history of Utah, including the infamous Mountain Meadow's Massacre.

Our Lord Jesus forbade the use of force of any kind in religion. It has been a law of God for the State from the time of Noah: "Who sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." But Mormon law makes a Mormon's murder of a Gentile no crime. Nothing more diabolical can be found in the moral teachings of any people than these principles of Mormon ethics.

Such is the Mormon theology, and ethics. They claim that they are a development of Christianity. But what concord hath Christ with Belial? Mormonism is not of the Old Testament nor the New. It treats of a different God, of different sinners, a different salvation, accomplished by different means, of different ideals of high life and duty. While Christianity is from heaven and bears writ all over its celestial character, Mormonism is the monstrous offspring of earth and hell.

It is a huge monster that would roll back civilization thousands of years and grind the weaker sex as degraded orientals or brutal and naked savages do. It would re-establish in our Western world, blessed of high heaven with independence of Church and State, that adulterous communion from which comes the motley brood, Intolerance, Priesthood and Persecution unto death.

Mormonism aims to control this nation in its politics as it tries to control Utah.

We are told that in the State of Utah no Mormon can be a candidate for office of any kind save one authorized by the President of the Church, and that he will authorize no one but an actual and avowed polygamist; that no bill can pass the legislature save by the consent of the Mormon Church; that all objectionable bills are strangled in the committee rooms; that the church has a committee to devise and

and supervise all legislation; that their approval means passage and their disapproval failure; that all schools are in the hands of Mormons, even the State University and the Agricultural School, which is largely supported by the aid of the National Government; and that all of these are branches of the Mormon propaganda.¹ If this be regarded as an over-statement of their power in Utah, it may nevertheless be taken as a just exhibition of their aim.

Mormonism would turn right into wrong and wrong into right. It would deprive us of that God who is glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders; and give us instead its gods with ethical ideals lower than Jesuitism ever reached in its lowest grovelings.

We have called this monster huge. It has grown great and is still growing. It has met obstacles many. Its wanderings from 1831 to 1847 are matters of familiar history. Hundreds of Mormons have perished at the hands of their incensed neighbors. Elder Richards, speaking from the point of view of a Latter Day Saint, says: "Persecution raged against the church from the beginning. All kinds of misrepresentation were resorted to by its enemies. The Saints were driven from their possessions in Missouri and afterwards in Illinois; many of them were slaughtered by mobs, their property was confiscated, and in 1844, on June 27th, the Prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hiram were shot to death by Mobocrats with blackened faces, at Carthage, Illinois. Subsequently the body of the Saints were driven from Nauvoo, which they had built on the banks of the Mississippi, and under the leadership of Brigham Young, who was the President of the Twelve Apostles, the persecuted Saints made their way to winter quarters, on the banks of the Missouri, near where Council Bluff now stands. . . . In 1847 the famous journey from the Missouri river across the plains and mountains was

¹R. W. Jopling's Report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson's Address.

accomplished by Brigham Young and the pioneers, numbering one hundred and forty-three men, three women and two children. They reached the spot where Salt Lake City now stands, the 24th of that year. The great temple, costing more than three million dollars, rears its towers on the spot where Brigham Young declared at that time: 'Here we will build the temple of our God.'

"The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has now its branches in all the civilized nations and upon many islands of the sea. It has sixteen hundred elders in the mission field, laboring without pay. Its membership numbers about three hundred thousand. It has four magnificent temples in which are administered ordinances for the living and the dead. It is presided over by Lorenzo Snow, George S. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, Apostles of Jesus Christ, holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with the binding and loosing power which Christ conferred on Peter, James and John, and which they restored to earth. It has twelve Apostles to open the door of the kingdom in all nations, and set in order the affairs of the church. It has all the orders of the Christian ministry and priesthood which were in the church during the first century of the Christian era. It administers the same ordinances and enjoys the same unity, power, spiritual gifts and divine communications as were then bestowed."¹ Thus speaks Elder Richards, telling the truth, too, so far as his account is concerned with the progress of Mormonism and the surmounting of difficulties, the growth and spread of the sect, the zeal of its representatives, and its spirit of propogandism; but misrepresenting anew the relation of Mormonism to Christianity. This Mormon Church is no more like the Christian Church of the first century than that arch-rebel who was cast from the heavenly heights to the infernal depth, is like those pure spirits that kept their first estate and minister about God's throne this hour.

¹In Progress. Vol. III. No. 11. P. 684.

The growth of Mormonism is probably to be explained :
1st. By its religious earnestness. Some Mormons are earnest to spread their tenets because of the temporal gain they will thus get. Some have been given over to a strong delusion, to believe a lie, the lie they teach ; because they wished to believe it instead of God's truth and to serve gods of their own instead of the true God. Some are honest fanatics, deceived and deceiving. This earnestness is a powerful faction in their growth.

2d. They are organized compactly and are under the direction of one all powerful will. Officers abound. Every officer has absolute control over all beneath him. At the head stands the President, who is the Prophet, Revelator and Seer. Near him stand his advisers, who can advise only. Next comes the College of Apostles ; next the Seventy. These are the general officers. Each district has its subordinate organization.

Everywhere official promotion is the certain result of efficiency in office already held. Scores of men are appointed to go out and serve as missionaries, says Bishop Tuttle, every year ; and they go usually without purse or scrip, save such as they themselves provide. This compact organization helps it to grow.

3rd. Polygamy welds the Mormons together in a solid unity, inasmuch as it separates between the Mormons and the rest of the world ; and inasmuch as having permeated Mormon society it cannot be condemned without disgrace either in one's self or kinfolks. The very women who hate it, know that its overthrow will affect themselves and their daughters with dishonor.

Hence to-day, while they publish to the world that they have ceased to contract polygamous marriages since Utah was made a State, they still do make them, if outside witnesses can be trusted. 'The missionaries of the Northern Presbyterian Church last year found 2,000 polygamous marriages that have been celebrated since Statehood was

conferred, and over 1,000 children born of these marriages." And these children are having Mormonism instilled into them from their earliest years. Thus Mormonism grows. It claimed 65,000 additions last year.

This groveling monster, for a time fed chiefly on the peasantry of Europe, but alas! it is now preying on our own land. Nor is it confining itself to the more out of the way places and the homes of the illiterate and morally untrained. It has become bolder. It has newspapers in prominent cities. It held a convention recently in Atlanta, Georgia. The Atlanta Constitution gave a broadside to it, and no condemnation. These are but illustrations of the present history of Mormonism. We should arouse ourselves, my brethren. Christian people generally should arouse themselves.

If the people were properly instructed in God's truth comparatively few of them could be led off. But now vast numbers about us are as sheep having no shepherd. They are the prey of wolves. We ought to teach God's truth and so fill men's mind with it as to fortify them against such anti-Christian religions, and we ought to expose Mormonism, and we ought to pray to God to bring this pestiferous religion to naught, at once. What are you going to do about it, my brethren? Carry this question with you. A part of the responsibility for the future evil of Mormonism rests on you. God help you to meet it! Amen.

THOS. C. JOHNSON,

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

IV. SKETCH OF THE POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF BRITAIN WHEN THE WEST- MINSTER ASSEMBLY WAS CONVENED.

The English Revolution was in effect begun by the Reformation and the principles of truth which were triumphant in politics and religion in the middle of the 17th century were disseminated through Britain by the scattering abroad of the Sacred Scriptures in the English tongue. If, however, we seek some formal point of departure, or definite fountain-head for a great stream, we may find it in the lectures of Cartwright, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, delivered in 1570. In these lectures prelacy, ecclesiastical vestments, and various things in which the Anglican Church was declared to be nearer Rome than the Bible, were denounced, as was the low standard of piety accepted by the Church. As an essential element of the movement thus inaugurated, side by side with the demand for a freer, more spiritual and more scriptural Church, went a demand for deliverance from despotism in the State, the removal of political abuses, the recognition of the rights of the subject and the authority of the parliament as a representative assembly. In short, the party siding with Cartwright is immediately marked as the champion of civil liberty as well as religious truth. But Queen Elizabeth, with that rare sagacity which compared with the true patriotism in her official life, recognized the justice as well as force of the rising tide, and making just concessions to its demands prevented any active antagonism or actual bitterness from arising. Moreover, if in a fit of temper Elizabeth dealt harshly with some especially zealous divine, she cared not a jot for the result, knowing that this same divine in his dungeon would in

unison with his brethren on the outside, earnestly pray for the preservation of her life and health, and invoke every blessing upon her head, inasmuch as though her personal piety might be limited, she was recognized as the true and honest champion of Protestantism and its grandest bulwark against the colossal efforts of Rome to stamp it out by force. In March, 1603, the great queen died, having named in her will as her successor her cousin, James II., of Scotland, the son of that unhappy queen Mary, whom she had sent to the scaffold. Mary's sad fate has obscured through sympathy her many faults, but those of her son are known to all men. From one of the weakest and poorest thrones in Europe, James was suddenly translated to one of the strongest and wealthiest, without losing his Scottish throne, but combining the two kingdoms under himself as the common head. He discovered also that not only was England greater and richer, but the authority of the throne in England was far greater than in Scotland. And these things seem to have completely turned a head which was never remarkably strong. James was a bundle of contradictions. Uncommonly shrewd and cunning, he was also remarkably silly, so that Henry IV., of France, called him "the wisest fool in Christendom." A learned man, he was not an educated one, so that his teacher said he was a pedant because it was impossible to make anything else of him. In a way zealous for religion and anxious to pose as a theologian and an eminent saint, he yet went so far in his extravagance, buffoonery and love of pleasure as to give rise to suspicions of abominable and debasing practices. However, he conferred a lasting benefit upon his nation and the world in encouraging the magnificent English version of the Scriptures which still bears his name.

Just here we may note that the Bible was the prime factor in the stirring events of the century. It became for a time largely the literature of Britain. It colored the thought, the language, the life and manners of the people.

It dominated everything, and men looking to it for true ideas of religious doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, the shackles of tradition and Popish tyranny being broken, also began to look to it as the source of light as to true theories of civil polity. These things King James was poorly able to appreciate. His experience with the Presbyterians in Scotland had been most distasteful to him. There they were too strong for him, and told him plainly there were two Kings in Scotland, and King James must not trespass upon the Kingdom of King Jesus. He dissembled with them and declared himself a staunch Presbyterian, and thanked God that Scotland had the soundest and purest Kirk in Christendom. But the mask was quickly thrown off when he came to London. Henceforth he was the implacable foe of Presbyterianism and the champion of Prelacy. "No Bishop no King," was his theory, and the aim of his life being to exalt the throne and exaggerate the royal powers, he hated the Presbyterians as being necessary foes to despotism. And throughout his life he confounded all English, the Puritans with the Presbyterians, being unable or unwilling to distinguish between them.

The term Puritan was first employed by De Dominis, a Romish Bishop, who during James' reign came with quite a flourish of trumpets to England to embrace the Protestant faith. James at once made him an Anglican bishop. But some years later, tempted by the offer of a cardinal's hat, he returned to Rome to become again a Papist, but found himself trapped, as after his second recantation instead of a cardinal's hat he was given a dungeon in the Inquisition, where he died. The English Puritans—so named by this time-serving priest when an active supporter of King James' theories, were some of them evangelical and moderate Prelatists, some inclined to Presbyterianism and others to theories of Independence or Congregationalism in church polity. But to James they were all Presbyterians—suspicious personages, who were not

apt to properly regard the king as supreme in religion and politics alike. The Puritans, finding the ablest and best organized resistance to the encroachments of the throne upon their civil and religious liberty in the Presbyterians, did more and more take their places behind Presbyterian leaders. They objected to many things in their king. His favorites, first Carr, whom he made Earl of Somerset, and enormously enriched out of the public revenues, and then Geo. Villiers, made Duke of Buckingham, and still more prodigally endowed with the peoples' money, being men of evil life pleased them not; nor did other forms of royal extravagance. Still less did they like the determined usurpation of their sovereign. When James on ascending the English throne discovered that appointing powers were his in respect to both ecclesiastical and judicial offices, he exclaimed in delight: "I make Judges and I make Bishops, do I? Then (God's hands) I make Law and Gospel;" and he proposed nothing short of this: A careful student of this period tells us that the king had ever consistently in view three principal objects: 1st, To establish the royal prerogative according to his own principles. 2d, To protect and befriend the Papists in England, provided they lived peaceably and took the oath of allegiance. 3d, To express his hatred for the Puritans (whom he regarded as Presbyterians) and to create the same aversin for them in the nation.

The king wrote theological treatises against Romanism, but displayed a liberality toward Romanists which was in marked contrast with his temper towards the Puritans. He declared that he would not "force the consciences" of the Papists, but he demanded entire submission as to their religion of the Presbyterians, though ever so unwilling—an inconsistency which did not escape notice. Prince Henry, the heir apparent, an amiable and wise prince, had little sympathy with his father's errors, and was disliked by the king and greatly loved by the nation. Dying young, the

bitterness of the people was illustrated in the shocking charge that his father had him poisoned, to open the succession of Prince Charles, whose views on matters civil and religious were more in accord with those of James. Having now an heir apparent who suited him, the king began to make it the most important of all possible affairs of state as to whom the young man should marry. The Protestant princess of Europe being inferior in grandeur and power to the Roman Catholic potentates were ignored now by James, and, heedless of the temper of England and Scotland towards Rome, he sought a Romish princess to be the wife of an English king and the mother of future English princes. Turning to Spain, he proposed to marry Charles to the Spanish infanta, and there followed a most humiliating story to Englishmen. With grief and rage they beheld the King of Spain persecuting and seeking to exterminate their Protestant brethren on the continent, who cried in vain to them for aid, whilst the hope of marriage of the infanta to Prince Charles was held out to King James. They saw the Pope and the Spanish King amusing themselves with James, procrastinating action, and ever inventing fresh reasons for delay, and while England was idle Spanish troops over-ran the Palatinate and chased from his dominions the elector Palatine, a Protestant prince whose wife was King James' daughter. They saw their king failing to help promptly and effectively the Protestants in the critical and terrible thirty years war whilst parlying over the Spanish marriage and agreeing to proposed Romish practices in the royal family; and they saw all these things with ever growing indignation. And when at last the project was abandoned and Charles married a French princess who came with her priests and Romish followers to England, this too, failed to please the Puritans, who felt that Protestantism was still fighting for its life against Rome.

Another source of discontent lay in the favor shown

Arminianism by the court. Looking to the Bible directly for their theology, the early Protestants of Britain were naturally Calvinistic, and it must be confessed they had little toleration for Arminianism when it appeared in England. But it met with general favor amongst the extreme Prelatists and the court party—and indeed the term Puritan was primarily used by De Dominio to describe the Anti-Arminians.

The king's "Book of Sports" and the liberal views of Sabbath observance and worldly amusements advocated by him and his bishops, likewise made him to be out of harmony with his people. The progress of stricter views amongst the people was illustrated in 1617 when the king's carriages, starting on a journey on the Sabbath day, were halted by the mayor of London when they sought to pass through the city, and only released upon the arrival of a direct command from the king. Another source of increasing irritation was the growing power of Buckingham, who was himself practically of no religious faith and of most dissolute life, whilst his mother, a most zealous Papist, had great influence over him, and encouraged by them the Romanists in great numbers flocked to England, not even the Guy Fawke's plot having availed to diminish the king's partiality for them. James did indeed, in 1620, remonstrate with Louis XIII, against the persecution of the Huguenots, and Buckingham led a futile expedition to the aid of Rochelle, the last stronghold of the Huguenots in France. But the miserable end of the English expeditions and the general belief that Geo. Villiers made England war with France as a result of the quarrel arising from his astonishing attempt to make the French queen his mistress, caused this tardy movement to win but little favor for King James among his people. The king through years humbled and oppressed Puritanism in England, but was sorely vexed by Presbyterian Scotland, being always too much occupied elsewhere and too timid in nature ever to attempt to carry

out the schemes he formed from time to time for crushing out Puritanism there. The reign of James was marked by struggles betwixt him and the parliaments the need of money forced him from time to time to convene. The parliament represented the people, and though he could make bishops and judges his creatures he could not control these men always, as the people had a voice in their selection. Parliament was ready to give him money when it was to be rightly used, but again and again protested against the despotic usurpations of the king, in language growing always plainer and clearer. Indignant, the king would arbitrarily dissolve parliament, only to be driven in time by the want of money to convene another. The battle was at last openly drawn in the parliament of 1621—that which has been disguised in language at least, now being clearly recognized. The immediate result of this was the organization of the Whig and Tory parties which endure to this day ; the first standing for the rights of the people and progress ; the latter rather for the rights of the king and old institutions. This parliament, in effect, wanted the king to take sides with the Protestants in the thirty years war then in progress. This suggests to us the facts that Puritans, in the religious sense being the most determined and systematic opponents of the king's usurpations, were the leaders in this parliament. And now are to be added to the ranks of the "Church Puritans" great numbers of "State Puritans"—men not always of great religious zeal, but opponents of the king's increasing tyranny as patriots, or through alarm as to the safety of themselves and their prophets, as the rights of Englishmen were yearly diminished. The folly of the king and his favorites drove these men over to the Puritan camp to follow religious leaders, and of these leaders the chief were Presbyterians—the heart and brain of the British revolt against the Stuarts being Presbyterian. The king's following embraced many kinds of people, but the historian tells us that the Papists

and Arminians all sided with the king against the parliament. King James died in March, 1625, having reigned twenty-three years, and has an appropriate epitaph in the statement of the sagacious French historian, Rapin :

“England never flourished less than under James I.” Charles II., who succeeded his father, was a man of whom it may emphatically be said that nothing in life so became him as the manner of his leaving it. After doing to death most unjustly, in prison, in banishment, and on the scaffold, some of the best of his subjects, he was finally beheaded by the existing government in front of his own palace of Whitehall. He met death in so Christian a temper and displayed such courage and royal dignity at his trial, that it did much to efface the bitterness engendered by his treacherous and tyrannical career. But his life was not such as to warrant his present glorification in some quarters as a blessed martyr. Superior to his father in dignity of appearance and character, in courage and some other traits, he was, if possible, more imbued with the idea that the king was the State, the Lord and Master Supreme, of the property, lives and consciences of his subjects. The terrible despotism which Richelieu and Mazarin succeeded in producing in France, he desired for England, and employing cruelty and deceit alike in the effort he lost his head as the final result, well nigh destroying entirely also the monarchical system in the state and the Prelatical system in the church, to both of which he was so sincerely attached. That’s the story of “the royal martyr!” The Duke of Buckingham was accused by public fame of having poisoned King James, to prevent his being cut out by the old favorite Carr, Earl of Somerset, who, released from prison where he had been confined for murder, was again attracting the favor of James. King Charles evidently attached no value to this story, for Buckingham was more the royal favorite and the nation’s master than ever, after Charles’ ascension to the throne. But the people feared and hated

him. Assassinated by Felton, his death was a misfortune to Charles, as it showed the true responsibility for his course to rest with himself, and that it was the king, and not his ministers or favorites, who was the soul of the effort to absolutely enslave the British people. Charles early sought the church in carrying out his schemes. And from a thousand pulpits the doctrines of extreme royal power as ordained by God, and the religious duty of the people to bow to the king as God's direct representative, were preached to the exclusion of the gospel. The Puritans are justly condemned for the extent to which they carried political preaching, but the Royalist began it and drove them to it at first. In 1626 Charles forbade pulpit discussion of Arminianism, but it was noticed that only those who preached against it were severely punished, whilst those who advocated it with strong sermons were let off with light fines and speedily promoted to fat livings or important Episcopal sees. And to be a bishop now meant something, for under James and Charles the bishops ever grew more and more powerful, and it may be remarked that they were wonderfully distinguished for the energy with which they fought the Presbyterians. In this they pleased the authorities, for the "king and his whole court (says Rapin) mortally hated the Presbyterians." And this was for three reasons: 1st, The Presbyterians were against the hierarchy—opposing Prelacy; 2d, They were against the king in his effort to stretch his authority and prerogative; 3rd, They were Calvinists and the court was Arminian. But their opposition to the increase of royal privilege and power ever increased their following in the nation, whose best citizens everywhere viewed with increasing alarm the course of Charles. The effort of the king and his ministers, and in Strafford and Laud he had more dangerous servants than Buckingham, was to vest the king with arbitrary power and to set him above all laws. This involved reducing the authority of parliament to a nullity,

and this Charles deliberately undertook to do—a thing unheard of heretofore. Henry VIII. was a tyrant, but it was through parliaments always that he exercised his tyranny, while Charles tried to set them aside.

One after another successive parliaments were dissolved because of their effort to take part in the government and their disposition to question the king before voting taxes to furnish him with money, instead of meekly voting subsidies and then, leaving the government entirely to the king, returning home as he wished them to do. At last Charles undertook to do without them entirely, and for a number of years no parliament was called and the people saw themselves calmly ignored as a factor in the government. To get money Charles adopted various expedients. He exacted forced loans, revived an obsolete custom in the form of the hated ship money tax; arrested, imprisoned, and in effect murdered, in some instances, his subjects when they refused to pay these illegal taxes, and imposed unjust and enormous fines for free speech, practically confiscating the offenders' possessions. Furthermore, he deprived the writ of habeas corpus of its venerable authority, and through the Star Chamber Court, and the Court of High Commission, (a great pet with his worthy father) he practically deprived his subjects of the right of public jury trial, which had been secured to them by Magna Charter itself. The man who in the pulpit or through the press denounced these things, was liable to prompt prosecution as a libeller, and then without constitutional judicial process he was punished—it might be by a fine which beggared him, or by having his ears cut off, his tongue slit and his cheeks branded with a red hot iron, or perchance he would be delivered by death alone from the foul vapours of a pestilential dungeon. And when in most loyal and respectful language the representatives of the people presented their grievances in "The Petition of Right,s" that great document was utterly without effect, for when remonstrated with by his people,

Charles ever did one of two things: he either ignored it as rebellious impertinence or promised faithfully to reform every abuse complained of and then broke his promises so regularly that in time he had the misfortune to have his subjects cease to put any faith in his word. 'Tis a pity to say it, but "the blessed martyr" was a prevaricator whom no oath or pledge could bind. Undoubtedly he would have kept his head on his shoulders at least if he had not repeatedly added treachery to tyranny.

Under the circumstances described, the unhappy Englishmen saw themselves deprived of liberties enjoyed unquestioned for ages. They could look for no help from Charles' two ministers. Thos. Wentworth, once of the people's party, had turned traitor to them, and now as Earl of Strafford was the king's tool, arrogant and cruel to the people and obsequious to the king, whom he labored to aggrandize. He was not a whit more hated and feared than his able coadjutor, Bishop Laud. Laud introduced extreme ritualism, copying Romish ideas, encouraged Sabbath sports and Popish ideas of piety; expelled Oxford divines who preached against Arminianism, and persecuted the Puritans. In common with the court he favored two classes, Papists and Arminians, and his special fight through life was against Presbyterianism. And so it came to pass that the English in their extremity turned to the Presbyterians for leadership in resisting the systematic effort they believed to be on foot to rob them of civil liberty and a Bible religion. And so about the year 1630, just when Laud's fight against it is hottest, we see a remarkable growth of Presbyterianism in England proper, until the historians tell us that standing as Presbyterianism did for civil liberty as well as Bible religion, almost all England grew to be Presbyterian, in the court sense of the word. Heedless of this fact, Charles and Laud entered upon the task of substituting the Episcopal church for the Presbyterian in Scotland. The work was vigorously prosecuted,

but the resistance was even more vigorous. Scotland in righteous wrath hurled a stool at the head of the man who would "say mass in her lug," and then over the graves of her dead signed her name in letters of blood to a solemn league and covenant to hold to a pure gospel and keep alive the true Apostolic Church as the Kirk of Scotland. The attempt to force uniformity in Scotland in short produced a great national uprising against it, and the resultant conflict between the king and the Scotch passed through various stages. After much discussion, Charles conceded the rights of the General Assembly, established since 1580, and in 1638 a General Assembly was called to consider the matter at issue. The king tried to secure one elected by ministers only objecting to ruling elders voting for commissioners, because he fancied he could through offers of fat benefices, etc., more easily control the preachers than he could the elders. But the Scotch outwitted him. The Marquis of Hamilton, the king's high commissioner, found the assembly staunch and clear for Simon-pure Presbyterianism and firm in their opposition to Bishop Laud and the King. He therefore on the seventh day declared the assembly to be dissolvent and ordered its members to go home, but the assembly went calmly on with its work, utterly ignoring his orders. By so doing they really began the revolution in Britain, for in repudiating the king's authority over their religion they inaugurated formal resistance to royal tyranny—their action being so far unparalleled.

The nation being with the General Assembly, Charles pronounced the rejection of Episcopacy alone, on the part of subjects otherwise most loyal, to be a sufficient *casus belli*, and declared war against Scotland. To secure men and money for the prosecution of the war, Charles in 1640 convened a parliament—the first in eleven years. But no sooner was it manifest that this parliament was in no haste to aid the king in attacking Scottish brethren whose

case was so like their own, but in great haste to investigate the grievances of England, than Charles angrily dissolved it as an insubordinate and rebellious body. Thereby he greatly enraged all England, and the general irritation was increased by the royal favor to Papists, talk of Popish plots and projected massacres, and also by the severe measures employed in pushing the odious ship money tax. To the funds thus raised were added the liberal contributions of the Papists and the Anglican clergy, and with these funds the king equipped an unwilling army and set out to invade Scotland. But the Scotch army, triumphant everywhere, invades England, driving Charles before it, and goes into camp at New Castle. The king having good reason to distrust the army which he has raised to fight the Scotch, in the face of the Scottish invasion is in despair, and in November, 1640, in answer to the royal summons, the famous "Long Parliament" convenes at Westminster. But this parliament, too, shows no haste in helping King Charles against the Scotch army which they are justly disposed to look upon rather as a friend than a foe. It addressed itself promptly, however, to a full ventilation of the nation's grievances. The great speech of the enlightened patriot, Pym, was a righteous arraignment of the king, and foreshadowed the subsequent history of Britain. In a short time the state of things was reversed and parliament had taken the reins and was executing justice on one hand and instituting reforms on the other. The Presbyterian party furnishing the ablest and the safest leaders in parliament and having the moral support of the Scotch army was in the ascendancy. In 1640 the Presbyterian form of worship was openly practiced in London, enormous crowds attending, and many remaining all day to successive services, whilst multitudes unable to get in hung about the windows and doors. Through 1641 parliament made rapid strides. Strafford was sent to the scaffold, whither Laud was to follow him in 1645, his royal

master through cowardice approving it. Many tyrannical measures were ended, whilst the king was respectfully but clearly told of the evils of his course. Affairs were further complicated by the Irish rebellion which was inaugurated by the massacre of the English in Ireland and of the Protestant Irish by the Papist Irish on October 23, 1641, when the number of the murdered was at the lowest estimate 40,000, whilst according to some it reached 200,000 persons, embracing all ages and both sexes. In savage excesses, pitilessness and strange brutality, this massacre far exceeds that of St. Bartholomew in France. The king called for help to put down the rebellion, but the parliament and the nation suspected him of complicity with the Irish, doubting his word when he denied the genuineness of the royal commission under which a savage Irish leader claimed to be acting.

Indignation against Rome intensified opposition to Prelacy, and mobs stormed through London crying, "No Bishops." They even invaded the courts of the royal palace, and the queen looking through the window lattice with her maids pointed to a young apprentice saying, "See that handsome young Roundhead," thereby creating the nickname which was to distinguish the short haired Puritan from the ringleted royalist for all time. The attempted arrest of the five members of Parliament by Charles in person, in violation of all law and precedent, greatly widened the breach between the king and parliament, and at length the king having his adherents in the Papists and Arminians, the Anglican clergy and the greater part of the nobility and a Conservative or Tory element in the nation, the matter came to the arbitrament of battle and the Civil War was inaugurated. It is not our province to follow its varying fortunes, but we may remark that though the flames of strife were fanned by the pulpit, this war was remarkable for the absence of treachery or cruelty, and the only excesses were committed by Royalist troops who in time

came to be dreaded by friend and foe alike, while the parliament's army was wonderful in its order and piety. The religious temper of this party was so marked that libertines and men of extreme worldly tastes adhered to the cause of the king with the nobles and Prelatists, but the people were for parliament, their unquestioned and uncriticized representatives. And the people showed their zeal by the enormous contributions of money and plate made to enable parliament to equip its armies, while the Puritans and Presbyterians were found to make soldiers whose superiors were never seen.

From the first of the war the king looked to Roman Catholic Ireland, and the parliament to Presbyterian Scotland, for aid, which further inclined the English to the Scottish faith, with whose adherents Charles I. always confounded all Puritans. The Presbyterians, seeing their religion at stake, were from the first the king's most active, intelligent and efficient opponents, and some historians think that for years they were working cautiously and persistently towards making Presbyterianism the established faith of Britain. The chief causes of the English revolution are by every historian of note admitted to be religious, and Charles I. was ruined mainly through his devotion to the hierarchy, while on the other hand England owed her deliverance from civil oppression to the revolting Presbyterians who become her leaders. And the revolution would have gone further had it stayed in their hands. As Goldsmith tells us, the Presbyterians were the conservatives of the peoples' party, who wanted a limited constitutional monarchy as the outcome of the struggle. On August 3, 1642, the Scotch commissioners at London memorialized parliament as to Scotland's wish for "religious uniformity and church union on a Bible basis." Early in 1643 a Presbyterian minister, Mr. Alex. Henderson, represented the parliament and people when he went to Oxford to treat with King Charles and seek to terminate the war, and was

amused at the confidence with which the Episcopal divines sought to convert him to Prelacy. But that vigorous effort at conversion was an illustration of the recognized weight of the Presbyterians now in national affairs. And so in June, 1643, the Westminster Assembly of Divines met, convened by that great parliament which had arrested the tyranny of the Stuart Kings and restored and extended liberties of Britons. England was free and England was Presbyterian.

It was in the midst of the great struggle for liberty, and at the time when the authority of the Bible was supreme, and England and Scotland were one great Bible class, and the Puritan was seeking to realize on earth the Holy Kingdom of Heaven, and when man demanded a "thus saith the Lord" as a settlement of every question, that these men gathered at Westminster to draw forth from the Word of God the true doctrine and polity of the visible church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

J. C. MALLOY.

Maysville, Ky.

V. SOME SALIENT FEATURES OF PRESBY- TERIAN DOCTRINE.

We shall all agree that the great end to be aimed at by those connected with any branch of the church is to seek to be well instructed in the doctrines and practices of that branch of it with which they are identified. We may rightly assume that the church member who is most fully informed in regard to his own and other churches, is least likely to be bigoted and sectarian, and that he will be the readiest to acknowledge the good there is in other churches, and to rejoice at the same time in their prosperity. In like manner it may be safely said that he who is most intelligently devoted to his own church, and who does most for her best welfare will be found doing most in the long run to advance Christ's cause in the world. It is ignorance that begets sectarianism, and we may be sure that loose church relations mean little work for the Master. This being the case, we may rightly rejoice in every opportunity given us to understand more fully the doctrines and practices of the church with which we are identified.

The Reformed churches holding the Presbyterian system have a communing membership of nearly 5,000,000 which represents a population of about 25,000,000, scattered throughout the whole world. The history of these bodies is an honorable one, and their influence for good has ever been potent. In the sphere of education, in the matter of civil and religious liberty, in the work of Foreign Missions, and in the production of religious literature, these churches have a record of which they need not be ashamed.

But our present theme limits us to the doctrinal contents of our own beloved Presbyterian system, and engages our attention with some of its outstanding features, so that many

inviting and more popular aspects of our noble system must be passed by as we keep closely to our theme.

By Presbyterian doctrine is to be understood the general system of religious truth which is set forth in the Reformed or Calvinistic Creeds, as distinguished from the Romish, the Lutheran, and the Arminian schemes of doctrine. This general system is embodied, with more or less completeness, in many Confessions and Catechisms. It is represented by the Swiss, Dutch and French Reformed or Presbyterian systems. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Churches, with some slight exceptions, are Calvinistic. The Welsh Methodists are also Calvinistic, as their title, Calvinistic Methodists, indicates. The regular Baptists, especially in the South, are strongly Calvinistic in their views of Christian doctrine, and the Congregationalists, both in England and New England, were originally of the same well defined type of doctrine. But in none of the great creeds is this system so clearly and completely exhibited as in our own Confession of Faith and Catechisms, known as the Westminster Standards. It is the outline of this system, therefore, which we are now to have before us in our discussion.

The salient features of Presbyterian doctrine have often been identified with what are called the five points of Calvinism, which some people think are exceedingly sharp points. To refresh our memories, these five points may be briefly stated. The first is entire depravity, which means that man in his natural state is apostate, guilty, and wholly unable to save himself. The second is the unconditional election which teaches that God's choice of the heirs of life and salvation is not conditioned upon anything in them, but is of his good pleasure. The third is particular redemption, which implies that though certain general benefits come to all men through Christ, yet Christ obeyed and died specially to redeem particularly and completely all those given to him by the Father. The fourth is efficacious grace, which

holds that the special renewing grace of the Holy Spirit is operative in the regeneration of the elect. The fifth and last is final perseverance, which announces that all those who are elected, redeemed and regenerated, shall surely persevere unto life eternal.

It is admitted that this is a true delineation of the main features of the Calvinistic system, as they stand over against Arminianism, but the statement of the five points scarcely expresses the whole scope of the Calvinistic system, which is, as we hope to show in this address, exceedingly comprehensive. Moreover, these five points, on the negative side, ought rather to be called the five points of Arminianism, for they were really formulated by the Arminians of Holland, as a remonstrance against the doctrinal conclusions of the Synod of Dort, which were consistently Calvinistic. In addition, our Presbyterian Standards are not framed according to the plan of the five points, but are broader.

We have often thought, therefore, that it is a real pity that the debate between Calvinism and other systems has been cast along the lines marked out by these five points, for the reason mainly that the Calvinism of our Westminster Standard, in its maturity, symmetry and completeness is a distinct advance upon that of the Synod of Dort, in 1618-1619, A. D. This being the case, it may be better in this discussion not to follow the plan of the five points, though the doctrines implied in these points will at times be under consideration. We may gain in completeness of view and thoroughness of treatment if we mark out another line of discussion. In addition, if we were to follow the beaten track of the five points, we would almost surely project the discussion along the lines of burning controversy, which we do not think is desirable in an exposition such as we now desire to make. Hence, to secure completeness of treatment, and to avoid unnecessary controversy, we shall follow another plan in dealing with the

salient points of our Presbyterian doctrine. In following out this plan, we shall first call attention to some general aspects of our doctrinal system which are well defined; and secondly, we shall follow this up by a discussion of some special features of Presbyterian doctrine which are apt in some cases to be overlooked, but which constitute its peculiar excellency.

I. SOME GENERAL SALIENT ASPECTS OF PRESBYTERIAN DOCTRINE.

I. The very first of these is the remarkable scripturalness of our doctrine.

This is a striking feature of our creed when compared with almost any other, for in so many cases these other creeds err either by excess or defect. But our Standards, above all others, honor the Word of God. This appears in the fact that both the Confession and the Catechisms give the Holy Scriptures a first place in their plan. The first chapter in the Confession and the opening questions of both Catechisms speak of the inspired Word of God. Then our whole system of doctrine is drawn from this divine treasury of religious truth and teachings. The great doctrines are often expressed in our Standards in the very language of the Holy Scriptures, and all through they breathe the true spirit of the Word of God.

It is well to keep this fact in mind, for it is sometimes asserted that Presbyterian doctrine is speculative rather than scriptural in its nature. Such a judgment is, to say the least, hasty, and betrays a painful lack of knowledge concerning the way in which our system of doctrine was formulated, as well as of the actual contents of the system itself. A moment's reflection will show this, and at the same time will reveal the wonderful scripturalness of our whole system. When we go back to the Reformation we find that there was in it a breaking away from scholasticism, with its speculative theology, and a return to the direct

study of the Scriptures. Luther's great and abiding work was his translation of the Bible into the German tongue. Calvin in his great commentaries did little more than expound Holy Scripture, and his Institutes is as fine a specimen of biblical theology as we find anywhere. Knox in all his labors was constantly preaching and expounding the Holy Scriptures.

The history of the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, which framed our Standard, with so much care, and the directions given to that body show plainly that the Assembly was to lay all human philosophy aside, and that they were either to directly deduce their doctrines from the Word of God, or to plainly prove them by that infallible rule. Nothing was allowed a place in our Standards which was not fully sustained by the Holy Scriptures. Hence we find that none of the philosophies of their own day, nor of the ancient times is to be discovered in our creed. It is orderly and systematic, one might say scientific, in its form, but the domination of no philosophy in any way appears in it. The authors of our Standards were bound by no human speculations, but they bowed reverently before the Word of God.

Further, all inspection of the Standards themselves shows very plainly that oftentimes the very form and phrase of Scripture is woven into the fabric of our system. Open the Confession at any chapter or the Catechisms at any question, and you will find this fact to be self-evident. Even at those places where we would naturally expect the flavor of speculation, we find that the Scriptures themselves often provide the form, and always the materials of the doctrinal statements which are made. Only a few examples can be cited to illustrate and confirm this fact. In the second chapter of the Confession which treats of God and the Trinity, the whole statements of the nature and attributes of God are just phrases from the Word of God. The proof texts make it very plain. So in the eighth chapter, which

has for its subject, Christ the Mediator, we find clause after clause taken almost directly from the Scriptures, and woven together with much skill. In the statement of Effectual Calling in the tenth chapter, the four factors of conviction, enlightenment, renewal and persuasion are all taken from the Word of God. The same is true in regard to justification, sanctification, faith and repentance. The language of our creed is cast again and again in the very form of Holy Scripture. This fact is one of the marked features of our system of doctrine. The result is that no branch of the Church has done more to honor and use the Word of God than the Presbyterian. Let no one, therefore, imagine the Presbyterian doctrine is not "founded on and agreeable to the Word of God." There is no creed more scriptural.

2. A second main salient feature of the Presbyterian system of doctrine is its comprehensiveness.

Our doctrines are sometimes said to be very rigid and narrow, and those who adhere to them are often called strict and stern. The strait-laced Presbyterian is almost a by-word, while it is really a compliment. So far as doctrinal statement is concerned, our system is definite, and gives forth no uncertain sound. And it is strict in the type of morality which it prescribes for the conduct of the Christian man. There is an ethical virility about our system which produces a healthy Puritanism in all the relations of life. But to assert that the type of Presbyterian doctrine found in our creed lacks in breadth of vision, or is narrow in the horizon of its outlook is as far from the reality as anything could well be.

The system of doctrine which we hold centers in, and radiates from, the eternal purpose of an omnipotent, omniscient and holy God. All things are from him, through him, and for him. He is the source and end of all there is, and such a doctrine cannot be narrow in its outlook. In a word, it is as comprehensive as the wide sweep of that

eternal purpose according to which all things come to pass.

Hence it is that our system is a sound philosophy, based on the Scriptures, of the origin and continued existence of the universe. God is its author and ruler. All the processes of nature are but the operation, through what we call second causes, of the wise agency of Almighty God. The laws of nature are but an expression of the presence and purpose of God. The discovery of these laws becomes the process of tracing out the thoughts and activity of God, for, according to our doctrine, God is in constant contact with all the complex movements of nature. Hence whenever modern science correctly unfolds and interprets the mysteries of the universe, it but reveals, to some extent, God's modes of working out, in this sphere, his all-embracing plan. And the more fully the unity and continuity of nature is exhibited by scientific inquiry the more plainly will it appear that Calvinism is the true philosophy of nature, and that it has nothing to fear from reverent scientific research. Calvinism is scientific and comprehensive in its views of nature.

The same is true of what our doctrine teaches concerning God's providential oversight of men, as it appears in human history. All through this history it discovers a moral purpose. It teaches that no event is entirely isolated, but has relation to some extent with all other events. It asserts that nothing happens by chance, and that everything is but the unfolding of an eternal plan which moves steadily towards the goal of its consummation. Efficiently or permissively God's purpose is held to have relation to every event which occurs in the history of mankind. Here again the broad reach of our doctrine is evident.

But further, our doctrine is not only the philosophy of the universe, and of human history, it is also the complete philosophy of redemption, resting on the basis of God's Word.. Over against sin which was foreseen and yet permitted by God, and at the same time is bounded and con-

trolled by him, the plan of redemption was provided. In the eternal purpose of God this purpose or plan was made ; it is wrought out in the progress of time, and it shall in due season be fully consummated. Sin was not an incident which took the Almighty by surprise ; nor is the gospel remedy for sin a mere after-thought of God, to which he was driven by the unexpected machinations of Satan. According to our doctrine, the purpose of God in its far-reaching sweep includes all that has been done, all that is now in progress, and all that shall yet be brought to pass in the unfolding of the wonders of redeeming wisdom and saving grace. Who, then, shall say that our system of doctrine has a narrow outlook, or lacks in breadth of vision ? It puts the observer on a lofty mountain top, and enables him to command a wide view of the whole horizon of God's eternal purpose.

In addition, our doctrine presents a noble ideal of the individual Christian man. He is looked upon as an object of divine regard from all eternity, as the subject of saving grace in this life, and as an heir of glory in the world to come. It first makes him a free man in Christ in this life, and then it enables him more and more to attain unto the ideal of that character which requires the reproduction of the image of God. And not only for the individual, but also for the family, and for the State as well, our Calvinistic doctrine has its broad and elevating teaching. In a word, this doctrine is the true philosophy of man, redeemed man, in all the relations in which he is to stand. Its great principles, so clearly wrought out in American Presbyterianism, and nowhere more consistently held than in our branch of that great family, its great principles of a free Church in a free State, and of the rights of the individual conscience are of the utmost importance. To these principles, held by Presbyterians everywhere, the world owes a debt of lasting gratitude, for they are at once the watchword and the guarantee of civil and religious liberty among us.

Such then, in brief, is the comprehensiveness of our system. It is the profound philosophy of nature, of human history and of the individual man, in all his domestic, civil and religious relations.

3. A third general salient feature of our system is its Catholicity of spirit.

Our system is often charged with a narrow spirit, and with an unkindly temper. But a little consideration will reveal the true temper of our system to be generous and kindly to all men, specially towards all who are of the household of faith in the widest sense. This catholicity relates to that spirit of generous fellowship among all Christians which our system constantly inculcates. This catholic, or universal spirit of recognized brotherhood among all who love the Lord Jesus Christ is one of the noblest features of our system. This feature appears in the very terms of our creed, as, for example, in the definition of the visible Church, and in the description given of the communion of saints in the Confession of Faith. "The visible Church consists of all these, throughout the whole world who profess the true religion, together with their children."¹ "All saints, being united to Christ, are united to one another in love and have communion in each others' gifts and graces and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good."² And "this communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus."³

These great statements of the Confession guide Presbyterians in all their relations with their brethren in other churches, and out of them grows that intelligent catholicity of spirit which appears among Presbyterians every-

¹Confession of Faith: Chapter xxv: 2.

²Ibid, Chapter xxvi: 1.

³Ibid, Chapter xxvi: 2.

where. We, consequently, hold no close communion views, and we exclude no one from Christian fellowship who is in good standing in any evangelical church. Further, we receive members from other churches on presentation of their credentials, and thereby recognize their ecclesiastical standing as complete. We also receive ministers from other evangelical churches without re-ordination, if they have the educational qualifications, and accept our system of doctrine, and in this way we recognize the validity of their orders. We can, with perfect consistency, unite in any proper inter-denominational movement, such as the work of the Bible Society, or the Young Men's Christian Association, and transgress no principle of our system. We even go so far as to invite to the Lord's Table all those who love the Lord Jesus Christ, who have made profession of faith in him, and who are in regular standing in their own churches. Surely these, and other facts which might be mentioned, amply reveal the broad and consistent catholicity of our doctrine and practice. We rightly maintain a healthy and vigorous denominationalism, yet we refuse to be dominated by any narrow sectarianism. Presbyterians have often been persecuted for Christ's sake, but they have seldom persecuted others.

In no spirit of boasting or self-praise it may be added that for all interdenominational and public educational and philanthropic schemes Presbyterians in this land, and in every land, give of time, and energy, and money more than their share. Moody is reported to have said that if he wanted \$100,000 for any good cause, he would expect to get about \$80,000 of it from the Presbyterians. This is just what we would expect from the practical effects of our doctrine of the visible church, and of the terms of communion which we hold. Hence, both doctrinally and practically, our Presbyterianism breathes no narrow spirit, but is as generous and catholic in its temper as is the love and mercy of God.

4. A fourth general salient feature of our system is its symmetry, or well balanced harmony of parts.

This is an exceedingly attractive feature of our doctrine, especially to thoughtful and logical minds. Some care is needed here to have a right understanding of our system, for it is sometimes charged that it is one-side and extreme, and needs some toning down. It is also hinted in certain quarters that our system gives undue emphasis to certain points, and these points are at best obscure or mysterious. Against all such allegations we are prepared to maintain that our system is wonderfully symmetrical, and possesses a harmonious balance in all its parts such as is to be found in no other system. There is nothing one-sided about it, and it puts the emphasis just where God has put it in His Word. It is this striking feature of our doctrine which has always made it attractive to the most thoughtful minds. The experience and testimony of Dr. Thornwell and Dr. Girardeau, neither of whom was reared a Presbyterian, but both of whom became devoted adherents of our system, as the result of their own investigations in their mature years, fully confirms the claim we are now making.

In this connection it should be carefully noted that the contrast between Calvinism and Arminianism is not always clearly conceived. It is sometimes said that Calvinism views the facts and doctrines of the scheme of grace from the divine side chiefly, and that Arminianism regards them mainly from the human point of view. Then it is hinted that both of these are defective, and that the truth lies somewhere between them. To this way of putting the contrast between typical Arminianism and generic Calvinism we cannot agree. Such a way of putting the contrast would be true only of Arminianism, and supralapsarian Calvinism. But this is not the Calvinism of our creed, nor was this type really held by Calvin, nor is it found in any of the Reformed or Calvinistic creeds. Only a few writers from time to time have been supralapsarians. Generic Cal-

vinism as represented by our Westminster Standards is a well balanced middle view, which avoids the extremes just stated, and relates the human and divine factors in the scheme of grace just as God has related them in His Word. In this way our doctrine balances the sovereignty of God and human freedom, and gives to each its proper sphere, only subordinating the human to the divine as the Scriptures teach, and as the relation between creator and creature demands.

If the Arminian so exalts human freedom as to limit God's sovereignty, and if the supralapsarian so emphasises divine sovereignty as to impair human freedom, our system gives both their proper place, and holds that human freedom is a fact, and yet God governs through that freedom. By the operation of efficacious grace the sinner is made able and willing to believe and obey the Gospel, and in this way all the conditions of human freedom are preserved. At the same time the operation of this grace is in accordance with God's eternal and sovereign purpose wrought out by the Holy Spirit, and thus all the requirements of divine sovereignty are secured. Moreover, we do not feel ourselves under any obligation to reconcile divine sovereignty and human freedom at all their points of contact. But we do feel bound to hold both together, because each is fully attested by its own unimpeachable evidence in experience and in Scripture. Most earnestly, therefore, do we claim for our system a symmetry and balanced consistency at this central point of view.

This same symmetry and cautious moderation appears at various crucial points in the details of our system. It does not commit us to positions of doubtful controversy, round which theologians have waged fierce warfare. The doctrines of the Trinity and of the Deity of Christ are stated in such a reserved and careful manner as to show but little trace of the burning controversies which have raged round these cardinal doctrines. In regard to the nature of man,

theologians have earnestly debated whether his constitution is dual or triple ; that is, whether man is made up of two essences, body and soul, or of three, body, soul and spirit. But our standards do not absolutely commit us to one or the other of these positions. The same is true in regard to the view taken of the connection between Adam and the human race, and especially in regard to the way in which the whole race has become sinful by reason of Adam's apostacy. Touching this point there has been endless, and often bitter, controversy, and perhaps the debate can never be finally settled. But our system takes a careful and consistent middle view here, and avoids extremes. The Pelagian, on the one hand, denies that there is any moral connection between Adam and the race in the matter of sin, and hence he can give no good account of universal sin among men. The realist, on the other hand, so merges the race in Adam in the matter of sin, that the basis of individual responsibility for each man is virtually destroyed. But our system, holding both the natural and federal headship of Adam, presents an admirable middle view, which fully accounts for the facts of sin, and does ample justice to the teachings of God's Word upon the matter of sin. In like manner our system teaches a symmetrical middle view in regard to that central doctrine known as the atonement. Upon this vital doctrine our system plainly teaches the vicarious and sacrificial nature of the obedience and death of Christ, by which an adequate moral equivalent for our sin was rendered to the law and justice of God. Thus the superficial extreme of the example and moral influence views of the atonement are avoided, and it equally guards against the other excessively literal view known as the commercial theory. At every point, therefore, our doctrine has moderation and symmetry. It is irenical on all points where extremes appear.

But nowhere does this moderation and symmetry appear more clearly than in the doctrine of the Church, and of her

government under Christ the head thereof. Here one of the great excellencies of our system appears. In our system we find the headship of Christ, the functions of the rulers in the Church, and the rights and privileges of the members of the Church all related to each other in the most harmonious and symmetrical way. The result is that the honor of Christ, the delegated authority of the rulers in the Church, and the rights and liberties of the people under their spiritual rule, are all finely balanced over against each other. In this way the centralization of all forms of Episcopacy, on the one hand, and the individualism of all types of Independency on the other, are happily escaped, by the fine balance which our system maintains between the corporate unity of the whole, and the individual liberty of the parts. Here order and freedom, rule and liberty, are finely blended.

But, further, this fine balance and symmetry of parts appear in the practical working of our system of polity, with its gradation of representative courts in the church. If, for example, any member feels that he did not get justice in a trial before the session of his local church, he can appeal to the Presbytery, and from the Presbytery to the Synod, and again from the Synod to the General Assembly. In this way he has every possible opportunity to secure an impartial hearing, and to obtain full justice at the hands of the courts of the Church, as, under Christ the Head, these courts represent the body of his people, and administer the power lodged primarily in that body. Surely Presbyterianism is symmetrical, and an eirenicon between Episcopacy and Independency. In it both Scripture and common sense are to be found.

Thus the four salient general features of our doctrinal system have been outlined. It has been seen that our system is Scriptural, comprehensive, catholic and symmetrical to a remarkable degree. Now for the rest of our time we shall give attention to some special salient features of our system.

II. SOME SPECIAL SALIENT FEATURES OF OUR SYSTEM.

Many of these special features might be selected, but time permits the consideration of only a few on this occasion. In making choice of certain features of our system, we shall be guided by two considerations. The one is the importance and value of the points themselves considered, and the other is the necessity of giving proper emphasis to certain features of our system which are sometimes partially obscured. By the guidance of these two considerations, we shall try to give a brief exhibit of some particular aspects of our doctrines, which may place them before our minds in their proper proportions.

1. First of all the Sovereignty of God is a special feature of our system which merits attention first of all. This sovereignty consists in the unerring oversight and almighty control of all things by the all-powerful and ever wise agency of the one living and true God. He is high over all blessed for evermore. He worketh all things according to the counsel of his own will. One doctrine puts us on our guard against narrow ways of thinking at this point. If we are not mistaken this tendency to narrowness of vision sometimes appears even among the adherents of Calvinism. We shall not be misunderstood when we say that we are inclined to think that the precious fact of election, or the choice of the heirs of salvation is sometimes so pushed into the foreground that at least a wrong angle of vision for the whole vista of God's sovereignty is obtained. Election is a vital and very precious component part of our system, but it is not the fundamental fact in the Reformed doctrine, as exhibited in our Standards.

The sovereignty of God is the basal fact and the structural principle of the entire system. That sovereignty exhibits itself in various ways in the carrying out of God's all-embracing purpose or plan, known as his decrees, according to which He foreordains whatsoever comes to pass. This sovereignty is operative in his rule over the various

activities of nature, where each form of existence is governed according to the nature, and in harmony with the laws which God has prescribed. It also emerges in his moral government over men and angels, even over fallen men and angels. It appears very definitely in the arena of redemption, where God's purpose to save by the appointed remedy the heirs of salvation, is properly termed election. The elect are chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and were given to Christ by the Father to be His seed. In due time they are redeemed by him, and one by one they are effectually called by the Holy Spirit, and are thus brought into vital union with Christ. In this way they come into possession of the benefits of Christ's redemption, and in due time they are finally made meet for heaven. Thus the sovereignty of God is seen to be the central principle of our system, and that election is the application of this principle in the sphere of redemption.

Let it never be forgotten that the scope of this central principle of our system is very extensive. It embraces all nature, and extends along the entire current of human history. It includes the entire of the operation of God's redeeming grace among men, and it extends its wide sweep over all the institutions and activities of mankind. Almighty God, whose sovereignty is over all, is King of kings and Lord of lords, as well as King and Lawgiver in Zion. The powers that be in civil government are ordained of God, and the affairs of all the nations are under his providential control. In the Headship of Christ also over his Church, and over all other things in relation to and for the benefit of the Church, we have an important mediatorial aspect of this sovereignty. Such then is the basal fact in our system, the very core of our scheme of doctrine. Before a holy and mighty God, who is sovereign supreme and gracious, our system bids bow with profound reverence, godly fear and filial trust.

2. A second special salient feature of our system is the

large place it gives to the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.

This is one of the salient features of our system which is often obscured in its interpretation. When the proposal was made, by our sister church a few years ago, to revise the Confession of Faith, it was seriously proposed by some to add something more definite in regard to the Holy Spirit and his activity. Such a proposal betrayed ignorance of the fact that our Standards do lay great stress upon this very matter, for a little careful study will show that the agency of the Holy Spirit is assumed all through the Confession and Catechisms. Follow me for a little, in an attempt to lift this salient feature of our system into its proper place of honor in it.

First of all, the Holy Spirit is the divine originator of Holy Scripture by revelation and inspiration.¹ At the same time the full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority of the Word of God is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit.² And in addition the inward illumination of the same spirit is necessary for the saving understanding of what is revealed in the Scriptures.³ And, to crown all, the Supreme judge in matters of religion is the Holy Spirit speaking in the Word.⁴

Then in creation and providence the Holy Spirit has part with the Father and the Son.⁵ He is the Executive of the Godhead in these spheres. Under the Old Testament dispensation the operation of the Holy Spirit instructed and built up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah through whom they had salvation.⁶ Then in constituting the person of Christ as the God-man through the incarnation, the

¹Confession of Faith, Chapter 1:2-3.

²Ibid, Chapter 1:5.

³Ibid, Chapter 1:6.

⁴Ibid, Chapter 1:10.

⁵Ibid, Chapter IV:1.

⁶Ibid, Chapter VII:6.

Holy Spirit performed an exceedingly important part.¹ And then, all through our Lord's public ministry he was annointed with the Holy Spirit above measure.²

In like manner our system gives great prominence to the work of the Holy Spirit in connection with the way by which the benefits of Christ's redemption are applied to its subjects, at the very first stage, effectual calling, by which the elect are united to Christ, is by the Word and Spirit of Christ.³ And all subsequent quickening and spiritual removal are due to the working of the same spirit.⁴ Then Sanctification throughout is by means of the Word and Spirit of God dwelling in believers.⁵ And it is by the agency of the same Spirit that they are enabled to die into sin and to live unto righteousness.⁶ And not only so, but the exercise of saving faith is the result of the work of the Spirit in the hearts of those who believe.⁷ And repentance also is a saving grace wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Word and Spirit of God.⁸ And still more, good works are simply the fruits of the Spirit, who dwelling in believers, works in them both to will and to do of God's good pleasure, as they, in turn, strive to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling.⁹ Perseverance also is the result of the abiding of the Spirit and seed of God in the heirs of salvation.¹⁰ And assurance of salvation is the product of the Spirit of adoption, Who is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption.¹¹ And, to crown all, the sacraments are made effectual, as a means of grace, and as channels of spiritual good, only by the

¹Ibid, Chapter VIII:2.

²Ibid, Chapter VIII:3.

³Ibid, Chapter X:I.

⁴Ibid, Chapter X:2.

⁵Ibid, Chapter XIII:I.

⁶Larger Catechism, Question 75.

⁷Confession of Faith, Chapter xiv: 1.

⁸Ibid, Chapter xv: 2.

⁹Ibid, Chapter xvi: 3.

¹⁰Ibid, Chapter xvii: 2.

¹¹Ibid, Chapter xviii: 2.

working of the Holy Spirit in the heart.¹ And the preaching of the word has efficacy unto salvation and edification, only as it is blessed to spiritual and saving results by the Holy Spirit.²

We may rightly conclude, therefore, that we do but simple justice to our standards when we recognize the place of honorable prominence which they give to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. We need no new doctrine upon this vital point. We only need in our thought and teaching to rise up to the lofty doctrine of our system in regard to the person and activity of the Holy Spirit.

3. A third special salient feature of our system is the profound view it gives of the unity of the human race, especially in its moral aspects and relations.

The moral unity of the human race as taught in our system gives the key to solve not a few problems in anthropology, and it affords the best philosophy of the race sin of mankind ever set forth. The pressing question of the ages and of every philosophy is the origin of sin. And a particular query under this great question is as to how the whole race seems to have fallen under its awful effects. The patent fact is that sin rests universally upon the race. All men seem to be born into the world with a moral history behind them, so that they, from the first lie under dire evils for which they are not directly responsible, and from which they are unable to set themselves free.

The question then is, how are these evils and man's sad state under them to be explained in harmony with the justice and goodness of God? This is the problem of every theodicy. Shall we with the Pelagian deny the reality of the apostasy of the race through the sin of Adam, and hold that each generation comes into the world practically in the same moral condition as Adam was when created? Or must we,

¹Confession of Faith, Chapter xxvii: 3.

²Ibid, Larger Catechism, Question 155.

with Origen and some others, suppose that men had a moral probation in a pre-existent state of some sort in which they failed to stand the conditions of that probation; and as a penal consequence for this failure they were condemned to be born into this world in that sinful and disabled condition in which they unhappily find themselves. Or shall we assert, with the Realist and others, that the individuals of the race are all so bound up together in one, and were so actually one in Adam as a single substance or as a unitary nature that they were really present and actually sinned in and with Adam, in such a way that when they come into the world they have a sinful moral history behind them, and the penalty of sin upon them.

Now a little reflection will serve to show that all these attempts to explain the problem are ineffectual, and are cumbered with various difficulties. The Pelagian not only ignores scripture but goes squarely in the face of the facts of human experience, when he asserts that men come into this world with no such moral disabilities as lead them invariably into sin. The pre-existence theory is a pure speculation, which has no Scripture to support it, and is ever hampered by the fact that no man has any memory of any such an important moral experience as this pre-existent probation implies. And the realistic theory in all its forms is at best quite vague, and is in danger of providing no proper basis for the personality and responsibility of individual men.

But what about our own system on this knotty point? Can it supply a better solution of this great question? We assert with a good deal of confidence that our system can give a better solution than any of these mentioned. Its answer does justice to the teachings of Scripture and to the facts of experience. It regards Adam as the natural root and federal head of the whole race. As the root of the race he is the source or fountain whence all the individuals of the race of mankind have come by natural descent. As the federal head of the race he acted as the representative

of the race which was regarded as a moral constitutive unity in him, in such a manner that the personality and responsibility of the individuals of the race are in no way impaired. Moreover, the natural rootship of Adam accounts for heredity depravity, and his federal headship lays the basis for imputed guilt. By this means all the facts of guilt and depravity, as they rest on the race, can be reasonably explained. Guilt is imputed as liability to penalty, so that the evils under which the race lies have a proper ethical basis given them. Depravity is inherited, and in this way all the facts of human experience which modern science is bringing out in regard to heredity in the moral sphere are accounted for. In addition, the very latest conclusions of sociological research which discovers a corporate unity and organic solidarity in the human race are in perfect harmony with our doctrine at this point. Hence in our doctrine here, which is an expression of Scripture teaching, we find that it is in full accord with the latest conclusions of reliable science.

Hence our doctrine of race unity in relation to Adam and of race sin by reason of his apostasy is only Scriptural and rational, but it harmonizes with the very latest results of modern science in regard to the inbeing of the race in Adam, and in regard to the racial basis for some of the profound features of original sin. Moreover, the stress which our system lays upon the heinousness of sin and of man's helplessness under it, but magnifies the glory of the wisdom and grace which delivers from its dreadful bondage, and cleanses from its debasing pollution.

4. A fourth striking special feature of our system is the large place it gives to the activity of Jesus Christ as the Mediator of the Covenant of Grace and the Redeemer of His people.

This mediatorial and redeeming activity of Christ in the world is the central fact of the gospel, and very diverse views are held as to its nature and scope. These views will largely determine the type of theology and of religious life

which appears in any branch of the church. Our system is exceedingly rich and complete in its teaching on this vital point, and we may be sure that so long as we remain true to this teaching we cannot but continue to be thoroughly evangelical.

According to our doctrine the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ, or of God through Christ, is exercised in three distinct yet closely related ways. Our system finds these three in the Scriptures, and it gives full scope to each of them, and yet blends them all harmoniously in Christ's mediatorial work as our divine Redeemer.

He is the prophet of the covenant of grace. In this capacity He is the teacher sent from God, and as such he makes known to men God's will for their salvation. In this aspect of his redeeming activity he is the revealer and the revelation of God in all the ages. During the Old Testament period and prior to his personal advent among men, He, through the prophets and institutions of the Old Testament, revealed the purposes and will of God. During his earthly career, especially in the period of his public ministry, he was the medium of the revelation of and from God. Then since his ascension to the right hand of the Father, all saving truth in all the ages has been, and is still mediated by Him. Thus our system lays great stress upon the revealing and teaching functions of Jesus Christ, and we go heartily with those who make a great deal of this aspect of his saving work.

Again, his redeeming activity appears in the fact that He is also the priest of the covenant. As such He offered up himself once for all a true sacrifice for our sins, and he continues, as our advocate with the Father, to make continual intercession for all those who look unto Him for salvation and hope. Here one of the cardinal aspects of Christ's redeeming activity appears. He saves men not merely as a divine prophet, or as a teacher sent from God, by means of the truth, or by his splendid example alone. As a true

priest and offering for sin, He saves us by atoning for the guilt of our sins, and by rendering such an advocacy on our behalf before God as we require. To this end he kept the law perfectly, and thus obtained righteousness for us; and He suffered under the law and thereby removed the penalty from us, and so laid the ground for the pardon and acceptance as righteous of all who come to God by Him. This priestly activity is sacrificial and vicarious in its nature, so that thereby God is rendered propitious, and our guilt is expiated. Then on the basis of this satisfaction, that aspect of his redeeming activity known as his intercession is conducted. According to our system this saving priestly activity of Jesus Christ is continually operative through all the ages. He is our great High Priest who has passed into the heavens, and He ever liveth to make intercession for us. This is a vital aspect of our doctrinal system, and is to be held fast.

Once more, Christ's redeeming activity is further exercised in the kingly rule which He maintains and administers over his church, and over all other things in relation to the church, and for its welfare. All power or authority is given unto Him in heaven and on earth; and in a manner which men are too slow fully to realize. He sits on the throne of mediatorial rule, and sways that sceptre of universal dominion, which shall eventually cause every knee to bow to him, and shall make even his enemies his footstool. His is a universal umpire, and it is destined to be world-wide in due season.

This then is the wide three-fold scope of the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ as set forth in our system. On the basis of the covenant, and for the sphere of redemption our system is Christo-centric, though its wider aspects are theocentric. Its salient feature here is that it exalts Christ. It may be safely said that no other system does such justice to the teaching of Scripture in reference to the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ among men. He is at once the prophet, the priest and the king of the covenant of grace,

and as its mediator He performs necessary redeeming services for all those who come to God by Him. As prophet He issues the Gospel message and makes known the terms of salvation, as priest He makes good the conditions of salvation, ratifying the covenant by His blood, and making intercession, and as king He dispenses and applies the benefits of the covenant by his Word and Spirit. And with wonderful adaptation to the needs of sinful men all of this activity is perfectly suited to meet that need. As prophet He instructs their ignorance, and gives them the knowledge of the way of life, as priest He atones for their sins and brings them acceptably to God, and as king He subdues them to himself, rules over them with a gentle sway and defends them with his almighty arm. Whatever may eventually be thought of Christ's threefold activity as redeemer, it is evident that no system that leaves any one of them out or fails to blend them together in its teaching can ever be scripturally complete, or suitably adapted to the needs of men, who need a Saviour from sin. We lay a great deal of stress upon this salient feature of our system.

5. A fifth notable salient feature of our doctrine is the unique place which it gives to the Spiritual Fatherhood of God, and the Spiritual Sonship of believers.

The doctrine of adoption contained in our system deserves special notice, for it is one of the salient features of our system which is in danger of being obscured at the present day. Indeed, there seems to be a good deal of confusion and some exaggeration among modern theologians in regard to the whole subject of the Fatherhood of God, the sonship of believers in Christ, and brotherhood of believers thereby. A clear understanding of the doctrine of our system on this point would remove the confusion, relieve the exaggeration, and give simple scriptural ideas upon the whole subject in its threefold aspects of Fatherhood, Sonship and Brotherhood.

In the Scriptures, according to our system, God is repre-

sented as Father in three distinct senses. First in a trinitarian sense He is the Father of his only begotten Son; secondly, in a natural sense as the Father of all his creatures by creation; and, thirdly, in a spiritual sense as the Father of all those who truly believe upon his Son, Jesus Christ. Our doctrine clearly recognizes these three senses, and in doing so, gives a well defined place to spiritual Fatherhood and Sonship. To as many as believe upon his Son, Jesus Christ, God gives the right or authority to become the sons or children of God by that faith. They thereby receive the spirit of adoption whereby they are able to cry Abba, Father. Hence to confound this spiritual Fatherhood with mere natural fatherhood is to do serious injustice to the full teaching of Scripture, and to rob spiritual Fatherhood and Sonship of half its preciousness. On the other hand to confound spiritual sonship entirely with either justification or regeneration, both of which it certainly implies, is to introduce an element of confusion from another source. Our system, with its doctrine of adoption and spiritual sonship, strikes the happy medium here in an admirable way. It gives a separate place for the fact of spiritual sonship of all true believers. This it does on the firm basis of those Scriptures which speak of believers as Sons of God, as His children, and as being the heirs of an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled and unfading.

We lay special stress on this fact. It may be that some theologians have given reason for the emphasis which is given to the Fatherhood of God in recent theological thought, for they have not done justice to the doctrine of adoption. All that is needed is a fair and sympathetic interpretation of our own system at this point. Such an interpretation will bring out all the excellency of our doctrine, and will show that it needs really no new additions to do justice to the Fatherhood of God.

6. A sixth well marked feature of our system is the solid

basis which it provides for the entire security of all God's children, as members of the household of faith.

Few things in our noble system of doctrine are more valuable in themselves, or more cheering and comforting to believers than its teaching in regard to the assured and stable security of all those who have laid hold of the hope set before them in the Gospel. It teaches that all who are truly united with Christ, and really regenerated, shall certainly retain the seed of spiritual life in their souls, and that they may rest secure in the assurance that the work of grace will be carried on till complete. Or, to put it in another way, all those who by faith in Christ are justified, regenerated and adopted, are thereby placed in a relation of abiding favor and acceptance with God, through the merit and abiding mediation of Jesus Christ. Hence an abiding relation of favorable acceptance having been established in justification, and an assured state of grace having been originated in regeneration to be continued in sanctification, then neither shall that relation be ever broken or that state of grace ever be destroyed. Thus their security is complete, for the believer is surrounded by the munitions of the divine purpose, has his hope fixed on the merit of Christ, and enjoys at once the protections of God's providence, and the working of grace in his heart. The resources of almighty power and infinite grace are enlisted on his behalf. Christ's work for us, and the Spirit's work in us give ample guarantee of the believer's security. In our rich doctrine of justification, resting on the atoning work of Christ, and in our deep doctrine of regeneration, growing out of the renewing work of the Holy Spirit, we find the firm foundation which is solid rock upon which assured hope may rest.

No other system provides such a basis for the believers security. The mere moralist, professing to stand in his own moral strength on merely legal ground, may at any time fall, and consequently cannot have security, for he has no remedy

for his evil deeds. The Romanist even, trusting for life and salvation to the church cannot have an unfailing sense of security, for misgivings will ever arise as to whether the church really can and actually has so attended to matters that there will be no failures. An infallible God and his infallible Word are more reliable than a professedly infallible church of recent date. And the Arminian, who makes justification consist in pardon of sins only, and not also in acceptance as righteous also on the basis of Christ's righteousness imparted to us cannot provide abiding security for believers. He is liable at all times to the contingency of falling away from the state of grace. In fact, every time the believer sins he must have his justification renewed, and is always in a condition of unstable equilibrium. Hence, if the Arminian is to obtain security he must discover it on the believer's side alone, and this naturally leads to some form of perfectionism wherein believers shall not sin, and hence retain their sense of security and consequent assurance only because they do not fall into sin. It is thus evident that defective views of justification like the Arminian which makes it consist in pardon only, logically lead to falling from grace; and falling from grace renders security and accompanying assurance impossible save on the unscriptural hypothesis of entire sanctification or sinless perfection.

But our doctrine founds the believer's security, not on his character or deeds, but on the complete work of sanctification which Christ rendered and which is made good to him in justification, and on the renewing work of the Holy Spirit in the heart. Thereby his relation to God's law is fixed and secure in the divine favor, and the work of grace is pledged to go on, with all its fluctuations, till the believer is presented faultless and complete in Christ on that great final day. This is our doctrine of the believers security, which grounds his assurance of life and salvation, and pledges his perseverance to the end. We do well to hold fast and rejoice in our strong and comforting doctrine at this point.

7. A seventh salient feature of our system of a special nature is the special stress which it places in ethics, or the practical conduct of life.

We have seen that our system has a clear and comprehensive outline of the Christian doctrines, and we now turn to consider its ethical teaching. If its doctrines are clear cut, its ethical code is likewise quite rigid. This is a feature of our system not always rightly understood. The idea sometimes prevails that our system is hard, stiff doctrine without much reference to the practical conduct of life. That this is far from correct, everyone knows who has studied the exposition of the commandments given in our Catechisms. It is true that our doctrine gives no place to good works as the ground of our salvation, but it very strongly insists on the keeping of the moral law as the rule of conduct for the Christian man. The result of this position is the production of a strong, sturdy set of virtues on a true Gospel basis. The faith is shown by its works.

That this is true is fully confirmed by noting the type of men and women this system of teaching has produced. It makes men humble and tender, because it causes them to feel that their salvation is of God and purely of grace. It makes them strong and heroic, for it teaches them that God requires a perfect obedience in the life they are now living, and it assures them that He will grant grace even more fully to obey. It also makes them patient and persevering, for it tells them that God is working in them to will and to do of his good pleasure as they are working out their own salvation with fear and trembling. It has, as a matter of fact, made heroic martyrs and liberty-loving patriots. It has given men such a vivid sense of God's presence that they were inspired to noble deeds of self-sacrifice. It has engendered a spirit of patient submission and trust in the midst of trial, for it gives assurance that all things work together for good to them who love God and who are the called according to His purpose. Hence the ethical strict-

ness, and almost puritan rigor of our system is one of its features which is worthy of careful regard. We shall be wise not to depart from it.

8. The last salient feature of our system now to be noted is its admirable teaching regarding the Sacrament, especially the Lord's Supper.

In many respects this is one of the best features of our whole system of doctrine. We should always give due importance to the sacraments of our Church, and to all that they imply. In general we ought carefully to note the fact that our system gives a sacrament for each of the great sets of facts implied in the Gospel. What Christ has done for us is represented in a general way in the Lord's Supper, and what the Holy Spirit does in us is exhibited in the ordinance of baptism. This is the order and symmetry of our system compared with some others at this point.

Space compels us to pass by the ordinance of baptism with brief notice, though it would well repay us to consider the teaching of our system, both as regard to the mode and subjects of baptism. We can note only one thing, and that is the clear teaching of our system in regard to the covenant relative of the children of professed Christians. They are members of the Church by virtue of their birth, and on the basis of infant Church membership infant baptism securely rests. Both the doctrinal importance and the practical value of this aspect of our system can scarcely be overestimated. In no system is there such good teaching, for it avoids the errors of those who teach baptismal regeneration, and the mistakes of those who deny infant Church membership and baptism. Let us hold fast our good doctrine here.

We can do little more than mention a few things about the Lord's Supper. The doctrine of this ordinance stated in our standards is well worthy careful study, for it is truly scriptural and deeply spiritual in its nature. It sets forth a doctrine, which if correctly and intelligently held,

will forever guard us against all ritualism, formalism and sacramentarianism, and equally protect us from taking trivial or superficial views of this holy ordinance. It holds wise middle ground.

The doctrine of our system on this subject regards the Supper of our Lord, as a divinely appointed seal or pledge of the covenant of grace, and it therefore guarantees the bestowment of the benefits which that covenant provides and offers. It utterly rejects the notion of the real presence of the body, soul, blood and divinity of our Lord in the bread and wine of the ordinance, as transubstantiation teaches. Nor can it accept the magical presence of the humanity of Christ in, with and under the elements as consubstantiation maintains. Neither can it be entirely content with a merely symbolic or pictorial presence of our Lord in the Supper where the elements merely represent certain truths, as some assume. Our system rather maintains, with fine balance and profound insight, the truly spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to which Christ is present, with all his saving benefits, to the faith of the true believer, just as the bread and wine are present to the senses of the worthy partaker of the Holy Supper. According to our doctrine, further, the Holy Spirit renders the Lord's Supper a real means of spiritual good to the true believer, who rightly partakes of the emblems of Christ and his saving benefits. Thus in no ritualistic manner, but in a deeply spiritual way, the Lord's Supper becomes a means of grace and channel of spiritual good, by the blessing of Christ on it, the operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the observer, and the faith of the recipient of it. This in the briefest way is a statement of what may be regarded as one of the salient features of our system which gives it superiority over all others.

Four general, and eight special features of our Presbyterian doctrine have been hurriedly passed under review.

From what we have learned we shall surely be thankful for the splendid heritage which we have in our doctrinal system, and we shall also be ready to maintain it, in all its scriptural completeness in our own restless age. Whatever changes may be made in the historic doctrines of the Church, in the future, and however further the Church may, by the Holy Spirit in coming days, be led into the knowledge of God's will, as set forth in Holy Scripture, we are strongly inclined to believe that it must take its point of departure from our system, and build upon its strong foundations. Our system gathered up into itself all the streams which flowed along the channel of the Reformation, and is the most mature, and scriptural creed ever formed.

If there is to be any real doctrinal advance it must be, not by setting aside our system, but by setting out from it. In the meantime, we shall be wise always to seek to adapt our splendid system of doctrine to the pressing needs of our own changing times. Nor shall he forget our duty to set forth the strong, saving truths of our system to all men, as far as lies in our power.

Geneva! Holland! Scotland! The nurseries of this grand type of doctrine. John Calvin! William the Silent! John Knox, the noble exponents of it in these lands. Think what these have done! Geneva, the blazing light from which many a bright Reformation torch was kindled. Holland, whose sturdy patriots held in check for years the proud hosts of Spain, as her own dykes held back the rolling sea. Scotland, whose little sea-girt isle has made a deeper impression, for its size and its number of people, upon the civilization of the world than any other.

What might the world have been today but for these, and for God's power exercised through them. They, under God, made possible the Great Britain and America of today. And these have wrested the sceptre of the world's dominion from the Latin races and the Romish hierarchy, and

placed it in the hands of the Anglo Saxon and the Protestant. And by this agency civil and religious liberty has been established on a secure foundation, and the heralds of the cross have been sent into all lands.

May God make us more worthy of our noble heritage, and may it be ours, in some degree, to be faithful in our day and generation to all the responsibility which rests on us, as the heirs of so much that is at once humbling and inspiring.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

VI. THE WOMAN QUESTION.

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE HOME AND CHURCH.)

In the April number of this magazine, of this year, will be found Article No. 1, upon this subject, by the present writer.

The object of that article was to lay the whole field bare before the reader, so that he could see what is called the "Woman Movement" in its whole dimensions, both as to extent and influence. He therefore did not confine himself to its phenomena and effects as found in the home and church alone, but he presents them, or samples of them rather, as found in all the spheres in which woman moves, in society and state as well as home and church. This comprehensiveness of treatment he believes to be necessary to an adequate idea of the movement either as a whole or in its parts. This survey of the whole field develops another most important fact, viz: that the movement wherever found, is one and the same movement, and that therefore it is impossible to ignore it and its manifestations in one or two spheres, and hope to treat it adequately in the others. This most pregnant fact will be taken up more fully further on.

The studied aim of the writer was to preserve a calm truth-loving, truth-seeking spirit, free from prejudice and partisanship. The issues are too momentous, the problem too profound, the crisis too grave, for any other temper. He desires to preserve the same spirit, in the inquiry before us. He repeats, therefore, the words of the other paper, viz: "If mistakes exist in any of the statements forth coming, he will be glad to have them corrected." His only object is to bring forth the truth.

The other article is made up mainly of a mass of facts; as any one can see by reference to it. Its aim is not so much to argue as to lay before the reader the facts, so that he may form his judgment for himself.

The facts accumulated therein are so abundant, so startling and so plain in their disclosure of the way things are tending, that it is impossible for a thoughtful reader not to see that nothing less than a revolution is upon us. This "Woman's Movement" is a revolution, radical in nature and influence, completely uprooting and destroying all the ideas, convictions, customs heretofore cherished by the Christian world as to woman's sphere, woman's training, woman's rights, and even woman's character and nature.

Nevertheless this mass of facts, great as it is, which the first article presents does not constitute one-tenth of the material on hand. They are but samples. Time, space and even propriety (on account of the character of some of them) forbade the mentioning of more. One object of the writer was (and is, in this paper also) to awaken interest; an interest that will lead to investigation, and finally to an arousing of our church as to what is threatening her. Necessity compelled a separation of the treatment of the subject into two articles, and a gap of six months in the publication thereof. The writer therefore, is at a disadvantage, for much of the force of the present paper depends upon its reader's knowledge of paper No. 1. For this reason he craves the privilege of referring all who read this article, to paper No. 1 in the April number, and to ask that they ponder well (if they have not already done so) the facts there marshalled.

This "Woman's Movement" or revolution has by no means spent its force. Recent comments in one or two of our church papers have said that it has, but they are mistaken. So far from having spent its force, it has gone on steadily and is still going on with ever increasing momentum. Facts in proof thereof are overwhelming. The writer has continued his habit of gathering data, and since the meeting of Synod, and even since the publication of his April article, he has accumulated the most abundant and convincing evidence that this revolution still goes on and still is growing.

It is going on in every sense of the word, and in every sphere of woman's activity, in society, in state, in home, and in church. It is going on everywhere; but what is still more to the purpose of this article, it has reached and is rapidly invading every corner of our own territory, the South. Changes affecting woman's social life, her manners, customs, pleasures, attitude and demeanor towards men, the treatment she receives from them; changes affecting her occupations, her industrial pursuits, her safety and shelter therein; changes affecting her domestic tastes, preferences and usefulness; changes affecting her progress and development in morals, religious faith, character and influence, and in the refinement of her better nature; changes affecting her civil and church life and status, influence and activities; all of these changes are silently but very swiftly going on amongst us, with a subtle stealth constantly and unconsciously, to them no doubt, stealing into the hearts and minds of our own maidens, wives, and even mothers, making different women of them day by day, giving them more and more the stamp this revolution gives women everywhere.

This inquiry into what the Bible says upon the subject has little or no data, from our own or any other ecclesiastical body to aid it. Not much indeed beyond brief deliverances. This is a strange fact. Not so strange, it is true, as to our own church, because with us it is just beginning to be a living question; but a strange fact as to the church bodies to the north of us. They all, or nearly all, seem to have fallen into line with the movement without one single earnest effort to search the Scriptures to see whether these things be true and right. I wrote to friends in the Northern Presbyterian church and to that church's Board of Publication, and the answer from all parties was the same, viz: No literature upon the subject. This is all the more remarkable when we consider that the whole mind of the church in all previous ages as to the features of this revolution affecting it has been uniformly one way, and that

against it. As the "Interior" of Chicago flippantly puts it in a sarcastic reply to one of our church papers, "as to our church deliverances brethren, we are all right," or words to that effect—the inference being that their "deliverances" were now of no force. Hence, in searching for Scriptural truth upon this subject I have confined myself almost literally to searching the Bible and the Bible alone.

Subject of our Inquiry—as given already (see introductory words).

(I.) Bible testimony as to woman's sphere and rights in the home and church.

(A) In the home.

(1st.) Sphere. The home itself is always presented in the Sacred Scriptures as pre-eminently the appropriate, the chief, the peculiar, the normal, the divinely ordered sphere for woman's life, true happiness, activity and usefulness. This is true, of all ages, of all the thousands of years covered by the Old and New Testaments. From Genesis to Revelation, amid all of the changes, numberless and oftentimes profound, that came upon the life, social and domestic, of God's people, we find the women moving about, as a rule, almost entirely within the sphere of the home. In this respect there is no change. The first women we read of, approved of God, are women of the home; so also the last. The first teachings as to woman and her sphere assign her to the home; likewise also the last. This fact is reinforced by numerous, almost numberless considerations. For instance the very first command put upon woman was, "be fruitful and multiply;" that is, have a family. The last commands thousands of years after are like unto it, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the household, give none occasion to the adversary to blaspheme." (I. Tim. 5: 14.) "Teach the young women to be sober-minded, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be keepers at home." (Titus 2:4.) Thus, the sphere of woman, from lid to lid of the Bible, is found unchanged.

And when we reflect that these words of Paul just quoted, were spoken to people just lifted up out of the reeking Roman social life already referred to, but still surrounded by it, that Roman society which the present state of things seems to be approximating, we can understand the emphasis of the reason added, viz: that they might "give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully;" and we can also see the fundamental nature of the truth, that woman's proper and chief sphere is the home.

Again. The object of woman's creation, viz: That she might be a "help meet," that is, a companion suitable for man, suitable to live with him and help him to attain the chief ends of his being, viz: to glorify God and enjoy Him forever; the divine instituting of marriage; that is, the fact that God did not leave man and woman to run together and mate at will, as the rest of the brute creation, but checks and limits them, puts a holy seal upon their sexual relation, and thereby shuts them up therein, to a monogamous home; the very nature of marriage, viz: the making of the two to be one; the object of marriage (so far as the Church is concerned) which is the giving birth to, the rearing and perpetuating of, a "godly seed;" the great fundamental and unchangable doctrine and fact of Scripture statement and Scripture history of all ages, viz: that the family is the very basis and unit of the Church of God; all of these considerations point to the Home as woman's proper and peculiar, chief and indeed, essential, sphere.

Again. The domestic virtues are the only feminine virtues which God in His Word singles out and exalts. Namely, the virtues of the wife and mother and maid servant, the performance of the duties of the household, etc., etc. For instance, "A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband," (Prov. 12:7)—"whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing, and obtaineth favor of the Lord," (Prov. 18:22); "A prudent wife is from the Lord," (Prov. 19:14); and then that noble portraiture of the ideal woman, in Prov. 31:10-31,

too long to quote here, is the portraiture of the woman of the Home. "Who can find a virtuous woman? For her price is far above rubies. The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her--she will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. She looketh well to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness. She openeth her mouth with wisdom and in her tongue is the law of kindness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also and he praiseth her. Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised," etc., etc. When we turn to the New Testament we do not find the tone different, as indeed we have already seen.² The Domestic Virtues are the only ones singled out and exalted. Love and obedience to the husband, love and faithfulness to children, the right ordering and ruling of the household, the cherishing of home's privacy, and like faithfulness as to other domestic duties, are the things specified and emphasized. Elizabeth, mother of John Baptist; Mary, mother of our Lord; Mary and Martha, the mother of Zebedee's children, the mother of James and Joses, Salome wife of Chuza, the widow of the widow's mite, Dorcas, Priscilla, Lois and Eunice and most of the women held up as approved of God, are domestic characters. Once more--the Bible throughout represents the ideal woman as constituted by nature and by destiny for the Home sphere. On her body, her temperament, her affections, her traits of character, her Maker has stamped the noble seal and mission of Motherhood. She is made for Motherhood. The Bible teaches this. "Adam called his wife Eve because she was the mother of all living." To protect her in this her essential mission, to ennoble it and sanctify it and make it honorable in her own sight, and a thing to be desired, God Himself instituted marriage, and said, "her desire shall be to her husband." To encourage to the bearing and rearing of children, He says to her, "the promise is to thee and thy children after thee." The

ideal women of Scripture are all represented as loving children, loving their husbands, accepting and looking forward to this divinely appointed mission of wifehood and motherhood, willingly and even joyfully. A special blessing is promised to the bearing of children. It is a significant fact that to this day the Jewish woman has this stamp, for in the terrible statistics of this land, showing the decline and perversion of marriage and disinclination to offspring and decrease thereof, the Jewish women are excepted.

All of this holds forth the Home, as the chief, the peculiar, the essential sphere of woman.

Of course, if these considerations have any weight, that weight applies with as much force as ever, to woman now. To say otherwise would be to say, that the Bible is no longer binding, has been superseded by something else as an infallible rule of faith and practice, and would make the study of its pages an absurdity and waste of time.

There is a seeming defect in this argument for the Home as woman's chief and proper sphere, but on investigation this difficulty is seen to disappear. For instance, it might be said that it proves too much.

It is indeed claimed, I believe, that if the duty and the destiny of marriage prove home to be the proper and essential sphere for woman so likewise does it prove home to be the proper sphere for man, and the theory therefore proves too much. The answer is, the premise is correct in one sense, but the conclusion does not follow. The Bible does represent the Home as in a very important sense, the proper and essential sphere for much of the life of man also, as well as for the woman. But not as regards the peculiar obligations and prerogatives which distinguish the domestic sphere. There is a division of labor, for instance, as to the sexes. In the Scriptures, the man is the outside worker, the woman is the inside worker; the man is the money-maker, the woman is the home-maker. It is

precisely here that her work as "helpmeet" is seen. Man is no more fitted for the inside work than woman for the outside work. Without her he cannot truly have a home! And without the home, society and the church become chaos. Abundant proofs of this are seen in Scripture. It is Adam, we see, tilling the ground in the garden of Eden. In the curse even it is Adam who is to earn his bread from the ground "by the sweat of his brow," while the curse upon the woman points her to the privacy of home. In all the scenes that pass before us from earliest times to latest, it is the men who are the farmers, shepherds, vinedressers, warriors, politicians, statesmen, public officials of religion, etc., etc., in other words the outside workers. The earliest proofs of this are no stronger than the latest. For instance, in one of the last books added to the Scripture canon, viz: First Timothy, it is expressly said, "if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own household, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." (1 Tim. 5: 8.) That these words are spoken to the man is evident from the context, if from nothing else. They teach that not only is man by divine arrangement the bread-winner and supporter of the family, in other words the outside worker, but that it is a religious duty of the highest kind for him to fill this sphere, and the neglect of it a great sin in the sight of God. When we reflect that there are about 14,000,000 young men in this country between the ages of 14 and 24, and that a most alarming proportion of them are doing nothing as can be seen by the armies of tramps, crowds of idlers on the streets of every village, town and city in the land, and that on the other hand, women by the millions, mothers, widows, wives and maids, are flocking into the places these young men ought to be filling, in other words, supporting them instead of being supported by them, becoming the bread-winners as well as the bread-makers, doing the outside work and the inside work as well, we then can have some idea of the practical bearing of this point, and of the great crime

that (according to this text) is being committed in the sight of God against the women of our land, in taking them out of the home.

There are exceptions to this position, that the Bible presents the home as woman's essential and peculiar sphere, and there are difficulties in the way of applying it to the facts of present times.

As to the exceptions, a study of them seems to show that their fewness and their nature both, serve rather to strengthen the home theory than weaken it. For instance, they can be counted on the fingers of your hands—or less.

In all the long stretch of thousands of years, covered by the Old and New Testaments, we have but a very scant sprinkling of exceptions to the doctrine that woman's essential sphere is the home. Ruth gleaning in the fields of Boaz, Deborah leading an army, or publicly prophesying, Lydia merchandising in purple dye or stuff, Philip's daughters who prophesied, and a few more, are all we can find. And now, as to the nature of these exceptions. The cases of the "prophetess" will be examined further on. Ruth's working in the harvest field with the other maidens cannot be denied, yet the passage shows no necessary approval of it, only (1) that it was a custom in crude and lawless times, the times of the Judges; (2) that Ruth felt forced to it by stress of special circumstances; (3) that Boaz was careful to throw around her while doing so special protection. (Ruth 2: 1-23), and (4) that the danger and objectionableness of it were freely felt. Deborah's case also shows that she felt herself out of place in leading an army, for she reproaches Barak thus: "I will surely go with thee, notwithstanding the journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honor, for the Lord shall sell Sisera into the hands of a woman." (Judges 4: 9.) Lydia as a merchant is as yet but an unconverted heathen woman, not yet under the influences of the gospel, and therefore no true exception, a product and proof indeed of the loose Roman society of the

day in which the presence of women in public and masculine pursuits was a marked feature; the very type of society to which things now seen tending. These seeming "exceptions," therefore, are found to be no exceptions at all. The "difficulties" in the way of making the home the chief and proper sphere of woman "in these days" are admitted and must be noticed. But the best place to notice them is after considering woman's rights in the home; and in truth, the consideration of the home rights of woman will do away with some of these objections. Yet before we proceed to that point one reminder just here is pertinent. Let it be noted that these "difficulties of the present day" are the fruit in good part of this very "Woman Movement."

2. Woman's Rights in the Home.

1st. The "right" to a Monogamous Marriage.

(a) Woman has a right to marriage. The Scriptures teach the duty, the necessity, the blessedness and the destiny of marriage, as we have seen; and doing so, they clearly show it forth as "woman's right."

Nor ought this simple statement to be put away by the breath of ridicule or levity, for grave facts already do, to some extent, make it one of the living questions of the day. Disinclination to marriage is becoming more and more prevalent, as we have seen. "Forbidding to marry" is one of the marks of the "perilous times" of the "last days," and that can be done and is being done to-day, in many ways, and one way is through the spread and imbibing of false and perverting ideas about marriage among the young of both sexes. Mischievous mistakes too are inculcated. For instance, that there are so many more women than men in the land. The truth is, the last census (1890) shows there are over 1,500,000 more men than women in the United States, and that for twenty years or more they had been steadily getting more and more numerous than women. This "right" to marriage is, indeed, the great safe-guard to woman's virtue, and also to her highest and best earthly happiness

and usefulness, yet it is practically being taken away every day by the perverted and perverting ideas about marriage which are getting so common.

(b) This right is of course to a monogamous marriage. The nature of true marriage as a union between one man and one woman and the repudiation of polygamy by our Saviour suffice to show this.

2nd. Mistresship of the home is another woman's "right" therein.

This is taught plainly in both the Old and New Testaments of the woman as wife and mother. For instance, in that beautiful Old Testament picture of the ideal woman in Proverbs 31, we have the "mistress of the house" before us, guiding the affairs thereof, recognized and honored as such by husband and friends, looked up to and loved by children and handmaids. And then in the New Testament (I Tim. 5: 14.) the same thing, "guiding" or ruling the household," *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* Paul puts as one of the prerogatives of woman in the home.

3d. An honored and honorable and voluntary subordination as wife to her husband's headship.

This subordination as taught in Scripture is an honored and honorable and voluntary one. It does not imply inferiority. On the contrary, woman was formed in the first place, not from an inferior being, but from man himself, and her marriage to him is said to be "the two becoming one" again. Man is told to love her and to honor her as his own self. Her relation as wife to man is likened to that of the Church to Christ. Indeed she is declared to be "bone of man's bone and flesh of his flesh." This subordination is moreover a voluntary one. It is not a thing of constraint, not a thing dependent on force. Her "desire" shall be to her husband, and he shall rule over her. (Gen. 3: 16.) And this is in accordance with her nature. God has not only written it in Holy Scripture, but stamped it on and in her heart. All the facts of life in every happy marriage and

happy home attest it. And herein lies one great safe-guard to woman's welfare, and as a consequence, to the welfare of the family and the home. Not in teaching the socialistic doctrines of equality and individualism, but that the family is the true unit of society, and therefore, that the husband of necessity is the head. Not in teaching that the husband's headship is that of a brute or tyrant, the right of the strong over the weak; but that it is the prerogative of love, as much for the welfare of the woman as the man, the true exercise of which will meet the very demands of the true nature of woman herself. For there can be no doubt that God has not only printed in His Word, but printed it also on woman's own heart that "her desire shall be to her husband."

Nevertheless it is a true subordination. Among the very first words spoken to woman, after the fall, are these, "Thy husband shall rule over thee" (Gen. 3:16). And among the last instructions given to the Church, there are none more solemn, more emphatic, more fundamental, than those bearing on this same point. "The husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church." "Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing" (Eph. 5:22-24). "Teach the young women to be obedient unto their own husbands, that the Word of God be not blasphemed" (Titus 2:4). "Likewise ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands, in order that if any obey not the Word, they also may without the Word, be won by the conversation of the wives." "For after this manner, in the old time, the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands, even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord; whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well and are not afraid with any amazement" (I Peter 3:1, 2, 5, 6).

4th. Again. Marital fidelity on the part of the husband is a woman's "right."

5th. A Scriptural divorce, that is the right on the one

hand not to be put away by a husband except for Scriptural grounds, viz : proved adultery and abandonment, and on the other hand the right to have such divorce for herself if such charges against her husband can be proven.

6th. Again, the right as parent or mistress to honor and obedience from children and servants; and (7) the right as maid servant to all proper respect, kindness and justice belonging to her position in the home.

8th. The precious and peculiar prerogative of fostering religion in the home; of winning or encouraging the husband and other adult males thereto by her "chaste conversation and life" therein, and of training her children therein. The effect on this most sacred right, of her going out into public life, can hardly be estimated, either as regards her influence over her husband and other men of her house or over her children. In the one case there can hardly be any doubt that it is the shelter of the home which has preserved and fostered the religious nature of woman and made her more religious than man, and therefore if she goes out into public life we have no reason to say that she will not be injured by it religiously, just as truly as are the men. As a matter of fact this is precisely the effect public life is having on women now. It is the woman at home that makes home what it is to the man, makes it the haven of rest and the sweet antidote to the wicked, outward world, that it is. As for the children, of course her religious training of them is bound eventually to cease. She will have neither time nor fitness nor inclination for such prerogative. This too is being only too plainly and increasingly verified, as can be seen from the mass of appalling facts gathered as samples in the article in the April number of this *QUARTERLY*.

9th. A right to love, honor, respect and support as wife and mother from husband and sons, and

10th. Finally, a right to the protection and privacy of the home.

All of these last points, thus rapidly cited, without Scrip-

ture comment, need no proof, I suppose, before the readers of this QUARTERLY. I feel sure that they all will be recognized as Scriptural "rights" of women in the home. Let me however, single out the two last "rights" as worthy of special consideration just at this time, viz: the "right to support" from her husband and her sons, and the "right to the protection and privacy of the home."

First then, as to "the right to support from husband and sons." Take the text already quoted in another connection, I Tim. 5:8, "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house" (*οἰκεῖων*, "kindred," "lineage") "he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel" or "unbeliever." The reference here is plainly to support, and the duty as a duty of religion is plainly put upon the man; and the most striking feature about the duty is that it is not merely limited to one person, as a wife for instance, but it is a duty owed his whole household.

In this particular case it was some widowed kinswoman, as the context shows. If then the right to support is, in the sight of God, due the widow, in the home, how much more the wife? Notice that this text is in the New Testament. In this respect it does not seem to be the will of God for His people in these New Testament times to differ from those of the old. In Isaiah 58:7, we find God denouncing His people because they hid "themselves from their own flesh," i. e. turned their back upon their poorer kindred. So in Neh. 5th chapter, and in other places, the same thing is rebuked. But how much more must it outrage God to look down and see wives and mothers and daughters not merely receiving no support from husbands, fathers and sons, but the very reverse: actually forced to go out of the God-given protection of the home into the innumerable perils of public life to do man's work in order to earn support for their ignoble men? The Scriptures plainly teach that this is mischievous and sinful. The woman, whether wife, mother or maid has a God-given right to support from the stronger sex.

Note now the practical bearing of the fact that she has a right to the protection and privacy of the home. We do not understand by this that she is constantly to be shut up in the home. The Scriptures while teaching that the home is her essential and peculiar sphere of activity and usefulness, yet represent her as enjoying freely a suitable social liberty. The Old and New Testaments are alike in this. We see, for instance, in Old Testament pictures Miriam and her maidens, Jephtha's daughter and her companions, the women in David's time at the restoration of the ark, coming forth with songs and dances to greet the men of Israel in their hour of triumph; we see in New Testament pictures women present as guests or attendants at social gatherings, such as the marriage feast at Cana (John 2) or at the supper given to Jesus at the house of Lazarus where Martha and Mary were present. (John 12.) There is a significance in this fact of which we will speak hereafter. But note now, that this social liberty while all that was desirable, still had its limits. And those limits were precisely those which you might expect where the home is woman's essential and peculiar sphere, viz: the preservation of woman's modesty and reserve. One exception only have I found to this, but it is one so absolutely unique, that I am sure all will agree that as an exception it has no force. I refer to the women who followed the Saviour from Galilee, and indeed in His other journeys. For women to follow a religious teacher from place to place in these days, would be, we all feel, most improper. But we all see also the difference. These women of the gospel saw in the religious teacher they were following their adorable Messiah, Saviour and Lord; their conduct was not only therefore excusable, it was in the highest degree indicative of faith and duty. The limit, therefore, was not really transgressed. The limit to social liberty, viz: the preservation of their modesty and reserve, is illustrated in the case of Vashti, queen of Ahasuerus, as told in Esther 1:10. Her husband at the height of a great revel

and orgy, when his heart was merry with wine, commanded Vashti, his queen, to be brought into the banquet hall to "show the people and the princes her beauty;" and Vashti refused to appear. She declined to exhibit herself. The lesson it teaches, it seems to me is, the right to the privacy and protection of her home; in other words, the right to the preservation of her modesty and reserve which the shelter of her home secures.

This, I am persuaded, is one of woman's highest, most priceless, "rights." Vashti's lord declared it to be a denial and rebellion against his headship over her. But a man's headship over a woman does not supercede the woman's right to the preservation of her modesty and reserve. It is an abuse of his headship to demand such a thing. For a Colorado husband, for instance, to order his wife to ride a horse "a straddle," as is now so commonly done there, or for him to order his wife to go to the polls and vote, or to run for a political office, would be an abuse of his headship. It is a violation of another and equally, if not more priceless right, the right of the woman to the preservation of her modesty and reserve.

There is another aspect of this matter.

This right of a woman to the protection and privacy of her home is assailed from another direction. It seems to be a two-fold direction, but it is in reality one. A new test is put to woman's conscience, these days, a new standard for measuring her zeal and fidelity to duty. It is the test of taking up public work. This test comes to her in both church and state. A new strain is put upon the consciences of our women. In the state, a ceaseless assault is kept up upon our women's modesty and reserve, to come forth from the home and vote, hold office, enter the lists with men in the strife for equal work, etc. It is put upon the ground of duty. A burden is put upon their conscience. So too, in the ecclesiastical sphere, our women are appealed to constantly and in various ways to take part, take leadership in

the Church's public exercises. And it is put upon the ground of duty. A burden is put upon the conscience. And the burden is felt. Vividly does there come before me a case of a mother of eight children, a typical Presbyterian lady, intelligent and godly, training up her children on the catechism in the home, whose conscience got perplexed upon this point. My answer was that she was filling the highest church duty that could fall upon a woman, in training those children at home for Christ and his Church. In truth the question is pertinent, is this new test, this new standard that is being applied in state and church to woman's conscience, is it a lawful test, a right test, a Scriptural test? The answer seems to be that if home is the woman's essential and proper sphere, and if her rights therein are such as have been described, especially the right just mentioned, viz: the right to the protection and privacy of the home as a safe-guard for the preservation of her modesty and reserve, if these things are true, then this new test is a false test, this new standard a false standard, and this new strain on our women's consciences is one not put there by God. It is a strain, that not only were their mothers never able to bear, but one their mothers were never called upon to bear. But more, it is an invasion of a "right;" a right that is theirs, a right impregnably entrenched in Scripture, a fundamental right, and that is the right to the protection of private home life. "A man's house is his castle," according to human law. So is a woman's house her castle, and according to divine law. She has a right to be protected, it seems to me, against these attempts to force her from the retirement of her home.

This whole statement of the Bible view of woman's sphere and rights, and especially these last two rights of women in the home sphere, viz: the right to support from the man, and the right to protection and privacy, show the vast difference there is between woman's sphere and rights, as taught in the Bible, and woman's sphere and rights as found

in Oriental lands. The Bible home is not a harem; the Bible woman does not come before us always veiled; she is not shut up in her home, nor shut off from the gaze of other men, she is not a beast of burden as Oriental women often are; she is not scorned and abused by husband, father and son, as Eastern women are; on the contrary, she is a helpmeet, a companion to her husband; she enjoys a legitimate social liberty, she is revered and obeyed by her sons, loved, honored, rejoiced in by her husband, and her support, by her male kindred, is expected and exacted, in the strongest and most solemn language.*

So too, on the other hand, the ideal woman of the Bible is far different, as to sphere and right, from the woman the Bible found everywhere in the heathen Roman world, at the beginning of Christianity. As has been said already, the woman of the heathen Roman world had broken forth from the home into the chiefest avenues of public life; she was found in politics, business, on the stage, in the priestess' office. The "home and marriage were almost gone, divorce reigned supreme, also infanticide, and unnameable crimes, secret and open, abounded in every social rank. But the woman of the Bible is pre-eminently the woman of the home, called back there from all this heathen publicity and license, by a divine voice, sheltered and safeguarded therein by needful and wise restrictions, virtuous and happy there, with "rights" suitable and abundant, clearly outlined and recognized, just and true, fitted to her nature, and ministering to her highest usefulness and happiness and to her noblest progress."

I. (B) Let us now come to Woman's Sphere and Rights in the Church Organization.

I. And first, as to her Sphere :—

* Few facts, indeed, pertaining to the Bible, are more remarkable and significant than this. The Bible is an oriental book, coming out of the heart of the East, yet in every age the ideal women of the Bible have been as different from all other oriental women as is day from night! The reason is, the Bible is Divine, springing from woman's best friend, her God; it is a World Book, a book for every clime and for all time.

The Scriptures teach quite plainly that woman's proper sphere in the organized Church of God also, is subordinate and retiring.

1. All that has been said indeed, as to home being woman's essential and distinctive sphere, and as to her position there, carries along with it, with irresistible force, the conviction that if so, then her position in the church must also, of necessity, be in conformity with it; i. e., subordinate and retiring. For it can hardly be believed, unless indeed the evidence for it in Scripture is clear, conspicuous and conclusive, that God would give the lead in his organized church to one whom for the most of her life and work, he has remanded to the privacy of the home; especially as he has designed his church to be the most aggressive, most active, the most prominent of the outside public forces of human society. His church's work indeed is ceaseless, her mission practically endless, and the demands she makes upon heart and brain and body, upon time and energies, are such as to exhaust the stoutest men. How then can the women of the home be other than subordinate and retiring in the church as to position and work? Called upon to do what she can, 'tis true, but not expected by the Divine Head to take the lead, and blamed only when she does so. Especially strange would it be for her to be otherwise, when we reflect that here is man her companion, put by God out into the world as the outside worker; put here as her head and leader, framed physically, mentally and spiritually for work in the outside world in which the church must figure! And stranger still would it appear for her to take the lead in the public matters of a public institution like the Church, when she is undeniably subordinate in the private circles of her own particular sphere, the home! If subordinate and retiring in the home, how much more is she likely to be in the church?

Unless indeed, as has been said, there is clear, conspicuous and conclusive evidence that in the church her subor-

dination and retracy cease. But investigation shows that there is no such evidence. A few passages indeed, found here and there over the vast field of the Bible seem to give some support to this idea, but even they, on examination give little satisfaction, and their very fewness makes them of no force. Whilst on the other hand, the whole force of the abundant Bible references to woman's position in the church, corroborates with overwhelming power the natural expectation that woman in the church is no different from woman in the home; shows, in other words that her position is subordinate and retiring. This argument, drawn from Woman's position in the Home, is in itself, it seems to me, conclusive. For my own part, I am unable to evade its force. We will take up in a moment, the specific Scripture references confirming it, but suffer me again to bid you keep this point in mind and weigh its force.

Permit, right here, a brief notice of one or two practical considerations.

It is claimed that nowadays, a woman has time to do the home work and the Church's work too.

If not called nor fitted for it, even having ample leisure would hardly justify her taking it out of the hands of the men. But are we sure that even in these days, women are justified in having ample time upon their hands? In view of the almost universal difficulties of domestic service, difficulties which are multiplying every day instead of diminishing; in view of the constant and increasing testimony to the almost universal decay of family religion, home training of children and Sabbath desecration, is it not to be feared, that the "ample time" claimed here can only be gained by the neglect of these other most vital matters?

Again, it is claimed, that there are thousands of single women, to whom the argument from the home does not apply.

Waiving again, the fact that if not called nor fitted for it, they ought not to take the church work from the men, the

question comes, are not single women as a rule, daughters and sisters? And is it not to be feared, that many a sister or daughter, goes off, for instance to Young People's Societies and other church gatherings, on journeys, sometimes long and involving several days, to take a leading part therein, and has left work at home which she ought to do, upon the already burdened shoulders of the mother? Is it not to be feared that there is a growing defect in female education; that like as with young men, the tendency of the education of the day, seems to be to create a dislike and contempt for labor; and that just as young men seem more and more to be avoiding work, and flocking to the cities to escape it, just so the young women are more and more restive under domestic work, and are tempted more and more to despise it and ignore it. And yet, all honest necessary labor is in reality not only noble but ennobling; not only that outside the home, but that within the home. The girl who cooks the meal, washes the dishes, sweeps the house and thereby saves her overburdened mother; the girl who stays at home and sweetens life by ministering to her father; the girl who strives to make her home attractive to her brother, is really serving God, doing religious work and rounding out a noble Christian character and career. This is the spirit of Scripture wisdom and Scripture teaching.

We come now to the direct question as to the Bible testimony on the sphere of woman in the church. And at the outset, it will be well to remember that the mere fact of a few passages being found here and there in the Sacred Scriptures that seem to favor women preaching or otherwise leading in the public functions or work of the church, is of no weight when carefully considered. The Bible is a "great big book" and can be and has been made to teach almost anything by those who wish to make it do so. The few expressions that seem to favor these new notions about women are ambiguous, and not for one moment to be compared with

the clear cut, unmistakable, and abundant teachings, to the contrary. The sound laws of interpretation always held hitherto by evangelical churches easily explain these ambiguous passages.

Let us begin by taking up these expressions that seem to favor the "new woman," and giving them all due consideration.

For instance, "prophetesses" are pointed out to us, in the Old and New Testament as examples, justifying women of to-day holding public office and exercising public functions thereof in the church, viz: Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, etc., in the O. T. and Anna, and the four daughters of Philip, the evangelist, in the New. Again, certain other statements of Scripture, are claimed, such as, Ps. 68: 11, "The Lord giveth the word, the women that publish the tidings are a great host." Revised version. Gal. 3: 28, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." Acts 2: 17-18, the apostle Peter's use of the prophecy of Joel, "I will pour out of my spirit on your daughters and handmaidens, and they shall prophesy," etc. John 4: 28-39. The woman of Samaria who spake of Christ to the men of the city, many of whom believed because of her saying. Philip 4: 3, "Help those women who labored with me in the Gospel." Rom. 16: 1. Phebe, a "deacon of the church."

Some of our brethren, while admitting that these passages do not teach nor authorize the ordination of women to the Gospel ministry, or to the ruling eldership, are yet disposed to think that they authorize a larger liberty to woman, outside the ministry and eldership, and prove woman's right to "address" mixed audiences, as for example, a returned woman missionary on invitation of a pastor or session. No one sympathizes more than I do with the spirit these brethren are showing. They wish to avoid, if possible, an unjust and unwise suppression of a practice which is growing and threatening to be formidable, and which is "in keeping with the spirit of the times;" a practice which is the expression

of innocent and ardent zeal, and indulged in by some of our noblest and purest women. I feel the power of the pressure upon their hearts, and all the chivalry in our natures rises up when our ladies appeal for aid. But the objections to their views, seem to me, insurmountable, and our chivalry, on inspection is found on the wrong side. For first, the fatal difficulty with their position is that the passages they quote prove too much. If they authorize women to speak before mixed audiences at all, they unquestionably authorize them to preach. For a prophet, both in the Old Testament and New Testament is not only a recognized officer in the church but an officer who takes precedence even of the preacher and ruling elder. "And he gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the work of the ministry, etc. (Eph. 4: 11-12.) The distinction made, therefore, is a distinction that cannot stand. If these texts about prophesying put our ladies to talking "outside the limits of the ministry and eldership," as is claimed, it puts them to talking inside the limits of the ministry and eldership. This is evidently the way they are understood by our missionary ladies themselves, who speak in public, for while at home they may merely make "addresses" before mixed audiences, yet when they are abroad, in their field, I understand that they "preach." I do not mention this for censure. I state it merely to show the difficulty our ladies have in standing on this distinction.

Again, a second fatal difficulty with this theory is that it puts our ladies to exercising a "prophetical gift" that has long since been withdrawn from the church.

It may be urged that while they have no right to invade the prophetical office, it is their privilege to exercise the "prophetical gift or function" i. e. "speak for God." The best way to answer this to take up the texts on "prophesy" in turn, which have been cited, and examine them in their connection.

The character of Miriam's prophesying is easily seen; also

Deborah's, Huldah's, and indeed all of the Old Testament prophetesses. The context shows in each case, that these women were raised up in exceptional and extraordinary emergencies and were endowed with exceptional and extraordinary prophetic gifts for a special and temporary purpose. No one will deny this, I suppose. As to Anna, the prophetess, in the New Testament, who with Simeon met the infant Jesus, her words bear on their very face the fact that she was specially and supernaturally inspired to "speak for God" on that occasion. How else could she have recognized in that little unknown peasant babe her divine and adorable Redeemer? Would her words have any authority without it? She spake as she was moved by the Holy Ghost.

The case of Philip's four daughters, can hardly be different. If their "prophesying" was mere preaching, mere public speaking in God's cause, why should it be so singled out from their father Philip's, for he was a public speaker also. Why indeed, except to show theirs was not mere preaching. Nay, they "prophesied." They were specially favored of God with a separate supernatural endowment that no longer exists in the church, characterized by a distinct function, distinctly mentioned in Scripture and called "the prophetic gift." This is why the language is so singular and significant. "And the same man had four daughters, which did prophesy." (Acts 21:9.) What this "prophetic gift" was can be seen from the cases already mentioned; from the cases of Elizabeth, mother of John Baptist, and Mary, mother of our Lord, whose sublime outbursts of song and thanksgiving are called prophesying; from Zacharias also, father of John, and to go on farther, from the I Cor. 14th chapter, where in the list of special supernatural gifts of the Holy Ghost, we find "prophesying." And likewise, the "prophesying of daughters and handmaidens." Peter quotes from Joel, on the day of Pentecost. Peter also explains. His very explanation of the extraordinary super-

natural manifestation of the Holy Gost, and the extraordinary exercise of gifts by the disciples in consequence, enlightens us.

This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: "I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh, and—your daughters—and your hand-maidens—shall prophesy." (Acts 2:14-8). And notice too, that there was "preaching" on the occasion, but it came after all "the prophesying," viz.: when Peter himself preached.

The claim then, from these texts, that women, altho' not invading the prophetical office, are yet privileged to exercise the "prophetical gift" or "function," can hardly stand, because the "prophetical gift" was an extraordinary and temporary endowment from the Holy Ghost, peculiar to the early Church, and has long since passed away. Unless our ladies can show these signs of the Spirit's supernatural indwelling, our brethren can derive no support for them from these texts. The truth as to Bible "prophets" and "prophesying" seems to be, briefly, this:

The word "prophesy" is used in two or three senses in Scripture.

1st. Its primary meaning both in the Hebrew and Greek is "one who speaks for another," and in religious use, "one who speaks for God," or "declares the will of God." In this simple sense, the Old Testament priests were "prophets." That is, they "spoke for" or "declared the will of God." They did so both symbolically and orally. They were the preachers or religious teachers of their day. (See Malachi 2:7; Nehemiah 8:7, 8, etc., and other places). So too as the centuries passed, and the priesthood became corrupted, Samuel raised up another order of men called "prophets" who were trained to "declare" or "reveal the will of God." We can trace these men in "companies" or "schools of the prophets" from Samuel's day on down to Amos's day, and perhaps later, in Old Testament times.

They did not supersede the priesthood but rather supplemented them in their work as religious teachers.

But now note,

1st. Not one woman can be found among these men, in any age, either in the priesthood or in the "schools of the prophets!"

2nd. The word "prophet," in this simple sense of "speaking for" or "declaring the will of God," can not be found in the New Testament Scriptures!

Preachers are not called "prophets" in the New Testament. They "declare the will of God," it is true, but the term "prophet" is not applied to them, because it is not used in that simple sense in the New Testament.

2. And this brings us to the second and chief and current meaning, in the Bible, of the word "prophesy."

Namely, to "declare the will of God" in an inspired and miraculous way; i. e., under the direct supernatural influences of the Holy Ghost!

This, it is to be noted, is the current, the characteristic sense of the word throughout all Scripture, and especially, in the New Testament. This is the sense in which Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, David, Daniel and all the writers of Old Testament prophecies were prophets; and this is the sense in which the Lord Jesus himself, in which John the Baptist, Zechariah, Ananias the High Priest, Agabus, those spoken of in I. Cor. 14th chap., and all who "prophesied" in the apostolic times were "prophets."

It is in this sense, this special supernatural sense, that the few women spoken of in the Old and New Testaments "prophesied." Of course the exercise of this "prophetic gift" by these women, under such extraordinary circumstances can not truthfully nor wisely be used as a justification for women preaching now.

The other texts mentioned are, it seems to me, also otherwise adequately explained.

The "women who published the Word of the Lord were

a great host," in Ps. 68, were the women who published it by songs and dances at the return of the Ark from the Philistines. The psalm is the psalm that was written at the return of the Ark. The fact that the woman of Samaria said to the men, "Come see a man which told me all that ever I did," on her return from the well, does not prove that she said any more, or indeed did any more than simply say this to them as she went along the road, much less make any "address." She had no time to make any public address. Besides, it is the mere statement of a fact without any word added, approving or condemning. The "there is neither male nor female" in Galatians 3:28, refers simply to salvation; a blessed truth, but not pertinent here; the "godly women" who labored with Paul, in the Gospel in Phil. 4:3, no doubt labored with him, just as tens of thousands of our godly labor now and have been for years laboring with their pastors in the Gospel; that is, in the quiet, retiring but most effective and much valued ways which have not and do not transgress her own express and solemn injunctions. As for "Phebe the deaconess," of Rom. 16:1, it can never be proven that she was a deaconess. The claim stands entirely unsupported by any prop, either for the context or elsewhere. And the evidences that she was not a "deaconess," i. e., a church officer, are powerful. And if she was, that would not call for her to make public addresses. Thus we have gone over these texts put forth to uphold the claim, that while women may not preach, hold office in the house of God, yet they can make addresses before mixed audiences, and we find their support unfounded. But there is another consideration which, to my mind, is the most powerful of all, and that is, that this custom does not comport with that temper and attitude of retiracy, or privacy, as to public matters and of subordination, which we have seen the Bible so plainly enjoins. These two principles are the key notes, the great central thoughts of the mind of God upon this subject. The mighty movement now coming

down upon the South, like a great land slide, is in reality one; in the Church and out of the Church it is the same thing, viz: the forcing our women out of the sphere of unobtrusive, sheltered, private life and effort out into the untried and forbidden perils and paths of public life and leadership divinely assigned to man. It is impossible for me not to see that the movement is one. And when I reflect that God's gospel found the Gentile heathen world with pretty much the same type of society as this movement is now moulding; when I reflect that the sweet, gentle, yet strong and noble type of maidenhood and womanhood, that once characterized the ideal Southern woman, but now is in such danger of passing away, is what it is and has been, solely because made so by Bible influence; when I reflect that this position of an honored and honorable yet voluntary retracy and subordination is presented in the Bible as a safeguard not a cross, a safeguard of woman's highest and best interests; when I consider that it is not necessary, in order to "labor in the gospel," for women to thrust herself forth to these public performances, but that on the contrary, the whole drift of testimony goes to show that she, by so doing, will lose her influence and usefulness in the highest and best sense of the word; when these things, I say, come to my mind I am compelled to the conviction that not only are these innovations a mistake, but a grievous mistake; a mistake fraught with peril to the woman herself, to the home and to the church.

And now let us take up the normal teaching of the Sacred Scriptures as to the Sphere of Woman in the Church of God. We will find it to be overwhelmingly against the innovations of the "Woman Movement."

For instance, in the Old Testament. In the patriarchal age, the offices of religion are all performed by men; in the Mosaic age, it is the same way, the priests, the elders, the Levites, are all by explicit statute and in actual fact, in every generation, found to be men; in after years when modifica-

tions came in, when for instance prophets and then scribes appear upon the scene and exercising the function of religious teacher, we find them with the exception of three or four prophetesses, to be men; in the tremendous disorders and demoralization caused so often by great national calamities, such as the secession of the ten tribes, the seventy years captivity in Babylon, the conquests of the land by successive nations afterwards, although other profound changes occur, there is no change in this; in all the thousands of years down to Malachi, it is the same. Four thousand years elapse of blank silence, and then Jesus comes, and we find it still the same. Woman's position in the church is as subordinate and retiring in His day as ever. Her every place in the temple worship and in the synagogues shows this; in the temple she could not even enter where the officers of religion performed their duties; in the synagogues she was even separated by a veil or screen from the men.

The spirit and words of the New Testament are no different. This is worthy of careful notice. Indeed, the New Testament is more pronounced, if anything, than the Old. Note well this fact. This may be because the New Testament church was thrown in contact with the looser Gentile world and was preparing to embrace it. However that may be, it is certain that the New Testament is even more outspoken than the Old. The testimony of the Old Testament, though powerful, is yet mainly negative, whereas that of the New Testament is not only negative but most positive. It explicitly prohibits women from leadership in God's house in distinct and emphatic terms, and explicitly assigns her to a retiring and subordinate position. Not only does it present all church officials, with but two or three exceptions, as men, Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors or Teachers, Elders, Deacons, but it expressly raises the question, and then in terms of express prohibition pronounces upon the status of woman. Thus: "Let the women learn in silence

with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." (I Tim. 2: 11-14.) Now consider, (1) this occurs in Timothy, an epistle written especially for instruction and guidance about preachers; (2) it occurs in connection (to see the full force of this, read without regard to the division of chapters) with the giving the qualifications of preachers the terms of which qualifications limit the office necessarily to men. (I Tim. 3: 1-7.) Once more I Cor. 14: 33-37 (I give part) "God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all churches of the saints. Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. It is a shame for women to speak in the church. What! Came the Word of God out from you, or came it to you, only? If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Note these last words. The apostle solemnly invokes the authority of God to invest these his commands and declares that if any of the Corinthians claims to be a prophet or spiritual, i. e. claims to have power to discern spiritual things, the test of his claim is this, viz: "Let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Consider the force of the whole passage. (1) These words occur in an epistle written expressly to correct disorders in the church; (2) and in a chapter written to correct disorders in church worship. Two are particularly mentioned. First, there was a confused and fanatical use of the extraordinary spiritual gifts bestowed upon them, some singing, some praying, some "interpreting," some "speaking with tongues," some "prophesying," etc. (See V. 26-32.) And secondly, there was woman speaking. And now note well, the reasons for the prohibition. "God is not the author of confusion but of peace;" "women are commanded to be under obedience;" "it is a

shame for woman to speak in the church." The matter is presented as a matter vital to the order and welfare of the church. The prohibition is of the most positive and even vehement character, and in no question in the whole Bible is the authority of God invoked with more explicitness, solemnity and sternness than in this matter. Two other considerations occur here. 1. The force of this passage is such that it seems impossible for one, who accepts the unity of Scripture, to believe that they teach elsewhere, the contrary. And second, a full understanding of its force can only be had by keeping in memory that these people belonged to that corrupt heathen society whose women had the freedom Paul is condemning. Paul is correcting the looseness to which they had been more or less accustomed, and is bringing to bear upon them the stricter and more conservative notions of the gospel. Such then is the true significance of these, his teachings, here about women.

Again. As in the Old Testament, so in the New, the laws concerning church officials are such as to shut the offices and functions up to males. Just as with the Levites, whose males alone were set apart to public church functions, so with the officers of the New Testament Church, especially the permanent officers, the Elders and the Deacons. (I. Tim. 3: 1, etc.)—their functions are limited to males.

Once more. The Scripture doctrine of Marriage is irreconcilable with woman's occupying any other than a retiring and subordinate sphere in the Church. As we have seen, the headship of the man belongs to the very nature and essence of the institution! The illustration Scripture uses is absolutely overpowering in its convincing force. "The husband is head of the wife even as Christ is Head of the church." If then, this is so in the home, how much more so, is it so in the church? The contrary view and practice will utterly unfit our women for marriage and lead to its perversion, as indeed, facts only too abundantly testify.

The words of I. Cor. 11: 1-16, are also strong and positive.

It is true, that this passage speaks in one place of women "praying," and the connection makes the language somewhat ambiguous; but careful investigation shows that the praying alluded to does not mean "praying in public" as now practiced and advocated.

For, first, such praying by women, is explicitly prohibited in this same epistle only a chapter or so beyond, (I. Cor. 14.) It is not wise nor reverent to make the Holy Spirit contradict himself. In this 11th chapter, we have simply an allusion to a custom current in the Church. What that custom was exactly, can not now be ascertained. In the 14th chapter, however, we have a distinct prohibition of woman's praying in public, and of her assuming the leadership and prominence of any kind. There is also this consideration; the "praying" alluded to seems to have been that "praying with tongues," i. e., in an unknown tongue, which was one of the extraordinary and temporary gifts of the Holy Ghost, bestowed upon the New Testament Church at the outset of its career. If so, it affords no example for present custom, any more than does the possession and exercise then, of the other such gifts, for they have long since been withdrawn. The coupling the "praying" here, in this passage, with "prophesying," another of these extraordinary gifts, favors this idea; but in addition, Paul in I. Cor. 14: 14 makes distinct mention of the "praying," then alluded to "praying in an unknown tongue."

But the rest of the passage is conclusive. It is too long to quote in full. The following, however, will suffice; "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ and the head of every woman is the man." "The man is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man." "The man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." "Neither was the man created for the woman,

but the woman for the man." Such language cannot be explained away. It is overpowering.

Other considerations are at hand to show that woman's sphere in the church is, as woman's sphere in the home, an honorable, honoring and voluntary subordination and retiracy; but this paper threatens to be too long and we must pass on.

I. (B) (2) The "Rights" of Women in the Church of God are still to be considered. But the ground has been so completely covered in amplifying the sphere of woman in the home and church, and the rights of woman in the church are so much the same as the rights of woman in the home, already considered, that there remains for us at this point little more than a mere mention of these items.

The "rights" then of woman in the church, as set forth in Scripture, are briefly these :

(1) A monogamous marriage; (2) A Scriptural divorce, i. e., only for cause of proved adultery and abandonment; (3) An equal right as church member to all the ordinances and sacraments of the church; (4) Suffrage, or the right to vote for officers and on other church questions; (5) The special prerogative of teaching the young in a private sphere, both in the home and in the Sabbath school; (6) church work in other ways consistent with the position in the church, such as work in the choir, the ladies' societies, ladies' prayer meetings, etc.

We have now to consider the second division of this subject.

II. The bearing of the current movement on Woman in the Home and Church. It is not deemed advisable to treat this point formally here, as the ground was gone over thoroughly in Paper No. I (April QUARTERLY).

There are some vital considerations, however, well worth adding.

Let me endeavor to define more fully the rationale of the two Scripture principles, which settle woman's sphere and

rights in the home and church, viz : The principles of subordination and retiracy.

(1) This view is not that of Orientalism, either ancient or modern.

This has been already pointed out fully enough, but I wish to repeat and emphasize it. Woman in the Bible and in Christian lands, for instance in our own South, is as far removed from an Oriental woman as the poles from each other. The Bible home is not a harem, the Bible woman is not a slave nor a beast of burden; she is a companion, a loved and honored wife, mother, sister, daughter, the subject and object of man's shielding and protection, man's support and toil; the salt and savor of man's home, yea of man himself; for both in God's economy and man's experience it has been proven that, next to the preached Word, the chief agency of man's salvation has been the mother and the wife of his home. But to continue so she must continue in the home.

(2) Again, this retiring and subordinate attitude is not a sign of inferiority. This, too, has been already said. Woman is from the man himself, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Nevertheless, she is from the man, and not the man from her. "Adam was first formed, then Eve." She was created for the man, and not the man for her. It is a matter of vital order and welfare, as truly for her true good, true happiness and true dignity as for the man's.

(3) It is a memento of woman's sin in the fall. "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression." It was woman's first venture into leadership, and fatally did it terminate! "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children!" And can we doubt for a moment that one great bar to woman's going forth in public life, either in or out of the Church, is furnished by the pains, the sorrows, the inconveniences of motherhood?

(4.) Again. It is an indispensable safeguard of woman;

of woman's finer nature, true influence, true rights, true happiness and true progress. The curse upon woman, like as the curse upon man, has been turned into a blessing. It remanded her to a private sphere, and therein is her salvation. It is the safe-guard of her finer nature. Proof of this is multiplying daily, all the time. Women are becoming more and more masculine, masculine in dress, in manners, in morals, and more still, more masculine in skepticism.

There can be no doubt that this change has been caused by women's breaking forth into public life, both in the church and out of the church, and taking man's place. For it is precisely in that part of our country where this is done that women are becoming more and more masculine. It is seen in dress, manners, morals and religion; a grave charge I know, but the proofs are graver, far graver. Modesty and reserve are passing away, and women on the platform and even in the pulpit, handle themes which would have brought the blush not only to our mothers' cheeks but to our fathers' also. This safe-guard I am speaking of is a safe-guard also of woman's true influence. Say what you will, a woman's modesty and reserve are the key-note of her true influence; say what you will, she can best influence men in religion, not from the platform but in the home. Her mounting the platform, in church work, will not only tend to give men an excuse to get down from it but leave her bear the burden of the church work. And that suggests the third fact, viz: that this position God has placed her in is a safe-guard of her true rights. True rights, both in the church and out of the church. If this movement of the publicising of our women (if I may be permitted to coin a word); if this movement goes on, it will make our women the burden bearer, both outside and inside the home. And here is where our chivalry should come in. Her going into politics, her going into business life, her going on the platform, what does it mean? What is the fact even now? The fact is this, she is becoming more and more the supporter of the man. The

more she crowds man out of his place the more must she meet the responsibilities of the place; and so, instead of the man supporting her, she is daily becoming more and more the supporter of the man. Now may God forbid our having anything but sympathy, respect, admiration, pity, for the woman, the maid, wife, mother, who, from bitter necessity, goes out into the world to earn her bread; but, is it a thing to be encouraged as good? Is it not a thing to be deplored; is it not an evil; is it not a thing to be opposed and rectified? But the present movement makes it worse and worse, and to-day, millions of women are supporting millions of men. And can we expect it will be different in the church? Does not every pastor know how hard it is to get work out of the men? Why? Business! But suppose the women do their own work in the church and the men's work too. Nay, suppose the women do the men's work both out of the church and in the church? What then? The church will no doubt take on for a time a great boom of prosperity, but—the women, how about the women. The women will be the burden-bearers inside the church as well as outside. And it will be a grievous burden, more than they can bear.

This is no fancy sketch. I wish it were. It is based on simple, solid, stubborn facts.

This is an age of "reforms." A reform most sorely needed, is to re-form once more upon that fundamental factor in the Bible doctrine of the home, viz.: the headship of the man, and his consequent responsibility for the support and protection of the woman! This is the root of "chivalry," the sine qua non of the preservation of woman's modesty and reserve. This should be taught our boys; the sons, brothers, husbands of our women; taught them for their own sakes, to make them manly men, taught them for our women's sake, to keep them womanly women.

II. (B) The effects of the current revolution on women in society and the State, can not be separated from the effects on women in the home and Church.

Imagine a young woman making all the advances to a young man; "calling" on him, inviting him to the theatre and other public entertainments and even virtually making the marriage proposition (as is being done these days); or, a wife or mother supporting the men of her household, or spending a good part of her time in "club life," or in running over the country, on "business," or "politics," or voting against her husband, or running for office against him, (all of which is now being done); imagine such women bowing to the Saviour's words, "the husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the Church," or willing to heed the injunction, "let the women keep silence in the churches."

Per contra, how can we dismiss the fear that the mounting the platform, the assuming the other public functions, the running around to Church conventions here and there, etc., is nothing more nor less than training for political publicity and the other concomitants of Woman Suffrage?

(C) Woman's work in the home is the work of women, that is of fundamental importance and dignity and influence. To remove her, is to remove the foundations; the foundations not merely of the home, but the foundations of society, of the state and of the church. No one else can take her place. Mark it well. No one else can take her place! To remove her, means total ruin, anarchy, chaos. The noble "Pastoral Letter" of our Assembly of '98, finely says: "The centres of most powerful influence are the homes of the world. Let Christian women set the homes right, and there will no longer be in the church and state, the great evils of which they now complain."

And yet, one of the great dangers of the day is the "passing of the home," the Christian home. Of all the venerable institutions so cherished by the Church, none has against it at this day, so many and such deadly assaults. Decay of family worship, family government and training, decay of a holy "home Sabbath," decay of Chris-

tian marriage, the fearful strides of divorce, the increase of adultery; all these and more are assaulting now, the Christian home!

And they are all summed up in this "Woman Movement!" It only remains for me now to make an application closer home.

IV. This revolution is rapidly invading the South, i. e., our own territory, Church and homes.

(A) The South has problems enough of her own without this; problems grave and menacing. They are grave and menacing enough now; but the coming of this one on her will make them all the more so.

What, for instance, will be the effect of the maturing of the "Woman Movement," among us, on the "Negro Question"? What effect will it have upon the Negro women?

There is no reason to suppose that they will remain influenced by it. They are an imitative race; they watch closely and quickly catch up every new thing adopted by the whites. The negro women of the South will do, as to this matter, just what the negro women of the North are doing now, viz: fall in with the movement in all of its advanced and notorious features. In the North they have their negro women clubs, their negro women congresses, their negro women platform speakers, preachers, political and reform agitators; why not expect them in the coming years among us also? All the baneful effects already described as coming upon the social life, the homes, the industrial, the civic, the church life of the whites, will come much more upon the blacks. It will work among them like a rapid rot. If the marriage bond is loosening among the whites; if adultery and divorce are running rampant; if the women are becoming more the supporters and burden-bearers of the men, much more will it be so among the blacks. If the ballot given to the white women seems fraught with havoc to the home and to all things most dear, as we have seen, what will be the effect of the ballot given

to the negro women of the South? What effect upon them; what effect upon home and church and state; and what effect upon the ever-menacing, ever-growing incubus called the "Race Issue?"

We have no right to say these can never be living questions. The negroes number millions: they are a vast black, undigested mass, lying unassimilated in the stomach of the body politic, a source of chronic and increasing fever and decay, yet—they cannot be expelled. They will be here when we—are dust; here, facing our children and our children's children. We ourselves may not see the questions above cited, become living issues, but our children may. And if "Womanism" matures among us, they probably will. And if the Negro Question remains an open sore in the side of the South, the climax of the Woman Movement in her midst will be like the climax of all evils.

(b) The South cannot afford to take on this problem also, nor need she.

There are two encouraging facts about the South.

1. She is still, for the most part, an agricultural section, and the growth of all innovations is in an agricultural section, for several reasons, slow. Especially one, like "Womanism."

2. She has still, as a rule, the old fashioned ideas and customs concerning "the home."

3. And third, she has as a section, her old fashioned faith in and reverence for the Bible as God's Word.

These three things ought to enable her to resist the tide that's on her, flood-tide though it be; or, if it passes over her, remain unscathed, unharmed, unshaken and unchanged, lifting her head high above the muddy and receding waves.

One lesson from Church History it is timely to remember now. It is, that in testing times such as is the present, the temptation of temptations that comes to the church is to "adapt," under pressure, our interpretation of God's Word, to "the demands of modern civilization."

That was the snare that trapped Jewish scholarship before Christ's day, when it came in contact with Grecian thought; "trying to connect Greek Philosophers with the Bible," "finding a deeper meaning beneath the letter of Scripture, which would accord with philosophic truth."

That was the snare which beset Melancthon after the rock he leaned on, Luther, left him, and the result was Synergism, i. e., compromise of God's truth. That was the snare for Cranmer and the other English reformers, and the result was a Church half reformed.

So now, as to this great, this vital, this fundamental question, this is the temptation of temptations before our Church to-day.

P. D. STEPHENSON.

Woodstock, Va.

EDITORIAL.

RECORD AND REVIEW.

THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

To those who attended the Nashville and Charlotte Assemblies of the Southern Church the Pan-Presbyterian meeting was at first a disappointment. Geographical lines rather than ability or reputation are the necessary determinations in the selection of delegates. But when the great idea of the Council is considered and the work it has done in bringing together the insignificant and unknown members of the Presbyterian family, it is well worth a long trip to see and to hear.

Dr. DeWitt's opening sermon was strong and fearless in its stand for the integrity of the Word of God. It especially gratified the Southern delegation. It was an open challenge to the radical criticism. Dr. J. Marshall Lang, of Glasgow, Scotland, President of the Council, followed with an address upon the Permanent and the Progressive in Doctrine and Ministry. He trode difficult ground with a pretty firm tread, though some of his admissions as to the creeds of the Church need not have been made. The reception at the White House closed the first day's proceedings. The Cabinet officers were all there besides a large number of prominent people who were invited to the reception.

The report of Dr. Matthews, Secretary of the Alliance, and his paper on the history of the Alliance during the first quarter century were both of exceeding interest. Dr. Matthews is of giant frame, most pleasing voice and manner, and to him more than to anyone is due the success of the Alliance. It is interesting to know that out of the 5,000,000 communicants of Presbyterian Churches, 4,000,000 are of the English-speaking races and the other 1,000,000 on

the European Continent. Dr. Matthews linked Presbyterian progress with Anglo-Saxon destiny in fitting terms.

He referred to the work of the Alliance in making Presbyterianism one. As an illustration he gave an English expert's opinion to the effect that up to the war the United States was merely a Federation of States. After the war it became a nation. So, argued Dr. Matthews, Presbyterianism is a unit through the work of the Alliance in finding and consolidating the different churches of the system.

There is a tendency to Organic Union which the Alliance has developed. This work has been accomplished already in some churches, kindred in faith and geographically near together. In November, 1900, in all probability, the Free Church of Scotland and the United Church will become one organization.

Dr. Strickler's address was, to quote from a Scotch delegate, "like a demonstration from Euclid." There are elders in the New Testament as in the Old Testament Church. These elders are rulers. They are the only rulers. They are associated together in government. Hence the Presbyterian system is Scriptural. Another interesting paper was that by Samuel Smith, M. P., on Sacerdotalism in England. Mr. Smith looks like the typical Kansas Senator, with whiskers flowing to the breeze. But he is a good speaker and his vigorous stand for Protestantism was warmly commended and applauded by the Alliance. He referred to the Jesuitical teachings of Pusey and Newman and their corrupting influence. For example, Pusey taught that a priest need not reveal the secrets of the confessional on the witness stand because he was ignorant as a man of what he learned as the representative of God. He said that the hope of England was in the Parliament, whose ministry elected the rulers of the Anglican Church. That the Church had recently taken the position that the Parliament had no right to concern itself with religious questions and that the result must be the separation of church and state in England.

Mr. R. R. Simpson, of Edinburg, an elder, spoke on the Diaconate and urged the employment of Deaconesses as a scriptural arm of the Church's work. This address was followed up by a lively discussion, all tending in the Deaconess direction. It was closed by a dignified address by the venerable Moderator of the Reformed Church of America, who gave in brief his Church's doctrine as to the Diaconate, which is also the exact doctrine of the Southern Presbyterian Church.

The pulpit of the New York Avenue Church is a spread-eagle. One of the best addresses of the Council was delivered by Principal Salmond, of Aberdeen, Scotland, on the Influence of Calvinism in the Formation of the National Character of Britain. It was a great subject and ably handled. He was followed by Dr. William H. Roberts, the gist of whose address was the fact that American character under the same Calvinistic influences had gloriously defeated the British during the Revolution. Frankly, the address was an exhibition of bad manners, unless the English and Scotch visitors enjoy the story of their defeat. As Americans we felt a little ashamed of the setting forth of the American Revolution as a religious war against British intolerance and persecution. Moreover even that treatment of the subject was defective. Dr. Roberts is a good encyclopedia but he ought to get a historian to arrange his facts for him.

But the spread-eagle met his match at last. Dr. Thomson, the able and efficient Secretary of Home Missions for the Northern Church, spoke on Tuesday night of the great work the Northern Assembly is doing. It is a magnificent work and the temptation was a great one to make as fine a display as possible before the visitors from abroad as well as those from the South. But Canada's turn came next and Canada was represented by a tall, black-bearded, clear-voiced speaker, full of native eloquence and loyal to his Church. Somehow as he proceeded the Home Mission

work just before mentioned grew smaller and smaller until it became insignificant. It was the most complete triumph of the Council and when Dr. Johnson sat down the Canadian Church had taken the position as the model home mission Church, and the spread-eagle, before alluded to, as it heard the closing periods of the address, quietly and despairingly folded its wings.

Dr. W. McF. Alexander, of New Orleans, had a thoughtful paper on the Reflex Influence of Missions. He was only permitted to read for fifteen minutes when he had prepared a paper for twenty-five. And that was short enough for a man to come half way across the continent to read.

But Dr. Alexander served as a martyr for the rest of the speakers and they were allowed twenty-five minutes. We believe that it would be still better to have subjects requiring a treatment of forty-five minutes and to select the ablest possible speakers, while cutting down somewhat the number. The speaker before Dr. Alexander, Dr. Buchanan, of Edinburgh, had referred to the institution of human slavery in the United States in terms of unqualified condemnation. It is perhaps just as well that Dr. Alexander was not allowed to finish, as he had a closing paragraph setting forth the extraordinary missionary results of Southern slavery, whereby some 6,000,000 of degraded and cannibal heathen were brought into a condition of at least semi-Christianity—more than the missionary societies of all the world have accomplished in a hundred years. Our British brethren have taken a one-sided view of the slavery question. If they will compare the record of the Southern States with that of the West Indies under British control in the simple matter of humanity to the slaves and their vital statistics, they will praise instead of blame the South.

And if they will compare the system abolished here with that existing in India to-day under British rule they will have nothing to say. Moreover as long as the Sultan of Sulu is allowed to maintain slavery under the United

States' flag there would seem to be some work for abolition other than self-glorification for the past. Why can we not all recognize that slavery in some form is the tutelage through which the inferior races must come in their progress from childhood to manhood?

One of the encouraging aspects of Protestant work in Europe, according to a statement made by Dr. Matthews, is the movement of the priests away from Rome. This remark was confirmed by one of the delegates, who has traveled much on the Continent. He said that if there was a movement towards Rome among the English High Churchmen, there was a vastly greater exodus from Rome on the Continent. This is especially true of France and Austria. In French Switzerland the churches, already in full sympathy with us, are gradually changing from the consistorial to the sessional form of worship. Several speakers urged American Christians to attend the native Protestant churches and not the Romish cathedrals, when they were traveling on the Continent, and especially were they besought not to break down the respect for the Sabbath which the Protestant pastors were trying to inculcate.

Dr. Bannerman, of Perth, made an excellent showing of the work done for English-speaking peoples on the Continent. There is a religious paper, *The Continental Presbyterian*, edited in Scotland, for the especial benefit of this large and influential class. Dr. Bannerman gave special praise to the Scotch servant-women who were the life and support of these churches in many instances, and to the generosity of the American travelers whose gifts were most acceptable in maintaining the work of providing English services for English-speaking people.

One of the Hungarian delegates, Mr. Kalassay, made an address that carried one back to the old days of persecution for conscience sake. Presbyterianism is still obnoxious to tyranny and our representative government is looked upon with disfavor. For example, the King of

Hungary sends a delegate to their General Synod to represent the throne and all of the Synod's laws must receive the royal sanction.

The General Synod of the Hungarian Church is composed of 116 delegates and meets but once in ten years. The inferior courts are the classis, answering to our Presbytery and the Congregational Presbytery or Session.

Dr. Teofilo Gay, of Naples, is an orator of the fiery type and received an ovation for himself and the Waldensian Church which he ably represented. He opened his address by remarking that the word Council did not have the most pleasant associations for him. But that we had redeemed the word. It meant now a gathering not for innovating but for conserving, not for inventing something new but for holding on to what was old. Almost the only Latin in attendance, he congratulated the Council on being sufficiently latinized to adhere to the teachings of that distinguished Latin, John Calvin. He declared that his fathers were Presbyterians long before Columbus discovered America or Luther discovered the Bible. In passing he paid a tribute to Napoleon Bonaparte, who was so much impressed with the Waldensian work as it was then, that he gave to the pastors a thousand francs annually, on their salaries. He intimated that they were not receiving quite as good a stipend now.

During their fifty years of religious liberty, the work of the Waldensians has been marvelous. Their presence in the kingdom was the occasion of the granting of religious liberty in Italy. And now they have established fifty new churches and have received as many converts from Romanism as there were Waldensian members fifty years ago, namely, twenty-five thousand souls.

Such has been the influence of the Waldensian missionaries in disseminating Bible truth that even the Pope has been forced to commend its study to the faithful. A recent edition of the Bible has been published by the Catho-

lic authorities containing the preface, 'The Holy Father grants forty years of indulgence for every quarter of an hour spent in the study of the Bible.'

A feature of the work in Italy not often thought of is the influence of the Italian immigrants who become converted to Protestantism during their exile and return to Italy to preach and teach the Gospel. Recently a Calabrian family, converted by the work of the Protestant Missionaries in Brazil, returned to Naples, joined the Church there and began at once to work. Another family from South America who settled in Lisbon, have gathered a congregation of 500 in sympathy with Protestant doctrine and are waiting to be taken under the care of some Protestant church—preferably the Presbyterian Church.

A resolution which stirred the Council to its depth was offered by Dr. Cyrus Cort of the Northern Presbyterian Church. It was preceded by two whereases, one setting forth the fact that at the last Council arbitration between Britain and the United States had been commended, and the other mentioning the Hague Conference as endorsing the principles set forth by the Council. The resolution read :

"Resolved, By this Council of Reformed Churches throughout the world, assembled October, 1899, at the city of Washington, D. C., that in the name and interests of the Prince of Peace Himself we earnestly deplore and deprecate any resort to the terrible arbitrament of war in the settlement of pending difficulties between the governments of Great Britain and of the Transvaal Republic, and implore both parties to seek more earnestly a solution of the questions at issue by recourse to methods of international arbitration so recently recognized and commended by representatives of all civilized governments on the face of the earth."

Instantly Dr. Lang was on his feet protesting against the adoption of the resolution and asking the substitution of a general reference to arbitration. Dr. Meiring from Johannesburg, a loyal Afrikaner, demanded its passage, as general principles were of no avail unless applied to particular cases. Dr. Johnson of Canada held that there was nothing political in the resolution. But Dr. Matthews, the Secretary, asserted that the political question was in the very heart of the

resolution, since this was not a conflict between two governments, the Transvaal being a part of the British Empire. To which Dr. Meiring retorted that "the Transvaal is an independent Republic." The issue was clear enough. The political question was apparent.

What to do with it was the next question. A motion was made to refer it to the business committee. Another motion was made to postpone the resolution, as the subject of arbitration was to come up in another form. Eighty delegates voted to refer and eighty to postpone. Dr. Radcliffe, pastor of the church in which the Council met, failed to vote and asked to be recorded in favor of the resolution to refer. The request was denied. Dr. Hamlin, as Chairman, broke the tie by voting to postpone, which was recognized as the effective mode of killing the resolution. But this seemed to favor the view that the Transvaal was a part of the British Empire and therefore arbitration as between nations was impossible. So Dr. Bosman of South Africa left for home and Dr. Meiring wrote a letter asking that his name be stricken from the rolls of the Council. Then a Southern Presbyterian, Dr. Kerr, of Richmond, affected a compromise between the two parties just in time to prevent secession, and the Council unanimously passed the resolution offered by Dr. Kerr, that "in the distressing crisis now existing between Great Britain and the Transvaal the Council expresses its earnest hope and prayer that a peaceful solution of present difficulties may be reached."

And so the Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian System has practically endorsed the position of the Southern Presbyterian Church that the Church should handle nothing political. The first resolution assumed the truth of one side of the very question at issue. The Council is not a legislative body and hence the results could not have been very serious. Yet if the resolution had carried, the British delegates would probably have left the Council while its postponement offended the Afrikanders. The

simple principle is that the Church has a higher mission than that of deciding questions on which men honestly and conscientiously differ, and by offending those against whom she decides she loses the opportunity of reaching them with her distinctive work.

In 1861 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in Philadelphia. A political question as old as the Government itself and one that had been debated on the stump and in political platforms and in the halls of Congress, was agitating the country, whether the allegiance of American citizens was due to the State or to the Nation, whether a State could retire from the Federation it had entered, or the Union were indissoluble. Men honestly and conscientiously differed on the question, and the student of history knows that it was never settled, and never could have been settled without the appeal to the sword.

But this Court of the Lord Jesus Christ undertook to say that the allegiance of the citizen was due to the General Government. There were those present who believed otherwise and the decree of the Assembly was as the stone in mid stream over which the torrent rushes with undiminished force. These formed the Southern Presbyterian Church and their children form it to-day. By force of circumstances in its own history, this Church has stood for liberty of opinion in all matters not within the sphere of revealed truth. By the conviction that its war record was an honorable one, that it accomplished something for the preservation of the Union, and perhaps for consistency's sake, the Northern Church has felt bound to make political deliverances wherever it imagined that a moral question was involved. The Southern Church feels more and more the need of standing for the principle which it calls the Crown Rights of Jesus Christ.

That the Southern position is by far the broader and the only possible basis of union is clear enough. There is a

moral element in every political question. There is no reason, logically, why there should not be Gold Presbyterians and Silver Presbyterians, High Tariff Presbyterians and Free Trade Presbyterians, Imperialistic and Anti-Imperialistic Presbyterians. It is only necessary for one party or the other in the Assembly to offer a resolution condemning the political principles of the other, and to get it carried or defeated. Then the minority can set up for themselves. For political questions are divisive and when they are solemnly settled by a church court, separation is the only way of peace.

The little breeze in the Council would seem to indicate that there was still some necessity for the Southern Church's existence and for its adherence to its distinctive principle. And we trust that, as the exhibition of wounded feelings was made by other than Southern delegates, the lesson may not be lost upon the noble body of Christians which we call the Northern Presbyterian Church. There is an infinitely higher work for the Church of Christ to do than the settling of these little issues. Its work is the salvation and sanctification of men; and the renovation of society and the purification of government will follow the faithful adherence of the Church to its divine mission far more certainly and far more speedily than by the entrance of the Church into the sphere of partisan politics, helping to inflame the passions of men, and, even when in the right, arousing the opposition of those condemned, and thus effectively blocking the way of influence for eternal good.

A delegate from the French Reformed Church spoke of their holding to the exact form of Government established in the days of Calvin. There are 600,000 Protestants in France. And the nation is looking to Protestantism for the principles of truth and justice, so conspicuously absent from the Dreyfus trial. In spite of the verdict, the Rennes trial was a defeat for the Catholic party. All conscientious Frenchmen know that Protestantism is on the side of truth and will suffer and die for it if necessary.

The favor of the French people is shown by the fact that city halls and other public places are frequently offered to Protestants for holding church services. The work is growing rapidly in spite of opposition. The speaker brought down the house when he said that they had no time for Higher Criticism. It was not a suitable time to pick one's gun to pieces when in conflict with the enemy.

One of the most pleasant incidents of the Council was the introduction of Dr. Newman, delegate from the International Council that recently met in Boston. His address, bearing the greetings of the Council, was a model expression of sincere Christian fellowship. Dr. Lang replied in fitting and eloquent terms, bringing to mind the common glorious achievements of Presbyterians and Congregationalists and the bond of sympathy that had always united the two bodies in the cause of Christian progress and human freedom. Dr. Lang is a typical Scot, tall, big-jointed, large-featured, with blue eyes, sandy hair and beard and awkward limbs, but with the impression of giant strength held lazily in reserve.

Dr. Sanders, the Negro President of Biddle University, Charlotte, made a fine address in which he took occasion to mention the friendly feeling of the Southern Church for the negro race as well as the fact that Presbyterianism is doing more for the education of the Negro than all other agencies combined.

Dr. Coe, of New York, read a thoughtful paper on Christianity and Socialism. A discussion ensued, participated in by Mr. Smith, M. P., Dr. Ross, of Newcastle, and Dr. Sample, the Moderator of the Northern Assembly, who made an earnest plea for the preaching of the old-fashioned gospel as the remedy for all social problems, reaching the masses through the individual.

Dr. Cunningham, of Edinburgh, read a paper full of interesting facts with regard to the continental movement in favor of the Sabbath. It is about time for Americans to stop talking patronizingly about the "Continental Sunday"

and to see to it that the "American Sabbath" is kept better than it is. There is an International Congress for promoting the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship. Through the work of the Congress 80,000 Belgian workmen were released from Sabbath work. Through the suppression of Sunday freight trains (goods' trains, as he called them) 50,000 railroad hands are allowed their Sabbath, while Denmark's law against Sunday factories has released 100,000 workmen from Sabbath toil. Even in France freight trains are stopped after ten o'clock Sunday morning.

We have often thought that this was the true method of Sabbath reform. Let the workingmen understand that they have a right to one day in seven, let the law protect them in the exercise of that right by forbidding all unnecessary labor and then let the churches visit the people and persuade them to come within their walls for worship, and the present condition of things will be vastly improved.

Mr. Charles Guthrie, Q. C., son of the famous Dr. Guthrie, of Scotland, made an admirable address on Christian Morality in its Application to Business. He began, contrary to the usual apologetic custom, by saying that he regarded himself as peculiarly fitted for the task before him. In the first place he was a lawyer, and it was generally understood that the lawyer saw all sides of life.

Nevertheless, the speaker continued, the law has its great rewards only for those who believe in Christian morality. The last five occupants of the woolsack, the ambition of all young lawyers, have been eminent Christian men.

The second qualification, said Mr. Guthrie, was his having been brought up in a manse. He referred to his famous father in thrilling words. The children knew of his eloquence in the pulpit, and saw the admiration of men for his qualities; but they were influenced chiefly by "the abiding eloquence of his Christian life."

Christian morality is not always the morality of Christians. The Dreyfus conviction was justifiable on grounds

of expediency. Yet it has been condemned by the world. The man who obtains charity on false pretences should be hanged higher than Haman because he not only deceived and defrauded his fellows but—quoting from Dr. Guthrie—“he poisoned the springs of charity.” The law of truth and honor are obligatory on Christians. Sir Walter Scott might have been legally relieved of his debts but he preferred to toil the remaining years of his life until he had paid them all. So the American humorist, Mark Twain, when he might easily have compromised with his creditors, began life anew with nothing and has labored until his obligations have been met. Balfour, who will be Prime Minister some day, is called by his Irish opponents, Prince Arthur, for his chivalry and generosity. Dr. Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury, when a master of a school had this compliment paid him: “Temple,” said a schoolboy writing home, “is a beast. But he is a just beast.”

Mr. Guthrie then referred to the ethics of the sermon on the Mount and closed with this fine paragraph: “As we pass from the crowded peaks of the written law to the solitary summits of the unwritten law, as we ascend from justice to generosity, we may see yet beyond and above us the path untrodden save by the pierced feet of the Son of God.”

These few extracts from the proceedings may serve to give some idea of what was said and done in Washington at this session of the Council.

The Council elected Principal Caven, of Canada, next President, chose Liverpool as the place of next meeting and adjourned Friday evening, October 6th.

I. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

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., L. L.D.*, late Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia. Crescent Book House, Mexico, Mo.

This work has already been intelligently reviewed in the *PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY*, and yet it may not be amiss to give it another examination somewhat more critical than it has yet received. It is the last and possibly the greatest work of its distinguished author, and is unfortunately a posthumous publication.

It is to be lamented that the book should have been manufactured by an inexperienced house in a small town; as it is marred by typographical errors. More than this, the editorial supervision was not well done, as may be seen throughout the volume, sometimes to the confusion of the meaning. The title page shows inaccuracy. Is Union Seminary the property of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia? It is just, however, to say that the book is as well made up as could be expected from the conditions of its publication.

Dr. Dabney calls this treatise on ethics "The Practical Philosophy." The Greeks divided human knowledge into theoretical and practical. The practical was subdivided into the practical proper and the poetic. The distinction between the practical and poetic is that indicated by the words. The practical embrace those arts which involve action and nothing more: while the poetic include those whose action results in making or producing something. Thus Ethics, Politics, Economics, Music, and Dancing are practical, while Oratory, Poetry, Painting, and Sculpture are poetic. We thus see that ethics was by them considered practical, both in the generic and specific senses. Ethics, however, was not "The Practical Philosophy," the only, the generic, or even the specific Practical Philosophy; it was regarded simply as one of the practical studies. Kant has perhaps justified this limitation of practical philosophy to ethics.

While this book is Dr. Dabney's contribution to ethics, it is more than that. It is his Psychology of what Stewart calls the Active Powers, embracing both the Sensibility and the Will; in other words, it is his discussion of all the mental faculties, except the intellect. The question arises, why dissociate the intellect from the other powers as not practical in its nature and relations? Dr. Dabney not only admits but asserts that the intellect is active, as truly so as the feelings and will. Moreover, he affirms the practical nature of the intellect in his argument for our responsibility for belief. It seems an error and an important one, to treat ethics as not concerned with the intellect as vitally as with the other

powers; inasmuch as the intellect largely influences and determines the affections, desires and volitions.

The treatise has four chief divisions: I. Psychology of the Feelings. II. The Theory of Volitions. III. Ethical Theory. IV. Applied Ethics.

Dr. Dabney seems to use the word Philosophy, not only in the title of the work, but also in the book itself, as the equivalent of Psychology. This is allowed by popular but not by scientific usage. Philosophy is concerned with the entire universe of being. There is, however, a recognized department of Philosophy, Epistemology, which is concerned with the origin and extent of human knowledge.

His analysis of the intellect, Dr. Dabney gives us in the first paragraph of the book; it is virtually the same as Hamilton's, and has similar defects. It omits the powers of expression, conception, and invention. He probably makes generalization include conception; there are, however, two kinds of concepts, which are not produced by generalization. There is the complex individual concept; for example, the idea of a man, some particular man, tree, horse, etc. We do not perceive John Jones, we perceive each separate quality of John Jones, and by conception combine these into the complex idea of John Jones. There is also the collective concept, as forest, army, etc. This concept is not generic but individual, and is formed by combining the individuals of the mass into a collection.

The inventive power he would probably place, as is frequently done, under his representative imagination. But the inventive power is quite distinct from this. The representative imagination simply pictures to the mind some object of past knowledge. The inventive power is that which creates a new object of knowledge by a combination hitherto unmade, the invention of the telegraph or the making of a poem. The representative imagination is a low power of the mind, possessed in vigor sometimes by feeble intellects; the inventive, creative power is that which shows the intellect to be most like God.

There is no recognition of the power of expression; in this, he has the company of others. It is strange that psychologists have overlooked this power. Every human being has it, even the infant, more or less developed. It is a power of the mind, not of the body. It is true that the mind uses the body as the instrument of expression. Just as the mind uses the eye to see with, so it uses the mouth to express its thoughts and feelings. It is an intellectual power, it is intelligence making itself known.

Dr. Dabney also omits instinct as one of the powers of the intellect and puts it among the feelings. It is indeed both; we have some instinctive knowledge, as well as some instinctive feelings. In man the intellectual instincts are limited to knowledge necessary for the perpetuation of life.

In his nomenclature Feeling is a generic term embracing all the mental powers, or capacities, except the intellect and will. He thus adopts that analysis of the faculties whose excellence has given it credit over the eminent authority of Aristotle's dichotomy, continued down to Reid

and Stewart as Understanding and Will, and Kant's proposed trichotomy into Intellect, Feeling, and Conation.

Feeling includes sensations, simple emotions, affections, desires, and hopes. He subdivides these into two distinct classes: 1. Sensibilities, or the passive feelings; and second, Conations, or Desires, or Appetencies, the active feelings. This distinction is just. Objection may be made, however, to the distinguishing terms, active and passive. There are, rightly considered, no passive powers of the mind; the terms indeed are contradictory; for a power cannot exert itself when it is passive, it must act when it is in exercise. What is true is that these so-called passive powers do not originate action, they never act until they are first acted upon. They are objective in origin, while the active was subjective. The true basis for the radical division of the feelings is their simplicity; they are either simple, mere modifications of pleasure and pain, or they are complex, combining other feelings with these agreeable or disagreeable emotions. The complex feelings are the affections, desires, and hopes.

Dr. Dabney places the sensations of sight, hearing, etc., among the sensibilities. This accords with the general view. It is however not true. Baldwin is right in declaring that sensation, as distinct from perception, is purely physical; it is merely the nervous condition of perception. All mental feelings are modes of pleasure and pain, but the sensations may be perfect without any consciousness of either. I see the paper on which I write without the experience of the least pleasure or pain.

Dr. Dabney places the Affections among the mere sensibilities; they properly form a sub-class of the complex emotions. They contain two elements: 1. The generic feeling of pleasure or pain. 2. That peculiar feeling which every mind recognizes as love or hate.

It is also noticeable that there is no recognition of the Hopes in the Table of Feelings and Appetencies. The complex feelings embrace the Affections, which are pleasures or pain plus love or hate; the Desires, which are pleasures, loves, and craving; and the Hopes, which are pleasures, loves, cravings, and degrees of expectation.

He subsequently mentions Fear and Hope, and says that they are not original, but derivative feelings. They are as original as any of our affections or desires. They are not simple, neither the affections and desires; but they are *sui generis* and cannot be resolved into anything else than themselves. They have elements in common with other feelings, but they have that which is their *proprium*, and is not found in any other class of feelings.

One of the most interesting and important points in the entire discussion is found on page 14, where it is held that our sensibilities are non-moral; that, as we are passive in them, we are not responsible for them; that our responsibility is limited to our appetencies or desires, in which alone the soul is active. If this distinction be correct and the loves, as Dr. Dabney states, are mere sensibilities, then they are without moral char-

acter. Again Dr. Dabney puts "inordinate self-will" among the sensibilities, p. 39, and must consistently hold that it has no moral coloring. Dr. Dabney is therefore surely mistaken either in making the sensibilities non-moral or else in putting the social affections and inordinate self-will among them; he may be wrong in both.

He seems to err here in what he considers an important discovery of his, our lack of responsibility for our sensibilities. The mind moves, as Dr. Dabney allows, in this order: First, thoughts, then sensibilities, then appetencies, then volitions. We are responsible for our thoughts as found in our opinions and beliefs, as Dr. Dabney distinctly teaches. We are also responsible for our appetencies and volitions, the sensibilities are thus left as the only mental exercises of an irresponsible character. It is strange that what precedes and what follows are moral, and that the intermediate link is not. It is also strange that man is responsible for all his mental acts except his sensibilities.

On what ground does he exempt them? It is because the mind is passive in them. This, however, is not true. A power may be latent, dormant, non-acting at any particular moment, though this is doubted by some thinkers. But it is incredible that a power can be in exercise and yet be passive. Take for instance what he calls "the ethical sensibility, resentment;" is the mind passive when it is exercising the feeling of resentment? Surely not; it is active in resentment and may be intensely so. What is true is not that mental powers are ever passive in their movements, but that their action is not primary but secondary, their action is a reaction. Resentment is never a primary movement of mind, it is its response to some action by others.

Are we responsible for our secondary as well as for our primary actions; for our reactions upon the influences exerted upon us by others? This depends upon whether they are our acts; if so, we are responsible for all in them that is ours. Our sensibilities are as truly our own as are our appetencies, and we are therefore as surely responsible for them.

Dr. Dabney's reasoning in this reminds us of his defence of American slavery. He not only admits but asserts that the origin of this relationship was wrong; that the African slave trade was evil, not only in the horrors attending it but also in the act itself. If it was wrong to bring the negro into slavery, how could it be right to keep him in that state? So if the appetencies are moral, how is it that the sensibilities which give rise to them are non-moral?

Dr. Dabney declares, p. 28, that "all activities of our natural powers involve some degree of pain or pleasure." This is surely not true, as he himself calls to our attention "the action of those powers of whose presence we are only conscious by the pain they cause us." The perfectly healthy man knows by consciousness nothing of his nervous system; it gives him neither pain nor pleasure in its normal working. Moreover, there are thousands of perceptions every day, sights and sounds, which are absolutely neutral to us so far as any pain or pleasure is experienced in them.

P. 89, Love is limited in its objects to "human, or at least rational beings." So others teach. This seems contrary to experience. Horses, dogs, cats, birds and other pets are objects of affection. So are flowers, our home, our country. Dr. Noah Davis says that we do not love our homes, but the people of our homes. This is seen to be untrue in the case of the hermit, whose attachment to his hut cannot be doubted. In this connection, we note that Dr. Dabney, like many other psychologists, does not believe that the lower animals have rationality. This position can not be maintained in view of many facts. - Even the careless observer cannot fail to note instances of comparison and judgment in the acts of the domestic animals. Time and again, cats can be observed to stop suddenly as they are walking along, apparently deliberate, and then either proceed, turn back, or aside, as they seem to decide. Moreover, it is thought to be orthodox to deny real mindhood to the lower animals; on the contrary, materialism results, if it be true that mere matter can do all that we see in the brutes.

P. 92, there is inaccuracy in discriminating the love of complacency and the love of benevolence. It is said that the mother "loves a reprobate son in spite of his ill-desert," and that this is the love of benevolence. No, this is the love of complacency, as truly as her love for the obedient son; because it is due, as Dr. Dabney says, to the fact that "he is her son and she recollects many natural graces of body and wit which once pleased her." The love of complacency is based on the desert of its object; the love of benevolence on the need of its object. The mother loves her truant boy benevolently not in spite of his ill desert, but because of his ill desert. In his fallen, depraved condition, he needs her love and she gives it to him without stint.

It is strange that, in giving the various kinds of love, enumerating philanthropy, patriotism, friendship, conjugal, parental, fraternal, and filial love, he omits any mention of love to God. We have already noted that he denies man's love for the irrational world; he seems to have forgotten in his discussion of love the highest of its objects and to limit it to the human. We may observe that our love for God is mainly that of complacency; in a sense, it is exclusively so. God deserves our highest, supremest complacent love. He does not need our love of benevolence; and yet he desires it towards his people, his cause, his church, as his representatives and the agents of his declarative glory.

Dr. Dabney teaches that the mind has a moral faculty, and indeed this is palpably true in a certain sense, for the mind must have a faculty for doing what it actually does. But when we ask. Has the mind a special moral faculty, distinct from all other faculties, the question is different. By the law of parsimony, if the other recognized faculties are capable of doing all that is attributed to this alleged moral faculty, why multiply the mental powers? The truth is, that the mind has no special moral faculty, but rather a moral nature, by virtue of which any of its faculties may exercise themselves on moral objects. Thus we have moral intuitions, moral judgments, moral reasonings, moral feelings, and moral volitions. The same is true of the alleged aesthetic faculty.

Page 268, approbation is declared to be a feeling. This is not true; approbation is an act of judgment. There is a feeling which accompanies this act of judgment, which is sometimes called the feeling of approbation, because it springs from the judgment of approval.

Page 312, all but the first four lines belongs to "(B) From Analogy," on the preceding page. This is probably the fault of the printer who made up the forms.

Page 323, there is a heading to a section, "The 'Golden Rule,' Rationally Interpreted, is the Principle of All Duties between Man and Man." The Golden Rule is probably the most lauded moral maxim that human literature contains. It is found in the writings of Aristotle, Isocrates, Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed in a variety of forms. It is first seen, so far as this writer knows, in Levit. 19:18. It received the approval of our Divine Lord; it is therefore good. It is however not a perfect rule, nor did our Master declare it to be. He simply quotes it from "the law and the prophets." It is a law probably higher and better than are the actions of any man that ever lived; still it is an imperfect law, because it sets up for us a fallible, human standard; we are called upon by it to love our neighbor as we love ourselves. We may and often do love ourselves unwisely, inordinately. The Great Teacher supplanted this rule with another, which He calls the New Commandment; Jno. 13:34, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." He makes His love for us the standard of our love for others. It is unaccountable that this new commandment is so generally overlooked.

Page 346, it is asserted that the angels are "single integers; they do not multiply themselves." Do we know this to be true? The Mormons teach it, as a revelation to them. On it they base their assertion that the angels are inferior to man. If it be true, it is contrary to analogy; for all the higher forms of creatures within our observation can and do multiply themselves. Man, the glory of terrestrial creation, multiplies himself, body and soul, either efficiently or instrumentally. Dr. Dabney may have based his opinion on the Master's statement, that "in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven." This may or may not imply it.

In an argument against an opponent, where authorities are appealed to, exact reference should be made to the place where the authoritative statement may be found. This is not done on pp. 355 and 357.

Page 357, it is said that God made of Israel "a federal republic of eleven cantons." Dr. Dabney seems to think that because Levi was not a separate canton but was scattered among the other tribe, therefore there were but eleven. He forgets that Joseph was divided into two tribes, each of which was as separate from the other as were any of the tribes.

There is an unwise arrangement of the material in the 4th chapter of the 4th book. He first states and expounds the Social Contract Theory; then after discussing at length the Theistic Divine Right Theories, he

returns to the refutation of the Social Contract view. It would have been better to put the refutation along with the exposition.

It is to be deplored that reference is made to wine, p. 478, as though it were an entirely proper object for use as a beverage. Any other article of domestic consumption would have served the purpose of example as well as wine. There are many wise and good people who conscientiously believe that wine is not now a proper beverage. Dr. Dabney suddenly offends these, and gives the weight of his great name to the encouragement of young men, in a book prepared for them on practical morals, to drink wine.

Dr. Dabney contrary to the practically unanimous judgment of scientific economists, favors the enactment and enforcement of usury laws. When money was loaned, as it was until modern times, almost exclusively for unproductive consumption and to men in distress, there was some propriety in this legal interference with the right of private contract. But now, when 99 per cent. of the loans are for productive consumption, there is neither justice in it nor necessity for it. It has been often shown that it is as much to the interest of the borrower as of the lender that money, like everything else, should be free.

There are 201 pages devoted to Applied Ethics, of which barely seven are given to our "Duties Relating to God," and not a chapter, nor a section, nor a paragraph that discusses our practical duties to ourselves. He confines himself virtually to social ethics, ignores personal ethics, and dismisses theistic ethics with a word.

The style is clear and vigorous. In exposition, he rarely fails to be luminous. In an argument, he is strong, if not always convincing. The discussion would be improved by toning down or removing its superlatives, its adjectives, its sectionalism and partisan expressions.

We have yet to present the most important criticism on the book as a whole. All things considered, Alexander's *Moral Science* is one of the strangest volumes ever issued from a Christian press. It is a discussion of man's duty, theoretical and practical, by a pious and learned Christian divine, in which the Bible and Christianity are ignored; it could have been written by a sober, virtuous and intelligent pagan. A similar though not so severe a criticism can be passed upon Dr. Dabney's *Practical Philosophy*. While the Bible is often mentioned, and Christ occasionally, and always with respectful deference, the entire discussion, theoretical and practical, expository and argumentative, is conducted upon the basis of natural reason. The Bible is used merely to confirm the facts or conclusions of rational inquiry. Not a truth is presented nor a duty urged that does not appear to the natural man. The body of the volume could have been written by a heathen, and would contain every truth that it now holds; a few Christian illustrations and confirmations have been added.

Against this treatment of Ethics, we earnestly protest. If Christianity be true, if it be an infallible revelation from God as to our faith and practice, then its voice is authoritative within the domain of duty. We

believe that Christianity is dumb as to science, as to politics; we believe that it speaks with a "categorical imperative" as to Ethics, as an inherent and essential part of Redemption. I am writing now with the aid of electric light; when I was a boy I studied with the help of the dim flicker of a tallow candle. We live now in the perfect light of divinely revealed truth; shall we ignore this, and grope our way along the path of right and duty with the uncertain and feeble rushlight of natural reason? Let us have a distinctively Christian system of Ethics.

This review of the *Practical Philosophy* has so far repeated little or nothing contained in the notices of it already published. The impression forced itself on this writer that some of them were written by those who had not read the book. Whether right or wrong, an effort has been made in this notice to call attention to those features of the work which are of a doubtful character.

It may be thought, if these criticisms are just, that the book is full of error and imperfection. This writer does not think so, for he has used it two years as a text book with his classes. He expects to continue to use it, as upon the whole the best treatise on Ethics that he knows. The last criticism he regards as by far the most vital, and he deeply regrets that Dr. Dabney did not unfold and elaborate the principles of right and the rule of duty as they are found in the teachings of Him, who is "the way, the truth, and the life."

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

A SYSTEM OF ETHICS. *By Friedrich Paulsen.* Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin. Edited and Translated with the Author's Sanction from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition, by Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri, New York. Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1899. [All rights reserved.] 8 vo. Pp. 723.

The Scribners are the leading publishers of philosophical literature in this country. Their imprimatur guarantees a superior book. Having a high standard of excellence in their selection, they are careful and intelligent in the mechanical manufacture of their publications.

Paulsen discusses Ethics under four general heads: I. Outline of a History of the Conceptions of Life and Moral Philosophy. II. Fundamental Concepts and Questions of Principle. III. The Doctrine of Virtues and Duties. IV. Forms of Social Life. The historical portion presents the Greek, Christian, Medieval and Modern Conceptions of Life; a chapter on the Conversion of the Old World to Christianity, and another on Medieval and Modern Moral Philosophy.

Book I is his Theoretical Ethics, and discusses Good and Bad, Teleological and Formalistic Conceptions; the Highest Good; Hedonistic and Energetic Conceptions; Pessimism; the Evil, the Bad, and Theodicy; Duty and Conscience; Egoism and Altruism; Virtue and Happiness; Relation of Morality to Religion; and the Freedom of the Will.

Practical Ethics, in Book III, has eleven chapters, treating succes-

sively Virtues and Vices in General; the Education of the Will and the Discipline of the Feelings, or Self-Control; Bodily Life; Economic Life; Spiritual Life and Culture; Honor and the Love of Honor; Suicide; Compassion and Benevolence; Justice; Love of Neighbor, and Veracity. The translator has omitted his discussion of the Duel from the sixth chapter. The work has been criticised for giving a disproportionate attention to these practical questions, but Paulsen defends and justifies himself for doing so. Nevertheless the topics discussed are far from exhaustive, allowing that he should confine himself to the most important. Personal duties owing to one's self, are fairly full in their treatment; but social are quite meager, and theistic are entirely neglected.

Book IV, sociological and political, is not included in this volume.

The treatise is well written to interest the general reader. The author says that it was not prepared for philosophers, but for the intelligent public. The translation is the work of a master, and confirms the reputation made by Prof. Thilly's earlier success in giving English readers valuable German discussions.

Among the important views held and taught by Prof. Paulsen are these: that Ethics is a practical rather than theoretical, empirical rather than rationalistic science; that the will is superior to the intellect and has an independent freedom; that ethical laws are natural as the physical are; that perfection is the highest good; that there is no universal concrete morality; that the Christian conception of life is not natural but supernatural; that Christianity condemns the virtues and goods of this world; that the gospels are not historical but poetical; that pessimism is not true; that evil has no existence but as the foil for good; that duty and inclination are normally the same; that conscience is the consciousness of customs; that pure egoism and pure altruism are both false; that miracles are incredible; that religion helps but is not necessary to morality; and that the lie of necessity is proper.

His system he calls Teleologic Energism. By Teleologic he means that the right is not an original, simple element of moral action intuitively known; but depends upon the end in view, the consequences of the action; that is, he is a utilitarian empiricist. By Energism he means that he is not a hedonist, does not believe that virtue is pleasure but is action.

A more interesting, and at the same time more harmful book is not likely to come into our college halls to poison the minds of our young people.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

THE CONVERSION OF THE MAORIS. *By Rev. Donald McDougall, B. D.*
pp. 216, price \$1.25, net. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, Pa.

One of the most thrilling romances of missions is found in the work of the Gospel among the heathen Maories.

The picture of these cannibals is one of the most awful in missionary

annals, and the heart grows sick, as one reads of their revolting deeds, eating flesh and revelling in blood.

The author draws the picture from life, the real being sufficiently awful, without aid from coloring, and then he describes the steady conflict between light and darkness, Christ and Belial, the struggles of the Christian, not only with the enemies without, but also with friends within, the petty denominational differences, small enough at best, but in the mission field contemptible. When one gazes upon the picture he paints of this man-eating savage and then compares it with the Maoris of to-day, he begins to realize that the gospel is indeed turning the world upside down. Every pastor who can afford it, ought to collect a missionary library. This is a book that ought to be there. J. R. BRIDGES.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. *By Rev. James S. Dennis, D. D.* Volume II. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago. pp. 486, price \$2.50.

Every student of the great Missionary movement of the present century will greet with pleasure another volume of this gifted author.

The mechanical work reflects credit upon the publishing house of the Revell Company. The paper is good and the type is clear, and the illustrations are abundant and fine. Without making any invidious comparisons we may say that no work on Missions heretofore published can compare with this in scope and thoroughness of treatment. Some years ago an Episcopal brother remarked to the writer, when he heard that he had monthly lectures on Missions, that he wondered where he found his material.

If he could only see this volume, and glance over the wealth of material, he would now wonder when a man would stop, when he had once begun.

The very title of the book shows a new idea on the subject of Missions. Heretofore the success of Missions has been measured by the number of converts and the general change in the country; but now the whole social life with its many ramifications is held up to view, and the influence of Missions upon it is brought forward as a witness in favor of this great work. The world is filled with social reforms. In Germany and even in Chicago, they meet and preach their doctrines, but beyond talk they never go.

Here we have the wonderful exploits of a few thousand missionaries and a few hundred medical missionaries, insignificant at best, yet they have done a work before which we stand in amazement. Perhaps we could do no better than to give in as short space as possible the plan of the book. Passing by the usual idea of Missions, he shows that there has been a steady advance according to a well defined plan whereby the Church of God in foreign lands has left its impress upon the heathen world along the line of social life.

Missionaries may have done nothing, as is charged, yet under their

influence there has arisen a new type of individual character in these lands, as evidenced by the changed lives.

Then the old ideas have been overthrown, and a new public opinion has been created, by means of which there has been a reversal in the usual idea of the education of the masses.

Again if we measure the value of Missions by its literary contributions to the intellectual life of the non Christian races, it becomes more imposing in our eyes—for there is scarcely a known branch of learning that has not been either inaugurated or stimulated among these people by the work and presence of the Missionary. Another test of the far reaching influence of Missions is seen in the awakening among men of the philanthropic spirit. When we compare the princely sums contributed by the Christian world to-day with the thirteen pounds, two shillings and sixpence the twelve Baptist Missionaries in the Widow Wallis' house at Kettering contributed to the evangelization of the world, we catch some glimpse of the all pervading influence of Missions, but what shall we say when this mysterious power even affects the newly converted heathen themselves, and out of their poverty they give?

Even the national life of these people is affected also, and through the work of the Missionary there are enkindled new national aspirations, and a higher conception of government. Thus the writer follows the work of the Missionary in its influences along every line of social life, and in support of his views he accumulates data that will be of inestimable value to every student of Missions. There are some books that are indispensable. This is one that no lover of Missionary work can do without. J. R. B.

THE SHRINE OF LOVE AND OTHER POEMS. *By Lucien V. Rule.*

Printed Under the Direction of Herbert S. Stone & Company.
Chicago and New York. MDCCCXCVIII.

This little volume is noticed because of its being mainly a collection of Sonnets by a Southern writer. There are one hundred and sixty of them under the several titles of *The Shrine of Love*, *The Greek Crisis*, *The Cause of Cuba*, *America's Answer*, *On Reported French Enmity to America*, and *Why Should She Now Be Spared*. Mr. Rule is a Kentuckian.

He is a successful maker of verse; the rhythm, meter, and rime being almost universally correct. There is a strange irregularity in one of the Sonnets of the *Shrine of Love*, where he has, probably unconsciously, inserted an extra line in the octave. He does not always observe in the octave the rime order *abba abba*, but frequently changes it to *abba acca*.

There are two themes for his muse, *Love* and *Liberty*, upon both of which he writes passionately. His *Love Sonnets* are pure, without being Platonic, or spiritual. They are redolent of a fondness for nature as she shows herself to the senses. They are faulty in their egotism and vindictiveness.

In *America's Answer*, addressed to Alfred Austin, he indelicately refers to our war with England. He excites but does not win us.

Lexington, Va.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

SONNETS OF JOSE MARIA DE HEREDIA. Done into English *By Edward Robeson Taylor*. San Francisco: William Doxey, at the Sign of the Lark. MDCCCXCVIII.

Gosse has declared de Heredia to be "a great poetic artist, and probably the most remarkable now alive in Europe." These Sonnets are from the principal part of *Les Trophies*, which secured for him membership among the immortal of the Academy. De Heredia is a Cuban by birth, of mixed French and Spanish blood.

The translator, Dr. E. R. Taylor, is a native of Tennessee, who spent his early life in Missouri, but has lived now for many years in San Francisco. He was first a physician and attained distinction in that profession, but turned from it in middle life to the law, which has brought him fame and fortune. He is now Dean of the Hastings College of Law.

The Sonnets, one hundred and eighteen in number, are divided into five groups: Greece and Sicily, Rome and the Barbarians, The Middle Age and the Renaissance, The Orient and the Tropics, and Nature and Dream. Mr. Gosse has well expressed the poet's design to be "a rapid descent of the ages, with here and there a momentary revelation of some highly suggestive and entertaining scene, or incident, or personage." The Sonnets together form a gallery of paintings intended to represent what is most interesting in myth and man and nature. His conception and that of Col. Wm. Preston Johnston are alike, though they differ widely in the selections they have each made. There is a minimum of the real in de Heredia, his eyes see the imaginary, the mythical, the ideal. The heroes and the sages of the race are by him unnoticed as subjects for his Sonnets.

G. H. Lewes "protests against the adequacy of all translation of poetry. In its happiest efforts, translation is but approximation." This difficulty is at its maximum when the effort is to reproduce in a different language not only the idea but the form also of the original. Dr. Taylor's task was of this kind. The sonnet itself is exacting as to its forms: there must be just fourteen lines, with ten syllables in a line, and with rimes that for the octave must obey narrow rules. Moreover, the French has the Alexandrian as its sonnet measure, giving to each line two syllables more than the English pentameter. It is considered a more condensed language than ours. Dr. Taylor undertook to reproduce de Heredia's rimes in the same order, and to compress the French sonnet of one hundred and sixty-eight syllables into the one hundred and forty of the English.

His success is attested by the fact that his work passed to a second edition in a year, and has received the commendation of such competent judges as Prof. Gosse, *The Manchester* (England) *Guardian* and *The Nation*. The English paper says: "Wonderfully marvelous, his work must be confessed to be. * * * The work is a landmark in the production of such translations, being done during the life of the original

poet. That it has been done quite successfully we cannot say. But it is a work that will take rank with the best of its kind."

All three of these volumes of Southern Sonnets, Col. Johnston's, Mr. Rules, and Dr. Taylor's, have one thing in common, it is the use of the Sonnet as a minor section of a larger poem. This is an innovation. It has been hitherto used as a separate and complete poem; as such it has been styled. "A little picture painted well." To be degraded from this royal position to that of a plebeian stanza is indeed a grievous fall. Is the sonnet suited for such a purpose? We think not, except within narrow limits. A pair of sonnets may be suitable companions; we can conceive of a cluster that might properly embrace as many as a dozen. But when we are called upon to read over a hundred on the same subject, we protest that it is too much of a good thing. Think of a hundred and eighteen little pictures side by side, all painted well, if you please; but every one of exactly the same size, with all the parts similarly arranged. and all intended to portray different phases of the same thing!

This weariness in number is not peculiar to the sonnet, it is true of all the stanzaed verse. The Fairie Queen is intolerably tiresome, because of this practically endless repetition of the same mechanical conditions. Take any of the new French forms, the model, modean, triolet, and string out scores of them on the same topic, and every one would be wearied. No, the stanza should be confined to short poems. The sonnet should be a poem of itself. For continuous poems, let us use the paragraph, as in prose.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

SOUTHERN SONNETS—SEEKERS AFTER GOD. Sonnets by *Wm. Preston Johnston*. Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton & Company. 1898.

The author of these verses has lately died in the home of his son-in-law, Prof. H. St. Geo. Tucker, at Lexington, Va. It was interesting that he breathed his last in the room where his wife had died, the guest of Judge Lea, and in the bed on which he was born. His last and most distinguished service was as the genial and cultured President of Tulane University at New Orleans.

As verse these sonnets are marked by the freedom and variety of their rhythm and rime and meter. Most of them are in the prescribed and practically universal iambic pentameter; a few, however, have the anapestic tetrameter as their metrical scheme; and in one it seems hard to decide whether the movement is anapestic or dactylic.

The utmost liberty is used in the rimes. There is hardly a sonnet which has the conventional rime arrangement for the octave, abbaabba. What is perhaps a more daring innovation is that occasionally the rimes of the octave are carried on into the septette. There is one sonnet with only three rimes in its fourteen lines. There are some feminine rimes. Like most verse-makers he likes to close the sonnet with a ruined couplet.

Part II is not in sonnet form, but in continuous anapestic tetrameter,

without rime. This is also exceptional, as most blank verse is iambic pentameter.

The rhythm is generally smooth and pleasant, but not always perfect.

The idea underlying this collection of sonnets is to present distinguished representatives of different beliefs who have seriously and more or less successfully sought to know and worship God. It is thus an assemblage of portraits, as it were, of the heroes of religious belief.

The book is divided into two parts, of which the first is composed of fifty sonnets, preceded by one of dedication to the poet's sister. They are arranged under five heads. The first three constitute the Prologue; the next five give us the Windows of Heaven, Reason, Obedience, Faith, the Law, and Inspiration. Then follow ten, which present the heathen sages and heroes as "At the Barriers." The succeeding eleven are devoted to the Disciples of the Lord, who are distinguished as having "The Eyes Unsealed." The final collection of twenty-one sonnets sing the virtues of the "Pilgrims of the Cross."

The broad-mindedness of Col. Johnston is shown in placing not only Socrates and Seneca but also Cicero and Calsar among the Seekers After God at the Barriers, and is perhaps even more plainly revealed in his reckoning Jas. Martinean among the Pilgrims of the Cross.

Part II is not in sonnets but in two sections of continuous verse. He calls it, "The Absolute, The Cry of Faith." It is doubtless meant as the confession of his own creed. It is reverential and devout, and recognizes "The Saviour who ransoms and rescues the vanquished." The volume from first to last breathes a pure, pious, generous, hopeful spirit, and contains gems of thought happily expressed.

Lexington, Va.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

MONTAIGUE'S EDUCATION OF CHILDREN. Selected, Translated and Annotated. *By L. E. Rector.*

This is one of the volumes of the International Educational Series, edited by the United States Commissioner of Education, W. T. Harris, and published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. To many Montaigne in his educational views is less known than either Pestalozzi or Froebel, yet in many respects he is original in his views, and was the forerunner of many of the methods of the present day. The key note of his whole system was that emphasis should be placed upon fitness for practical life and to teach the pupil to use his own judgment.

Some of us can remember when the school room was one of the most unattractive of all places, yet years before Montaigne had taught that children should find their duty where they found their pleasure.

He believed that children should be trained to sift all things, and to take nothing on trust; that they should be taught to argue, yet to argue fairly; and above all things to acknowledge frankly their errors.

Those interested in the education of the young, both parents and teachers will find in this book much to instruct.

TROOPER 3,809. A Private Soldier of the Third Republic. *By Lionel Declé.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Price, \$1.25.

Ordinarily this book would not attract attention except among students of military affairs, but coming out just at a time when the eyes of the world were upon the French Army, it has excited interest such as few books have done.

According the French law every man is liable to military service for 25 years of his life.

In times of peace it is divided as follows: Three years of active service, ten years in the reserve of the standing army, six years in the territorial army, and six years in the territorial reserves.

In times of peace young men who have obtained the degree of B. A. or B. S. in government Universities, and who pay to the government £60 can serve for one year.

These men are called *Volontaires*, and such M. Declé became. His book is not one of abuse, but a calm recital of his own experience, showing the awful results of a vicious system, and thus incidentally explaining the actions of the army in the Dreyfus case.

We venture to say that on no plantation, under the care of the most brutal overseer, were slaves treated as the French soldier is, according to this book.

We furthermore venture the prediction that no army can fight when it is composed of men trained under such system. During the American-Spanish war foreigners who studied the movements of our army were particularly impressed with the ability shown by our soldiers in taking the initiative. The French soldier is a machine, and a brutal, unprincipled one at that, and the brutality runs from the lowest to the highest rank.

The recent exhibition of the French Army so shocking to the world is the natural fruit of the system described in this book.

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY. An Analysis of the Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization. *By Franklin Henry Giddings, M. A.* Professor of Sociology in Columbia University in the City of New York. 1754-1894. Columbia University Press. New York. The Macmillan Company. London. Macmillan & Co., L't'd. 1896. All rights reserved.

The author says that the time has not come for an exhaustive treatise on Sociology; nevertheless he gives us a comprehensive, compact discussion of 422 octavo pages, followed by a bibliography of 20 pages. It is introduced by an excellent table of contents and concluded with a no less excellent index. Mechanically, literarily and scientifically, it is creditable to American progress. The discussion is divided into four books. The first treats *The Elements of Social Theory* in four chapters: *The Sociological Idea; The Province of Sociology; The Methods of Sociology; and The Problems of Sociology.* The doctrine is advanced "that Sociology is a psychological science, and that the description of

society in biological terms is a mistake." The essential of Sociology is not impression nor is it imitation, as taught by Durkheim and Tarde, but is objectively the equilibration of energy, and subjectively the consciousness of kind.

In the second chapter, he discusses the relation of Sociology to the sciences; especially to psychology and the special social sciences. He lets us know that he believes psychology to be the science of the association of ideas, as Sociology is of the association of minds. He makes a classification of the sciences into abstract and concrete. The abstract are concerned with relations and properties, and only incidentally with aggregates, their names all ending in—*ico*. They are mathematics, physics, economics, ethics and politics. The concrete deal chiefly with aggregates, and their names end in—*y*. They are chemistry, astronomy, geology, biology, psychology, and Sociology.

The methods of Sociology are both inductive and deductive; including inductive guessing, deducing conclusions and verification by wide observation.

The primary problems of Sociology are descriptive, and to these he devotes his second book; and historical, presented in the third book. The secondary are problems of social process, law and cause, to which the fourth book is given.

Book II is headed The Elements and Structure of Society, and treats in successive chapters the Social Population, the Social Mind, the Social Composition, and the Social Constitution. This book is an abstract discussion of the forces, mainly psychic, which bring men together, and of the concrete forms which their association assumes. He is disappointingly brief in his treatment of the social organizations; there are only four pages on the State, and fourteen on all the voluntary societies, political, juristic, economic and cultural; with somewhat more than a page on the church, and a brief paragraph on the school.

Book III is Historical, and presents the author's conceptions of the Evolution of Society. He is, of course, an evolutionist, but believes that there have been two parallel processes, the physical and the psychical. He emphasizes the psychic, though he takes care to disclaim any intention of assuming philosophic dualism, and strangely, for an associationist, intimates a leaning towards idealism. This process of Social Evolution has been four-fold: Zoogenic Association, Anthropogenic, Ethnogenic and Demogenic. He asserts that animal and human society were continuous; that there is no evidence of a single pair as the progenitors of the human race as a whole or of its varieties; that the patriarchal theory of man's primitive social state has thoroughly broken down; and that no existing society among the most degraded races is as low as was man's primeval condition. He holds that speech differentiates man from the brute. Zoogenic Association presents man's social state as an animal; Anthropogenic gives us his generic social state as man; the Ethnogenic treats of the grouping into families, hordes, clans and tribes; the Demogenic presents his most advanced state, and discusses his pro-

gress in civilization. This progress has been in three stages: Military—Religious, Liberal—Legal, and Economic—Ethical.

He believes in the Malthusian law, to which he gives the interpretation that man's ability and tendency to multiply is greater than his ability to secure for himself not a bare subsistence but the increased comforts of a growing civilization. The costs of progress are degeneration, suicide, insanity, vagabondage, and vice.

Book IV is abstract, like the second, and presents Social Process, Law, and Cause. The discussion is in four chapters: The Physical Social process; the Psychical Social process; Social Law and Cause; and the Nature and End of Society. It may be accidental, but it is noticeable, the author has four books and four chapters in each book. It is interesting to observe how strong minds are sometimes dominated by trivial considerations. Kaut's double series of four classes of categories, with three in each class, and Hegel's fascination for threes are noted examples. Giddings was probably born at the fourth hour of the fourth day of the fourth month of the fourth year of the fourth decade of the century.

The last book does not seem to add much to the general treatment, but is chiefly a restatement of what is found on the earlier pages. The final idea is that society is an organization for the development of humanity.

The entire volume impresses one with the fact that the author is both a student and a thinker, who expresses himself with clearness and force. The Christian theist lays it down with admiration for the writer's intellectuality and sorrow that he seems like Laplace to have no need for the hypothesis of a God.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

JESUS CHRIST DURING HIS MINISTRY. *By Edmond Stapfer.* Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. XXXIV., 265.

This is the second volume of the work entitled: *Jesus Christ: His Person—His Authority—His Work*, by Dr. Edmond Stapfer, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Paris. The volume which preceded this one was: *Jesus Christ Before His Ministry*, and the one which follows is: *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*.

It represents the rationalistic view of Jesus. The author thinks that the Gospels must be reconstructed by the critic, whose work is to eliminate suspicious traditions and doctrinal tendencies, and to determine the oldest and most authentic account, when the Gospels differ. He accepts the fourth Gospel as Johannine, and of great historic value, but says that it "abounds in theological deductions which can be nothing other than the evangelist's own reflections and not the authentic words of Jesus." He does not discuss the text or the interpretation of what he considers controverted passages. He makes use of facts that he considers certain and sayings of Jesus that he considers perfectly authentic, with the purpose of drawing from them what took place in the soul of Jesus. He does not seek to set forth a history of the ministry of Jesus.

but Jesus himself during his ministry, especially the history of his thought and development of his soul. As he leaves out of consideration all events and sayings that have been controverted or considered by him for any reason as not authentic, very much is left out which, if admitted, would modify very greatly his conclusions. He thus arrives at conclusions very different from those warranted by the complete evangelical narrative as it has been handed down to us. We have, then, in this volume, not a representation of Jesus as he appeared to the Apostles, but a history of the evolution of his thought and development of his soul as imagined by Professor Stapfer. He says in his preface: "I judge it to be needless to repeat what the Gospels say: I shall particularly seek for what they have not said, but in this search I take as point of departure certain data given by the Gospels themselves." We must keep this in mind as we read, for the author sets forth his conjectures as if they were facts, and we must remember that they are conjectures from data so reconstructed and modified as to make them no more valuable than fiction.

He imagines Jesus to be simply a man of his time, whose ideas were constantly being modified by circumstances, and who believed and taught one thing during the early part of His ministry and another and quite different thing during the latter part of his ministry. "His thought was on the march, and every day some new horizon would open before him, and he would better understand the Father's will," p. 6. "An itinerant Essene in his manners, a liberal Pharisee in his ideas—such Jesus appears to us all through this first period of his activity. * * * He firmly hoped to be recognized and hailed as Messiah by the people; and, above all, by their leaders, the Pharisees," p. 11. "He was certain of only one thing—final success. He would have his day of glory, and he expected it on earth, in a future which could not be very far distant," p. 65. "There were many years before him, as he hoped. We know that it was not to be so—that, contrary to his expectation, he was not to succeed," p. 64. "There was never any thought in these early teachings of a possible violent death in the future, by which Jesus purposed to accomplish salvation. He simply preached a new relation between God and man. The way of salvation which he opened and offered was the Father's forgiveness. And the Father forgives those who forgive," p. 56.

Luther lost all his illusions at Rome. In the same way Jesus learned much from his visits to Jerusalem. His rupture with the temple preceded his rupture with the Pharisees. Up to this time he had been a Jewish reformer, henceforth he was to be the destroyer of Judaism. The latter, under its sacerdotal form, inspired in him a repugnance with which its Pharisaic form was shortly also to inspire him. It was necessary that the sacrifices should be abolished," p. 140 f.

"Up to this time, Jesus had remained in the great current of the best Pharisaic ideas * * * believing himself to be faithful to the true spirit of the religion of his people. * * * From this time he perceived that the spirit which animated him and the reform which he de-

sired were not in the least conformable to the hopes of his people, and especially of those who led them, the Pharisees," p. 145 f.

"He not only separated himself from the Judaism of his time, but from the ancient law, the Torah itself," p. 150. Seeing the opposition against him Jesus surmised the result—failure, defeat, and death. "First, the possibility, then the extreme probability, and finally the certainty of a violent and approaching death—such was the new element which was about to enter into his previsions of the future. * * * He began to conceive of a Messiah who might be persecuted and put to death, and, consequently, who might disappear before the advent of the kingdom," p. 157. "At the same time Jesus became unsectarian. Before this he had been a Jewish reformer; now his ideal became that of universality," pp. 174-183.

Having such an opinion of Jesus, believing that he was simply a man of his time, and that his ideas and teachings changed with circumstances, of course, our author cannot value the teachings as believers have been accustomed to do. He looks upon Jesus as a Doctor of the Law (in his early ministry) sometimes agreeing with Shammai, oftener agreeing with Hillel, and sometimes reproducing the Old Testament teachings which Prof. Stapfer says, "it must not be forgotten, he read through the medium of the theology of his time," p. 45. He holds that the religious beliefs of Jesus contained imperishable and eternal verities but included, also, outworn elements which were doomed to disappear," p. 249.

"At the present time" he says, "among Christians, no one believes precisely like Jesus. Jesus adopted many of the opinions of his time, and these opinions are not always ours," p. 245. "Jesus, then, was a man of his time, and he shared the beliefs of his time concerning angels, demons, the authenticity of the law," p. 251. He finds that the beliefs of Jesus about God, sin, and holiness contain outworn elements, that is, the beliefs of Jesus do not agree with the teachings of modern thought on these subjects, and so must be placed among antiquated opinions. Notwithstanding all this, our author claims to believe in Jesus, but he says that when Jesus asks men to believe in him, he does not mean that they are to believe in what he thinks about himself," p. 257. "Each Christian who has faith appropriates the Christ to himself, and should remain faithful to him, however much his dogmatic conceptions may become modified. Hence it results that faith in Jesus Christ may live, develop, and triumph, whatever may be the believer's dogmatic notions," p. 255. All of which amounts to this, that, in the opinion of our author, Jesus is not capable of revealing either himself or the Father to us, but we must form our own opinions in spite of what Jesus thought and taught. It is evident that the Christ of the rationalists is not the Christ of the apostles—not the Christ as the apostles saw him, preached him, and wrote him in gospels, in epistles, in apocalypse—not the Christ who has satisfied the deepest longings of believers in all ages. If we accepted their Christ, we should have no sacrifice for sin, no trustworthy guide into the truth, no Saviour worthy the name. If one wishes to know the truth, he must accept the Christ of the Apostles, the real Christ.

All the imaginations of the rationalists are demolished by the teachings of the Apostle John, and hence they are in mortal antagonism to him. John himself has given us a test by which we can very easily detect false teachers. "We are of God," he says, (I John iv: 6), "he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of the truth, and the spirit of error." So we know when to place those who do not accept the teachings of the apostles, and especially the teachings of John's gospel.

The book before us represents a school of thought which seems to be growing, and those who wish to know how that school treats Christ may find out by reading this work of Prof. Stapfer.

J. W. LAFFERTY.

THE LEGIONARIES. By *Henry Scott Clark*. Pp. 385. Price \$1.50. The Bowen-Merrill Co., Indianapolis.

These are the days of many novels, some poor and some very good, and a man who attempts to read them all, will do little else.

The best one can do is to read a few, and then learn from his friends and the reviewers about the others.

Occasionally, however, one appears that no one ought to fail to read, and such is the novel whose name is given at the head of this article.

It is a novel that will make more than a passing impression for several reasons. In the first place it is one of the best novels bearing upon our Civil War that has appeared, and then in addition to that fact, it shows decided literary merit. The author is unknown, but he is said to be a prominent judge of Indiana, which makes the book all the more remarkable, for though written by a Western man, it is an impartial story of the Southern side of the great struggle in its connection with Morgan's raid. A young Virginian moves with his father to southern Indiana just before the Civil War, and receives his education in France at one of the military schools. He returns at the beginning of the war, and though his mother refuses to leave his father's grave, who has died while he is absent, he enters the Confederate army and becomes one of Morgan's men.

He follows him on his wonderful raid, but being captured he drops from the command and returns on a parole to his home. The book throws light on what is known as the "Copperhead Movement," explaining their motives, and relieving them from the charge of treason to the government. It also does full justice to Morgan, and must compel even his enemies to admire his boundless resources, his cheerful and undaunted courage, and the skill with which he led three thousand men over 500 miles through a hostile country, followed by generals and soldiers and opposed at every step by the aroused Home Guards, and only surrendering when the three thousand had dwindled to three hundred.

The veterans of that war are passing away, but they owe it to their children to give them books that will teach them that the cause for which the South fought was a just one, and that the world's history has never

yet produced a superior to the "man in gray," whether he trudged along the dusty roads of Virginia's great Valley, following Jackson, or rode gaily with plume and sabre following John Morgan to an unsung death.

Gather up such books as these, and then in coming years the South will be justified of her children.
J. R. B.

MY LIFE AND TIMES. 1810-1899. *John B. Adger, D. D.* Presbyterian Committee of Publication. P. 681. Price, \$3.00.

Looked upon merely as a product of the bookmaker's art, this volume reflects great credit upon our Committee, for the binding is heavy and solid; the type is clear; and the paper, while heavy and white, is free from that peculiar glaze that plays havoc with weak eyes.

It is, however, not so much of the book that we are speaking, as of the man portrayed in the book, a man who lived for eighty-nine years, and whose long life was as beautiful as a summer's day, and as pure as a mountain stream. Some may think that the writer is not the man to review such a book, yet a moment's thought ought to show that there is a peculiar fitness in it. If an old acquaintance were to undertake it, he might be accused of partiality, and thus his opinion would be impugned; but when a stranger to the man, the institution where he labored, and the very Synod where he spent his life, is moved to say that in all his reading he has never seen a pen-picture of a more beautiful life, these very facts add to the strength of his testimony. Sidney Smith claimed that he always reviewed a book first and read it afterward lest his judgment should be biased. In like manner the writer brings to the task no personal acquaintance whatever. To him this life is a sealed book, which he took up with no particular interest, but which grew on him rapidly, till he found himself reading into the small hours of the night, forgetful of time, and only thinking of the sincere and honest old gentleman of the Old School, whose life spanned nearly a century, and witnessed ecclesiastical controversies, wars and the founding a Church, that now covers the South, and has a large representation in the foreign field.

The ancestry of Dr. J. B. Adger was Irish, and as he draws the character of his father, we cease to wonder at the character of the son.

His earliest recollections begin with the war of 1812, or rather with its close, and taking that as a starting point, in a most delightfully natural way, he weaves together the gossip of his time and the experience of school boy days, till one almost imagines he is hearing some old man bringing up the past, with its old-time school-masters and its old-time customs. After a thorough training in the Charleston schools, he went North to school, and afterward to Union College, which was then presided over by Dr. Nott.

While at college he was converted, and after leaving school he decided to prepare himself for the ministry. To that end he entered Princeton Seminary, where he was brought under the renewed influences of the Spirit. If he had received this blessing fifty or sixty years later,

among the latter day saints, he might have been tempted to think he had received "the Second Blessing," but he merely looked upon it as it really was, as a renewed manifestation of the same Spirit that first brought him out of darkness into light.

His pen pictures of the Princeton men are very graphic. There were only three then, Dr. Alexander, Dr. Miller and Dr. Charles Hodge.

What a distinctively college flavor that joke has in which he reports Dr. Alexander excusing himself for not taking exercise by saying, "Bodily exercise profiteth little,"

After leaving the Seminary he went to Armenia as a missionary, where he remained about thirteen years, doing excellent work as a translator during that time.

As the slavery agitation and the extreme views of the Abolitionists began to effect the receipts of the Missionary Board, they gave the slaveholding missionaries to understand that their presence might endanger the contributions, so Dr. Adger concluded to devote himself to work among the slaves in his own land.

What seems to us the right and Christian thing to do, met at first with great opposition in Charleston, owing to the fears of a negro insurrection and their former experiences of an attempted one, that it was hatched in a negro church.

The Episcopal Church began a similar movement at the same time, but they met with little opposition.

Before Dr. Adger could carry out his scheme, a mob threatened the building where it was proposed to hold services, and a public meeting was held where its feasibility was discussed. He carried his point finally, and for five years he gave his splendid abilities to the work, and when he laid it down Dr. Girardeau took it up.

His war reminiscences are very interesting, though in places sad, and if any worshipper of the "Boys in Blue" does not wish his idols to be shattered, he would do well to skip this portion of the book. In a few pages, from his own personal observation, he gives descriptions of the pension drawers that place them among "Kirk's lambs." To the future historian and those who would know through what struggles our Church has passed, the chapters on "The Controversies" will be of great interest.

He devotes much space to the Evolution Controversy, and upholds Dr. Woodrow in his position.

Beginning the book as a stranger, we put it down with a feeling of regret that we did not know him in the flesh.

When we think of Dabney, Witherspoon, Plumer, Hoge, Adger, Girardeau, and that host of mighty dead, we hear ringing in our ears the words of the old prophet, "Your fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live forever?"

J. R. B.

UNION Theological Seminary,

RICHMOND VIRGINIA.

SESSION OPENS LAST WEDNESDAY IN SEPTEMBER.

SESSION CLOSES LAST WEDNESDAY IN MAY.

FACULTY.

THE REV. WALTER W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature.

THE REV. CHARLES C. HERSMAN, D. D., LL. D.,
Prof. of Biblical Literature and the Interpretation of the Testament.

THE REV. THOMAS C. JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Polity.

THE REV. THOMAS R. ENGLISH, D. D.,
Professor of the English Bible and Pastoral Theology.

THE REV. GIVENS B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology.

For catalogue, or other information as to course of study, rooms, etc.,
apply to—

Dr. ENGLISH,
Clerk of Faculty and Intendant,
Richmond, Va.