

JANUARY, 1900.

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN  
QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV. CONTENTS. No. 1.

I. THE TEACHING OF THE THEOLOGICAL CLASS-ROOM IN RELATION TO THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE STUDENT. Principal William Caven, D. D., LL. D.....	1-16
II. JOHN CALVIN. Henry E. Dosker, D. D.....	17-33
III. THE SALIENT POINTS OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION. Nicholas M. Steffens, D. D.....	34-47
IV. THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT. Prof. Henry Collin Minton, D. D....	48-62
V. SOME LOG COLLEGES IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA. Holland Thompson, Ph. D.....	63-73
VI. THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO QUIT ROBBING THE MASSES OF THE GOSPEL. Prof. Thos. C. Johnson, D. D.....	74-89
VII. THE PASTOR IN HIS RELATIONS TO GOD. Samuel M. Smith, D. D..	90-101
VIII. MACBETH AND THE BIBLE. L. G. Barbour, D. D.....	102-115
NOTES: CHURCH AND STATE. RATIONALISM IN THE TREATMENT OF THE BIBLE. W. C. Clark, D. D.....	116-119
EDITORIAL: THE MCGIFFERT CASE. D. L. MOODY.....	120-136
CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS: Rev. J. R. Bridges. Rev. J. A Quarles, D. D. Rev. D. J. Brimm, D. D. Peter J. Hamilton.....	137-163

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 :

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.
C. W. HUMPHREYS, 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.

---

## The Presbyterian Publishing Co., Charlotte, N. C.

Prints the Presbyterian Standard, the mechanical work on which is  
unexcelled in any Southern paper, and the Presbyterian Quarterly, the  
largest magazine published in the South.

Its printing office is fully equipped for all kinds of Job Printing,  
and it makes a specialty of the Minutes of Synods and Presbyteries,  
College Catalogues and Magazines, Church Registers and Envelopes.  
Save trouble by patronizing a Presbyterian office for Presbyterian work.

*LOW PRICES. FAIR DEALING. GOOD WORK.*

W. M. MOORE, Manager.

9/22/30  
Budget fund  
S.A. 10

X  
Per  
P928A  
v. 14

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

---

No. 51--JANUARY, 1900.

---

## I. THE TEACHING OF THE THEOLOGICAL CLASS-ROOM IN RELATION TO THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF THE STUDENT.

The aim of the theological student is generally a practical one ; he is in preparation for the ministry of the Gospel. With this end in view he is seeking to acquaint himself with the several parts of the theological curriculum. The promotion of his spiritual life—the increase of his faith and of the other Christian graces—is to him, therefore, of primary importance. Whether, indeed, the student has respect to his own well-being or to his qualifications for the ministry, the cultivation of the religious life should be his first concern. To know God and Jesus Christ is eternal life, and it is also the necessary condition of all effective service in the Kingdom of God.

Apart from his studies, there are various ways in which the candidate for the ministry will seek to cultivate and strengthen the life of the soul. He will do so through private prayer and reading of the Scriptures, through connection with religious societies in college or hall, through teaching in Sabbath school or elsewhere, through fellowship with some congregation.

But we are here rather to consider what help the spiritual life of the student may receive through his proper studies, and especially in the class-room. For we must not acquiesce in the notion that study is necessarily unfavorable to

piety, and that our attention should be given to escaping danger by means lying outside the province of study altogether.

Yet the fact of danger being connected with study—theological study—cannot be denied. Often does the preacher warn his audience of the danger of hearing and not doing. Pre-eminently, perhaps, does the theological student incur risk to his religious life in constantly reading books and listening to prelections on sacred themes, under circumstances which easily allow the idea of professional training to come too much into the foreground. Let the cultivation of the heart fall behind the increase of knowledge and the danger has overtaken us.

In regard to the effect of theological study upon the spiritual life of the student, responsibility clearly rests upon the student himself, and also upon his instructors. It is my purpose to speak of this matter chiefly in relation to the work of the theological professor—to the way in which he may contribute to the development of spiritual life in connection with his teaching. The entire influence of the professor's personality is, of course, to be taken into account, but we here limit ourselves to the subject of his instructions in the class-room.

All teaching not in harmony with Scripture is, in its tendency, hurtful to spiritual life. The soul is nourished by truth, and error, however sincerely held, cannot serve the purpose of truth. But this statement requires no elaboration here ; for the Presbyterian Church has been so careful in providing guarantees for the maintenance, in her theological schools, of the doctrine which she holds, that only through indifference to truth on her part can serious error be taught in schools under her supervision.

In regard to the pulpit, we often say that it is not enough to avoid error ; it should, with no uncertain voice, declare the truth in its fulness. In order to produce the best spiritual results the great truths of the Gospel must ever be kept in contact with the mind and heart of the hearer. So also the professor's lectures should keep the mind of his class in

contact with the principles of Scripture in relation to whatsoever subject may be under discussion. Certain topics which the theological curriculum must embrace lie more remote than others from the central truths of the Bible, but all are of some value in promoting spiritual life ; and the entire circle of teaching in the theological school should be of such a character as to aid the student in keeping his heart ; while it supplies the knowledge and discipline necessary to the duties which he will afterwards discharge. Thus may the work of the class be made ever helpful to piety. Professor and student will alike feel that they are in the presence of God and are working for God, and his Word will be quick and powerful within them. It would, indeed, be a reproach were it otherwise ; and we should thus supply the strongest possible argument against the course of study in preparation for the ministry which has received sanction in our churches.

But can justice be done to the theological curriculum, and especially to certain parts of it, should this idea of religious benefit—of the effect of our teaching upon the spiritual interests of the student—be kept in the foreground ? Theological instruction must deal with the entire contents of revelation, with its defence, with the history of the Church, with all practical qualification for the preacher's and pastor's work ; it cannot possibly limit itself to topics which are immediately related to edification. Certainly, but it does not follow that in teaching any branch of theology edification should be out of view, and that the effect as regards religion should be negative. Everything depends on the tone of the instruction given. It is possible to handle the themes nearest to the heart of the Gospel in a manner which shall not promote faith or religious emotion, and equally possible to deal with the subjects which lie farthest from the evangelical centre so as to contribute to spiritual results. If both the matter and the manner of our teaching are what they should be, the increase of the student's knowledge may well go hand in hand with spiritual growth.

How then are we to conceive of the teaching which shall

fulfil this high aim, which shall preserve a right religious atmosphere in the class-room, tending to the spiritual health of all who breathe it? This is the problem before us.

The solution of this problem cannot be found in refusing to acknowledge as legitimate any difference between the style of teaching proper to the professorial chair and that proper to the pulpit. Between these two kinds of teaching there are important differences. The chair must deal with a wider range of topics, its manner of treating topics which are common must be different, and the hortatory element, so prominent in preaching, cannot have large place. The pulpit should not occupy itself with the critical, scientific and philosophical questions which either form part of the theological course or are so related to it that account must be taken of them. It is not meant that the instruction of the class-room should aim less at thoroughness than at the production of immediate spiritual results. Every branch of study should be dealt with in the most complete manner of which the teacher is capable. In order to attain its end theological instruction should be truly scientific. The good preacher is indeed scientific in a quite real sense. He endeavors to go to the bottom of every theme which he handles, and in the course of his teaching he seeks to compass the whole field of revealed truth, and to set forth each separate doctrine of scripture in its relations to the other doctrines of God's Word. He avoids, however, technical method and phraseology and presents everything on a level with the intelligence of the ordinary hearer. The professor properly employs the forms and methods of academical instruction.

The professor of Systematic Theology, *e. g.* will not only seek to found the doctrines of his science upon a thorough inductive study of Scripture but will endeavor, as best he can, to justify them at the bar of reason; he will fortify his conclusions by every kind of legitimate proof; and he will elaborately compare his own views with those of different schools, in different periods. Further, the several doctrines of the Bible will be presented as parts of a system which

embraces the main contents of revelation (which is self-consistent throughout) with constant respect to the Analogy of Faith.

This scientific character of theology in the hands of the professor does not, however, imply that the interest in his subject which he would create or strengthen in the mind of his class should be exclusively, or even predominantly, scientific. It signifies only that the subject is to be handled in a quite thorough way. The special object in view requires that it should be so treated. The aim is so to discuss the problems of theology as to satisfy the demands of the most accurate and profound thought, by at once giving the most complete statement of scriptural truth and defending this statement against all assaults.

In such treatment of Scripture truth there is nothing necessarily hostile to edification—nothing which should tend to beget an unspiritual frame of mind in the student. The discussion to which he listens may indeed have this tendency, but not because it is scientific or thorough. Let it be conducted by a mind deeply imbued with love of divine truth, deeply concerned that the student also may reverence and love the truth, and may become well furnished for presenting it in the form appropriate to general edification,—and there will be nothing to chill the religious feelings of the student or to injure his spiritual life in any way. For we cannot admit that there is a snare in the very fact that the treatment of Bible truth assumes scientific form, and makes perhaps severer demand on the thinking powers than the pulpit can wisely do. The more strenuously the intellect is exercised upon divine truth the more completely should it penetrate the spiritual nature, and the more distinctly should we realize the presence of God. The mind in all its powers is made for God; and its most earnest efforts to apprehend the truth of God, and to grasp it in the mutual relation of its parts can never lead us away from God—provided only we are believing and humble.

There is, therefore, no good ground for representing the scientific study of theology as in itself of unspiritual ten-

dency and as constituting a special danger to the theological student. Rather, in the study of divine truth, should every faculty of the mind be summoned to its most perfect exercise, in order that the whole man may be rightly affected and influenced. The intellect is God's as truly as the emotions. All that is within us "should bless His holy name." If the scientific treatment of doctrine means its most thorough treatment—the treatment best capable of presenting the truth in its totality and in the just relation of its parts—then it is evident that true scientific study of the teaching of Scripture must be spiritually profitable to all who are capable of such study.

A survey of the history of theological instruction, as of theological literature, would confirm the views now expressed. The theological teachers who have done most, whether by oral instruction or by their writings, to produce and confirm faith in their hearers or readers, to quicken their whole spiritual nature and to kindle their zeal for the extension of the Redeemer's Kingdom, are those who have most successfully presented the doctrines of the Bible in their application to the whole man, and with constant regard to the unity of revealed truth. Whether employing technical formulæ or not, all real teachers of the truth are essentially scientific teachers. Paul, Augustine, Calvin, Edwards, are scientific not merely in their formal discussions of doctrine but also, we may say, in their practical and experimental writings.

Is there no risk then of the theological professor in his scientific prelections failing to speak to the soul of his students and to benefit them spiritually, while he does his best to reach his scientific ideal in form of treatment? Too certainly there is. In various ways this danger may be incurred.

(a) Should the professor through devotion to some scientific principle or method deviate from the essential doctrine of Scripture, his teaching will tend to the spiritual injury of his students. No teaching in the Professor's chair, or anywhere else, can be entirely innocuous should it not



hold fast to the Word of God. But, for the reason already stated, it is not necessary that I should here (though the matter is of great intrinsic importance) dwell upon this point.

(b) Should the professor be too much concerned about the scientific merit of his presentation of the system of theology, should his interest in the scientific form of his prelections be in competition with his interest in the truth itself, his state of mind will almost certainly be communicated, in some degree, to his students, and will mar the spiritual results of his teaching. For while, as already stated, the most strictly scientific treatment of divine truth cannot deprive it of its moral efficacy, nay should rather increase its efficacy for the audience in view, yet should any scientific or philosophical ambition find place with the teacher, it will detract from the moral effect of the truth presented. The spiritual force of any teacher is necessarily lessened unless his attention is steadfastly centered upon the great aim which he should have before him.

I am not here supposing that the professor is without vital interest in the truth which he deals with, or even that his interest in it is weak, but only that he is unduly concerned about the merit of his work from a scientific point of view, merely that he cannot, without serious abatement, say with Paul: "My speech . . . was not with enticing words of man's wisdom."

Should the ambition of theological instruction be literary rather than scientific or philosophical, the same vitiating element would be introduced, and the spiritual edification of the student would be equally hindered.

What has been said with regard to the teaching of Systematic Theology is in substance applicable to all other parts of the theological curriculum. Reference may be made to Biblical studies. Never, perhaps, in the history of theological education has more prominence been given to the several parts of Biblical study than at present. And this is certainly well: for the Bible is the great fountain of divine truth—of theology. We Protestants do not regard the

Church as a permanently inspired body, nor do we make the religious consciousness the standard of divine truth. We steadfastly maintain that no doctrine not contained in Scripture has claim to be of the faith, and whatever doctrines are taught by Scripture should be received by all Christians. Hence the transcendent importance of study which aims at discovering the meaning of Scripture, or is subsidiary thereto.

Biblical study should, of course, be thorough; and, when rightly conducted, it is no less scientific in method than the study of Systematic Theology. No one whose opinion is of value wishes the study of Scripture to be unscientific. To ask, in the interest of piety, that in the theological school scientific methods of Bible study should be laid aside, were ignorance and folly. As already said all true study, whether it employs a scientific terminology or not, must be essentially scientific; it must follow a true method of investigation and exposition. All pertinent grammatical and historical knowledge, so far as available, must be carefully applied in the study of the Scriptures,—all knowledge which may shed light upon Scripture in its several parts, in the relation of part to part and in the progress of relation throughout the entire volume.

The question of the Canon must be considered. The principle on which we separate canonical writings, whether by the Old Testament or the New, from the writings termed apocryphal, and from other cotemporary writings of a religious nature, must be determined and then applied to the several documents in our Bible. In this process both erudition and judgment are required. Reverent appreciation of the characteristics of inspiration is also necessary. More than literary knowledge only is obviously indispensable.

The important subject of the Text requires careful attention. From the mass of various readings the true reading must be ascertained; and this must be done not by any random process but by accurate knowledge of the sources of the text, and after careful comparison of these. The immense labor of constructing the text of the Bible cannot, of

course, be undertaken in the theological school, but the principles of textual criticism must be taught; and their application will be illustrated in some of the more important passages where the authorities vary.

Again, all questions within the province of what is called the Higher Criticism must be considered: questions regarding authorship of books of Scripture, time and place of writing, integrity of books, object of writer, literary and religious characteristics, relation to other productions of the same or other periods, etc. This important part of Introduction must be faithfully studied, both on account of its intrinsic interest and of its bearing upon interpretation. For evidently some of these inquiries, if not all, are necessary preliminaries to exegesis. Very especially the purpose of any writing and its literary and psychological characteristics must be carefully estimated, would we successfully grasp and present its meaning.

It is clear that questions of Canon, Textual Criticism, General Introductory Criticism must be dealt with in Biblical study, and that the satisfactory exposition of Scripture depends, to a considerable extent on these preliminary questions. On this matter all schools in theology are at one. It is not for a moment conceded that any true orthodoxy regards Introduction, in all that appertains to it, with an unfriendly eye.

But to bring this brief statement respecting Biblical Introduction into connection with our theme—the conducting of study in the class-room so as best to minister to the spiritual life of the student—let it be borne in mind that all topics of the nature of Introduction should be regarded and treated as subsidiary to the interpretation of Scripture—to the appreciation of its actual contents. To determine the meaning of the inspired Word, to master its teachings, is the end in view; and only by keeping this great end steadily before us can we rightfully claim for Introduction a place in the theological curriculum. Otherwise this study becomes merely a part of the study of general literature.

It is therefore very important that the theological teacher

should handle Introduction in due subordination to the study of the actual contents of the Word of God. In Biblical study the ultimate and main end is to give the fullest acquaintance with the teachings of the Bible. The truth of God as declared in his Word is the material of theology, and the instrument which the preacher and pastor will constantly use; but through that same truth must the soul of the student and pastor be nourished. Consider the effect on the student of fixing his attention inordinately upon those parts of the subject spoken of which have value chiefly as opening up the way for the earnest study of the Bible itself. There is here a greater error than a violation of the just proportion between Introduction and exegesis. The Divine Word is itself thrown into the shade, and that which should be first merely in order of study becomes first in importance. Should this mistake be made it is hardly possible that the student should receive full spiritual benefit from his Biblical studies—hardly possible, indeed, that he should not incur spiritual loss. High above everything else in the whole range of Biblical study should be the patient, thorough exercise of the faculties upon the substance of revealed truth.

No general charge of giving disproportionate prominence to Criticism as a part of Biblical study is here brought against our theological schools; but at present there may be considerable danger of committing this error. We all know that for some time there have been special temptations to give Criticism more than its own place, arising mainly from certain tendencies in connection with the study of the Bible, and certain critical results, of which we have heard a great deal. In order to make my argument clear it is not necessary to enter into details as to these tendencies and results.

Should the teacher have embraced what are sometimes improperly called critical views, he is very likely to give his strength to the exposition of these. He is very earnest in this task, believing as he does that the Bible cannot be rightly understood unless these views are accepted—believing, if evangelical in his doctrine, that the message of the Bible becomes more vital should these views be adopted.

Traditionalism, in his opinion, has so perverted the history of the Bible as greatly to dim its message and impair its religious value. It is not surprising, therefore, that he should insist, in season and out of season, upon what he deems so important. A teacher of this class does not usually confine the exposition of his own views and his polemics against traditionalism to questions of Introduction, for when he comes to the interpretation of the text he is too apt to allow his criticism to govern his exegesis—to keep it still in the ascendant. Here, then, in a marked form, is the evil of which I speak; for whether the critical views referred to are right or wrong, they are unduly to the front, and the result is that the more important part of Biblical study is relegated to a secondary place.

But may it not also happen that the professor who is opposed to the Newer Criticism shall devote too large a proportion of his strength to the refutation of critical theories? We must here speak with caution. It is quite necessary that the professor should take account of the different theories as to Scripture which are advanced by scholars; these are part of the history of Biblical study, of which the student will not remain entirely ignorant, whether they are discussed in the class-room or not. It is well that the professor should help his students to form a just opinion regarding new theories which have many influential advocates, should assist them in separating truth from error, should guard them against the seductions of error, should remove from their path, perhaps, hindrances to their going forward with a good conscience to the ministry. He will require to point out the bearing of such theories upon the whole question of the authority and inspiration of Scripture; while he endeavors with impartiality and adequate knowledge to estimate the evidence adduced in their support.

But, we again ask, is it not possible to give too much attention to theories which are rapidly undergoing serious modification and may soon pass from sight? Is it well to allow critics who are quite certain that the Gospels are the product of the second century, or that the incongruities with

which the Pentateuch is said to swarm are largely explained by the fact that a series of documents having different characteristics are woven into one by a reviser—sometimes with remarkable skill, sometimes in a careless and mechanical way—is it well, I say, to allow these critics to dictate to us the form which our labors in criticism shall assume; so that we should, as it were, be constantly declaring our concurrence with them or opposition to them? The press must deal, quite in detail, with all such questions as those referred to; but it is surely advisable not to allow the examination of doubtful theories to appropriate a very large proportion of the time available for Biblical study. Let the major part of this time be given to the exposition and support of what is deemed trustworthy in criticism, but especially to the direct consideration of the sacred text. At present the field of battle is the Old Testament; some time ago it was the New Testament. In both instances Introduction has been converted very much into apologetics, by the supposed necessity of counter-arguing, in great detail, opinions and theories of a semi-sceptical nature.

Is there not, then, ground for apprehension that the great prominence given to Apologetic Introduction, by its demands on the time and attention which might be given to the Word itself, may prove unfavorable to the religious life of the student? The result may not be to awaken or increase misgivings regarding Scripture in any mind: the very reverse may, in measure, be accomplished; but have we sufficient compensation for the good which might result from a greater concentration of thought and study upon the inspired Word itself? What is required above all else to confirm our faith in the truth and divinity of Scripture, and discredit all theories which detract from its authority and value, is to have the mind and heart filled with it—to have our thinking saturated with it.

One cannot be said, indeed, to have really entered into Biblical study unless he has sought to deal thoroughly with the contents of Scripture. Everything else merely opens the way for the main task. One who has acquired the most

intimate knowledge of all the theories regarding the composition of both Testaments remains in the outer court of the temple unless God is continually speaking to him in his Word.

It is hardly necessary to show that teaching which calls in question the veracity of any writer of Scripture impairs the authority and religious value of the Bible and inflicts injury on all who come under its influence. A writer who takes liberties with the truth cannot be governed by the Holy Spirit. God is a God of truth, and nothing can be more abhorrent than the thought that any one speaking under special divine direction should utter what he knows to be false, or should affirm what he does not know to be true. The question whether the inspired writers are strictly truthful cannot be an open question. The fundamental inquiry is whether the Bible is a revelation from God ; for if it is, Criticism which raises the question of its *bona fides* is out of its province. "Let God be true but every man a liar."

The inspired writers were not endowed with omniscience; on some subjects they openly confess ignorance ; but when they deliver the Lord's message we should receive it as his. It would be very hazardous to resolve that message into its divine and its human elements—accepting the former without abatement, but discounting the latter should it seem necessary. Happily in Presbyterian theological schools the veracity of Scripture is rarely questioned, but we too well know the effect of teaching, which impugns or doubts the truthfulness of the Bible, upon the spiritual life of all who come under its influence.

We have already tried to say emphatically that the rights of Criticism must be fully admitted, and that it must be allowed freely to do its appropriate work. No person who understands the scope and purpose of Criticism can doubt that it is legitimately applied to Scripture. Inasmuch as God has condescended to use men in the delivery of his truth, the validity of inquiry as to the characteristics of a writer, the circumstances in which he wrote, his object, the

history of his production since it left his hand, etc., is at once evident. Criticism of Scripture is in place because it contains a human element. But we have to regret that some critics, on the ground that the Bible was written by men and exhibits human characteristics, proceed with their work as if the Bible were merely human and not divine as well. We are thrown off our guard, perhaps, by the explicit statement that the book has a divine element; our orthodoxy is disarmed by prompt recognition of the two elements in Scripture; and then we are invited to follow a process of Criticism which is not in the least restrained by the fact that the Bible is divine throughout as it is human, throughout. If this is a fact, Criticism should constantly remember it, and should "put off its shoes from off its feet."

I do not here propose to discuss theories of inspiration, but if we believe that holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, we will require very sure evidence that any statement certainly made by the Bible needs correction, before we shall venture any suggestion to that effect. Could we separate the human from the divine element, so that our criticism should apply to the work of the writer only, the ordinary prerogatives of Criticism might not require restriction; but if the divine and the human so interpenetrate that mechanical separation is impossible, then clearly a reverent caution becomes the critic. In determining the true text of Scripture, the ordinary rules of textual criticism are to be applied; in all questions touching authorship of books, date of composition, objects of writers, characteristics of style, transmission of books and other points properly belonging to Introduction, there are no rules of criticism peculiar to the Bible; but when the exegete begins his work upon a pure text he must never forget that he is dealing with the Word of God. Hence, again, the responsibility is laid upon the theological teacher so to handle Scripture as to honor its real author, and to foster veneration for the Word of God in his students. In regard to them, the true teacher well knows that their reverence for the Word, confidence in it, ability to find spir-



itual food in it for themselves, power to use it as a mighty weapon in the pulpit, will depend infinitely more upon their hearing God himself speak through it than upon any aid which Introductory Criticism—useful as it is own place—can supply. We cannot err in our attitude towards the Word of God if we take Christ as our model: for it must not for a moment be conceded that any advance of true Criticism has made the Lord's way of referring to the Scriptures less an example to us.

Scripture must be allowed, without any strain put upon it, to express its own thoughts. Neither Criticism nor philosophy nor anything else must be permitted to change its natural voice. It hardly needs to be said that both in dogmatics and exegetics, philosophy has often usurped control, and not least in a school which boasts its entire freedom from metaphysics. Teacher and learner should both sit with simplicity of heart at the feet of the Lord. Thus the eyes will be enlightened and the simple will be made wise; while the judgments of the Lord will be seen to be true and righteous altogether.

Finally; the entire spiritual estate of the teacher will necessarily affect every part of his work, and hence it becomes a matter of exceeding importance as regards the spiritual profit of his students. The spiritual vitality of the preacher, as we are often reminded, is a main condition of his success. He may preach sound doctrine with much ability, and yet by reason of his defective spirituality his testimony to the Gospel may be largely robbed of its power; if, on the other hand his words come from a heart strong in faith and full of love, the souls of his hearers feel the unction of his speech. Not otherwise is it in the relation now before us—that of professor and students. A spiritual bond is established, and every lecture has some religious result, for better or for worse.

In some respects, indeed, the professor has an advantage over the preacher in the matter of influence. He has an audience of exceptional intelligence, responsive above most audiences to religious truth, and in most instances, very

favorably disposed towards their instructor. The professor has thus great opportunity for helping the spiritual life of his class. How important then that he should be able to take full advantage of his position and, by the divine blessing, strengthen and enrich the religious experience of those whose life and speech must tell so much upon the highest welfare—the everlasting destiny—of so many!

Let not the idea present itself to any one that an abiding aim on the professor's part to benefit his class spiritually in his daily work implies something inferior on the academic side,—a partial dereliction of his proper function in order to fulfil that of the preacher. He need not prelect with less ability or learning or thoroughness: what is wanted is that all he utters should take tone and color from a mind humble, believing, earnest, governed by the spirit of God and anxious to promote the religious as well as the theological attainments of those placed under his care.

It is surely possible that every meeting of a theological class should carry with it, for both professor and students, a distinctly religious meaning and purpose. Thus might we hope that there would be no chilling of the religious affections in the class-room, but rather that the hearts of all should burn within them while the Scriptures are opened up—the riches of divine truth unfolded.

Toronto, Canada.

WILLIAM CAVEN.

## II. JOHN CALVIN.

### I.

The sixteenth century is rich in gigantic figures, which stand boldly outlined against the dark sky of expiring mediævalism. One and all they were born from the political and ecclesiastical ferment, which originated in the emancipating influences of the Renaissance, and, in every department of life, changed the aspects of human history. In ecclesiastical history these towering giants form the most impressive and attractive group, which has ever appeared, in any given period. Each labors and strives, in his own divinely appointed sphere, and works out, by mighty efforts, his own peculiar and foreordained task; and yet all are dwarfed into comparative insignificance by a few special leaders, who are familiarly known as "the great Reformers." Among the latter the eye is arrested by one, the youngest and physically the weakest of them all.

Luther's typically German face is sharply contrasted with the pure Latin type of the reformer of Geneva. Behold a man of middle stature and attenuated frame. The face is thin, the complexion sallow, the nose prominent and finely chiseled, the brow high and commanding, the eyes black as night and gleaming with that peculiar bluish light, which indicates deep and clear views of abstract matters, the mouth large but well formed—a man who, in every line of face and form, betrays a Southern origin. This man, the most cordially loved and the most viciously hated of all the reformers, is John Calvin, or as the name is more accurately spelled, Chauvin or Chaulvin. He was born at Noyon, in Picardy, on the 10th of July, 1509. His father, Girard Chauvin, was the son of a cooper, and, therefore, belonged to the middle class, but by dint of great perseverance, became apostolic notary, fiscal attorney, and secretary to the Bishop of Noyon. Calvin's mother was Jeanne Lefranc, of Cambay, noted for her beauty and religious fervor. A Catholic tradition informs us that "his birth was heralded

by vast swarms of abnormally large flies, to indicate that he was to be a slanderer and backbiter." A few strokes of the pen must suffice to outline this truly remarkable type. At twelve years of age Calvin received the tonsure, as chaplain of the "Chapel de la Gesine," the benefits of which office were to aid him in gaining a liberal education. Two years later we find him at the University of Paris, still supported by Church benefices. This rapid scholastic career was interrupted, when, by the advice of his keen-sighted father, he left the study of Theology to turn to that of Law, in which study he so excelled that the University of Orleans bestowed upon him, a youth of not yet nineteen years, the honorary title of Doctor of Laws, which title, however, Calvin never used.

At Bourges he came under the influence of the noted Greek professor, Melchior Wolmar, through whose influence he turned to the study of the Scriptures and returned to Theology. Robert Olevitanus, a compatriot and relative, had just acquainted him with the new views of theology; through him Calvin was converted and experienced a sudden, radical and abiding change of life and heart.

The Nicholas-Cop incident obliged him to turn his back on Paris, and thus began a three year's period of wandering, which brought him great physical weariness and suffering and great spiritual and intellectual gain. A mere accident led him, August 5, 1536, to Geneva, and the adjuration of the gaunt but lion-hearted Farel kept him there; and thus a life-long and intimate friendship was established between these two men, so utterly dissimilar in almost every respect. The timid and reticent scholar was now unexpectedly forced into the thickest of the fight.

None of the Reformers had such dreadful odds to contend with as Calvin. No German city offered any comparison to the indescribably low moral condition of the beautiful "Bride of the Lakes." Its mixed population, its Latin impetuosity, its previous history, its wrong conception of liberty—all these combined made life in Geneva a continuous round of licentious brawls. An entire ward of the city was

given up to courtesans, who formed a distinct community by themselves and were governed by a so-called "harlot-queen," whose dominion was regulated by law. Says Henry: "Immorality had developed to tremendous and inconceivable proportions. Sexual sins were committed openly and without shame. Drunkenness and gluttony were common. Not rarely the wild licentiousness went so far that people staggered through the streets, stark naked and loudly brawling, to the accompaniment of drum and fife." Who ever heard of such an abomination as the deliberate infection, with the virus of the dreaded "black death" pestilence, of nearly every house in the city—in the expectation that thus the populace might be swept away and that the conspirators might remain masters of the situation and heirs of all things? And this very thing happened in Geneva in 1545.

And among such a people Calvin, the pure minded and shrinking and conscientious Calvin, was to labor! Can any one wonder at his zeal—a hand reaching forth with a bleeding heart, or at his device—"Liberty but order"?

The struggle was in vain, the odds were too great, the ideals of Calvin too high, his party as yet too weak; on Easter Monday, April 23, 1538, he and his colaborers were deposed and banished from the city. The "Libertines" had gained a complete victory, the cause of the Reformation seemed hopelessly lost.

But when Geneva expelled the great reformer, Strasbourg opened her arms to receive him, and the three subsequent years were spent in quiet study, in the final crystalization of his system of grace and in making a wide and helpful acquaintance of the leading spirits among the German reformers. There, too, in September, 1540, Calvin married Idelette Van Buren, a Dutch woman, widow of a converted Anabaptist, Johannes Storder.

Many apparently far more eligible women were desirous of uniting with the man of such fast growing fame; her, poor and unknown, he selected for her tried piety and her heroic spirit of martyrdom. Nine of the happiest years of

his life were spent with her and when in 1549 she fell asleep in Christ, Calvin never ceased to mourn her. Of the three children, born from this union, none survived.

Meanwhile Geneva had repented and was straining every nerve to regain the exiled reformer. Almost against his will, led by stern conviction of duty, Calvin returned in 1541. The council had prepared a home for him, and his wife was brought from Strasbourg to Geneva with the highest honors which the Republic was able to bestow. On this occasion Calvin wrote to Farel: "If I had a free choice I would be the last to do as you request, but since there is no question of my choice, I offer my bleeding heart to the Lord as a sacrifice." Now began the great struggle of his life, which wore him out and sapped his little store of vitality, till he died comparatively young at last.

With iron determination he fought the demon of immorality at Geneva. The stern consistorial laws of the early Dutch Reformed Church, those of the London refuge churches, those of Scotland and of Puritan New England reflect the blistering heat which seared out the festering sores of Geneva. They were copies, often, in bad taste for the necessity of the case demanded measures in Geneva, which out of their proper environment have but too often made a cruel caricature of Calvinism.

The consistory of Geneva became the embodiment of Calvin's theocratic idea. Elders were chosen for one year only. The most absolute poverty of the ministry was observed and the democratic ideal of Calvin was embodied in the veto power of the congregation over the resolutions of the consistory. The entire church of Geneva was organically one, after the collegiate plan, with its many houses of worship and pastors and parish-divisions; and its organization was so perfect that till this day it remains the type of its kind. Geneva never fully appreciated what she owed to John Calvin. Her sores were healed, her name was cleansed and from the vilest city of Europe she became the purest and best-governed community on the continent, a model to be patterned after. A century later

Drelincourt, who was Calvin's defender against Cardinal Richelieu, wrote: "Our present orderly life we owe to Calvin. One cannot conceive of a more beautiful connection between Church and State, nor of a finer co-operation between the civil and ecclesiastical powers. In all public acts one sees the Syndics and pastors harmoniously work together. The magistrates love to act in union with the ministers of the Gospel, for they love the fear of the Lord and know that therein lies the greatest support of the State. It may therefore be said that in Geneva righteousness and love go hand in hand."

But the change had not come by magic. The consistorial laws were iron laws, which piece by piece tore down the walls of the old free life of Geneva. Immorality of all kinds was severely punished, adultery was made a capital offense. The pothouses disappeared, the gambling hells were suppressed, dance and play houses were closed, excessive splendor of dress and the wearing of costly jewels were forbidden, the minutest details of domestic life, even to the matter of eating and drinking, were subjected to consistorial scrutiny. Thus the city of Geneva was by degrees brought to a high degree of outward morality and, let it be said, of inward piety also. The enforced seriousness, which to the first generation was a rather irksome duty, became habit to the second and a matter of privilege to the third, and thus Drelincourt's picture of Genevan life is a true one.

It would require too much space to enter into the details of the grievous struggles, by which the mastery was obtained. The final and dreadful conflict with the Libertinistic party must be passed by. In passing let it be said that the death of Servetus stands in the closest relation to this struggle and that the fate of the blatant heretic and Calvin's own were alike suspended in the balance of this sad historic trial, through the identification of Servetus' cause with that of the Libertinistic party. In judging the reformer's attitude on this occasion, let us beware of anachronisms.

A few words about his death before we attempt an analy-

sis of the elements in the character and life of John Calvin which made him great.

The device of Geneva may well stand for the history of this man — "*Post tenebras lux.*"

Always frail and of slender physique, Calvin's life had been sapped by excessive labors and incessant intellectual application, by multitudinous cares and life-destroying worries. From 1550 he suffered continually with raging fevers, from which he rallied only to endure repeated relapses. Yet not an iota of his literary activity would he relinquish. In this man the inward flame seemed to burn but the brighter as the outward light waned and burned low in the socket. In 1560, after months of suffering, he preached once more. Oh the joy of that sacred hour! But in December of the same year, in the pulpit, he was suddenly attacked by a dreadful hemorrhage of the lungs. Still he struggled on and continued to bear his excessive burdens, in which his very life seemed to be bound up. Again and again the dread omen returned, the building was tottering to its fall. The incessant activity of his mind hindered the natural functions of his body; through severe attacks of indigestion he ate but once a day, and that sparingly. A complication of diseases sapped his remaining strength.

Yet in January, 1564, all undaunted, Calvin began his exegetical treatment of Isaiah. In February he lectured for the last time to his students on Ezekiel. On Sunday, February 6th, he preached his last sermon. Then the end approached. Devoutly he took leave of the city council of Geneva on the 37th of March, 1564. At his urgent request he was carried into the old church, on Easter morning, to worship and commune with the people he loved; then came the leave taking of friends and associates, and on the 27th of May, 1564, Calvin breathed his last. Beza says: "On that day, with the setting of the sun, the life went out of a man who was pre-eminently foreordained to labor in this world for restoration of the Kingdom of God."

At his own request he was buried without pomp or



special ceremony, or without a token to mark the place, where his ashes await the resurrection of the just. Visitors at Geneva, who arrived a few days after his death, sought in vain for the place where he lies entombed. Geneva erected a statue to Rousseau, her eminent son; she herself is the memorial pile of her greatest citizen, John Calvin.

## II.

Of all the reformers no one has been more ardently loved and no one has been more bitterly hated than John Calvin. He lacked many things which Luther possessed; he possessed much which Luther lacked. Luther quarried the huge blocks of stone which Calvin polished; the one was the giant pioneer and bravely started the work, the other carried the reformation to its ultimate logical sequence and that fearlessly. The one is the man of action, the other of penetration; both belong together, each excelling in his own divinely appointed sphere. And strange to say the differences between them were less of their own accentuation than of that of the zealots among their partisans. Luther profoundly respected Calvin, who shrinks within himself, in conscious self-depreciation, before the man whom he honored above all others. Between the great reformers there existed a cordial understanding. Calvin was recognized by the German Zwinglians as the legitimate successor of their fallen chief. Melancton was his intimate friend and Luther said of him, when officious friends tried to anger him, by pointing out what Calvin had said concerning the Lutheran doctrine of the supper, "I trust that some time he may think better of us, but in each case we must bear something of so excellent a spirit." And again in 1545, "There is a learned and pious man, to whom I had safely dared to entrust the whole matter of this struggle. If Zwingle and Oecolampadius had from the beginning expressed themselves in such a way, we would never have got into this muss."

And yet whilst Luther has been extolled to the sky, and Melancton the "Magister Europae" has become Ger-

many's pride, Calvin for centuries has stood exposed to furious assaults and his portrait on the canvass of history has become distorted into a mere caricature of the original, accepted even in the house of his friends.

Nor is the reason far to seek. In the first place, unlike Luther, Calvin never became a national idol. What he might have been to France was undone by the undoing of the Huguenot cause. He had moreover deliberately expatriated himself to become identified with the cause of a detested little Republic, a sort of a European "nondescript." In the second place he followed the fundamental lines of the Reformation to their farthest issues. In him its logical consequences stood clearly embodied and the depth of the wide chasm between the old and the new was by no other reformer so fully sounded as by him. No reformatory system so completely undid and antagonized the semi-Pelagianism of the Romish Church as did Calvinism. Erasmus, the keen-eyed Humanist, had met Calvin at Basel and he had taken in at a glance what others still failed to see. Said he to Bucer: "I foresee that this man will become as dangerous to the Church as a pestilence." He had seen correctly, and therefore the vials of Romish wrath and vituperation were emptied on Calvin's head as on no other. Henry has tried to rescue Calvin's fame by an immortal biography. And no doubt Calvin's day is still coming, hazardous as the prediction may appear. For the pendulum of history has ever swung to and fro, in the ages of the life of the Church, through the Paulinic arc.

As yet Calvin is but little understood. Wrong or exaggerated conceptions of his system have given place to cold disdain. But if we wish to know him, as a man, as a reformer and as an exegete, we will have to dive deeply below the surface. The study of his works will amply repay the unprejudiced searcher after truth. The study of the man, as friend, as husband, as father and pastor will have to be pursued in his Correspondence. In his letters he reveals himself as nowhere else. And here tradition and actual history run counter.

The traditional Calvin is an iron hearted, painfully logical character, devoid of natural affections, a man to be dreaded rather than loved, of lofty intellectual powers, all brains without heart; a man loveless and unlovable.

Do I exaggerate?

Hear what one of his best friends, Dr. H. Bavinch, professor at Kampen, (Netherlands) said a few months ago: "The reformer of Geneva, whom the Reformed honor as their spiritual father, is yet known as a serious, sombre figure, inimical, or at least indifferent to all that is lovely and pleasing. He may arouse us to reverence and admiration by his perfect consecration to God, who called him, by the majesty of his character, by his holy earnestness, by his indomitable will. He does not inspire us with love and affection. This clean cut face with the sharp nose and the long thin beard, his movable, penetrating, imperious eye, his attenuated form, all bone and sinew, does not attract but keeps one at a respectful distance. He is accused of having had neither eye nor heart for whatever lay aside of his real calling. Sociality of life did not exist for him. Of his domestic joys and sorrows he never made mention in his letters. The beauty of nature left him cold. In art, poetry and music he took no interest. The most innocent diversions were to his view doubtful. In a word he was *un esprit chagrin, un genie triste*. Here is the traditional picture of Calvin and it is accepted without protest. It is all the more dangerous, since it has elements of truth.

The Calvin of his correspondence however can say with the great anchorite—"Homo sum atque nihil humanum a me alienum puto." A man of fiery Southern temperament, he was at times liable to fits of wild anger and he recognized in his fiery temper a lifelong and bitter enemy. He was a man of kind impulses and strong attachments, proud and reserved to those who knew him not, wonderfully open hearted to those whom he trusted with his confidence. This great kindness of heart profoundly impresses the reader of his correspondence. When his father died he said: "Oh! if I only have not, by my preaching, been the

cause of his death." And again, "I was willing to lose my father, but in him I have lost my best friend and adviser." When his son died: "The Lord has certainly inflicted a heavy and severe wound on us, by the death of our little son, but he is our father and knows what is best for his children." When he lost his wife: "I use every exertion in my power not to be entirely overcome with heaviness of heart. This so great calamity would inevitably have overpowered me, unless God from heaven had stretched forth his hand." On the same occasion he writes to Farel: "With all our exertions to repress the sorrow of my heart, we effect less than I could wish." "You know the tenderness of my mind or rather with what effeminacy I yield to trials, so that without the exercise of much moderation I could not have supported the pressure of my sorrow." When his friend Convault died, he wrote to Farel: "I am so overwhelmed that I put no limits to my sorrow;" and when Bucer died of the plague: "My heart is almost torn asunder."

Thus one might continue to disprove the slander, so often repeated, that Calvin was utterly unaffected by joys or sorrows and that his letters are mute on these topics. From his correspondence it appears rather that this man was effusive in his friendship; grief crushes him; misrepresentation wrings his heartstrings; he is fond of social intercourse with his brethren, he loves music, he translated Psalms for public worship, and he was fond of innocent games, as for example, quoits.

Again his letters prove that the arrows in his quiver are not all cut after the same pattern. At times they scintillate with wit and irony. When the exile had returned to Geneva and all her citizens seemed to vie in endeavoring to honor him, he wrote: "Surely not men but houses must have banished me from the city." Read "the excuse of John Calvin to the Nicodimites, about this complaint about his too great severity," and you will see at once of what satire this man is capable. When the faithless Baldwin had attacked his character, Calvin says in a characteristic reply,

quoting Socrates: "If an ass kicks me shall I legally prosecute the beast? And although I am far from possessing the noble magnanimity of Socrates, I am yet so accustomed to the barking of all manner of dogs, that I am not specially concerned about the yelping of the last one." After Maurice of Saxony had committed his second treason and thereby had revived the hope of German Protestantism, Calvin wrote: "I hope that our Antiochus (Charles V.,) who at present so much distresses us, shall be brought to such straits that he will have no time to think of the gout in his hands and feet, but that he will feel it over all his body. May God visit his assistant, Sardanapalus, (King of France) in the same way, for both have equally deserved it of us."

But it is in his serious mood that John Calvin is most attractive. This character was the most heroic of all the Reformers. He was moulded into a type, of irresistible strength by life-long trials and opposition. Naturally of an extremely diffident and shrinking disposition, he was made strong in weakness. Unswerving loyalty to principle became his chief characteristic. Even as a child he was remarkable for it and the courage to speak out boldly, to which it compelled, gave him among his schoolmates the nickname of "Accusatious." When the pestilence depopulated Geneva, in 1542, and minister after minister fell a victim, Calvin himself took his place in the pesthouse to minister to the wants of the dying; and only the decisive command of the Council could remove him from this post of danger. Listen to the words he addressed to the Libertines, at a time when their power was still unbroken: "If ye will not bow under the yoke of Christ build yourselves a city somewhere, where you can live to your hearts content; but as long as you are here you will have to obey the laws, and if there were as many diadems in your houses as heads, God will yet know how to remain master." And when the dangers thickened and death frowned on him from every shadow and street corner, he said: "They want to taste my blood, although I doubt whether they would like its taste as well as that of their own sins. But God lives and this faith en-

courages me. And if all Geneva conspired to kill me, I would yet cry out the word, for which they so bitterly hate me,—‘Repent.’” Or is it not a heroic scene, in the great church of Geneva, when Calvin, before the communion was celebrated, saw a movement among the Libertines, men of high standing in the city’s honors and trust, as if they would force their way to the Lord’s table; and cried out, covering the elements with extended hands: “These hands you may cut off; these members you may crush, my blood is yours, pour it out. But never will you compel me to give the holy thing to sinners.” Or again look at him, with uncovered breast and bareheaded, standing in the midst of a blood-thirsty mob, eager for his life, and calming their passionate fury into subduing shame, by the silent, withering glance of his eagle eye; and finally look at him, in the valley of the shadow, dying for years, a physical wreck, forbidden by his physicians to do a stroke of work, and yet in an heroic victory of a frail body, accomplishing an amount of labor which staggers and confounds the student of his work, and work at that not of a slovenly order, but such as is measurable only by the brief comment of Besa: “So many words as Calvin used, so many deeply-pondered thoughts.” Truly the learning and industry of this man must have been inconceivably great. Of all the Reformers none equalled him in the classic beauty of his Latin. As a mere boy he called Cicero his “intimate,” and one needs but to read his “Institutes” and commentaries, in the original, to feel the spell of his masterful language. And in his native French he evinced the same power as in Latin. It has been said that, as Luther created German by his Bible, so Calvin created French by his “Institutes.” The original was not, as some hold, written in Latin, but it was anonymously given to the world, in purest French. And the dedication of the book to King Francis, has always been considered a veritable classic of the French language—“*un discours digne d’un grand roy.*”

After extremely fatiguing intellectual labors, Calvin would not rarely compare himself to—“a soldier, who had

slain many enemies." Said he, "I never feel more pain than when I cease from labor, from which I conclude that work is not so harmful to my body as rest." In his twenty-third year he published a commentary on Seneca's—"*De Clementia*"—which sounds the keynote of his later triumphs. In his twenty-fourth year he wrote his wonderful treatise on "The Sleep of the Soul after Death," which indicates alike a complete mastery of the Scriptures and of the Church-fathers. Thus in the morning of life, at a time when others are usually just beginning to stretch their nestling wings, he had already attained a reputation for scholarship, which caused Scaliger, so sparing of praise, to say, "that Calvin was the most learned man in Europe." And at twenty-six he wrote that marvelously perspicuous and analytical compendium of the Christian faith, his "Institutes," which was later on elaborated and enlarged, but never really altered in a material sense. Schultingius says that the English preferred these Institutes to the Bible, and by popish authors generally they were considered more dangerous to the cause of the papacy than all the other writings of the reformers combined.

In this great work, in four main divisions—Creation, Redemption, Sanctification and the Means of Grace—he outlines, what has been called "the boldest and clearest scheme of the Christian faith, ever written." God, the Triune, to be praised forever more, is the very center of Calvin's system. To him, the eternal, the all perfect, the immutable God, belongs the adoration of all his creatures. God is to Calvin the most perfect unity. He loves to penetrate into the mazes of his dealings with men. Like Augustine he cannot rest in the creature or in any act of the creature. He finds no rest, till in all his thinking he has prostrated himself before the throne of the divine majesty. Every line of every problem runs into this one great center. The great fundamental doctrines of revelation remain dark, unless they be viewed in the strong light of the throne of God. Calvin saves himself from the imputation of fatalism, by sharply distinguishing, in his doctrine of the decree,

between the decretive and permissive will of God. God can never be the source of evil. The fact that sin is a factor in the attainment of the divine decree does not rob it of its sinfulness. Man's responsibility is taught as fully and as sharply as is the sovereignty of God. Calvin had the courage and the power to penetrate, more deeply than any of his fellow reformers, into the logical consequences of the formal principle of the Reformation. But he himself warns against all reckless searching after the incomprehensible. The great mystery of grace can be viewed as from a distance, it cannot be comprehended. Unbelief and spiritual barrenness are the sad reward of undue curiosity. It can easily be understood why all Europe, as by common consent, bestowed on the author of these "Institutes" the title of "*Theologus*."

And yet this logical and theological mind was agitated till the very end by strong longings for the outward unity of all believers. In this regard Calvin displayed a different spirit from Luther and was easily abreast of Melanchthon. With him, however, this longing originated rather in the loftiness of his conception than in an estimate of minor things as "*adiaphora*." Calvin looked above and there found the root of union, Melanchthon looked about him and found it there. To Cardinal Sadolet, Calvin wrote from Strasburg: "Let there be as much difference of opinion as is possible, the true-minded Christian can for all that find the straight way. I would rather not dream of that keensightedness in the recognition of truth, which is incapable of error and can proudly condemn all those who think differently. Much rather I believe that believers not only cannot understand all mysteries, but they can even be blind in the plainest matters. But this is sure to me,—if they accept God's word, with a believing heart, they can never err to such an extent as to be lost."

Is this the stern and narrow-minded Calvin of tradition?

On the 29th of November, 1552, Calvin wrote a letter to Melanchthon, which is alive with this desire for union. "I consider it of the utmost importance" he writes "that all



traces of difference between us be hidden, as much as is possible, from the eyes of posterity, even if they cannot be effaced. For it would appear strange if we, who had to separate ourselves as it were from all the world, in the very beginning should separate from each other also, instead of uniting together." This correspondence again and again reveals this longing for church union. And the deep source of it all was the genuine and unaffected piety of John Calvin. He is worthy of more than reverence; he is not "*un esprit chagrin*," or a "*genie triste*," he can be loved!

His faith was tried and it was not found wanting. When Calvin on April 25, 1538, was banished from Geneva he said: "If I had only served men, the reward, which I receive, might not be accounted very acceptable; but fortunately I have served him who never withholds the promised reward from his servants." To the Queen of Navarre, who finds fault with his treatment of the Libertines, he writes: "Madam, a dog barks when his master is attacked and would I not be a great coward, if notwithstanding the fact that I see the truth of God so vehemently attacked, I played the dummy and made no sound"? His whole life is one great sacrifice of self. He loved the Master with an inconceivable ardor. When remonstrated with, toward the close of his life, that he wasted his fast ebbing strength in hard intellectual labor, said he: "Would you that the Master should find me idle when he cometh"?

And the piety of John Calvin is not unrelieved by tokens of true humanity. It is human and humane alike. It is utterly unlike the stretch of grey and sombre-tinted sky, to which it is usually compared. Calvin loses friends and loved ones, wife and children, and he consoles others and himself again and again with the comforting thought that the loved ones have but gone before and that the trysting place is beyond the skies. In his treatise against Hehushius he exclaims: "O Philip Melanchthon, thou that art now living before the throne of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, and who there waitest for me, till death shall have united us again, how often hast thou exclaimed, when tired

of labor and oppressed by so many troubles and difficulties thou laidst thy head upon my breast. 'Grant, God, that I may die even thus.'" This sentiment we meet again and again in his letters. There is thus in this life a strong and deep undercurrent of affection and tender sympathy. Behind the mask of steel, Calvin hides a face of tender humanity. Whoever would learn thus to know the Reformer of Geneva must search for the man behind the man. Thus his biographer, Henry, found him, when, to his surprise, he discovered that the traditional and historic pictures of Calvin did not tally. He sought for a hero for his story and found "an honest and upright man, who filled him with respect and love."

Through the school of Geneva, Calvin exerted a wonderful influence. "Send us wood," he had written, "and we will cut arrows therefrom." And all Europe and Great Britain sent to Geneva for arrows. Scotland there got its Knox; Holland its Guido de Bres and Marnix of Aldegonde, and Louis of Nassau; England a long list of noble leaders. Great Britain upheld Calvin's College, after his death—1580-90, when, without such aid, its walls must have crumbled to dust. This College became the focal point of the Calvinistic movement, and through it Calvin exerted a far reaching and abiding influence; and the discipline of mind and body, there acquired, raised a set of heroic men, men of steel and granite, the progenitors of the men of the Dutch Republic and the English Commonwealth and the American free States.

No man accomplished more in a short life than Calvin. In industry and in the scope of his labors and in their tangible and appreciable results, he towers above all the reformers. Behind him stood no political shielding power, no willing swords of eager nobles, no national pride inflamed by his own enthusiasm. He came to Geneva alone and a wanderer. His native country had spewed him out and sought his life; he found no rest for the sole of his foot. At Geneva he found a raging hell of infamy and pollution. The Catholic power was overthrown, but a hierarchy worse than that of

Rome had fastened itself upon the fair city, a hierarchy of licentiousness and open sin. Geneva's reformation had been but a deformation; from bad the city had gone to worse. Calvin came and threw himself single handed into this unequal contest, the banner of "liberty and order" in hand; he laid his bleeding heart on God's altar; he stood alone and wavered not, but trusted in God his strength; he went down in the battle; he was on his feet again, recalled by a helpless people, a people that yearned for peace and knew not the way of its finding; he battled on and conquered at last and built, in the reformation of Geneva, a lasting monument to his God-given powers of faith and endurance and especially to the glory of a sovereign grace.

In his attainments, in his labors, in his sufferings, in his conquests, in his spiritual insight into the truth, in his exegetical work, in his relations with men, in the reach of his influence—in all these things, John Calvin towers above all his compeers and we need not hesitate to call him the greatest of the Reformers.

HENRY E. DOSKER.

Holland, Mich.

good summary

### III. THE SALIENT POINTS OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

The Reformation of the 16th century forms a turning point of the greatest importance in the history of the Christian Church. It would lead us too far away from my theme if I were to enter upon a discussion of the main character and the distinctive features of this wonderful movement, however inviting such a subject may be. Suffice it to make the single statement, that one of its universally recognized features is the breaking up of the organic union of the Occidental Church; and intimately connected with it, the introduction of many more or less elaborate confessions of faith as a bond of church-fellowship. But although the outward catholicity of the Church was irrevocably broken up, the spiritual unity of believers was retained notwithstanding the seemingly endless bitter controversies, and found its expression in the universal assent to the ecumenical creeds of the first centuries of the Christian era. It is true, the anabaptistical and antitrinitarian sects cut loose from the traditional faith of the catholic Church, but these can hardly be considered an historical development of Church-life. They were, whatever may be said in their favor in modern times, the revolutionary *enfants terribles* of the Reformation period, enthusiasts, entirely lacking the historical sense. To the ecumenical creeds, however, were now added particular confessions of faith, exponents of different tendencies of Christianity, growing up in the fruitful soil of liberty. These particular creeds may be looked upon as party programs, setting forth the peculiar character of the new church-formations, or perhaps as regimental colors, dear to the several divisions of the great army of God.

The Reformers, who never dreamed of forming new churches, emphasized the continuity of the Church of God through all the ages, although a schism had become unavoidable on account of the stubborn resistance of the Roman hierarchy, aided by the powerful arm of the State, to the reformation in doctrine, discipline and culture.

This in short is the cause why the Reformation in its formative period has become an epoch of creed productions.

Two different species of creeds chiefly have been evolved, almost from the start of the movement. It is true, some theologians\* have tried to prove the unity of reformation-theology in its genesis, but this attempt is now considered a total failure. There are expressions which confine themselves almost exclusively to the soteriological aspect of the Christian doctrine, while others assume a more intensely cosmological and theological character, although not ignoring the prime importance of individual salvation. The former cluster around the gigantic figure of Martin Luther, the hero of the reformation, as Dr. Kuyper calls him in one of his Stone lectures, while the latter form a kind of ellipse, having Zwingle and Calvin for their focuses and as their center the impersonal theological tendency, by common consent called Calvinism.

The Westminster Confession is the latest development of confessional Calvinistic doctrine.† Calvinism may have made some progress since the great divines, who met at Westminster, have died, but the confessional character of those churches, which find the expression of their faith in this renowned symbol, has remained stationary since those eventful days. Declarations of doctrine have been added in some churches, safety valves for disturbed consciences, or fences against disturbing influences from without,‡ in others an attempt has been made to revise it, although without any practical results, and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in our country has eliminated one of the fundamental doctrines of Calvinism from it, trying to play Hamlet with

\*Heppe and Ebrard are the champions of this view.

† The nine articles of the Evangelical Alliance and the recently published Catechism of Nonconformists in England are a return to a former type of Christianity and cannot be looked upon as a development of symbolical theology.

‡ The declarations of the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland are such safety valves, whilst the testimony of the United Presbyterian Church of America is such a fence.

Hamlet left out; but in the great Presbyterian Churches the Westminster Confession still holds its place as the official standard of their public faith.

If we desire to know the precise status of Calvinism as it lived in the Calvinistic churches at the end of the formation period of the reformation, at the very point, when Neo-Scholasticism began its sway, finding its strength, but at the same time manifesting its weakness in a monotonous reproduction of the works of the masters, we certainly can do no better than study this monument of religious and theological energy, zeal and scholarship.\*

The Westminster Confession, being far removed from the fountain-head of the new life, which sprung into existence at the beginning of the 16th century, and filled the churches with youthful enthusiasm, fervor and power, lacks many characteristics of the earlier days of the reformation period. Instead of these it shows signs of maturity and calm reflection.† In fact the Westminster Confession resembles a body of divinity rather than a confession. At a glance you notice that the usual form of a confession has been dropped altogether. How inspiring it is, when the Church of Christ speaks from the heart. "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth." It sounds like lyric poetry, which is more sympathetic than any other kind, because it expresses a sentiment in subjective form, while all, who read it, acknowledge it to be their common feeling. The objectivity of the subjective is the special charm of the ecumenical, and in a less degree of some of the Protestant confessions. For this quality we look in

---

\*In 1618 charges were preferred against Maccovius, the father of Neo-Scholasticism on account of his scholastical method, and about 30 years afterwards the Westminster Divines met.

† Some think that the Westminster Confession contains signs of degeneracy of the Reformed doctrine. Maturity, however, is no sign of retrogression. Calm reflection, a result of a feeling of security in the possession of spiritual wealth, follows outbursts of vigorous life and energy. This is an historical law, reigning in every domain of the life of mankind.

vain in the Westminster Confession. In ponderous statements, strictly theoretical in form, although now and then a little polemical salt is added, it gives us an admirable system of reformed doctrines. If it lacks the subjective flavor, it presents instead of it an objective view of the truth, as the reformed churches knew it, when this most scientific of all the Calvinistic standards was framed. Zurich, Geneva, Dordrecht, Westminster, behold! the successive stages in the development of symbolical Calvinism. The Westminster Confession is a work *sui generis*, and yet, if I may borrow a term from natural science, the different strata, still visible, tell the story of the gradual development of Calvinism and show us that it has reached the age of manhood in its latest, i. e. its Anglo-Saxon form.

The *genus proximum* of the Westminster Confession is apparent in its opening chapter. Reformed symbols give the place of eminence to the Holy Scriptures. The Westminster Confession takes its place within the ranks of these symbols. It emphasizes its faith in the written Word of God, mentioning all the books, canonically received by the Church. It does not deny God's revelation in nature, on which the reformed confessions lay special stress on account of the Socinian controversy, but it does not emphasize it. It affirms, however, in a very forcible manner, that the Holy Scriptures are a gift of God, wherein he has revealed himself in Christ as sinners stand in need of him. Everything of interest about the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, usually found in a dogmatical treatise, is found here in a brief and yet pellucid form. Any theologian may find in it methodological suggestions for his private studies in what is generally called the history of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.

After the *locus* of the Holy Scriptures the doctrine of God and the mystery of the Holy Trinity are taken up. The character of this chapter decides the Calvinistic *genus* of the Westminster Confession. Calvinism is theological and not anthropological in its root-principle. In this respect it is entirely different from the Lutheran standards,

which emphasize the soteriological principle to such an extent that Christianity almost exclusively is presented as the religion of justification and redemption. The influence of this character of the Lutheran symbols is even in our days apparent in Ritschl's theology. It is not by mere accident, that this master's greatest work is a monograph on "die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung." Lutherans certainly believe in God, but in their system they hang on to the work of Christ and its results in the life of Christians. Calvinists build the second article of the Apostolic Creed upon the first. The Westminster Confession is in full harmony with this position. At the same time, however, it is a remarkable fact, that very little space is given to this fundamental doctrine of our religion. In the copy I have before me the doctrine of God and the Holy Trinity covers only six pages, while ten are given to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. But this again is in perfect harmony with the Reformed doctrine of God's incomprehensibility. *Finitum non est capax infiniti.* Mysteries must not be unraveled, they have to be adored. It is genuinely Calvinistic, to confess that God is unknown in his absolute essence, knowable however and known in his character, revealed in the works of his hands, both in nature and supernatural revelation.

More space is given in the Westminster Confession to the doctrine of God's decrees. It is a fact, that the great reformers, Luther as well as Zwingle and Calvin, believed in absolutely sovereign predestination. In the Lutheran churches, thanks to the synergism of Melanchthon and his pupils, this doctrine has been modified, whilst in the Reformed churches the modification, proposed by the Arminians, has been eliminated from the confessions and branded as an heresy. It cannot be said, however, that the doctrine of predestination has found its adequate form in any of the confessions. Infralapsarianism and supralapsarianism both have been taught by eminent teachers. The official teaching of the churches, however, has generally been infralapsarian, although the more logical view of the supralapsarians



has always been tolerated. The Westminster Confession, although bearing towards supralapsarianism, is yet cautious enough to keep within the boundary lines of infralapsarianism. It is true the strong influence of the more logical form of supralapsarianism makes itself felt in the wording of the whole article. Some, it is true, have maintained that the Westminster Confession is supralapsarian because it places the doctrine of predestination before the doctrines of creation, providence, the fall of man and its consequences. In this respect the arrangement is far different from e. g., the Belgic Confession, which speaks of election only in its sixteenth article after creation and the fall of man. Logically considered, it might be expected that the position given to the doctrine of predestination in the Westminster Confession, would indicate a supralapsarian view, but a careful consideration of chapters III-V removes every doubt regarding its infralapsarian character. The beginning of the section sounds as uncompromisingly supralapsarian. "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory." It seems as if one hears Beza's voice in these words but the supralapsarian spell is broken when we read: "Out of His mere grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes among them thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace." All this is certainly very positive and in harmony with God's absolute sovereignty, yet an infralapsarian will take no objection to it. It looks upon men as sinners, who need the grace of God in Jesus Christ, and not as creatures in the abstract as supralapsarianism pure and simple requires. We maintain that the Westminster Confession gives in very strong language, approaching the abyss of supralapsarianism as nearly as possible, the infralapsarian view. This is just as we expect it, remembering that the Westminster Confession is the youngest of all the standards, belonging

to the Calvinistic type. In Dordrecht, supralapsarians and infralapsarians formed, guided by pedagogical considerations, in the so-called Canons, a declaration of doctrine, which is decidedly infralapsarian in character, although both views were represented in the General Synod and acknowledged as orthodox. Bogermann, the moderator of that body, and Gomarus, the keenest antagonist of Arminius, were great leaders in those days, although both of them belonged to the supralapsarian wing of the Contraremonstrants. Both parties instinctively felt that neither the one nor the other view was a perfectly satisfactory solution of the difficulties connected with the great mystery of God's eternal decrees. The Canons of Dordrecht are after all a compromise, a sacrifice on the side of supralapsarian in the interest of peace and humanity. A preacher of those times gives expression in a quaint way to the unsatisfactory formulation of the doctrine of predestination when he says: "In my study I am a supralapsarian, in the pulpit, however, an infralapsarian." The divines assembled at Westminster wrestled with the great task to find a more adequate form of the doctrine in question. They did not succeed in their endeavor. It was not given them to find a higher level where both forms of the doctrine are blended into one, embodying what is good in both and eliminating what is imperfect. They have, however, utilized some of the less dangerous points of the supralapsarian in the formulation of the doctrine and have thereby advanced its development. I repeat, this is just what we would expect *a priori*, believing as we do in the historical development of Christian doctrine.

Passing by the doctrines of creation and providence, wherein nothing original draws our attention, we find that much space is given in the Westminster Confession to the doctrine of God's covenant with man. Here we approach, if I am not mistaken, the *differentia specifica* of the Westminster Confession, whereby it is distinguished from all the rest of the Calvinistic standards. The doctrinal character of this precious document stands out in bold relief in this

article, and gives it a place by itself in the cycle of Calvinistic symbols. It is true, Olevianus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg catechism, which was published as early as 1563, has written a treatise on the covenant of grace, and a little later on we find that Cloppenburg, a Holland theologian, has made use of the doctrine of the covenant, years before the time of Coccejus, the father of the so called federal theology. The doctrine as such however, had no symbolical significance whatever during the formative period of the Reformation theology. It is not found in any of the older symbols of the Reformed churches. Neither Calvin nor Knox gave it a prominent place in their system, although it must be recognized that it lay at the root of the Calvinistic principle of the absolute dependence of the creatures upon God. In the earlier times of the Reformation epoch it possessed the nature of a theologoumenon rather than of a dogma. In the Coccejan form however it introduced heterodox elements into the Calvinistic system. Although we regret the bitterness of the controversies which were the result of this new departure in theological development, we owe many thanks to the great Gysbertus Voetius for being a strenuous and successful opponent of heterodox Coccejanism. Since those times theologians have worked out the doctrine of the covenant in harmony with the true nature of Calvinism. The Westminster Confession represents the first attempt to embody in a symbol, fortified by ecclesiastical authority, the newly developed doctrine. This is done in the first section of the chapter on the covenant of God with man. "The distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto Him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of Him, as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which He has been pleased to express by way of covenant."

The statement made in this section certainly is in harmony with the theological principle of Calvinism, and yet it is found nowhere in our rich symbolical literature as clear-

ly expressed as here. Latent it undoubtedly is everywhere in all truly Calvinistic symbols, for Calvinism loses its character without it, but it was given to the Westminster divines to proclaim it to the world in clarion tones, that no creature has any claim to communion with God, which is not based upon the condescension of the Most High. The fact of this communion is a blessed reality; the cause, which has established it, is found in God's absolute sovereignty; the *terminus technicus*, for this wonderful relation between God and man is called covenant. This is emphatically Westminster Calvinism. I have to refrain from investigating its exegetical basis and from entering upon a dogmatical discussion, I simply give the fact, which is embodied in the noble Westminster standards, and wherein I find something new indeed in the symbolical development of Calvinistic doctrine.

The doctrine of Christ the Mediator is intimately connected with the doctrine of the covenant. He is according to the Westminster Confession the foreordained Mediator to re-establish the original covenant—the covenant of works—by means of the covenant of grace. The development of the doctrine of the person and work of Christ however does not develop anything new or striking. The formulation of it is in perfect harmony with the accepted orthodox doctrine of the Reformed churches.

The chapter on the free will of man is again one of the salient points, which lend a special charm to the noble Standards of the Presbyterian Church. The question of the free will of man had been a bone of contention from the beginning of the reformation between the Augustinian and the Pelagian elements of this movement. Luther versus Erasmus, the Contraremonstrants against the Remonstrants are the exponents of this controversy. The great danger of asserting a *servum arbitrium* against a *liberum arbitrium indifferentiae* appeared always anew. It seems that the Westminster divines felt in their consciences bound to make a special statement with regard to this matter. They desired to escape the extremes of the Pelagian idea of man's moral freedom and of the Lutheran idea of the enslaved will of

man, the Flaccian leaven hidden in this system. They proclaim first of all the natural liberty of man's will. "God has endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil." Man, according to them, is a free agent. This freedom belongs to him as a creature, and is not taken away from him, although he has sinned, and is no longer morally free. He is not determined by any absolute necessity of nature, but he determines himself by his condition as a sinner. They do not believe in a physical determinism. At the same time however they assert man's slavery in the bonds of sin. "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."

The Westminster Confession brings in this chapter the net result of all the discussions about the preceding questions regarding the freedom of man's will and his enslavement to sin in his natural state.

In the following chapters, which describe the process of saving grace in the heart and life of man, the Westminster Confession is throughout in harmony with the other Calvinistic standards.

Some peculiarities however have to be noted. It is a strange phenomenon that the doctrine of regeneration as the act of God, whereby man's nature is renewed, was not clearly defined in the days of our fathers. While in the earlier part of the reformation period the term regeneration was used to denote not only the beginning, but also the development of Christian life, we find that, later on, especially in British and American circles, this term is often misunderstood for conversion, and what afterwards on the continent of Europe was called regeneration, i. e., the beginning of the new life, is known as *facultas credendi*. The Westminster Confession does not use the term regeneration in its continental meaning, but speaks of effectual calling,

which however as defined in chap. X, is virtually the same thing. "The effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed by it." The result of this identification of effectual calling and regeneration has been, that the passivity of man in the quickening act of God's grace is hopelessly mixed up in the theology of the Scotch type with the activity of man in embracing the offered and conveyed grace. If the term regeneration is exclusively reserved to denote the act of God, whereby he restores new life to a sinner, and the term effectual calling is used for the act of God, whereby the regenerated sinner awakes to spiritual consciousness, all haziness in the statement of doctrine vanishes. The article on effectual calling, as formulated in the Westminster Confession, might be—let me say it with all modesty—improved by making a clear distinction between the first part of the article, quoted above, which is identical with regeneration, and the second part, which really is effectual calling.

A special article is bestowed upon the consideration of faith, which is characteristically called saving faith. Lutherans prefer to call it justifying faith, because with them justification is the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*; the Reformed however look upon the entire process of salvation and connect faith with it as the means of its realization. The use of this term shows again the truly Calvinistic character of the Westminster Confession, especially when it is considered in the light of the following chapters on repentance unto life, on good works and the last of the soteriological articles on the assurance of peace and salvation. These articles emphasize the fact, which is typically Calvinistic, that faith must bear fruit and that no assurance is of the genuine kind if it leaves out of consideration the Christian life. There is indeed not the faintest trace of the antinomian leaven to be found in the Westminster Confession from beginning to end.

Our rapid review has brought us up to the 19th chapter, which treats of the law of God. The puritanical character of the Westminster Confession is now coming to the front. We have divided systematic theology into dogmatic and ethic, and for scientific purposes this division certainly is rational, but in a confession the unity of religion and morals ought to be maintained. The Westminster Confession emphasizes this union in a forcible manner. That the coloring of this article and those on religious worship and the Sabbath law, or lawful oaths and vows, finds its explanation in the consideration of the peculiar character of the times, in which our fathers lived, is known to all who have made a study of them. People who are legally inclined may perhaps draw wrong conclusions from these chapters, but notwithstanding all this the underlying principles are sound to the core. We repeat the ten commandments in our churches at solemn occasions, and not one of us is offended by the Israelitish form, wherein they are cast. Should we then be offended because we notice that the Westminster Confession was promulgated in a time, when the sturdy Covenanters and Ironsides assembled in Parliament and tried to make the confession of faith the religious-political foundation of their commonwealth as well as the expression of their faith. Let us be glad to find in this ethical part of the Confession that glorious article on Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience, which indeed is a jewel in itself which cannot be prized too highly. Dr. Kuyper, of Amsterdam, published some years ago an oration wherein he tried to show that Calvinism is the surety of the constitutional liberties of the Netherlands. We might have quoted *mutatis mutandis* this article on liberty in order to prove his position. Think of the marvelous history of the British Constitution since the Reformation, remember our own glorious history as a nation of free men, and I am sure after reading what the Confession has to say about liberty he will not be found unwilling to admit that puritanical Calvinism has had something to do with the building up of the glorious liberties of the English speaking peoples.

We do not wonder to notice that the Confession binds those who find the expression of their faith in it, to recognize the divine right—not of a certain kind of government exclusively—but of government itself. It devotes a chapter on the civil magistrate and it desires to keep the family pure and undefiled by adding a chapter on marriage and divorce. It is doubtless true that both these institutions are of a mixed character partly secular and partly religious, but if we believe as true Calvinists that both departments find their unity in God the Creator, the Redeemer and the Sanctifier, we have to admit that whatever regulations the State may see fit to make *circa sacra*, a Christian is in principle bound to the regulations and ordinances God has made *in sacra*.

The doctrine of the Church claims the rest of the Confession in elaborate articles, rather too elaborate and dogmatic, one might venture to assert. The dogmatic definition of the Church is given in the 1st section of Chap. xxv. "The Catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." This is the Church of the Apostolic creed, and we certainly are glad, that the Confession places this definition at the head of the seven articles, which give a detailed exposition of the visible church, its communion, the Sacraments, church discipline and church government in a decidedly true blue Presbyterian form. We may doubt the propriety of binding people's faith by all the minutæ of questions of church polity, requiring them to assent to a confession, if we take this term in the original meaning of a profession of faith; but when we remind ourselves of the fact, that the Presbyterian churches do not require their members to give adhesion to all the Confession contains, but that they expect their ministers and office-bearers to be in full harmony with the doctrines, polity and worship of the Church, we do not object. If men of sound judgment and honest motives have read and



studied this magnificent Confession, it may be expected, that they will loyally uphold what they have solemnly declared to be their own conviction of truth.

In two articles, one about the state of man after death and of the resurrection of the dead, and another on the last judgment, are set forth the current Calvinistic doctrines concerning the last things.

The result of our investigation is, that the Westminster Confession is a Calvinistic standard of an advanced type on the basis of the doctrine of the covenant, and that it contains the main features of the puritanical view of life in the family, the church, human society and the State. It may bear the marks of its environment on its forehead, yet the Calvinistic principles, which form its very life-blood, are presented in such a manner that we may well say of it: There is none like it.

NICHOLAS M. STEFFENS.

Orange City, Iowa.

#### IV. THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.

It is perfectly obvious that not every one who cordially accepts such a cardinal Christian truth as the Atonement, must, *ipso facto*, have a logical and consistent and clearly articulated conception of that truth. Thousands accept Jesus of Nazareth as the Divine Son of God who have never so much as heard of the theological doctrine of the Divinity of Christ; thousands regard the Bible as the very Word of God who have no sort of clearly wrought-out theory of inspiration; thousands believe in miracles who have never stopped to define miracles or the supernatural. All this goes without the saying, only it is by no means applicable to the Christian ministry. It is our privilege and high calling, as it is also our duty, to give very careful thought to these great themes. As ministers of Christ we are stewards of the mysteries of God and it is required of us that we be found faithful. We are called to teach men in holy things, to preach to them the unsearchable riches of Christ. For us, therefore, it is necessary that there should be more than a merely consenting and unthoughtful acceptance of the truth.

And this for two reasons: first, without an intelligent and mature conception of the truth, we can hardly expect to preach it to the permanent profit of the people. Indeed, I very much question, after all, whether we can distinguish sharply between the truth of the atonement and some doctrine of it. The doctrine is simply the fact—known and rationally interpreted. We accept the fact or the truth or the thing and, being intelligent persons, in accepting it, we at once understand it as meaning something and that something, whatever it is, is, in so far forth, our doctrine concerning it. By theory of the atonement, then, I mean simply a doctrine, a view, a conception of it. Certainly the preacher of the Gospel who fain would convince and persuade men to accept the truth, should aim first of all to have some rational conception of his own of what that

truth is. We shall heartily assent to the words of Professor Orr when he says: "I can not believe that any doctrine of Scripture—least of all the doctrine of the atonement, which is represented in Scripture as the Revelation of the innermost heart of God to man, the central and supreme manifestation of his love to the World—was ever meant to lie like a dead weight on our understanding, incapable of being in any degree assimilated by our thought."\*

The other reason why we should have a clear conception of this particular subject is because of its vital relation to our work in the Gospel. This truth is at the very core of our Christian faith and yet it has been the diverging point, the fork in the road, for hundreds of preachers who have gone astray. The great apostle did not regard that he declared a complete Gospel so long as he had been preaching Christ; he must preach that Christ crucified. Christianity, without the cross, was not his message. Jesus born, Jesus baptized, Jesus multiplying loaves and raising the dead, even the risen and reigning Jesus, is not the whole Gospel we are to preach. The atonement is the capstone in the citadel of Christianity and that minister who is not both spiritually enlightened and intellectually solid as to it, is neither able to give forth his message in clear and commanding tones nor is he in a position to be steadfastly confident in the midst of the distracting doubts and clamorous conceits of many-voiced modern unbelief.

The doctrine of the atonement is so closely related to that of grace and justification and faith and the personal righteousness of the believer that it is well to remind the reader that present limitations rule them out; otherwise it might seem that I am purposely evading questions which naturally enough suggest themselves. It is not salvation, nor who are saved, nor why they are saved, nor how, which is my theme, but rather the historical fact of the atonement of Jesus as understood in the light of Holy Scripture. This

---

\* The Christian View of God and the World, p. 340. First Ed.

shuts out merely philosophical notions of the atonement. For example, that brilliant native son of the golden West, in his last book, "Studies of Good and Evil,"\* finds what he calls "the immortal soul of the doctrine of the atonement" in the idea that all existing evil is necessary or God would not be God, that the existence of evil is necessary to the existence of perfection or as he says it, "The eternal world contains Gethsemane." It is a very significant that every philosopher has some philosophy of the atonement but if it ignore the Word of God, if it turn its back upon the common consensus of the people of God, we have neither time nor inclination to honor it with careful study or with very respectful thought—nor will it pay to do so.

There are two or three things presupposed in the doctrine of the atonement.

First, we must assume that God is just. The divine love is presupposed but divine justice is the norm of an atonement. To forget this is to shut the door at once against any place for an atonement. Underlying every biblical view of this subject, is the biblical teaching concerning the divine justice. I am not now trying to explain what that justice is, nor how it harmonizes with divine love, nor how it reconciles itself with divine forbearance; I am only saying that if we suffer our idea of God as just to be wholly merged and lost in our idea of God as love, then we have relinquished all title to any theory of an atonement and have no occasion whatever to consider how it is that God can "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Secondly, we assume that man is a sinner. The law of God, which, in its last analysis, is but the expression of his justice, has been disobeyed, This is the essence of sin. There can be no idea of crookedness without some kind of a straight-edge in mind; Dr. Samuel Harris may be right in saying that it is rather a formal than a real definition, but in any case it is a true one when we say, in its widest sense, that sin is lack of conformity to a holy law; for as John

---

\* By Prof. Josiah Royce, p. 14, et passim.

says, "Sin is the transgression of the law," and as Paul says, "Where no law is there is no transgression." This sin, then, is such, being itself a transgression of the law, as to lay the sinner liable to the condemnation of that law. He is both personally depraved and he is legally guilty. His depravity calls for the new birth and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, working mightily within him. His legal—or perhaps a better word—his judicial guilt calls for an atonement on the meritorious ground of which, he may be justified from that guilt, that is to say in order that his condemnation may be averted. In point of fact and of experience, these two factors in our redemption are never divorced from each other though they are entirely distinct in thought, in their nature and in Bible teaching. Justification has to do with the sinner's guilt before God's law, with his pardon, his forgiveness; sanctification has to do with his growth in grace and his development in the Christian character and life.

Thirdly, it is assumed that the crucifixion of Jesus was in some way the historical culmination of the accomplished atonement which he wrought out for men. What I mean is that the Christian idea of the atonement is not merely that of an eternal or transcendental metaphysical principle. When our Lord exclaimed "It is finished," we understand that he had completed a work, objectively in time, on the basis of which a way was opened up by which the alienation—such as it was—between God and the sinner might be overcome and a reconciliation effected by which they are to be at one; so it is that the apostle could write to the Ephesians that though they had been "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, yet now in Christ Jesus they who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ who had reconciled both Jew and Gentile unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." In classifying the leading doctrines of the atonement, and confining our view only to such as are influential at the present time, I should say that the word "*didactic*" might well designate a large

family of theories, presenting, to be sure, many minor differences. The essential idea in this group is that Jesus designed to teach men to be good, and that if we only place an interpretation broad enough upon this intention, we shall have entirely accounted for the atonement which he made. If we ask how he did this, we get a variety of answers. By a perfectly sinless life, from birth to death, from the manger to the cross, thus setting men an example which they can do no better than to follow; by his wonderful teachings, speaking as never man spake, appealing to every rational instinct and moral interest in men, thus pointing them to loftier ideals and leading them to purer lives; by his matchless display of self-denial, his most marvellous devotion to a unique mission in the spiritual amelioration of mankind, thus rousing and stimulating men to emulate his beautiful and saintly spirit; by his very death, indeed, going so far in the impressive drama of Calvary as to seal his mission with his blood and to set forth before the astonished gaze of all the nations such an overwhelming object-lesson of unselfish interest and of a love that passeth understanding as to shame the meanest of men out of their sins and to spur the most sluggish of souls to a nobler endeavor.

This is well called the Moral-Influence Theory of the Atonement. It has never had a more attractive or more effective setting forth than by Dr. Horace Bushnell, of New England, whose name is commonly associated with it, though it is very interesting to note that before Dr. Bushnell's death he wrote words which certainly read like a substantial retraction of the whole theory. This view of the atonement is one which, for obvious reasons, is bound to prevail most largely among those who entertain low views of Christ, and who, in a general way, are disposed to discount the supernatural elements in Christianity. A man can hold this theory and regard Jesus as man only; he was doubtless a very good man, a very bold man, but after all he may be classed, perhaps, *primus inter pares*, along with Seneca with his precepts, Socrates with his hemlock and

Prince Siddartha under his Bo tree. It takes no account of the sinner's guilt; it forgets that there are past transgressions to be forgiven; at the very best, it is only an incentive to a self-wrought reformation on the part of the sinner; it works its results only by ordinary means and according to natural laws; in effect, it makes Christianity a vast scheme of pedagogics, it makes Palestine the greatest of school-rooms, it makes Gethsemane and Golgotha the instruments by which the great teacher addresses his truths to the wondering eye; it makes the whole world—Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, bond and free—the school to be taught.

This general view of the atonement assumed a distinct form in the hands of the great jurist of Holland, Dr. Hugo Grotius. If we are to understand this view, we must remember that Grotius was a student of law and jurisprudence and that he had the idea of the nature of law and justice which many lawyers entertain. It has already been noted in this paper that justice is the only secure foundation stone for any conception of the atonement, yet a man may profess to hold to the idea of justice, but, while he retains the word, he may let its essential meaning slip away. Many people have such a conception of justice as really negatives or neutralizes what is its characteristic, its constitutive quality. We are properly told that justice is violated by wrong doing and that it is vindicated by the punishment of the wrong-doer. This is sound and if we would stick to that position we should be all right. But we are further told that the object of the punishment—instead of being the vindication of justice which is strictly the correct conception—is one or the other of two things, or both. If a man steals a horse he is sent to the penitentiary, one says so that he cannot steal any more horses; another says so that he may be taught better than to steal horses; a third says for both these reasons. This is all doubtless true, only it misses the essence of justice. Let it be observed that the criminal codes and human government generally have other objects in mind than simply the execution of justice.

Civil institutions are often and properly, protective, utilitarian, paternal, and I suppose that this extra-judicial function of civil government accounts for the fact that so many lawyers and law-makers and statesmen have no higher abstract notion of justice than Bentham's idea "of the greatest good for the greatest number." If it be said that God's government no more than man's is administered on the basis of impartial justice we reply, that while this very truth of the atonement is luminous with the benevolence, the love of God, still if God be not just we are in a moral pandemonium with no righteous rule on earth or in heaven and the Judge of all the earth may or may not do right. We must insist upon the first postulate which we laid down, that God is just and build our doctrine afterward; for "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

But now again, as to our horse-thief; in a purely judicial court, he is sent to the penitentiary because he stole the horse—and when that is said it is all said. In such a court, the penitentiary is primarily neither for the protection of society nor for the reformation of the horse-thief. These are both very good and desirable ends and I believe that it is well for our courts to have them in mind, only they are not justice. A quarantine is a good thing but it is not an institution of justice; a reform school is another good thing, but it is not distinctly a thing of justice. The punishment of the horse-thief is not accomplished either by keeping him from stealing more horses or by teaching him something better until he will not want to steal horses. Justice would send him to the penitentiary if there were not another horse or horse-owner in all the world.

It is of the eternal essence of right that it is what ought to be. If it is violated, there is a call for vindication. That call demands that the violator must suffer for his violation, must atone for his wrong-doing. The guilty thief often brings his conscience-money back years after it has been taken; this is the tribute from what is good in the man, paid to the principle of justice. It is restitution, but no one



knows so well as he that it is not everything that he owes. Judas Iscariot's conscience was not clear when he threw down his thirty pieces of silver. Punishment correlates strictly with justice and is therefore evil inflicted in vindication of justice. If the regulative principle of the divine government were aught else, then the foundations of the righteous are but shifting sands. If you make the justice of God only for the protection of society, then you must consign the destiny of the wicked to an eternal quarantine of isolation; or if, on the other hand, you regard the justice of God as only for the reformation of the sinner, then you can find no landing place this side of making the Inferno of Dante, the purgatory of the Roman Catholic faith.

There is no further space to support this fundamentally important truth; I have referred to it at all only to show how so great a mind as that of Grotius built a fallacious doctrine of the atonement by overlooking the essential nature of justice.

Instead of assuming God to be a just judge, he regarded him as a sovereign ruler, an almighty governor of the world. Sin came into the world and his law was broken. But God is holy, his rule is righteous, his kingship must be uncompromised with evil. The Ruler must see to it that his sceptre is not smirched, his dignity must not be impaired. Just here arises the emergency which the Son of Man came to meet. He volunteers to show how horrible an intruder sin is. If his sufferings were great, their greatness is the measure of God's abhorrence of sin. If the world can not understand the enormity of sin by seeing sin itself, it shall understand it by seeing what awful consequences it brings in its train; and nothing less than Calvary with its cross will avail to impress the fearful lesson upon mankind. Jesus Christ came not to bear men's guilt; he came to endure the chastisement of their sins but only in such a sense and in such a way as to show them how deep and high their sins were. The cross was the emphatic utterance of the World-Ruler's displeasure at sin; he intended thus to publish that displeasure to all his intel-

ligent subjects and so, if possible, to dissuade them from indulging in sin. It was for the sake of its moral, its didactic effect upon mankind that Christ died on the cross. When stripped of its incidentals, the Grotian doctrine, therefore, is substantially that of Dr. Bushnell.

This may seem far away and yet it is very near. There are pulpits all about us that echo to this theory. Principal Fairbairn tells us that it is one of the marks of the "modern evangelical theology."\* There are learned and popular professors of theology whose lectures and books do not disguise the old Dutchman's ideas. And yet it must face the same unanswered objections as the Bushnellian. If the one makes the cross a mere object-lesson, the other makes it a spectacular display. A human Saviour could have made such an atonement still. It ignores Bible teachings, or what is worse, it tortures and eviscerates them. It is built upon a merely empirical or utilitarian conception of justice, human and divine, which is not justice at all but mere expediency; it wholly forgets the intuitive and universal moral instinct of the right and the just which, as a mark of our higher nature, differences us from lower orders and constitutes us in the image of God.

This will suffice to show what is meant by the didactic idea of the atonement. It has taken almost countless forms and prevails very widely indeed. Just now, in certain quarters, it is undergoing some significant transformations but the same generic principle runs through them all.

There is another group of theories that stand at the opposite extreme of thought. According to the didactic idea, the historic Jesus suffered and died and the natural influence of his sufferings and death affects the lives of men for good. It is an influence working upon men from without. This second group I may call "mystical" seeing that it contemplates the atonement as a certain mystical or mysterious or supernatural process in the heart of the believer. It makes little of Calvary and much of the inner life. The

---

\* The Place of Christ in Modern Theology, p. 175.

Son of God did not become a man but Man, not a *vir* but *Homo*, and his people are ingrafted into or upon him by virtue of the fact that he became the new head of the human race. He is literally the Second Adam. Some say the whole race enters into this vital union with him, others say only his people, only the kingdom of God. This view, in a word, dissolves the fact of the atonement into a force and makes Christianity a life only. This may seem scholastic and yet it is very fascinating and very misleading. Some of us recall the preaching of a popular evangelist in this city a few years ago who has since turned his back upon the evangelical faith. He was very impressive but it may be remembered that his appeals were almost entirely to the crucifixion that must take place in the heart of the sinner while there was a very noticeable absence of reference to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ on the cross at Jerusalem eighteen centuries and a half ago. If it be true that many who hold the moral-influence theory, regard Jesus as only human, it is on the other hand true that no one can hold this doctrine consistently with regarding Christ as divine. However, there is too often a pantheistic whang about this style of preaching which is easily mistaken for deep and fervent evangelicalism. But it is charged with a virus that if unchecked will in time prove fatal.

Concerning this group of theories, I wish to make two remarks. First, they mistake the incarnation for the atonement. The first centuries of the church were occupied with formulating doctrines of the incarnation and the great truth of the atonement was left for the post-medieval era of the reformation. When St. Anselm wrote *Cur Deus Homo* in the 11th century he made the beginning of the turn from the standpoint of old Athanasius, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us" to that of Martin Luther "The just shall live by faith."

Now the modern evangelical faith does not hesitate to say that, great as is the truth of the incarnation, yet the incarnation was in order to and for the sake of the atonement. It is not only what Christ was but what he did also

that atones for sin ; it is not only what he is but also what he does that saves the sinner. When he exclaimed, "It is finished," he had "finished the work which his Father had given him to do."

I am convinced that there is a whole nest of errors in this plausible view. It hides the cross of Calvary in the mists of cloud-land. It exalts the ethical Christ, it honors the incarnate Christ, it urges the indwelling Christ, but it minimizes the historical work of the Christ of Galilee and it does not too plainly point men to the Son of Man who was lifted up even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness.

The other thought is this, namely: what is true in this teaching is made false by being put in the wrong place. When asked for a theory of the atonement, it gives in reply a doctrine of sanctification. We believe in the divine life within. We believe in the vital, intimate, mystical union of Christ and the believer. We believe in the Christ-life in the soul and that as are the branches to the vine, so are his people to their Lord. This is all very important and very true, but it is not a doctrine of the atonement. It is the work of the Gracious Spirit building up the saints of God into a new and purer life in Christ Jesus. It is very closely related to the atoning work of our blessed Lord, but it is not that work. Justification is not santification. We are saved on the ground of his righteousness accepted by our faith, but we no sooner accept that righteousness than the Holy Spirit, in the new birth, plants the new life within us and that new life is henceforth absolutely dependent upon and inseparately connected with the divine presence and power within; but we must not lose sight of the Christ crucified, in our ecstatic contemplation of the Christ enshrined. If there is a cross-bearing for us now, we must not forget the cross which was borne along the *Via Dolorosa* to the crest of Calvary. Rather shall we say that as we emphasize the Christ crucified, do we know and honor the Christ within us. We rejoice in the blessed experiences of redemption, but we must not therefore tear out and burn to ashes

the last few chapters of each of the four gospels. The present personal experience of God's people must be anchored to the sublime, supreme facts of Christ's passion and his death, or it is like a frail and floating craft, driven by fitful winds, enveloped in gloomy mists, without compass or rudder for the guidance of its course.

The one other class of theories to which I would like to refer may be generally designated as "sacrificial" I have already made way with so much time that I cannot hope to do more than simply to name it; but I am sure that I am addressing a company who are so well acquainted with it, that anything beyond the naked mention of it would be a work of supererogation. It may properly enough be called the orthodox doctrine, not because it is our own doctrine, but because it is the only one that has ever been formally promulgated by any of the great ecclesiastical councils or in any of the evangelical confessions of Christian history.

To be sure, there is a certain degree of latitude within the range of this evangelical view. But on the essentials of it there is agreement among all the Protestant churches. It regards the crucifixion of Jesus as the offering of a sacrifice to satisfy the violated justice, the broken law of God. It is sacrificial in the sense in which the typical offerings of the Old Testament, pointing forward to him, were sacrificial. When they are called vicarious, we understand of his sufferings, that he bore what but for him we should have borne. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." He was made sin for us who knew no sin. When it is said that his sufferings were penal, it is not meant that the sinless Jesus became sinful for our sake and then suffered the penalty of his own sins; when it is said that he bore our sins we understand that he assumed the guilt-element of our sins, that which made us liable to the condemnation of the law; that penalty was ours and he bore that for us so that we are delivered from that penalty only on the condition of appropriating his righteousness to our need by our own act of faith.

It regards that his active righteousness in his life as well

as his passive righteousness in his sufferings and death, is involved in the atonement which he has made; only, inasmuch as his whole work reached its acute and climacteric point in his death by crucifixion, that cross becomes pre-eminently the symbol of his completed atoning work.

This atonement is not susceptible of commercial or mechanical measurements. We can not say that if we could estimate the aggregate of the penalties of all who are saved through Christ, that that is the measure of his atoning merit. The *quid pro quo* notion is abhorrent here. For Mr. Gladstone to have undergone the inconvenience and indignity of having been thrust into prison for a single night would have been a greater punishment than for a Jack the Ripper to have been jailed for twenty years. The value of Christ's atonement follows from the dignity of his person and hence it appears how, just as the Bushnellian theory is logically and as a matter of fact entirely consistent with Unitarian and low humanitarian views of Christ, this evangelical doctrine calls for an atoning Saviour, such as the Scriptures present, whose person is divine and whose dignity is therefore infinite. This doctrine of the atonement prevails among those who regard Jesus Christ as divine as well as human. The redeemer of the world must not be a sinful man for such could not atone for his own sins; he could not be a sinless man even for such could not atone for the sins of less fortunate beings who were still of the same kind as himself; he could not be an angel or an archangel for any rational and intelligent creature-being must conform to the same holy law that is binding upon us rational and intelligent men; he could only be a divine person whose voluntary condescension is itself of measureless magnitude and whose becoming "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" forms the basis of a plea which far surpasses the need of man to exhaust or the mind of man to measure.

One thought in closing. The truth in this great doctrine is doubtless larger than any human conception of it. The cross was lifted up so that it has been seen at many angles, from many viewpoints and in many reflecting and refracting

lights. It penetrates the highest philosophy that is true; it hallows the noblest thought of the soul; it fathoms the deepest recesses of our being.

I am willing to believe that there is more truth in this subject than we have yet compassed or comprehended; I am ready to grant that in our nearest and clearest approaches to it there may be much of error and misapprehension; but I can not believe that, in the larger visions of the truth which God may vouchsafe to us, either in spiritual illuminations or by intellectual research, we shall ever find that the bottom elements of the evangelical doctrine, given to us in the Word of God, answering, as face to face in a mirror, to the inmost and universal needs of the human race, and confirmed in personal experience to those who by faith accept the atonement that has been made, will ever turn out to be anything else or anything less than the everlasting truth of the ever living God.

Here, as so often elsewhere, evangelical truth is more generous and comprehensive than any form of error. Does Dr. Bushnell argue that the sufferings of Jesus furnish an unparalleled object-lesson of self-sacrificing love? We answer, "Yes, certainly, and far more." Does Grotius argue that those sufferings are the expression of a righteous ruler's abhorrence of sin in his world? We answer, "Yes, certainly, and far more." Are we told that Christ lived as a man to impart a new and divine life to the individual and to the race? We answer, "Yes, certainly, and far more."

These theories have some truth in their affirmations, their error is in their negations. They mistake the moonlight for the undimmed glory of the sun. The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost. It was not meant to be a mere dress-parade of self-sacrifice and nothing more. That crown of thorns was not worn, that cross was not set up, he did not give up the ghost at the last, simply to awe and impress an onlooking world; and indeed, if that had been all, it had ended in failure for unto the Jews he is a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness. There are here mysteries too high and deep for us; we can not fully

scale their heights nor fully sound their depths ; but we do know that "he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, the chastisement of our peace was upon him and with his stripes we are healed." We know, too, that when the Lamb of God was offered to take away the sin of the world, when the earth trembled and shook, when the sun hid his face in the sky for very shame and sorrow, and when the veil of the temple was rent in twain from top to bottom, there was then accomplished a work for sinful men which lifted the load of guilt from their believing souls and opened up the way, by the riches of his grace, to the highest fulfillment of man's hopes and the utmost realization of God's promise.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON.

San Francisco, Cal.



## V. SOME "LOG COLLEGES" IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA.

Soon after the year 1735 there began to come into the middle and western section of North Carolina, a new race, different in habit and creed from any who had previously settled. Strong alike in body and mind, their descendants have left a lasting impress upon the policy and customs of the people. These sturdy Scotch-Irish did not compliantly conform to the customs of their neighbors, but endeavored to make their neighbors conform to them. Their experience in Ireland had given them a horror of any sort of imposed ecclesiasticism, but their own ministers exercised great influence.

Their coming gave a great impulse to the cause of liberty, education and sobriety. Nearly every member of the Convention which adopted the Mecklenburg "Resolves" was a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian. (For leaving out of consideration the "Declaration" of May 20, 1775, the "Resolves" of the 31st are unquestionable, and they speak more clearly and more defiantly than the formal expression of any body before July 4, 1776.) These people absolutely denied any "divine right" to rule, especially to a ruler of another faith, and yielded willing obedience to no other rulers than those of their own choosing.

The reason can be found. The echo of the hammer strokes on the Cathedral door in Wittenberg had crossed over the seas. The Scotchman read his Bible and meditated. He realized that the New Testament preached a doctrine of individual importance and individual responsibility stronger than any philosophy. He realized that he made his own individual connection with the absolute through intellectual acceptance of certain dogmas. He needed no one to hand down salvation to him, for he had the spirit of God within his breast. The only one superior was one who was closer to God than himself, *i. e.* knew more and understood better. This belief hardened into a

strict dogmatic theology, but acceptance was an individual matter. When an idea like this takes hold of a man kings cannot frighten him. Martyrs are made of such stuff.

The history of education in middle and western North Carolina up to 1800 is largely a history of Presbyterian effort. After this date they were less prominent—not that they relaxed their efforts for the schools, but because others began. To a people believing as they did, an educated ministry was a necessity. If the acceptance of certain dogmas was necessary for salvation, there must be some one capable of explaining and expounding this creed.

These settlers had not come to the Carolina wilderness to avoid churches and schools, for (from 1740-1765) we find many appeals to the Synod of Philadelphia asking for missionaries. Many of these sent settled permanently among the people and trained up young men to take their places. Whenever a faithful pastor dwelt, there was also a classical school. This was partly on account of necessity and partly a labor of love. Few ministers could live by the Gospel alone and teaching was generally most congenial.

Some of the schools whose reputation extended beyond the boundaries of their own particular congregations were Dr. Patillo's school in Granville (1760), Crowfield Academy in Mecklenburg (1760), Dr. Caldwell's school in Guilford (1766), Clio's Nursery in Iredell (1779-circa), Zion-Parnassus in Rowan (1785-1810), Poplar Tent in Cabarrus (1778-circa.) These are only a few of the many established. Among them but not of them may be mentioned Queen's Museum or Liberty Hall Academy (1779-1780). This was the outgrowth of a classical school established by Joseph Alexander, a Princeton graduate. In another State, though in the same Synod was Moses Waddell's school (1804-1819), which was possibly the most noted of all.

Some scoffers, ignorant of the true condition of affairs in the State and not knowing the work of these schools, applied the name "Log-College" in ridicule of the institutions. With the general type and then with some particular examples this paper has to deal,

All are strikingly alike in curriculum, methods of teaching and government. To describe one is to describe all except as the personal peculiarities of the teacher made a difference. All were modelled after Princeton so far as circumstances would allow. The influence of Nassau Hall under Finley and then under Witherspoon has affected North Carolina more than any institution since. Up to 1800 there was no institution in the State which offered real college training. The University, established in 1795, was hardly better, for the first few years, than some of the preparatory schools mentioned above, since funds, buildings and apparatus were all lacking. The University itself was largely influenced by Princeton in curriculum and methods of discipline, and even in architecture, the south building being a reproduction of Nassau Hall except in size.

A young man who had decided to preach the gospel would journey to the college of New Jersey to study for a degree and would then spend one or two years more in the study of theology. Then he would come back to labor among his own people—to preach, teach, practice medicine and often carry on a farm as well. The congregation paid the pastor a scanty salary and was satisfied with the divided effort. The minister was not expected to be informed on the latest developments in science and politics. Plain doctrinal sermons divided into heads with “firstly,” “secondly,” etc., satisfied the people, and they preferred the discussion of knotty theological points to the story of the lowly Nazarene.

Injustice has been done North Carolina by some historians. John Fiske says that, “until just before the war for independence there was not a single school, good or bad, in the whole colony.”\* Already the names of a few of the schools in the West under Presbyterian auspices have been given, and there were other schools in this section and some in the East as well. Probably the statement arose from inability to understand existence without a charter.

---

\* Harper's Magazine, Feb. 1883.

The fact is that these institutions were forced to run without charters since the charter for Queen's Museum (undoubtedly the school to which Mr. Fiske refers) was twice repealed by Royal proclamation after having been granted by the Legislature.\* The reason for the repeal is seen in the provision of the bill granting a charter for the Newberry Academy in 1764: "No person shall be permitted to be master of said school but who is of the Established Church of England.† No Presbyterian schoolmaster, particularly in a colony where Presbyterians were so prominent in resistance could be granted privileges by such a governor as Tryon or such a king as George III.

But it must not be understood that education, particularly higher education, was universal. A large percentage of the western population could read and write in 1800, but the interest did not always extend beyond this. The child was expected to be able to read the Westminster Catechism, but only special classes always had more.

A striking proof of this is seen in the advanced age at which many students were graduated from Princeton or from the Mt. Zion College, at Winnsborough, S. C. Although Joseph Caldwell, the first president of the University of North Carolina, was graduated at 19, David Caldwell was 36 when he received his diploma, Samuel E. McCorkle was 26, James Hall was 30 and James Wallis, of Providence, 28. This delay could not have been owing to poverty in all cases, for the parents of some of these men were in comfortable circumstance, at least. An expression found in the sermon of an old minister explains the puzzle, "Unsanctified learning has never been of any benefit to the church."‡ As the church was the chief object of concern to these people, parents did not consider themselves bound to give a collegiate education to a son until he had professed religion and expressed the intention of preaching. For this class chiefly these schools were encouraged.

---

\* Colonial Records, Vol. VIII.

† Foote's Sketches, p. 513.

‡ Coruther's Life of Caldwell,

We see the idea in the following extract from the Minutes of the Synod of the Carolinas meeting at Bethany Church, Iredell Co., in 1802. "This Synod enjoins it on each Presbytery of which it is composed, to establish within its respective limits, one or more grammar schools, except where such schools are already established; and that each member of the several Presbyteries make it their business to select and encourage youths of promising piety and talents, and such as may be expected to turn their attention to the ministry of the Gospel."\*

Later, in 1808, Dr. James Hall, in urging the cause of education, said: "Otherwise (if schools be not fostered) our churches, if any should remain, must be supplied with ignorant and illiterate preachers, or they must receive foreigners which past experience has for the most part shown not to be very eligible."†

Since women could not preach, their education was very generally neglected. When Dr. David Caldwell, after giving his daughter all that he could teach her, sent her away to Philadelphia to receive further instruction, it was considered quite a marvel.

Now what was the plan of these schools from 1775 to 1820? They were usually taught in a house, built of logs, of course, placed either in the yard of the teacher or by the side of the church. Sometimes there was but one room, though generally two were built around an immense chimney capable of accommodating great lengths of oak and hickory. It was part of the students' duty to keep the fire supplied in the winter and this was one of the ways in which exercise was secured. The seats were simple slabs ranged crosswise, with perhaps a board for writing. A plain chair for the "Master" completed the equipment. In the summer time the pupils were allowed to "go out to study" and when wanted, the teacher would come to the door and in stentorian voice call for the class desired. This

---

\* Foote, p. 454.

† Idems, 461.

went on until all the classes had recited, without any fixed time-table.

The pupils sometimes occupied little huts constructed around the school, doing their own cooking and washing. Oftener they boarded in the family of some farmer near by, sometimes helping to pay their board by assisting with the chores. This was the form that their athletics took, though "bull-pen," wrestling, jumping and running were among the list of sports. Little respect was given to the physical man then, and only their healthful simple lives outside the school room preserved their strength. At Princeton a "game played with a ball and stick" was forbidden as "unworthy of the dignity of college students and also being the cause of much violent altercation."\* Would not President Witherspoon turn over in his grave to hear of his beloved institution's athletic record to-day?

The curriculum of all these schools would be considered scanty and dry now. Some Latin and Greek, mathematics through Geometry and sometimes Trigonometry, particularly in its application to land surveying, a little theoretical physics, taught without any experiments, some of the dry rules of rhetoric, and possibly a little bald metaphysics. Nothing of English Literature or modern languages was taught. There was no science worthy of the name, and the only history known was, perhaps, a compendium of ecclesiastical events. The possibilities of the study to show the working out of theories, and to stimulate thought were unknown. The Bible, and the Catechism with it, formed a part of every day's programme.

Much of the difficulty was caused by lack of books. The boy learned his rudiments from the Latin grammar, and was compelled to master that before he was allowed to go on. Miscellaneous books were scarce. Judge A. D. Murphy says :†

"I spent two years [after completing his term under Dr.

---

\* Wallace, Princeton Sketches.

† Address Univ. N. C., 1827.

Caldwell] without finding any books to read except some old works on theological subjects. At length I accidentally met with Voltaire's History of Charles XII., of Sweden, an odd volume of Roderick Random and an abridgment of Don Quixote. These books gave me a taste for reading which I had no opportunity of gratifying until I became a student of the University in 1796."

But there were strong minds and strong wills among these earnest young backwoodsmen. Their parents had been thinkers for generations, though the only excitement their quiet, commonplace lives had known, had been the recital of the tales of Tory and "Britisher" during the Revolution or the animated discussion of theology. There were no cities to dazzle the eyes with a show of magnificence. To their natures, starving for want of stimulus, the pathetic story of Dido, the sufferings of Æneas, the wrath of Achilles, the wandering of the Ten Thousand, appealed with peculiar force. They were willing to work to get the story. Some wonderful tales are told of the amount of Latin prepared by some of these young men, studying before a pine-knot fire. George McDuffie, the distinguished governor of South Carolina, while a pupil of Moses Waddell, is said to have prepared 1212 lines of Horace for a single recitation, and the poorest of the class read more than a hundred.\*

They did not learn many things, but they thoroughly mastered what they attempted. (In fact, so far as discipline is education, it is doubtful whether we have had any schools better.) Pupils were prepared for the Junior class of such institutions as Yale and Princeton. Some entered the Junior class and a few the Senior class of the University of North Carolina from Dr. David Caldwell's school. These pupils were able to hold an honorable place by the side of those prepared at the most noted schools of the country.

The teachers did not aim at development, but at training. The pupils were not expected to discover new facts but to apply the facts already found. Their scholarship was not

---

\* Meriwether, Hist Ed. in S. C., p. 42.

broad but it was accurate. The men produced by this system were not liberal-minded, well-rounded specimens, but they were intense and strong. They did not always see all sides of a question, but they stoutly maintained their position. They were thoroughly in earnest and impressed their opinions on others.

Some special notice of the leading schools in three counties, which were in the very centre of Presbyterian strength, and which were adjoining then, will not be out of place.

Doctor David Caldwell's school was probably most widely known. It was located on the teacher's farm in that part of Guilford which was cut off from Rowan. It was begun shortly after the teacher moved to North Carolina and was continued until old age forbade. The exercises were interrupted several times, however, by the British and Tories to whom Dr. Caldwell was obnoxious on account of his bold stand for the American cause.

Dr. Caldwell was a Pennsylvanian by birth, but came to North Carolina to preach to congregations largely composed of those whom he had known in early life. On this account his political influence was considerable, and he served as a member to both the Halifax and the Hillsboro Conventions, besides often making speeches at rallies and musters. In addition to his other occupations he was a licensed physician.

The average attendance at this school was more than fifty and a large percentage of his pupils have become distinguished. "Five of his scholars became governors of States, a number were promoted to the bench, a larger number, supposed about fifty, became ministers of the Gospel; a large number were physicians and lawyers; many received their entire classical education from him and the ministers of the Gospel, in addition, their theological education; so that for a time his log cabin served for many years to North Carolina as an Academy, a College and a Theological Seminary." \*

---

\* Foote, p. 235.



His method of discipline was peculiar for the day from the fact that he so rarely used the rod. Solomon's injunction was construed literally in those days and moral suasion was chiefly used after good hickory switches had prepared the way. "Dominie" Caldwell used this latter means but seldom. His presence was commanding and his sarcasm was feared more than the thrashings of others.

His charges for tuition were low, ranging from \$10 to \$12 per annum, and the prices paid for board were in proportion. But even this small tuition fee was often remitted in cases where the pupil was poor and studious. A calculation will show that the teacher could never become rich as the receipts rarely reached \$600 in any year. While many of the students here entered the University, the great majority ended their school life under Doctor Caldwell.

Clio's Nursery had another strong man for a head. The career of Rev. Jas. Hall, the "fighting parson" of Iredell, is something unique in American history. He is believed to be the only minister who ever combined the two somewhat dissimilar offices of chaplain and captain. He also refused the commission of Brigadier-General when Gen. W. L. Davidson was slain. Like Drs. Caldwell and McCorkle, Dr. Hall was a native of Pennsylvania.

The school was established about the year 1778 on Snow Creek, in Bethany congregation, Iredell county. Dr. Hall did little more than supervise it, as most of his time not given to Bethany Church was devoted to missionary work in the southwest. The house was built of logs and the prices for tuition were slightly higher than at some other schools.

While at Princeton Mr. Hall was noted for his proficiency in mathematics and such science as was then taught. Feeling the need of proper scientific institution, he purchased some philosophical and chemical apparatus and opened an "Academy of the Sciences" at his own house. This was the first attempt to give science a place in the curriculum and up to the establishment of the University was the only scientific school in the State. The students of the other

school i. e. Clio's Nursery received supplementary instruction from Dr. Hall.

After about ten years' service the Clio's Nursery building was burned but a larger one was erected in its stead. The fanciful name was dropped but the school was continued, under charge of one or another of Dr. Hall's numerous nephews, up to about 1850. Nowhere in Western North Carolina was a school maintained so long.

To supply the lack of proper text books which was quite an obstacle in the way of successful teaching, Dr. Hall wrote an elementary treatise on English Grammar. He and President Joseph Caldwell are the first North Carolina authors of text books.

Though this school did less collegiate work than some others, many ministers received their entire training here. About twenty of Dr. Hall's pupils studied theology. Among them was Moses Waddell, South Carolina's most famous teacher. Dr. Hall was in entire sympathy with the University and seven of his nephews and grand-nephews were matriculated there. In 1816 he presented sixty volumes to the University Library.

Zion-Parnassus (1785-1811), as the name implies, was an attempt to combine the cultivation of holy things and the Muses. It was situated on the road from Statesville to Salisbury, near Thyatira Church, Rowan county. Dr. Samuel Eusebius McCorkle, first a pupil of Dr. Caldwell and then a graduate of Princeton in 1772 was a very successful teacher with bright, willing pupils. He had no patience with an idler or a dunce and sifted such out as soon as possible. In fact he discouraged all except the brightest from seeking a collegiate education. This was more or less a theological seminary also and forty-five ministers went out from this school. Dr. McCorkle was selected as "head-professor" when the University was established but declined on account of a slighting remark made by Gen. Davie. He was friendly to the institution however and six of the seven members of the first graduating class were prepared by him.

In connection with the academic department there was also a course preparatory to teaching. This was certainly the first Normal school in North Carolina and probably the first in the United States.\*

Though these faithful men did not love culture for culture's sake, yet the first impulse toward culture came through them. The schools were maintained primarily, for the preparation of ministers, but many a layman received through them a preparation for life which if not symmetrical, was at least effective and thorough. The name "log-college" was applied in derision but it could be worn as a title of honor. The people could not come to the school, but the school went to them. They are the bright features of our old educational history.

---

\*Dr. Kemp P. Battle, address.

## VI. THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH TO QUIT ROBBING THE MASSES OF THE GOSPEL.

In the discussion of this subject let us notice: 1. That the Church is robbing the masses of the Gospel, and in the following ways :

1st. She is doing this in the choice of her sites for church buildings. She is from time to time pulling down her houses of worship in those districts which have been submerged by the masses and removing them to fashionable districts where there is already ample church accommodation. She is carrying off from the districts, which have been invaded by the laborer with his grime, noise and sweat and which have been marred by poverty, destitution and crime, with her houses of worship, the privileges of worship, carrying them into the neighborhoods of the prosperous. Instead of giving the Gospel to the masses and thus trying to save them, she is trying to save her local organizations to the rich and the happy. She is trying to save herself, not the masses ; and in the selfish effort to save herself she robs the masses as well as loses her own larger and fuller life.

The church commits the same sort of sin often in the choice of places at which new organizations are to be formed. She is the guardian of God's truth for the world and when she withholds that truth from his people through fixing on a false location for the house of worship, she robs the masses of the Gospel.

Instances of this form of robbery crowd upon the memory ; but it would be invidious to name such cases. It would be unpleasant and it would perhaps be wrong to name here cases of the removal of houses of worship from downtown streets to uptown streets, from the streets where the multitude dwell to the streets where the chosen few dwell, from the abodes of toil and poverty to those of earthly fortune ; but such we could name. It would be equally unpleasant to instance new churches that have been located so as to be accessible only to that percentage of the popula-

tion which can command public or private conveyances, carriages or street cars, to reach them—and erected in communities where church capacity is already in excess of the demand and without regard to the districts destitute of accommodations of the sort. But such cases are not unheard of; and they are robbing the masses of that Gospel which has been given in trust for them.

2nd. When the Church encourages any part of her members to run away from their own neighborhoods on Sunday, to enjoy services in other neighborhoods, instead of supporting the ordinances of God's worship in their own neighborhoods and so furnishing to the masses about them the Gospel, she robs them of the Gospel.

God gives us the Gospel not for ourselves alone but for our poor neighbors as well; and whenever we fail to do our utmost to share it with them, we rob them of it.

Of course, we all know plenty of church-members who fail to maintain the ordinances of the Lord in their own neighborhoods—persons who pass by the small churches in their midst where there are such, or who fail to have such churches organized and to support them, and betake themselves to a church of the prosperous and well-to-do in a distant quarter.

These persons leave the masses in their midst to go to the Devil. They carry, to all practical purposes, the Gospel away with them, often crying as they go, "How shall we reach the masses?" We cannot help knowing such cases if we would.

3rd. Moreover, the Church is taking away the Sabbath of the Bible from the masses, and so robbing them of the Gospel.

The rank and file of the Church are helping to destroy the Sabbath now, by the circulation of the Sunday issue of the daily papers, by the operation of the railway lines, by the running of excursions, by the use of the street cars—all of which are carried on in the very teeth of the divine command. Even the highest court of our Church helps in this destruction of the Sabbath by the tacit approval of the

use of the street car in going to and from church, though the lines be employed for the purposes of gain throughout the day in express violation of God's law.

Thus the Church is taking away the Sabbath from the whole army of mail agents, newspaper men and boys, railroad men and street car men. And not only this. The Church is secularizing this day—turning it into a secular holiday largely in the eyes of the rest of the world; and by these means. And in taking away the Sabbath—in taking away that stated period set apart of God for his worship through the study of his revealed will and prayer and praise—they take away all vital possession of the Gospel; they rob the masses of the Gospel.

Now, we know that this is true, we know that many are engaged, in a more or less direct way, in taking away the Sabbath and with it the very possibility of a vital grasp of the Gospel, from the people. They insist on the circulating of the dailies on the Sabbath, on the distribution of mails, on the operation of street cars. They thus knock completely out of the Sabbath and ultimately out of the Gospel, the army of operatives; and they secularize the day and profane it in everybody's eyes. The people do it and our Church courts do it. They, in these ways, rob the world of the Gospel.

These are notorious facts. The most of them are widely recognized, and in word they are condemned. But we would not be misunderstood: The Church in our day is not utterly bad. It is even relatively considered a missionary church, reaching out in a way after the masses. Although a secular spirit prevails in it, there are true children of God. Through them the Church is making many praiseworthy and even Christlike efforts, does mission work of a genuine sort at home and abroad—employs some of its noblest spirits therein. Far be it from us to belittle this work of giving the Gospel to the masses or to belittle these workers.

But there is a waywardness attaching to some of the Church's work and a quality of doing it at arm's length that

makes it of too small value. And it must be said that the influence of the Church's nobler effort, is largely neutralized by the robbery with which we here charge the Church. Christ's servants can never take the world for him by such inconsistent and half-hearted service. The world needs in the Church examples of unswerving and whole-hearted obedience to God—men to do God's work in God's way—men with somewhat of God's own regard for his law and his creatures ; and men with such sympathetic appreciation for God's handiwork in the men and women of the masses, that they will be willing if need be as our Lord did, to live and work among them, day in and day out, for their salvation. The rank and file of the Church must be brought up to this ideal.

We do not expect God to do enough in our rank and file. We do not set the proper ideals before them. Let us take a case. There is one family of church members of refinement and culture living in a neighborhood of twenty families belonging in common parlance to the masses. We allow, sometimes encourage, this family of refinement, to insist that a part of the twenty shall distribute the mails, a part print and circulate the Sunday edition of the daily, a part operate the street car on which they may ride to church or parks.

This is not the way to reach the masses with the Gospel. It is the way to rob them. To require all this is to rob of the Sabbath a host of employees; it is to secularize the Sabbath in the eyes of the rest; it is ultimately to rob them of the Gospel.

And for this family to run off to another neighborhood for the enjoyment of worship is the directest form of robbery, also, of the whole home community of the Gospel. It is the withholding of that which God put into their hands for the very purpose of giving over to those about them.

It is time that the Church, in her choice of locations for buildings of worship, in encouraging her members to run away from their own neighborhoods in order to "worship" instead of worshipping where they can aid their neighbors,

in taking the Sabbath utterly away from some and in secularizing it in the eyes of all—the Sabbath which is God's appointed stated day for the study of his word—robs the masses directly and indirectly, to large extent of the Gospel which it is trying to give them.

II. The duty of the church to quit robbing the masses of the Gospel is so plain that there should be no need of arguing it. But it may be irrefutably argued as follows:

1st. The masses need the Gospel. The burdens of life sit heavily upon them. Their life is one of grinding toil, irksome poverty, and often hopeless struggle against inevitably growing destitution. The Gospel would bring to their view a land of promise, a haven of rest, a heaven of riches, and a struggle of victory. The masses need the Gospel in order to the introduction of the element of hope into their lives, in order that their sordid courses may be turned into paths of glory; and their crushing drudgery into joyful service to him who maketh all things work together for good to those that love him even to them that are the called according to his purpose.

They need it in order to good morals. However philosophers may be able to maintain themselves in the decencies and proprieties of life and exhibit in themselves examples of exalted morals, the common people—the masses—have never shown the abilities for proper self-restraint, respect for law and order, and the maintenance of high and noble endeavor, except when moved by honest religion. The abolition of religion in the French Revolution was succeeded by the reign of bestial passions in the multitude. The deprivation of the Continental Teutonic peoples of the Gospel in the course of our own century through the work of the critics has been followed by greater laxity of morals. The people need the Gospel in order to the best type of morals.

The masses need the Gospel in order to spiritual life. Not that the Gospel itself will give spiritual life. But that by the ordering of God it must be preached and heard as a condition and instrument of his saving souls. If any peo-



ple need salvation, the masses need it; and if any people need the Gospel, therefore, the masses need it.

2d. The prosperous and well-to-do part of the Church has before it a gloomy future unless the Gospel shall be given to the masses, and left with them.

No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself. If the masses of this generation be not leavened with the Gospel yeast, the Church will become a relatively smaller thing in the next generation. It will have less power; and it will exert less influence. The world will exert more power over it. There will follow on increasing secularizing of all that is sacred in Christianity; and the blight and chill of an ever-growing hostility of environment. The Church's future depends under God on its giving the Gospel to the masses. In the ages in which it has done this it has grown rapidly. In other ages it has necessarily declined.

3d. The Church owes it to God not to rob the masses of the Gospel.

This is the genius of God's redemptive work in man's behalf that he will have his Gospel given to the poor. Christ read in the Synagogue of Nazareth from the book of Isaiah, concerning himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath annointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."\* In this manner our Lord Jesus distinguished his mission as a ministry to the poor; and let no man eviscerate this text by making "poor" refer exclusively to the poor in spirit. The term is inclusive of poverty in the ordinary sense. He pointed, again, to this peculiarity as a proof that he was God's Messiah. You recall that John the Baptist, in prison and in temporary season of doubt as to whether the prophet of Nazareth, to whom he had pointed as the Lamb of God, were really the Messiah, called two of his disciples and

---

\* Luke iv; 18, 19.

sent them to Jesus, saying: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" Then Jesus answering, said unto them, "Go your way and tell Jesus what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them."\*

The divine pleasure with reference to the Gospel is thus made clear; and it appears that God is pleased to have his Gospel preached to the poor. He will represent himself as the poor man's God as much as the rich man's. He even lays special emphasis on the preaching of his Gospel to the poor. Now if the Church were inspired fully with the mind of Christ it would be found giving the Gospel more freely to the poor, and not doing this at a distance as to lepers, but in sympathetic contact. As Christ went about daily among the poor doing good, the Church should, so far as such a course is possible for it, be found doing the same.

God the Creator and Providential Governor, said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And who is thy neighbor? That Samaritan there, fallen amongst thieves--any poor fellow-creature whom you can help. God has made you his keeper--God the Creator and Moral Governor. God the Redeemer has reimposed the obligation. Is it an humble wish? He has humbled himself by the incarnation, the lowly ministry, and the ignominious death. Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus. Because you owe it to the Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, God, to help the Church to quit robbing the masses of the Gospel.

Because God is worthy of the fulfillment of his every desire, let the Church quit robbing the masses of the Gospel.

But why argue further that which is already patent to the meanest intelligence? The arguing even so far has been rather to emphasize the fact that the Church is guilty of robbing the masses of the Gospel, than to prove that it ought not be guilty of such conduct. "Of course it ought

---

\* Luke vii: 19-22.

fall in with the plan; that it will not work; and that in some cases it ought not to work."

We answer there are a few exceptional cases where some members of the church ought to work with other than the nearest congregation of their kind, where a few good members of substance, intelligence, character and influence as practical workers, ought to go to a distance and worship with a weak congregation. There are such cases. They are exceptional; and in their case there must be no breach of the moral law in order to reach their place of service.

But as for the unworkability of this plan: Nobody could expect it to be realized in a day. But let us "talk about it and write about it" as Martin Luther used to say; and let us wait on God. Were we to do this, twenty years hence a mighty revolution would at least have commenced. We lack heroism of faith. Why should we not in this realm, also, attempt great things for God and expect great things of God?

2d. Let the church encourage the people to support the ordinances of the Lord's worship in their own neighborhoods and quit running off to fashionable churches, by means of conveyances, either public or private.

As we have seen, numbers of well-to-do people make an exodus every Sunday from their own neighborhoods to fashionable quarters, where they and their children can enjoy the advantages of a congregation which they judge to be a desirable social club.

They go either by private or by public transportation and particularly by the street cars. They thus wreck often the possibility of maintaining services edifying in a high degree in their own territories.

The Sunday street cars and other public means of transportation looked at from the point of view even of enlightened Christian expediency, are amongst the greatest curses that ever afflicted the Church. They are a constant temptation to multitudes to go to churches remote from their homes for professed worship and instruction, instead of helping to maintain worship for their poor neighbors. They are

not, you say. It has as little right to do such foul wrong as the Pharisees of Christ's day had to shut the gates of the kingdom of Heaven against the multitudes, by their rubbish piles of tradition."

Let us ask in the third general place : III. How can the Church quit robbing the masses of the Gospel? We answer:

First. By having the ordinances of God's worship celebrated in every neighborhood every Sabbath day, so far as this is possible.

To put the matter in a concrete form: The Presbyterian Church of Richmond ought deliberately to district the city, try to establish a church within walking distance of every soul in the city, and to maintain the ordinances of worship there. In that case the poor people unable to attend church beyond walking distance could go to the house of God. They would have so far the privileges of the Gospel.

It might be objected here that if our Presbyterian Church of Richmond was to attempt this, it could have no great church buildings and no very large congregations. We remark, on this objection, that it has not been proven by actual experiment. We remark, further, that we are not aware of a divine command resting on us to build and maintain large and imposing edifices of worship. We are also satisfied that many of the church edifices of our land are monuments of selfish pride, vainglory, and want of true allegiance to the Lord. They embody a great waste of the Lord's money. Some should come down and give place to more modest houses of God, and the wealth piled up in them ought to be used in the spread of the Gospel. While there is no obligation resting on us to build and maintain such incubuses on the cause of Christ, we are under obligations to give Christ's word to his people. Therefore, we ought to have more houses of worship and houses so designed as to subserve the purpose of proclaiming the Gospel rather than fewer. We should aim for more accessible churches rather than for a few large and handsome churches.

It might be objected again, that it is "not worth while to attempt thus to district the city because the people will not

a constant temptation to great numbers of the able members of the flock to run away, carrying the Gospel from the masses.

But I hear some one objecting. How else can the families of the sons worship where their fathers have worshipped or do worship? We answer: Hath God said that they shall worship in the same place? This sentiment is often purely heathen. It is good Chinese religion, in which ancestors are worshipped. But God expects us to worship him, that is, to serve him. And the way to serve him is not for men and women to pass the church doors where they ought to labor for another to which sentiment binds them.

I hear some one else objecting: "How else can these people enjoy worship so thoroughly? How else can they hear preaching so suited to their tastes? How hear such acceptable service of song? How else be so lifted in prayer as by the leading of their favorite pastor? We ask: Who has said that pleasure in the service—enjoyment of it—is the only or the first end of service? Not God. No, my brethren, our old Shorter Catechism is right in making the "chief end of man to glorify God and enjoy him forever." The first end of man, of life, of worship, is the glorification of God. This is not merely the teaching of the highest human philosophy, as when Emmanuel Kant taught that man has a two-fold end—happiness and duty, but that duty must be done even at the cost of happiness. It is the teaching of the word of God. The Church ought to teach his people to ask, where ought we worship? not where would we enjoy attending church most? The men who ask the latter question alone, still bows at the shrine of self. We all sing:

"Am I a soldier of the cross,  
A follower of the Lamb,  
And shall I fear to own his cause  
Or blush to speak his name?"

"Must I be carried to the skies  
On flowery beds of ease  
While others fought to win the prize  
And sailed through bloody seas?"

But we act often as if the case were altogether different. We shun the battles before us. We act as if our desires would carry us straight to Heaven.

The Christian soldier should learn a lesson from the soldier in earthly warfare. And what havoc it would work to the best laid plans if Lawton's men in the Philippines were allowed to go over to McArthur, and McArthur's to Lawton at will. How would it do for General Otis to address the men of his regiments as follows: "Soldiers of the United States, consult your pleasure not your duty in regard to your regimental commanders. If you wish to remain with your proper leaders and fight, do so. If such is not your pleasure, go where you please. Seek your pleasure first as to where you will serve and what you will do."

The Church of our day would apparently approve of such an address.

But some one objects again. "Society is stratified, and the different strata will not worship together." Stratification! We may talk in some connections of the strata of society; but not as amongst men in relation to God. There is no "respect of persons with him." The slave and the free are alike to him.

The genius of the New Testament is at war with the idea that we shall cultivate this social stratification in the worship of the common Father and Redeemer of all. No; we must lift the ideals of duty in the minds and hearts of our people, make them see that the great laws of love to God and love to man demand such considerate behavior of poor to rich and rich to poor, of superior to inferior and inferior to superior, that their meeting together in the house of God shall be a positive pleasure to each class.

We are afraid to make the high demands of God's people which he makes of them. Let us trust him, and call on them for high things.

You say, again, "It is impracticable. You cannot get people to gather for worship in the way you propose."

It is impractical to do in a day, but it is sheer assertion to

say that it cannot be done. Nor must we ministers forget that it is sometimes our duty to attempt the morally impossible with our people; for the morally impossible in this sin-cursed earth is sometimes the only right thing, and we are obliged to attempt the right.

Third. The Church can quit robbing the masses of the Gospel by stopping its stealing of the Sabbath.

It has been seen that in several ways the Church is robbing the masses of the Sabbath. It robs a great army of mail agents, newspaper people, railway employees and street car men of the Sabbath. In a very effective way it, by its secularizing influence, helps to rob the rest of the world of the Sabbath which God gave it to keep for its own sake and the sake of the world. It robs men of that stated day fixed of God for the worship of him through the study of his word and prayer and praise; and in taking away the day, it takes away from vast numbers the possibility of vital possession of the Gospel.

Man is a creature of habit; if he will learn the word of God he must have a set time recurring regularly for its study. Sunday is the divinely appointed day. To destroy it is practically to destroy the Gospel. To take it away from the people is to take the Gospel away.

The Church ought to quit robbing the people of the Sabbath.

We may take measures to secure the better observance of the Sabbath, on the part of the business world—it will not amount to anything unless the Augean filth of the Church's Sabbath profanity itself be first washed away. The reform must begin in Jerusalem. Let the ministers quit their Sabbath-breaking and let the rank and file be taught that God has laid down one law for them and the minister; that esoterism is a lie; that God expects his people to keep the Sabbath; that he does not allow them to take any man's Sabbath or to secularize it and thus rob the masses of it, and of the Gospel which practically goes with it.

But we hear some objecting : "The Church does not sec-

ularize the Sabbath in the case of the street cars on the Sabbath. It uses them in the service of God, to attend worship or to conduct worship." The truth obliges us to answer: "Not so fast. There is confusion here. There is no confusion in God. He is the author of the Decalogue. He has said, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." He has forbidden all works on that day save those of necessity and mercy. He can not have commanded you to help run the street cars on Sunday as a money-making enterprise; but that is what you are doing. The companies are running their cars to make money on the Sabbath, not as necessities or mercies. They deliberately violate the fourth commandment. You aid them, support them. You are *particeps criminis* in their violation of the fourth commandment. Logic is inexorable. In many cases, perhaps in most, one of the inducements to the companies to move their cars on the Sabbath is the number of church-goers they can count on carrying. You uphold, support and entice them to this violation of the commands of God. Oh, that our people could see this matter as that devout genius, Stonewall Jackson, saw it. He saw with perfect clearness that the Christian could not countenance in any way, even for a supposed good end, such transgressions of the divine law without becoming thereby responsible for the violation. There is no possible way of evading the force of our present contention, It is shallow-pated trifling to point to acts of ours inconsistent with our contention. Our lives are not impeccable. We ought to quit these forms of robbing the people of God's Sabbath and his word. And if we are guilty of other forms of doing the same thing, we ought to quit those too.

Some one else objects: "We are under the necessity of using the cars. We live in the suburbs. Or we live in a district where there are few members of our faith."

Let us examine that necessity. If it is of God's imposition, then God is a God of confusion, for he has forbidden the desecration of the Sabbath. But is the necessity of God's imposing? You can't prove it. Who placed your



residence in the suburbs? Did God? You will have hard work to prove that you have no responsibility therefor. Take my own case. I live in the suburbs. Have I no responsibility for being there? It may be answered, "You have gone there for the health and comfort of your family." But we reply, "Might not God be pleased better with me if while studying the health and happiness of my family I were still more regardful of his honor?" Christ has said: "If every man come to me, and hate not (love not less) his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Does any one say, "You would cut me off from all social worship by such teaching." We remind him that one who spake with authority has said, "To obey is better than sacrifice." To a man or woman at a distance from a church who can only reach it by means of street cars run in violation of the Lord's commandment, we would say your duty is plain. It is to read and study with your family in your own home, or with such of your neighbors as you can help. There is something higher than gathering together in formal worship in a great church. "To obey is better than sacrifice." If men and women would pursue this course, the interests of the Kingdom of God would be indefinitely advanced.

But again, some one may say, "Only by allowing the use of the public transportation cars can men of great talent exert their full influence for good, and teachers of all classes reach their places of labor."

In reply we answer, it is to be feared that some ministers of commanding parts have reasoned that inasmuch as men who hear them will be greatly benefitted, therefore they need not be very scrupulous about the means of reaching the place of worship. This is an illustration of the working of that insidious Jesuit principle that "the end justifies the means." So we may say of our teachers working at a distance who use forbidden means to accomplish their ends.

There is no way of obviating the force of our present

contention but by showing that the fourth commandment is no longer binding.\*

We would remark also, in passing, that no one may abuse our contentions by asserting that if applied the chariot wheels of Christ's cause would cease to roll; that no one may say he could then do nothing as missionary worker or teacher. He might indeed have to do his wish at greater cost. If we will do the will of God we may expect the way to be rough at times, we must expect obstacles and foes. But shall we learn nothing from the history of Israel of old and the Church at the time of Christ? Shall we not learn that the Church succeeded better in attaining the ends of her existence when she did the Lord's work in his way, though it looked hard? How much better for the Church under Moses to attempt the passage of the Red Sea as the Lord commanded, though the passage seemed impossible! How much better for Israel to have worshipped Jehovah without the calf than through the calf.

Our men of talent must not get audiences by turning themselves into golden calves. They must not use the hand of Uzzah in helping on the ark of the covenant. They must not transgress the commands of God in offering sacrifice. "To obey," for them also, "is better than sacrifice."

But once more, some one may object, "Sunday mails, Sunday dailies, Sunday trains, Sunday street cars are here to stay. What good can we do by protesting?"

This is one of the shallowest and weakest of all objections to our contentions. Sin is here to stay. Shall we not fight it? Our duty is not determined by the possibility of success but by the revealed will of God, the transcript of his moral perfections—the embodiment of the eternal principles of rectitude.

Is not the Church eating meat that it doubts about and

---

\* We have in this discussion accepted as true the position of our Standards on the Sabbath. See Confession of Faith, Chap. XXI, Sections VII and VIII. Larger Catechism, Questions 115 to 121 inclusive. Shorter Catechism, Questions 57 to 62. We believe this position to be correct.

that even the world doubts about in this matter of trampling on the great Puritan conception of the Lord's day? Is not the Church incurring condemnation therefor and leading the world into condemnation? A blind guide?

I repeat, then: The Church is the guardian of the Gospel for men. When she does not give it fully and freely she robs the world—the masses—of the Gospel. She does not give it fully in the location of her places of worship, in the elective affinity principally on which she allows her congregations to be made up, and in her relative contempt for the Sabbath. In several ways she is robbing the masses of the Gospel, in spite of her acknowledged missionary spirit.

She ought to quit it for the sake of the people going down in sin unwarned, for the sake of her own future, and for God's sake, who has bought her with his own precious blood.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

## VII. THE PASTOR IN HIS RELATIONS TO GOD.\*

The unconscious testimony which current language bears to great moral truths is a very interesting subject of study. Man's careless every day speech sometimes proclaims a great spiritual verity which if recognized and appreciated would revolutionize the life of him who thoughtlessly utters it. Men constantly speak of one's business as his vocation;—his vocation was law, or medicine or merchandise—meaning only that by such occupation the man earned his living, that such was his calling in life; but mark it, a "calling" involves a caller; "vocation" presupposes a *vox*—a voice—albeit the vast majority of those who habitually and heedlessly use the terms seem never to have entertained the thought. When zeal rises to the pitch of enthusiasm and one follows his calling with a devotion which challenges attention to its singleheartedness and persistence, we occasionally dignify the devotion with a higher name and speak of such a man's work as his "mission;" but even then few pause to reflect that a mission assumes a *mitter*, *i. e.*, a sender; that such a man is to all intents and purposes an "apostle," one "sent out."

All these words, vocation, calling, mission, are based at bottom on the great primary truth that to each God allots by divine appointment his task in life; that he gives "to every man his work," and that in after years he will return and will reckon with each as to his discharge of the duties devolving and of the responsibilities resting upon him thereby and therein. What a truly transforming effect on daily life would be produced by an intelligent and conscientious recognition of this profound fact! Life would then become service, the lowliest calling would be transfigured with the glory of God, and work would be worship.

---

\*The first lecture in a series entitled "THE PASTOR IN HIS RELATIONS," a course in Pastoral Theology, delivered to the senior class in Columbia Seminary, session of 1898-'99, at the request of the Board of Directors.

While this is true of every form of legitimate business that engages the restless activities of man, yet there is a peculiar and distinctive sense in which the preacher is "called" to his work; the calling to other spheres of usefulness in many, perhaps in most, instances may possibly be purely providential, the will of God being ascertained, as it were, by induction from one's tastes, traditions, surroundings, opportunities, etc., etc., and while in every case there should undoubtedly be reference to and reliance upon the will of God, yet the determining factor will be human, whereas in the calling of the Gospel ministry the relations are exactly reversed; the will of God here is supreme and decisive, and that will, not learned by inference and induction from providential situation chiefly, but through the direct and personal influence of the gracious Spirit, the Holy Ghost moving upon the spirit of the man called and impressing him with the force of an individual revelation that his duty lies in the preaching of the Gospel, not by any means always a welcome and inviting field to him; and while the man's providential situation may be corroborative of the call, it is always secondary not primary, and sometimes that situation so far from being a decisive element in his assurance, would on the contrary offer a seemingly satisfactory reason for choosing some other line of service, so completely seemed the pulpit hedged about by the numerous obstacles presented in the man's peculiar and unfavorable surroundings. Indeed for some, the path into the ministry has been such an up-grade of continual difficulty and hindrance that there was great temptation to think that mistaken zeal had misinterpreted the Spirit, whereas when long years had put the crown on all the patience of previous self-denial no one doubted that God out of Egypt had called hisson, and that a veritable shekinah had led him through all the weary wilderness that lay between his aspiration and its final fulfilment. One of the greatest of preachers has said:

"For if I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel. For if I do this of mine own will, I have a

reward: but if not of mine own will, I have a stewardship intrusted to me."

The recognition and appreciation of this personal divine call is essential to an effective service in the ministry of the gospel, nothing can compensate the lack of it. The efficient preacher must be a prophet—not a predictor—for prediction has ever been a small part of the prophet's function; *πρό φημί* "speaking before," but not before the event by way of foretelling the future, but predominantly "before God" or "for God;" the prophet is the man who by divine call and commission speaks for or before God:

"Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

Preaching, to be influential, must be AUTHORITY. The preacher must speak "as one having authority" else hearers will give small heed to his teaching. Men uniformly agree to the necessity, though they differ widely as to the source, of this authority; by a broad and loose classification they may be divided into two great parties represented by the Ritualists and the Rationalists, the Papal communion furnishing the most eminent instance of the former, while the Unitarian society affords good illustration of the latter, diametrically opposite each to the other, yet both appealing to authority. The first party places this authority in an infallible Church which alone has the right to call and commission, which alone is the depository of the truth, the executive of the sacraments and the sole channel of divine grace; which speaks with all the authority of God, holding the keys of heaven and of hell; which opens and no man shuts, which shuts and no man opens. You will find this conception obtaining with more or less distinctness all through the ritualistic section of the visible Church, and along with it not by mere coincidence but by virtue of the inherent nature of principle and the action of uniform law, you discover also the prelatic in government, the theory of different orders in the ministry and a perpetuation of those orders by tactual succession; the sacramentarian in doctrine, the ritualistic in

worship, the prelatie in government, go hand in hand; they invariably magnify "the Church," they draw their authority therefrom and they recognize no other; this explains their uniform exclusiveness and accounts for their irresistible tendency towards high-churchism, and their progressive development of ritualism; such tendencies are natural and they are inevitable, they lie at the very centre of the system and all resistance on the part of the low-church and evangelical must ultimately prove futile.

The rationalistic party derive their authority from truth—as they see it—and they claim distinctive hospitality for all truth and profess reliance upon truth alone; but they do not use the word in the sense in which we use it in such connections, viz., the Word of God; but truth in general, any truth, all truth, the whole realm of knowledge, philosophic, scientific, moral, ethical, social, etc., etc. The message they deliver on any sort and on all sorts of interesting questions, ethical, social, political, literary, has simply the authority derived from the soundness of their views, the clearness of their statement, the cogency of their reasoning, the aptness of their exposition, the timeliness and importance of positions maintained. They have long since eliminated the supernatural from the scheme all along the line, they are natural through and through, all their principles and methods are naturalistic; they really have no place for a divine call such as we hold to, no call of any divine authority save in a sort of sublimated, æsthetic or literary sense such as that which "inspired" Shakespeare and "divinely" commissioned him to utter his message to a listening world.

Midway between these extremes stands what we believe to be the true theory, avoiding the errors and evils of each while having all the advantages of both. The call comes from God. He and he alone sends forth laborers into the harvest. The Holy Ghost appoints and he anoints. At the same time the freaks of fanaticism and the vagaries of mysticism are guarded against by the office and influence of the Church as God's divinely organized institute and the

visible representative of his Kingdom on the earth; the caprice of individual whim and the distempered fancy of well meaning but misguided men are brought under the restraint of this wholesome influence. But at the same time remember that the office of the Church is simply to scrutinize the credentials of those claiming God's call and to pronounce solemn judgment on the justice of such claims. If she sees the evidences of God's call, she so states, and her ordination is only her public and formal recognition of the fact that God has indeed and in truth called the man. According to the Presbyterian Church, grace comes perpendicularly from above, not horizontally from the hands of bishops one or many.

His message is found in God's inspired Word and is God's truth upon which all man's natural powers are engaged to recognize, to understand, to explain, to commend and to enforce; supernatural in its origin and in its authority, but natural in that all the cultivation of mental powers, all the acquisitions of human learning, all the gifts of oratory and the arts of eloquence, are subsidized and consecrated to its most effective presentation; even here we return again, in our endless circle, to the divine: for it is not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord; Paul may plant, Apollos may water, but God alone giveth the increase. Our apostolic succession is a succession to the apostolic doctrine and to the apostolic spirit in which that doctrine was declared, and stands not in ecclesiastical connection transmitted through tactual succession; a theory which compels the recognition of the orders of the most shameless papal priest, living in flagrant sin, a reproach to ordinary decency, while refusing it to the holiest minister outside of this charmed circle of ecclesiastical descent; so that in a General Convention of the Episcopal Church held some years ago, when one of their clergymen from Mexico pleaded for the Church's recognition and support of missionary work in that benighted country and portrayed the desperate moral condition of the people where their very priests, without even pretense of concealment, were so



degraded, polluted and shameless that their lives could not be frankly described in the presence of a promiscuous congregation; in the face of such indubitable evidence of dense spiritual darkness and exigent need of a pure gospel, the Convention felt constrained to turn a deaf ear to the pleadings of their own clergyman, and decided not to authorize missionary work, because forsooth it would be a violation of ecclesiastical comity and inconsistent with their recognition of the ministry and orders of the Papal communion\* In other words, the most vile and polluted of these vicious priests, reeking with moral filth, was a minister of God and to be recognized as such, while a Hoge, a Paimer or a Girardeau, were not ministers and could not be so considered! From the grotesque absurdity of such a position we are saved, at the same time maintaining an authority which safeguards from all the kaleidoscopic varieties of individual fancies and freaks which disport themselves like "wills of the wisp" over the ecclesiastical low grounds of such organizations as make human reason the guide and touch-stone of every truth and which speedily degenerate into societies of mere ethical culture slightly tinged with religion.

The minister according to the Presbyterian church is called by God to the work and speaks by the authority of God; let me impress this vividly upon you, my young brethren, you must speak as those having authority; it is necessary both for your own sake and that of those who hear you; if this be wanting, your ministry must be fruitless; you need not count on any substitute, for there is none; without it you will be weak and helpless and you will assuredly feel that weakness and helplessness as an inevitable paralysis which will cast the blight of death over your message. Your hearers will need it no less; they may be in doubt and perplexity for some time feeling a want though unable to define it, but sooner or later with the inevitableness of fate they will come to the decisive discovery and you will stand

---

\* In justice to the Episcopal Church I would say that my impression is that it has since discovered some way out of this fearful dilemma!

before them as a mere sham while all the splendors of your rhetoric will evaporate as the prismatic hues of a punctured bubble. Do not dare to enter upon your work without this authority; as you stand looking out from the seclusion and retirement of this institution upon the world waiting your word and opening wide its doors of boundless opportunity, you may well pray most earnestly. "If thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence."

You must have this profound conviction of a divine personal call, in the next place, in order to appreciate your responsibility. The higher the position the greater the responsibility, "for unto whomsoever much is given of him shall be much required." There is no calling in life which for real dignity and honor and usefulness approaches that of the holy ministry; there is in it every element that exalts; from whatever point of view you regard it, it requires a lifting of the eyes to see it in its relations. There is no vocation that brings man into so constant and intimate a fellowship with God: whether in the sympathy of purpose and of effort, or in the subjects which habitually engage the attention, or in the sense of dependence on God's presence and help uniformly engendered; the ordinary level of heart and mind seems necessarily to be an altitude far loftier than that of any other calling. If viewed in the ends contemplated, there is the same effect; how paltry seem the noblest aims of even the purest philanthropy that kindles its zeal at the altars of mere human kindness when compared with that divine love for man which comes to seek and to save that which is lost, and which casts the mantle of this mission on the shoulders of every truly called minister of the Gospel! When in such spirit he deals with the interests of immortal souls with a destiny which is eternal, embracing in its limitless scope the endless ages of heaven or of hell, and reflects that the Gospel of which he is the accredited herald must prove either a savor of life unto life or of death unto death, he may well exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things"! and God pity him if he cannot add immediately, "but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament."

“ 'Tis not a cause of small import,  
 The pastor's care demands;  
 But what might fill an angel's heart,  
 And FILLED a Saviour's hands.”

Can a more unspeakably pitiable fate be conceived than to rush heedless into such a position and to undertake such work without a profound and humbling sense of personal responsibility? One would say that the most elementary and fundamental qualification for the fit discharge of duty in such sphere would be some just appreciation of the transcendent issues involved; and what is more suited to impress its importance upon the mind, the heart, the conscience, than a sense of personal responsibility to God? Nothing is so likely to hold the minister true to his course as the habitual recognition of his relation to God: amid the seductions to personal ease and comfort, the fascinations of literary dilettanteism, the inducements to personal culture for its own sake, the enticements of an otherwise worthy ambition or the plausible subterfuges of self-seeking, the temptation to court the favor or shirk the disapproval of man by sacrifice of principle or compromise of truth—amid all these and the like, what can ever hold the preacher and pastor faithful to his holy calling except the constant disposition to endure as seeing him who is invisible? And when perhaps fidelity has brought reproach from hearts which should have been dear and lips which should have been kind, how soothing the remembrance:

“Thou shalt hide them in the secret of Thy presence from the pride of men: Thou shalt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues.”

Just in proportion as we can see God in every congregation, and recognize him in every duty, and remember him in every temptation, and resort to him in every trial—just in proportion as we can make our relation to him dominate all other relations, just in that proportion will a sense of responsibility to him dwarf every other consideration and render us faithful to every duty; paraphrasing a familiar quotation, I would say,

First to thy God be true, thou canst not then be false to anything.

There is another aspect of your relation to God well worthy your attention. As there is no work that deals with such transcendent interests and seeks such exalted achievements, strange to say there is no calling in life subject to such disappointments and susceptible to such discouragements. The greatest growths are also the slowest: the mushroom reaches perfection in the moist vapors of a single night; the sunshine and the darkness, the storms and the calms, the winters and the summers of full a hundred years are required to build the high stories of the oak; six years bring the noblest horse to his prime, while twenty-one years of tutelage and training lie between the birth and manhood of the humblest member of the human family; since the soul is a thing of eternal growth, how slow must we expect its progress to be! In the work which deals with soul-development we have a paradox most puzzling and one, the baffling mystery of which increases with advancing years and progressive experience. It is distinctly God's work, the power and prerogative are his. We are taught this line upon line, precept upon precept; with equal clearness and equal frequency are we taught his supreme willingness to exercise this prerogative, to manifest this power. The Holy Ghost is the comprehensive summary of every conceivable need for the most immediate, most rapid, most irresistible progress of this work, in every stage of it, from its very initiation to its most consummate completion, and God is declared more willing to give this all-inclusive gift than earthly parents are to give food to their own hungry, pleading children. In view of such facts, one would suppose *a priori* that a work prosecuted under such conditions would know no let or hindrance, would move on with steady step in a constant progress, going always and only from strength to strength until every one should appear in Zion before God; that no enterprise should ever fail, that no effort should ever prove vain, that no prayer should ever seem to send simply the echo of its own

longing back to the empty heart. And yet it is an inspired prophet, and one of the grandest of them all, that sends this lament mourning through the ages, "Who hath believed our report and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed." Of the three years' ministry of our blessed Lord—and such a ministry, too, as it was—out of all the multitudes who heard him speak as never yet man spake, the visible fruits were a scant one hundred and twenty; one hundred and twenty souls the result of three years' preaching by the Son of God himself! Said I not rightly that the success of such work, viewed in connection with the promise of the presence and power of God, presents a most puzzling paradox? Your experience, my young brethren, will in all probability emphasize that paradox most painfully. Your faith, your courage, your hope, your zeal, your enthusiasm, your patience, your persistence, will all be tried as by fire. In the midst of manifold discouragements you will need some constant, stable support that will nerve you to work faithfully on, and to speak whether men hear or whether they forbear; that shall give you a persistence which can labor even though there be no visible results to encourage, like the disciple of old who said, "Master, we have toiled all the night and have taken nothing, nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net."

This constant, stable support you will find in nothing else than the reflection that God is with you and that you are doing his work by his divine commission; no intellectual interest in the truth, no oratoric instinct in its development and delivery, no enthusiasm of responsive audiences, no compensations from literary culture, no absorption in courses of study however attractive, can stand the strain and relieve the depressing monotony of year after year of continuous pulpit effort. Over and over again, even at his very best, the preacher will be constrained to say to himself, "And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not." Nothing can sustain the soul through the sickness of hope

long deferred save the support derived from constant resting upon the fact that God is with him.

Finally in this connection, I desire to emphasize to the utmost the absolute necessity of much communion and fellowship with God. You cannot, I trust, misunderstand me as in any way or to any degree depreciating the importance of scholarship, the advantages of natural gifts, the duty of diligence in study, and the very great benefit to be derived from the improvement of every opportunity to increase your efficiency and enlarge your influence by every possible aid which may tend to make you able ministers of the New Testament. No conscientious man can fail in duty here, and no ministry can be fully efficient that does not recognize this fact; but at the same time remember always that there is a certain inestimable and indispensable power that can never come from such sources and without which all those advantages, helpful as they are, must prove unavailing; this power is the *sine qua non* of a truly effective ministry and it comes only from fellowship with God and waits on communion with Him; it is an unction from the Holy One and imparts a knowledge which no mere intellectual effort can attain unto; "But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." As this anointing gives a knowledge that no other teacher can impart, so likewise it confers a power that comes from no inferior source; it is an unction which vivifies with the spirit of life all other gifts and attainments and which energizes all efforts. Like Moses from the mount, the preacher comes from this fellowship with life shining; "beholding as in a glass the glory of God, he is transfigured into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord." Like the patriarch of old, he wrestles with God and is crowned a prince to prevail. Let me call your attention to the fact that God's prophet, referring to this strange experience ten centuries afterward, makes personal and pointed application of the

unique incident to the present needs of the people he was addressing by saying, "Therefore turn thou to thy God\*\*\*\* and wait on thy God continually."

Let this be the application of my whole lecture this morning, my young brethren, and leave the room each of you with this reminder ringing in your ears :

Therefore wait on thy God *continually*.

Columbia, S. C.

SAMUEL M. SMITH.

## VIII. MACBETH AND THE BIBLE.

The commentaries and critiques on Shakspeare would of themselves make a library, and yet something remains to be said. To say this something, it will be necessary to repeat several familiar thoughts which shall do service as points of connection.

1. The subject matter of Macbeth is three-fold, Temptation, Sin, Ruin. Therefore this drama belongs to all time, and to every land, and to all men. It is not so interesting a psychological study as Hamlet, nor so depressing a threnody as Lear, but in some of its aspects it is broader than either of them, and appeals more to the universal heart of mankind.

Temptation, Sin, Ruin, are not these in very large part the history of our race. With these our world-history began, in the garden that lay eastward in Eden.

The remarkable resemblance of Shakspeare's line of thought to that of Moses has fascinated the present writer, and this fascination may serve for his apology, if any apology indeed were needed for writing this article.

The brief intimations of Holy Scripture have led some of the wisest commentators to the belief that a similar course was passed through by a portion of the originally holy angels under the leadership of Satan. They were tempted, they sinned, they fell, and fell to rise no more.

By a narrow induction it has been inferred that this is the norm of Gods dealings with his intelligent and moral creatures as they successively come into being. This speculation, however, would take us too far from our subject. It is more *apropos* to call attention to the fact that in Macbeth the idea of Redemption is not introduced and in this particular Shakspeare does not follow the inspired writer of Genesis. There is no sunset glow in Macbeth; day dies in absolute gloom with no promise of a bright to-morrow.

2. Just as in Genesis, the first temptation comes from an already lost world.



The Witches are the agents of an Inferno. It is not necessary to hold that Shakspeare believed in witchcraft, any more than that. Homer accepted as true, all the stories he relates of the dwellers on Olympus. Of course Dante did not write the *Divina Commedia* as a history.

In justification of the introduction of these accomplices of Satan, several arguments may be adduced.

(a) In Shakspeare's day there was a widespread belief in the reality of witchcraft. This consideration alone is enough. Wordsworth had not nearly so much ground for bringing the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of all human souls into his deservedly celebrated ode on immortality.

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting." The lines are as beautiful as they are widely known; but it is incredible that Wordsworth believed they were true.

(b) The Scriptures treat witchcraft very seriously. While the Israelites were still at Mt. Sinai and the thunders of the Ten Commandments still reverberated in the air, the ordinance was given: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live;" and, more than fifteen centuries later, Paul commanded a spirit of Python to come out of a soothsaying maiden at Philippi.

It is possible, of course, that the sacred writers regarded all sorcery as merely a wicked pretence of commerce with the devil for the purpose of gaining filthy lucre. Even in this view, it was a most abominable fraud on the part of the wizards and witches, and an execrable attempt on the part of the souls who resorted to them, to utilize the powers of darkness for obtaining knowledge which God and his prophets refused to give. In either case an epic or dramatic poet might well use an old tradition as Shakspeare did in this instance.

(c) Most, if not all, of the readers of the *QUARTERLY*, believe, with the writer, in the genuineness of the demoniacal possessions in New Testament times, and of the temptations of Satan and his spiritual ministers in all times, until indeed they shall be cast into the pit. Hence, although we

most cordially condemn the persecution of witches in England and in New England in former centuries, we are not prepared to deny the reality of witchcraft, or, still less, to disapprove of the use of witches in the drama. So that we are in no sympathy with the French critics in their ridicule of Shakspeare on this point.

3. The Witches then are not the Weird Sisters of the old Saxon mythology, nor human harpies, nor simply poor vagabond outcasts from society; but agents of the Devil, and indwelt and inspired by demoniacal spirits, precisely corresponding to the word, *מכשפה* translated witches in Ex. 22:18 and elsewhere, and to the maiden in Philippi, who had or at least claimed to have within her a spirit of Python i. e. Apollo.

As in Genesis Satan is represented as using a serpent for a visible, material vehicle; so in Macbeth his demons employ the Witches as the media of their temptations. So closely has the bard, whether intentionally or not, yet in fact, followed holy writ.

4. We have sometimes considered this the chief thought in Macbeth: We are tempted by an alien and infernal Power, whose baleful influence clings to our world, as the shadow, which we call Night, clings to our planet, and is not shaken off by all earth's rotations. Further reflection has led us to modify this pre-eminence so far as to say that it is one of the chief thoughts of the play. Yet we observe in connection with this, that Shakspeare introduces the drama by a witch scene. The curtain rolls up and a ghastly light falls upon the stage. To use an artist phrase, this lurid glare gives the pitch to the painting; in the last scene it alights upon Macbeth's bloody head borne in upon a pole by Macduff. So, too, the long world-struggle is foretold in Genesis. The scene, the light, the prophecy, the curse are there. Is not this more than wonderful? And after centuries and millenniums have passed by, the echoes answer faint and far from the heart of the island poet; not sweet and joyful, for the sweetness and the joy

have died away, and only the bitterness, and the sorrow remain.

We are pleased with this introductory scene. It is not so didactic as the first sentence of *Paradise Lost*; it does not tell so much of what we are to expect in the play; yet it tells enough to awaken attention, and would not, like Sallust's often criticized preliminary paragraph, fit any other piece of literary work about as well. And it is a happier beginning than Homer's account of the despicable squabble between Agamemnon and Achilles over Briseis; if it be not impious, as Burke said in reference to Sir Isaac Newton, to criticise so great a man.

Shakspeare's judgment has been pronounced equal, if not superior, to any other of his qualities as a poet.

5. But in his detailed treatment of the witches he must yield the palm to the inspired writers. His description of their personnel borders upon the disgusting. They are not only withered and wild, but each lays her chappy (chapped) finger upon her skinny lips.

"You should be women  
And yet your beards forbid one to interpret  
That you are so."

They are "secret, black and midnight hags."

Far worse than their appearance are the ingredients of their "hell-broth."

"Nose of Turk, and Tartar's lips;  
Finger of birth-strangled babe,  
Ditch-delivered by a drab."

Even worse are the lines:

"Pour in sow's blood, that hath eaten  
Her nine farrow; grease that's sweated  
From the murderer's gibbet, throw  
Into the flame."

With all our admiration for this incomparable band, must it not be admitted that we have here specimens of Teutonic coarseness, reminding one of *Beowulf*, and alas! of *Faust*? In *Genesis* the tempter is a serpent. His venom is not adverted to, but his craft, his superhuman wisdom in a bad cause, his wickedness, the first appearance of wickedness

in the whole narrative. The guile, the malice, the blasphemy came to the front. So, too, in the Cavern scene in Act 4th, which was evidently suggested by the extraordinary, and intensely dramatic interview of Saul with the witch of Endor. With what dignity and propriety do this hag, and the King of Israel, and the ghostly prophet deport themselves!

#### THE PLACE OF THE TEMPTATION.

6. In the scriptural narrative the place is one of divine beauty. Jehovah God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and adorned it with every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The LXX. translated the Hebrew  $\text{גן}$  by  $\text{παράδεισος}$ , the Greek form of *Paridas*, a Persian word which had crept into the later Hebrew; and thus we have the exquisite, soul-charming word Paradise. The conception of the Paradise has never been blotted out of the memory of the human race in all our wanderings. We perpetually strive to realize it on the surface of the earth; but the ideal will never be fully attained until the new heavens and the new earth shall have emerged from the final conflagration. Then shall be fulfilled the saying of the glorified Saviour to the beloved disciple in Rev. 2:7, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God."

But in Genesis a curse was pronounced upon the earth—that earth which God himself had pronounced good, yea very good. One of the primal blessings was the ordination of labor in dressing and keeping the garden. This blessing survived the fall. One of the primal curses was that of the resistance of the soil, making man's healthful labor a painful toil. Cursed is the ground for Adam's sake, and the sorrow of toil falls upon us to-day. Thorns and thistles are still brought forth, and in the sweat of our face we eat our bread until we return unto the ground whence we came.

This is the long struggle of the ages; and by patient labor much of the curse has been driven from the earth. For in a certain sense labor is godlike: "My Father work-

eth hitherto and I work," and that most industrious, never idling, always busy worker aids us by the forces of nature which are his ministers for good; and coal and steam and electricity and mirrors and lenses lift us up one round of the ladder toward him who is everywhere present, and everywhere wise and strong.

The superb passage in the 8th of Romans settles all question as to whether Paul was or was not a poet as well as a philosopher. The earth waits and longs for the manifestation of the sons of God. When they shall appear in their true glory, earth also shall be delivered from the curse, and shall bloom and blossom as the rose. Earth too shall be delivered from corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. But the time is not yet, nor does man or angel know when it shall be. Forty centuries after the curse was pronounced, Paul says that the *κρίσις* groans and travails in birth until now; and at the end of our nineteenth century we can but repeat the sorrowful refrain of the Church, "until now."

In the heath the curse still lingers. The unprofitable furze held dominion there in Macbeth's day, and holds it now, and the "blasted heath" is well associated with the accused witches. Surely in the promised Paradise there shall be no heath, no witch; no Satan nor other spirit of ill; no death, and no *disjecta membra* of men's or children's bodies boiling in horrid caldron.

Shakspeare has not disclosed his reasons for selecting a heath for the first interview of these three wild creatures with Macbeth. It may have been due merely to his having seen old croons haunting such localities; or by one of his intuitions he may have perceived the congruities of the case. To us following in his footsteps, the heath and the witches seem akin.

The principal of a city school in Louisville once showed us a pretty piece of his own work in water colors,—a huge, tawny camel standing on the sands of his native desert,—the desert stretching away in the far distance to the dim line of the horizon, where the skies are gray. The camel

was the daughter of the desert; and the witch with her hateful attire of muddy yellow, and browns and homely grays, is the daughter of the heath. And "in thunder, lightning and in rain," the heath sobs, and sighs for deliverance from the curse, and for the glory that shall be revealed.

THE CAVE SCENE.

If we may be pardoned for saying it, the cave seems incongruous with the heath. The Teutonic type of representation is jumbled together with the classic;—Hecate, the goddess of hell, and Acheron, the river across which the dead were ferried, now come upon the stage with the weird sisters. Yet some important points are gained. For instance the close connection of the witches with the infernal powers; and this proves the correctness of the view already set forth. The witches, are subordinate to Hecate, who meets them on a heath—Act 3, Scene 5—and rates them soundly for daring

"To trade and traffic with Macbeth  
In riddles and affairs of death  
And I the mistress of your charms  
The close contriver of all harms  
Was never called to bear my part.  
" \* \* \* \* \* Get you gone,  
And at the pit of Acheron  
Meet me i' the morning.

The cave gives an opportunity for scenic exhibition; for apparitions that must have powerfully impressed the spectators in the Globe Theater.

As in Samuels' case, several of the apparitions, possibly all of them, arise; though it is not absolutely plain whether they arise from the floor of the cavern or out of the flame of the boiling cauldron.

The whole scene reminds one of Æneas's interview with the Crimean Sibyl.

" \* \* \* *Horrendæque procul secreta Sibyllæ; Antrum immane.*"

THE SECOND TEMPTER.

8. A most noteworthy resemblance of Shakspeare's work to that of Moses is found here. Adam's second tempter is

Eve ; not the serpent now, but the man's best-beloved, the wife of his bosom ; and Macbeth's second, and indeed far the most effective tempter, Lady Macbeth ; Lady Ruach, as she is called from her maiden name by Richard Grant White. In a highly interesting article on this play, that accomplished critic gives the tradition that Lady Macbeth was a woman of remarkable personal charms. To us, indeed, she glares out of the past, a modern Jezebel, a fell spirit of crime and blood. Her "little hand" may have been beautiful ; but so was the exquisite marble once on exhibition in a Paris shop-window. A certain artist could not pass by it without stopping to admire its graceful curves, its admirable proportions, until he was informed one day that it was the hand of a murderess.

Milton's Satan is a villain of larger build than Lady Macbeth ; but in appalling atrocity he is hardly her equal. She might be styled the concentrated quintessence of Satan.

But, to Macbeth himself, she was his most ardent supporter. Her ambition was for him. He calls her, "My dearest love." He bids her, "Bring forth men children only." He idolizes his "dear wife," and she puts her soft hand in his and leads him down to the bottomless pit.

Now this brings us face to face with one of those mysteries which Shakspeare must have beheld, but which he does not take it upon himself to unravel.

We once met on a Lake Chautauqua steamer a perfect stranger, who proved to be a blatant infidel. We were told afterwards that he was a man of scandalous private life. He denied the existence of a personal God, the Deity was a mere farce. We asked him :

"Do you love God ?"

The question staggered him, he rallied, however, and said :

"Yes, I love him."

Which, of course, was impossible. But he was quite bitter at the idea "that God would quarter a Satan on this world. Ah ! no, I can't believe that."

Christ, however, said to Peter : "Simon, Simon, Satan

hath desired you, that he might sift you as wheat ; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Paul exhorts the Saints at Ephesus to "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil ;" and Peter gives us a very noted warning against our "adversary the devil." So that Moses and Christ and his Apostles dissent from the unclean infidel on the steamboat.

Now Shakspeare was not prone to discuss Apologetics, though he was an openly professed believer in Christianity, and in his last will and testament commits his soul to the Redeemer of sinners. But as to the mysteries of religion, he sets before us with extraordinary skill just what he saw with his own eyes.

"Look here upon this picture and on this, and work out your own solutions; I am a Poet, not a Philosopher."

The sacred writers tell us that Satan tempted our first parents and continues to plot the ruin of our race. Many of the profoundest students of uninspired history have reached the same conclusion; there must be some Ahriman, some Satan, some Spirit of Evil abroad in this world. But you cannot reconcile this with the existence of an Almighty, All-wise and All-holy God ?

Very well; but what are we to say of the undeniable facts in daily life, of temptation at the hands of men and women all around us—some of them of consummate skill and irresistible fascinations? Why does the blessed God permit this? Or why did he permit that foul man whom we met on the steamer to live forty or fifty years on the divine bounty, and then spew out his vile atheism as we have briefly recounted? We may be unable to answer these questions, but we cannot deny the facts. To an archangelic intellect the solution may be as easy as to a great mathematician the solution of a problem which baffles the understanding of an ignorant peasant. And surely to the infinite mind there is no difficulty in the matter; to him, and possibly to him only, the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are both alike to him.

The Scriptures give some explication of the unfathomable



mysteries of life and being; not so much, perhaps, as our sometimes fainting hearts might desire, but such, as being duly pondered, may furnish us the sweetest consolation. And Shakspeare is reticent, even painfully reticent, where we could wish that he had spoken, and we ask in whispers, Did he who saw so deeply into man and into life, understand these mysteries of the

“ \* \* \* Divinity that shapes our ends,  
Rough hew them how we may ?”

To which the answer is, manifestly not. Shakspeare indeed, knew no more on these perplexing subjects than has been known to the great teachers of the Church. We dare say, Not as much; that he was aware of his own limitations and acted wisely in doing very admirably what he could do, and in refraining from the attempt to do what in fact has never been done by any man born of woman.

9. DeQuincey has written a highly ingenious, psychological explanation of the effect produced by the knocking at the door after the murder of Duncan. Shakspeare, himself, however, gives a much simpler and more satisfactory account. Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are afraid of being detected. Why are they out of bed at this uncanny hour ?

M.—“Whence is that knocking?  
How is't when every noise appalls me?”

The tell-tale blood is on his hands. When Lady M. re-enters the room she says :

“My hands are of your color ; but I shame to wear  
A heart so white, \* \* \*  
A little water clears us of this deed.”

\* \* \* \* \*

“Get on your night gown lest occasion call us  
And show us to be watchers:—Be not lost  
So poorly in your thoughts.”

i. e.—Do not lose your head in this crisis.

After Adam and Eve had sinned against God, they “heard the voice of Jehovah God, walking in the garden in the cool of the day ; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of Jehovah God amongst the trees of the garden,

And Jehovah God called unto Adam, and said unto him, 'Where art thou?' And he said, 'I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself.' "

While Dr. Samuel Johnson commended this play, he says, "But it has no nice discrimination of character." With all due deference to that great man, we see with our own eyes that Shakspeare in this scene, as indeed throughout the drama, does discriminate most effectively between Macbeth and Lady Ruach. Look for another instance at Act 2., Sc. 2 :

Macb.—I have done the deed—Didst thou not hear a noise?

Lady M.—I heard the owl scream and the crickets cry.

Here the description is by innuendo, yet unmistakable. It is more pronounced farther on.

10. Paul said to Timothy, "Evil men shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." This is true of classes and individuals. Not only does one crime necessitate another, but one degree of wickedness in the heart leads to a lower depth. *Facilis descensus Averni*. In what a calculating, even a jesting way, Macbeth approaches the murder of Banquo! In the growth of sin in Macbeth's soul we find one of the choicest parts of the portraiture. As Lessing so well teaches in his Laocoon, the pen has here a great advantage over the brush and the chisel.

But how is it with the delineation of Lady Macbeth? She never descends below her first level of wickedness. We confess to some former disappointment at this apparent mistake of the author, but on maturer consideration we apprehend that he was wiser than we. Which was to be expected?

For observe: If Lady Macbeth had been portrayed as sinking deeper and deeper into the hell of crime, it would have been only a repetition of what we have already seen in her husband. Sameness and paucity of thought would have resulted. Again we should not have had the omnipotent force of contrast which Shakspeare uses so largely and with such prodigious power all through the play.

And once more, Lady Macbeth's nervous collapse, which

Richard Grant White considers not so much an individual trait as a characteristic of her sex. Concerning which he is most readable and maybe altogether sound.

There are three scriptural personages which we beg our readers to ponder in this connection. First, there is Elijah. Heaven save the mark! As had been so well said by Krummacher, Elijah flames out like a red meteor in the sky, without an announcement, and boding disaster. Only the pen of inspiration could or should have followed up the magnificence of that scene on Carmel, by that other scene a day's journey into the wilderness beyond Beer-Sheba, where he "sat down under a juniper tree and requested for himself that he might die, and said: It is enough; now O Jehovah, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers."

So that a fainting of spirit may come even upon the strongest of men. The second is the Elijah of the New Testament, John the Baptist. We do indeed have a glimpse of him in that charming idyll, with which Luke begins his gospel. Only a glimpse; for the child grew and waxed strong in spirit and was in the deserts—for some thirty years—till the day of his shewing unto Israel; and then the long-foretold voice of one crying in the wilderness is heard at last. What a phenomenon it was—that voice of a man clothed with camel's hair, and with a leathern girdle about his loins. "O generation of vipers," said those piercing tones, "who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" And multitudes went forth to hear that voice, as multitudes went forth long afterward at the cry of Wickliffe and Tauler and Savonarola and Whitfield. Such voices, such divinely impassioned cries, always reach the heart of humanity. But what is that which we hear from the fortress-palace of Machærus in the wild heights beyond Jordan? "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"

After all the attempts to explain and to apologize, our very deliberate opinion is that imprisonment, solitude, helplessness, and Christ's seeming forgetfulness of John wrung

a moan of weakness from one of the bravest hearts that ever beat in a human bosom. God help us all! for our hearts are weak. These two were men, not women; heroes, not poltroons.

Our third instance is that of Jezebel, from Sidon, a Phœnician city of wealth, material culture and Baal-worship, which was quite fashionable in that day. She was not, therefore, necessarily cruel, but a fanatical type of cruelty is the first personal quality ascribed to her. Jezebel cuts off the prophets of Jehovah. This is stated in the matter of fact way so characteristic of Scripture narratives. The meteor at first merely bright and glittering, sometimes turns to blood-red.

Shakspeare might have taken some hints from Jezebel; but it is surprising that the most daring, least nervous or hysterical, most self sustained of the three, whom we have named, was not a man, but a woman. She does not say with Milton's Satan :

“ \* \* \* Myself am hell,”

Or, “Is this the region, this the soil, the clime  
That we must change for heaven?”

A few groans were extorted even from Prometheus on his sea-girt rock.

But Jezebel—! When Jehu came dashing into Jezreel, did she fly, hide herself, shed womanly tears? Not at all. She puts her eyes in painting in the oriental style. See marginal translation, 2 Kings, 9: 30. The queen-mother tires her head, looks out of a palace window, defies and infuriates Jehu; is hurled down by two or three traitorous chamberlains, crashes against the wall, her blood flies everywhere, horses' hoofs and chariot wheels crush her, and an hour later only the skull, the feet, and the palms of her hands can be found of this cursed woman, who was the daughter of a king.

In the French Revolution women were as desperate, as unflinching and as deadly as Danton, Marat and Robespierre, and after the Franco-Prussian war the gentler sex furnished Paris with the petroleuses.

So that we can accept Mr. White's criticism only with reservations,

May we venture to say that the manner of Lady Macbeth's death is unsatisfactory? Birnam Wood is marching on Dunsinane. There is a shriek within of women: \* \*

\* "The queen, my lord, is dead." Was it from remorse? fright, or disease? Why should she die at all! And be trundled away out of his thought by Macbeth with some philosophical reflections on the vanity of life in general.

" \* \* \* It is a tale

Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,  
Signifying nothing."

The last topic to which we shall revert is that of the slow-following justice, which sixteen years after his crimes overtook Macbeth. It is well known that this idea of a Nemesis pervades the Greek drama. Nemesis with her white wings and her soft footfall, her two-edged sword and her relentless heart, pursues Oedipus and Clytemnestra on and on, until at the fateful moment she smites and slays. Is this thought peculiar to the Aryan race? Is it not also Semitic? And old as the human race in its very fountain, old as Eden, as the fall, as earthly sin itself?

"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die." Spiritual death supervened at once, and the Nemesis of physical death began her long silent march.

Dr. Kitto has compared the 5th chapter of Genesis to an old cemetery, with its gravestones and their brief inscriptions. All the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died. All the days of Jared were nine hundred, sixty and two years, and he died. All the days of Methusaleh were nine hundred and sixty-nine years, and he died.

Even more fearful than Dr. Kitto's thought is this of Nemesis following by day, by night, winter and summer, through the decades, and through the centuries, until she destroys one and all. Except when the last trumpet shall sound, and they who are alive and remain on earth shall not sleep, but be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and death shall be swallowed up in victory. Then shall the two-edged sword smite Nemesis herself, and her white wings be reddened with her own blood.

If the readers of the Word of God shall more than ever reverence its sacred pages, and if the students of Shakspeare shall ponder more profoundly and more lovingly the wise sayings of that great seer—my labor will not be in vain.

Richmond, Ky.

L. G. BARBOUR.

## NOTES.

### CHURCH AND STATE.

The history of the Church in its relation to the State furnishes an interesting and valuable lesson to the true lover of God's Kingdom. With the beginning of the Christian Era there was a complete separation of Church and State. Then the State hated and persecuted the Church. Then hundreds and thousands were called to yield up their lives as a price of their loyalty to God and to his Church. Then, notwithstanding all opposition and persecution the Church spread and grew and prospered.

The State, convinced of the power and influence of the Church, sought an alliance with her, and at length, under Constantine, secured it. From that day the interests of the Church began to suffer and her spiritual prosperity to wane. From Constantine to the Dark Ages the history of the Church is but the sad record of her decline and fall from that high spiritual position she had enjoyed to that of well-nigh total apostacy from the truth which had been committed to her keeping. At one time the State dictated to the Church what should be done while at another the Church, through its pope, placed her foot upon the neck of the State and dictated terms and conditions of subjugation to her authority. During the entire period of this unholy alliance, whether the Church or the State enjoyed the supremacy, the Church's glory was obscured and her influence for good weakened. The Christ who had taught that his Kingdom was not of this world, would not smile upon the Church and give to her prosperity while she was living in open violation of the great charter principles upon which she had been founded. By that providence by which failure attended her efforts Christ was calling upon his Church to come out and be separate from the world. But that voice was not heard and heeded till the dawn of the Reformation. Then prosperity began to return to the Church and she began to accomplish the high mission to which she had been called. Then she began to preach the Gospel and to win men to God. The signal evidences of God's favor that

attended the Church in the Reformation period are familiar to every student of Church history. In England, however, the separation of Church and State was not complete and hence evil resulted. The State which supported the clergy claimed their right to appoint ministers to the churches and these appointments were frequently made without reference to the spiritual qualifications of the ministers. In this way many worldly-minded men came into charge of congregations which were led by them into ways that were not pleasing to the great Head of the Church. Hence in the providence of God came the Wesleyan movement which did much to save the spirituality of the Church and to render it a power for good in the land.

In Scotland too there was an established Church over which the State exercised too great an influence, and as a consequence the Church did not accomplish fully her great work in that land. Then came the Free Church movement, which brought the blessings of the pure Gospel to so many homes and hearts. In America the Church and State agreed that the spheres of the two are separate and distinct, and hence the marked prosperity which has been granted to the Evangelical churches, which have accepted and acted upon this view. Even in this country there has been a temptation to both Church and State to cultivate an intimacy which is not authorized by the constitution of either. The Church has sometimes sought to decide political questions and to dictate to its members the form and objects of their civil allegiance. And the State has sometimes given aid to the Church, thereby tempting her to make some return to the State. In so far as this tendency is yielded to by Church or State injury will result to both. The Church should ask no favor of the State except to be let alone as she seeks to call and train men for the Kingdom of grace and glory. And the State should seek nothing from the Church, but that beneficent influence which she can best exert by keeping within her own sphere and doing the work of her own King.

Augusta, Ky.

W. C. CLARK.

## RATIONALISM IN THE TREATMENT OF THE BIBLE.

The application of rationalistic methods, in the treatment of the Bible, has become so prevalent as to demand the thoughtful attention of all lovers of the truth. Men, puffed up with worldly wisdom, boldly profess to decide, with authority, what ought to be in the Bible and then, with equal confidence, declare the meaning of that which is written. With the assumed sagacity of sages they sit in judgment on the text and assert that Moses wrote this and did not write that, and that Isaiah is the author of this chapter and not of that.

In their pity for the uninitiated they print in "many colors" the text, that all may have the benefit of their power of discernment in deciding what is myth and what fact, what is inspired and what not. Then with the same air of superior wisdom they dictate to others the meaning to be put upon that part of the Bible they have condescended to leave to those who would cleave to a written revelation. As their misconceived ideas as to what should be in the Word decided the color to be given to the printed page so their own conception of truth gives color to the interpretation of the Bible. Having decided that evolution is taught in nature they concluded that this theory must be taught in the Bible or that the Bible must be silent on the subject. Having concluded that God would not, under any circumstance, authorize the use of intoxicating spirits they assert that nothing but unfermented juice of the grape can be used at the Lord's Supper. Having learned that women can speak effectively in public, they convert the plain prohibitions of God's Word into express sanction of the exercise of the right, on the part of modern women, to preach and pray in the church.

If such interpretations were confined to the higher critics and avowed rationalists our concern would not need to be great. Already there seems to have been a healthful reaction against the extreme views of writers who constitute these classes. But that which demands the consideration of pastors and teachers is that similar views have found their



way to the minds and hearts of many of the rank and file of the great company who claim allegiance to the King. The prevalence of such views in the higher latitudes is evident from the books and papers which are issued there. Nor is the conservative South exempt from these rationalistic tendencies. Along the borders there are churches that have discarded the use of wine at the Lord's table and individuals who openly dissent from the teaching of God on the position of woman in the church. More than once the writer, when upholding the teaching of Paul on the subject of the silence of women in the church, has received the reply, "Paul lived a long time ago;" "circumstances have changed." The reply that the "declogue was delivered a long time ago" and that "the sermon on the mount is not a modern production," did not seem to carry conviction.

The feeling is deep in the minds of many otherwise good people that anything in the Bible which does not conform to their higher reason and conscience may be disregarded or interpreted away. It is high time that God's ministers should boldly teach and defend the position that the human reason, having examined and weighed the evidence in favor of the inspiration of the Bible and having accepted that book as a revelation of his will, should humbly bow to all of its teachings and let it be the rule and square by which views of truth and duty shall be shaped. People must be taught that the Bible is the sole and sufficient rule of faith and practice.

This note is written not so much with a view of discussing methods by which the evil may be met and counteracted, as with a desire to call attention to its prevalence and spread even among the common people and in the most conservative parts of our Church and country. The wise pastor will seek to meet and arrest the evil in its beginning.

W. C. CLARK.

## EDITORIAL. RECORD AND REVIEW.

PRESBYTERIAN.

The McGiffert case has so absorbed the attention of Presbyterian circles North and South, that a review of its recent developments and their significance will be, perhaps, of more value than the notice of minor occurrences in the history of the denomination.

The Presbytery of New York, to which the case was committed by the General Assembly, waited until after the meeting of the Synod of New York, to which appeal might have been made, before acting on the matter. The Presbyterial Committee, Dr. Robert F. Sample, chairman, made its report in November but it was not taken up until the 18th of December. We make the following extracts from the Committee's report :

The General Assembly of 1899, convened at Minneapolis, Minn., took the following action in reference to a recent publication of the Rev. A. C. McGiffert :

"Resolved, That the whole matter of the teachings of the Rev. A. C. McGiffert, D. D., in his book 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 Church and purity of doctrine may require."

In compliance with this action the Presbytery of New York, at a regular meeting held June 12, 1899, adopted the following resolution :

"Whereas, the General Assembly has committed to the Presbytery the charge of the case of Dr. McGiffert,

"Resolved, That the matter be referred to a committee of seven, of which the Moderator of the General Assembly shall be the chairman, which committee shall report not later than the November meeting."

At the first meeting, Dr. McGiffert, at the invitation of your committee, being present, made a statement declaring his accord with the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church—a recital in substance the same as that made in a communication addressed to the last General Assembly. At the same time he announced that he had not changed his views as expressed in his book, nor could he conscientiously withdraw from the Church. He was subsequently requested to make a more specific statement to the committee either in writing or orally, concern-

ing certain quotations from his book which he claimed had been misapprehended, but he declined, thinking it unnecessary to add anything to the written statement already made.

At our second meeting, the whole situation was earnestly and prayerfully considered. The committee felt seriously embarrassed. They could not so interpret the teachings of their brother McGiffert as to bring them into accord with the standards of our Church, nor could they see how any thoughtful reader, familiar with our system of doctrine, could do it. The book left us with an uncertain inspiration, a fallible Christ, a dismembered New Testament, a doubtful authenticity, and with views of the Lord's Supper, and of justification, out of accord with the faith of the Presbyterian Church.

And now in the fear of God, in conditions we have not evoked, burdened with a sense of solemn responsibility, cherishing an affectionate regard for our brother, Dr. McGiffert, and not questioning his sincerity and conscientiousness in what he has written, your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

I. We recommend that the Presbytery declares its accord with the deliverance of our last Assembly respecting the fundamental doctrines as found on the 96th and 97th pages of the Minutes for 1899.

II. That the Presbytery expresses its disavowal of the points in Dr. McGiffert's work indicated in the foregoing action of our General Assembly, as being inconsistent with the Constitution and Standards of our Church.

III. We express our great regret that Dr. McGiffert refuses to change his views, or withdraw from our communion.

IV. That in view of the fact that this matter is "important, difficult, and of peculiar delicacy," respecting which the Presbytery is "greatly divided," and believing that the ecclesiastical trial at this juncture would be a serious detriment to the church in this city, we overture the next General Assembly in the exercise of its constitutional authority, to deal directly with this matter as in its judgment may seem best, so as to secure an early and final disposition of it.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

Robert F. Sample,

Robert R. Booth,

J. Balcom Shaw,

John C. Bliss,

Ministers.

William E. Magie,

Oscar E. Boyd,

Titus B. Meigs,

Elders.

WHAT DR. MCGIFFERT BELIEVES.

The following is the statement of Professor McGiffert made to the committee on June 27, and referred to in its report :

I. In reference to the first point in the Deliverance of the General Assembly, permit me to say that I believe, as I believed at the time of my ordination, that the Bible is "the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice;" for I believe it to be such a revelation of

God to man that every one may gain from it all needed light touching the character of God and the way of salvation, and may learn from it with absolute assurance what God would have him be. The fact that there are errors in the Bible, which I am compelled as an honest student to recognize, does not in the least affect my estimate of it as God's Word. If the Westminster Confession of Faith asserted the absolute inerrancy of the Bible I should be obliged to dissent from the Confessional statement, but as a matter of fact the Confession asserts nothing of the kind, nor did I assert my belief in anything of the kind when I was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. It is only of the Bible as a rule of faith and life that the Confession speaks, and I believe any one to be fundamentally in accord with its doctrine of the Scriptures who regards the Bible as inspired of God to be the rule of faith and life, and who believes that in it is to be found adequately set forth the way of salvation, whatever his opinions may be touching its errancy or inerrancy, or touching the authorship and composition of any of its parts.

II. So far as the second point is concerned I desire to say most emphatically that I believe in the deity of Christ, and I am not aware that my book contains anything inconsistent with that belief. For the deity of Christ, unless it is to be interpreted as excluding his real humanity cannot be held to involve necessarily the possession of unlimited knowledge, or absolute freedom from all liability to error, during his earthly existence.

I do not care to commit myself to any particular theory touching the limitations of Christ's earthly life—my work is that of a historian, not a dogmatist—but I may venture to remind you of the Kenotic doctrines which have been held by so many leading theologians in our own and other branches of the Evangelical Church.

III. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper I believe in with all my heart, and I partake of it with the greatest joy and spiritual profit, but the question as to the exact way in which it was instituted seems to me a purely historical question which does not affect the nature of the Sacrament. I regard it as certain, to quote from my book, "that Jesus ate the last supper with his disciples, as recorded in all three of the Synoptic Gospels, and that he said of the bread which he broke and gave to his companions, 'This is my body,' and of the wine which he gave them to drink, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many,' and that he did it with a reference to his approaching death." But it seems to me somewhat less certain that he explicitly directed his disciples at that time to go on repeating the supper in remembrance of Him, and I cannot regard it as a fundamental doctrine either of the Word of God or of the Confession of Faith that he did.

A full and sufficient warrant for the observance of the Sacrament may be found, as I believe, in the words of Christ touching the bread and wine, and in the teaching and example of the Apostle Paul acting under the direction and authority of the Lord.

IV. So far as the fourth point is concerned I am in sympathy with the genuinely Pauline and Protestant doctrine of salvation through faith alone, and I am not aware that I have ever said or written anything which, to quote the language of the Assembly's deliverance, "in any way modifies or belittles the essential act and exclusive necessity of faith in human salvation."

This report was not discussed at the meeting in December. Thus six months of delay was secured by the conferences, consultations and report of a committee, which was not even accorded the courtesy of a serious hearing when the report was presented.

On motion of Rev. Robert Russell Booth, D. D., the following paper was adopted by a vote of 78 to 27, after the defeat of an amendment offered by Dr. Francis Brown, which substituted confessional statements for the condemnation of Dr. McGiffert's views. The paper was offered by Dr. Henry Vandyke and Dr. Howard Agnew :

Whereas, The General Assembly of 1899 referred "the whole matter of the teachings of the Rev. A. C. McGiffert, D. D., in his book entitled 'A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age,' to the Presbytery of New York, for such disposition as in its judgment the peace of the Church and the purity of doctrine may require;" and

Whereas, In accordance with this reference of the General Assembly, **this** Presbytery has carefully considered the teachings of the book in question, and has also, through a committee appointed for that purpose, conferred with Dr. McGiffert in regard to his interpretation of the book; therefore be it

Resolved, That the following minute be entered upon the records as the judgment of this Presbytery in the matter :

I. It finds that the teachings of the book entitled "A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age," by the Rev. A. C. McGiffert, are in certain points, according to the judgment of the majority of this Presbytery, erroneous and seriously out of harmony with the facts of Holy Scripture as they have been interpreted by the Presbyterian Church. These teachings, according to their author, have already been misunderstood; but this very liability to misunderstanding is one of the elements which make this Presbytery disapprove of them, as likely to lead to yet more serious error. The following examples are cited as statements especially open to such construction, viz.:

(1) The apparent acceptance of the theory that the Sacrament of the Holy Communion was not instituted by Christ himself upon the occasion of the last supper as a memorial feast (Page 69, Foot Note.)

(2) The discrediting of the view so long accepted by the Church that the Third Gospel and the Book of the Acts were written by St. Luke, the

companion of St. Paul (pp. 237, 433,) and the suggestion that they were more probably the work of some writer living in the latter part of the first century, a generation after the death of the Apostle (p. 436).

(3) The expression of uncertainty as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and the assertion that the discourses in it attributed to our Lord, although "they embody Christ's genuine teaching at least to some extent," are the composition of the author (p. 616.)

(4) The view that "Jesus's emphasis of faith in, or acceptance of himself is throughout an emphasis, not of his personality, but of his message and thus simply a reaffirmation of filial trust in, devotion to, and service of God as the essential and sufficient condition of an eternal life of blessedness in heaven" (p. 30.)

II. This Presbytery recognizes the principle frequently asserted by the Presbyterian Church, that a man is not necessarily to be held responsible for the general consequences which seem to others deducible from his views in certain particulars. The distinct and definite disapproval of the aforesaid teachings of Dr. McGiffert by this Presbytery does not preclude it from accepting as sincere and reassuring his public and personal avowal that he is "in accordance with the faith of the Presbyterian Church and of Evangelical Christendom in all vital and essential matters;" that he reverently accepts the Holy Communion as one of the divinely appointed Sacraments of the Christian Church; that he acknowledges the authority of the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; that "most emphatically" he believes "in the Deity of Christ;" and that he is "in hearty sympathy with the genuinely Pauline and Protestant doctrine of salvation through faith alone."

III. The Presbytery, moreover, is persuaded that the action of the last General Assembly, taken in connection with this action of the Presbytery of New York, is sufficient to guard the purity of the doctrine of the Church so far as any teachings of the book in question may affect the same, inasmuch as in view of said action there can be no possible misunderstanding in any quarter as to the attitude of the Presbyterian Church towards teachings which it formally disavows.

IV. In view of the foregoing considerations, and recognizing the manifest evils and misunderstandings that are wont to connect themselves with an attempt to establish by judicial process the limit of conscientious differences in the interpretation of the standards, the Presbytery, having herewith recorded its disapproval of the teachings referred to its judgment by the Assembly, believes that neither the interests of the peace of the Church, nor the protection of the purity of its doctrine calls for any further action at the present time, but that a trial for heresy would work grave injury to the interests of Christ's Kingdom.

V. Finally, the Presbytery counsels and enjoins all members of this body, and especially such as are engaged in critical studies, to refrain from setting forth the disavowed teachings as if endorsed by the Presbyterian Church, and while exercising the liberty of scholarship to be careful to distinguish between the theories of criticism and the certainties of faith, and also faithfully to maintain sound doctrine and loyally to study the peace of the Church.

It is not too severe a criticism to say that in this action the Presbytery stultified itself. It lays itself open to the accusation that the fear of man was the controlling motive. The dread of a heresy trial is conspicuous from the first agitation of the question to this action of the Presbytery. If the Presbyterian Church does not stand for the defence and the proclamation of the truth, it has no distinctive mission. Yet, even where fundamental truth is involved it is the judgment of the Presbytery that "a heresy trial would work grave injury to the interests of Christ's Kingdom." That is, it is better that error be tolerated than that men should be offended by the rebuke of a teacher of false doctrines. So did not think the Apostle Paul. Is the Church so much weaker in New York than it was in ancient Ephesus?

The Presbytery in the minute which it adopted finds the teachings of Dr. Giffert's book "erroneous and seriously out of harmony with the facts of Holy Scripture as they have been interpreted by the Presbyterian Church." The only possible action that could logically follow such a finding would be the admonition not to teach those views, however such an admonition would have to be enforced. Yet the Presbytery simply enjoins upon all its members, including Dr. McGiffert, though not by name, "to refrain from setting forth the disavowed teachings as if endorsed by the Presbyterian Church." Nevertheless, it can now be confidently claimed that these teachings are tolerated by the Presbyterian Church, in one of its ordained ministers whose special work is the instruction of theological students.

The members of the Presbytery are also enjoined to distinguish between "the theories of criticism and the certainties of faith." That phrase, probably from the facile pen of Dr. Vandyke, has been widely quoted. It will not bear analysis, however. The Christian religion is a religion with a basis of facts and it is the legitimate province of historical criticism to question those facts. The Bible is more than history but it is never anything less. And never since the days of Uzzah has there been a weaker attempt to stay

the ark of God than this admission that what are called the "certainties of faith" may not be able to resist the force of the "theories of criticism." The only possible position for a truth-loving Church to occupy is that which meets criticism on its own grounds and refutes its results by the same methods of historical investigation.

Again, the Presbytery appears to bring as weak an indictment as the facts would warrant. The first error which the Presbytery finds is a point well taken. If Dr. McGiffert believes that First Corinthians was written by Paul, then it is indeed difficult to see what view of inspiration could be held that would deny the fact of the institution of the Lord's Supper by Christ himself on the same night in which he was betrayed. At the same time Dr. McGiffert's defence that there was sufficient warrant for the institution of the Supper "in the teaching and example of the Apostle Paul acting under the direction and authority of the Lord" meets the accusation, if any cross-questioning on the point is stopped.

The second point is weak. It leaves the Protestant ground that the long acceptance by the Church of a certain theory is to be taken as evidence merely and takes the Romish view that such acceptance is to be taken as authority. The canonicity and authenticity of the books of Luke and Acts do not rest upon the fact that the authorship of Luke has been long accepted by the Church. While the contention that these books were written by an author in the latter part of the First Century, is old straw threshed over, and in which no grain of historical truth was ever found, yet the Presbyterian Church cannot afford to take the position that the traditions of the Church must be adhered to whatever historical facts to the contrary may be discovered. And the same thing is true as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. What we want is truth. We should never be afraid of the truth. And while the suggestion is the very acme of absurdity, if any scholar finds and proves such facts as to the third and fourth Gospel and the Book of Acts, the only thing for the Church to do would



be to revise its declarations as to those books and pass a vote of thanks to the scholar who had found the truth. The Presbytery has here merely erected a barricade of straw for the defence of the integrity of the Word of God.

We may be permitted to remark that the battle for the authenticity of these books has been already won, and that Dr. McGiffert is a generation too late for the serious questioning of his conclusions. Yet the fact that the writer of Luke and Acts is put in the first century even by the Radical School of Critics in which Dr. McGiffert places himself is a trophy on the battleground of historical criticism showing that the tide of the conflict has receded far from the high water mark which it reached under Strauss.

The fourth point made against the teachings of Dr. McGiffert is hardly sufficient to warrant the charge which the Presbyterial Committee made that he taught a "Fallible Christ." It is an old device of a half hearted prosecutor to subordinate damning evidence. It is strange indeed that in defining the errors of Dr. McGiffert this sentence from his statement before the Committee should have been passed over without notice. "The Deity of Christ cannot be held to involve necessarily the possession of unlimited knowledge or absolute freedom from all liability to error during his earthly existence." It seems to us that there is enough here to stir the heart, not only of the Presbyterian Church, but of evangelical Christendom.

Let us distinguish. That our Lord increased in wisdom as in stature, necessarily involves the limitation of his knowledge. Unlimited knowledge admits of no increase. Our Lord also defined that limitation when he said "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,"

But liability to error is a far different thing. It is difficult for any sound philosophy to separate error from sin as its underlying cause.

The New Theology has received no deadlier blow than this wounding in the house of its friends. First we were told that we must discount much of the New Testament as

not accurately setting forth the mind of Christ. Those who were most intimate with him and who wrote of him did not interpret him correctly and we must read between the lines. It is true that a very poor case was made out, either by Dr. John Watson or Principal Fairbairn when it came to any proof of the discrepancies between the teachings of Paul, for instance, and those of Christ, as reported by Matthew and the other Evangelists. Still the cry, Back to Christ, and the exaltation of the teachings of Jesus over those of Paul, inspired by the Spirit of Christ, did seem to exalt Christ, in the shallow conception of the popular mind.

But now Dr. McGiffert declares that we have in the Fourth Gospel, for instance, no certain report of our Lord's sayings. The discourses in it attributed to our Lord are the composition of the unknown author, although "they embody Christ's genuine teaching, at least to some extent." But what if they do? At last we put our finger on something that even Dr. McGiffert will admit is a "genuine teaching of Christ." Then we are met by the claim that Christ himself was in his earthly existence, "liable to error."

The progress from a fallible Bible to a fallible Christ is instructive.

It need hardly be pointed out to the readers of the QUARTERLY how deep this cuts. Take the fundamental doctrine of regeneration. It is taught in Christ's discourse with Nicodemus. But that is John's Gospel, the authorship of which is uncertain. It is certain however that the unknown author composed the discourses attributed to our Lord. This discourse with Nicodemus therefore, may or may not embody the genuine teaching of Christ. But here is a man who denies the necessity of regeneration, as we presume Dr. McGiffert would not do. The man argues that not only are these doubts cast upon the divine origin of the doctrine, but even granting that the discourse with Nicodemus did take place, Christ, as a religious teacher, was liable to error, and may very well have been mistaken, when he said, Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God.

Yet the Presbytery of New York passes this by without even forbidding its members to promulgate it as avowed Presbyterian doctrine.

It is impossible for the matter to remain where the Presbytery would leave it. The challenge is too open. The religious papers of the Northern Church, such as the Presbyterian, the Herald and Presbyter, the North and West, are outspoken in their protest. The Evangelist and the Interior are violently opposed to taking up the matter further, while the Banner and the New York Observer are at present giving forth an uncertain sound which will probably change into the true ring as the history of the case proceeds.

Just as we go to press, the news comes that Dr. Birch, the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery, has boldly faced the issue and preferred charges of heresy against Dr. McGiffert. The Presbytery will be bound to take them up and the case will doubtless come before the Assembly in May, where we cannot believe the issue to be doubtful. There is too much at stake, even the existence of the Northern Presbyterian Church as a Confessional Church. The interests of Presbyterianism at large, throughout the world are touched. And we are sure that the Southern Presbyterian Church desires to encourage with united voice the conservative party in the sister church in the effort to defend and maintain the truth of God.

#### EPISCOPAL.

The Church Congress met this year, October, in London instead of Bristol, on account of the burning of a great hall in the latter city. One of the most interesting features was the discussion concerning the Church and Non-conformity. The pressure that the Parliament is bringing to bear upon the Church has created a feeling of sympathy for what was once classed indiscriminately as Dissent. One of the speakers declared that henceforth Anglicans like Non-conformists would recognize the impossibility of the Church being bound to obey the State. He acknowledged freely the debt of the Established Church to the learned Non-

conformist theologians, among whom he mentioned R. W. Dale. Dean Farrar gave it as his opinion that while reunion was not immediately probable, yet a better understanding already existed than ever before. There has been hearty co-operation between the Anglican and Non-conformist bodies this year. One of the evidences of better feeling was the generous address of Dr. Forrest Brown, Bishop of Durham, to the Congregational Union which met in Bristol just before the meeting of the Church Congress in London.

There is a vast difference in the attitude of a soul that stands for liberty in non-essentials and defies all the forces of tyranny to impose candles and incense and other ceremonies upon worship, and the attitude of dependence upon these things. There is something of the martyr spirit in the asserted right to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience. But the spirit that makes external rites essential to the worship of God is puerile and contemptible. The High Church party in England in its devotion to these minutiae is making itself ridiculous. But the church or the individual who boldly stands against the right of a party to force these things upon others breathes the spirit that we honor in John Knox and the Covenanters.

Rev. R. C. Fillingham, vicar of Hexton, England, is putting his principles into practice. He calls his efforts "Putting Down Ritualism." In Lower Gornal a little band of worshippers protested against the Romanizing practice of the vicar of their parish by fitting up a barn and holding "plain Protestant Church of England services in it." Then they sent for Mr. Fillingham and he organized victory for them. He preached to them on "the national peril of idolatry." He pointed out that "the worship of a senseless wafer of flour and water was even worse than the heathen worship of an image made in the likeness of man." Then he got the names of all who would agree to attend the parish church in a body and greet the elevation of the Host with shouts of "Idolatry." This action was to be taken, however, only if the memorial to the Bishop failed. The

Bishop grew frightened and reluctantly acted in accordance with their wishes. He assured them that after an interview he had with the lawless vicar that "nothing in the conduct of the services in his church shall call for my intervention." There is hardly enough in the worship with candles to incite to a martyr's death or even to the loss of a salaried office.

Mr. Fillingham concludes his letter by saying:

"So we have triumphed, and in Lower Gormal, Ritualism is at an end. And now I am organizing bands of parishioners in various parts of England prepared to do as I advised the Lower Gormal men; and by the blessing of God, idolatry shall be put down."

#### CONGREGATIONAL.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions held its annual meeting in Providence, R. I., the first week in October. Mr. S. B. Capen, a business man of Boston, was elected President. Twenty new members were elected to fill vacancies on the Board, among them five women. A debt of \$88,000 rests on the Board, but strenuous efforts will be made to lift it.

Rev. R. S. Storrs, D. D., probably the first preacher in America now living, resigned the pastorate in November, a pastorate that had lasted for fifty-two years. Since the death of his wife, two years ago, his health has been precarious. His work has been well done. He has directed the energies and inspired the zeal of a great church, lifting it always to higher planes of Christian liberality and holy living. He will be elected pastor emeritus and a successor chosen as soon as possible. One sentence of his letter of resignation deserves to be quoted: "If to-day were offered me the choice of a pathway in life, the most alluring and rewarding, I should choose none other than that which has been given me—the pathway of the Christian pastor, joyfully trying to bring to men the grace and glory of the Lord's Gospel.

#### UNITARIAN.

The National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches met in Washington October 16-19. While

there were six hundred delegates present there was a sufficient contrast between the real strength of the Unitarian body and that of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches throughout the world. Senator Hoar was re-elected President. Unitarianism is really declining in numbers, so it puts forth claims of influence upon other Churches which are supposed to compensate for numerical inferiority. Unhappily that influence, upon the Congregational Churches for example, is very marked, and in the case of Dr. McGiffert would seem to be infecting Presbyterianism. Rev. Edward Everett Hale made an ill-tempered address, in which he claimed that a large proportion of the ministers of other Churches were Unitarians in disguise. His challenge was abundantly answered.

#### UNIVERSALISTS.

The Universalists held their general meeting in Boston about the same time with the Unitarian meeting in Washington. A new creed was promulgated.

There was much talk of a union between the Unitarian and Universalist bodies, but the objection came from the Universalist side, for reasons of orthodoxy. Overtures to union have been made several times since in the religious papers but it seems far enough off now.

What is known as the Chicago Declaration was ratified by a vote of 132 to 10.

The conditions of fellowship shall be as follows:

I. The acceptance of the essential principles of the Universalist Faith, to-wit: 1. The Universal Fatherhood of God. 2. The spiritual authority and leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ. 3. The trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation from God. 4. The certainty of just retribution for sin. 5. The final harmony of all souls with God.

II. The acknowledgement of the authority of the General Convention and assent to its laws.

One is bound to make the reflection that principles three and four must be held in a Pickwickian sense.

#### DISCIPLES.

The Disciples of Christ held their annual convention in Cincinnati the last week in October. It was the greatest

religious convention in the history of the denomination or of the city. Ex-Governor Drake, of Iowa, presided. The extraordinary growth of this communion is one of the religious phenomena of the age. It numbers now 1,200,000 communicants and over 10,000 churches. There was an enrollment of 14,000 delegates to the Convention.

#### D. L. MOODY.

When the religious history of the nineteenth century is written the most illustrious name on the record will be that of Dwight L. Moody. Spurgeon will be only less conspicuous and Spurgeon has left some written works that will be read for another generation. But Moody, while he has written nothing that will live, and while he has left no successor to carry on the work of his Northfield institutions and no organization to perpetuate them, was one of those rare men who set in motion causes which change the course of history itself. For religious ideas are the most powerful factors in developing the character of a people, and the history of a nation is largely the result of the outworking of national character.

Mr. Moody was a man of ordinary attainments and fewer advantages than most Americans have in the way of education. He was a man of warm heart and strong common sense. He was absolutely fearless in all his dealings with men. His energy was untiring and his will indomitable. No obstacles could block his path. After his conversion he gave himself as heartily and as wholly to the Lord's work as he would have done to any business of earth that might have enlisted his energies. At first he devoted what time he could spare to Christian work in the Sunday school and prayer meeting. But his success as a lay worker emboldened him to attempt public speaking in somewhat larger spheres, and before long he began his great career as an evangelist.

No better evidence of the influence of Moody's career could be given than the change of attitude toward him on

the part of the ministerial profession. When he began his work with his co-laborer, Sankey, he was severely censured by the ministry generally, and his critics were the best and most successful pastors of all denominations. Moody's methods and the Sankey hymns were both denounced from the pulpit. To-day, whatever views men may have as to ordination as a prerequisite to preaching, Moody is looked upon somehow, as an exception to the rule, while his evangelistic methods, and especially the use of the Gospel in song have been almost universally adopted.

Of the success of Moody's work as a preacher of the Gospel unto salvation, much might be written. In New York, in Philadelphia, and in almost all the large cities of America, thousands of souls were brought into communion with the Church of Christ and have been accounted ever since among her most useful members. In England and in Scotland there was at first the same opposition and condemnation. And then all at once such great cities as Glasgow were swept by a rising tide of revival and conversion such as this generation had not seen, nor the world since the days of Whitfield and the Wesleys.

With this work of evangelization there followed a wise and conservative pressing into service the great undeveloped power of the laity. The word is used for convenience though the idea is unscriptural, logically and etymologically. Men of means gave their wealth to the enterprises of the Church as never before. Men of culture and talents spent their time and energies in Sunday schools and Missions, working among the lowest substratum of society. The Young Men's Christian Association with all that it has accomplished in the rescue and development of young men, owed more to Moody and his influence than to any one factor in its remarkable growth. The whole awakening of the Church to the use of its lay members in Christian service, in personal work, was due to Moody. And when we consider that this mighty achievement could hardly have been accomplished, so dead was the Church to its own interests, unless some lay worker had himself blazed the



way by successful labors, the Church is perhaps more to be blamed than Moody was for the fact that he did not seek a formal ordination to the Gospel ministry.

But the Spirit so abundantly blessed his labors that the world was made to recognize once more that the essential thing after all is the power of the Spirit, and that all other things, however important in themselves, are valueless without that power.

Another great result of Moody's work was the breaking down of denominationalism in its extreme manifestation. We could have wished that Moody had been a Presbyterian minister. He was a thorough Calvinist. He relied on the Presbyterian Church for the greatest part of the means which he used in the carrying out of his plans and of the men that were engaged in the service of the institutions which he founded. Yet we cannot help seeing that in the same proportion that our Church would have gained others would have lost because he represented one set of denominational ideas. It might not be so to-day. Indeed we have an example to the contrary in the work of the Christian Endeavor Society, founded by Dr. Francis Clark, a Congregational minister. But that came after the different churches had been fused together as to their common interests by the great union meetings which Moody and his co-laborers, held. The union of the churches on interdenominational lines with all the grand results accomplished by such union, is one of the fruits of Moody's work.

Much also he accomplished, especially in New England, in the way of overthrowing the forces of Unitarianism and infidelity, and that by the preaching of the simple Gospel and the example of a spiritual life. In Northfield itself, even among the members of his own family, this valuable work was done. People said, "Mr. Moody has something that we have not and something that we want." And so to these hungering souls he was the means of bringing the Bread of Life. No account of his work is complete without a mention of what he accomplished in this direction.

His later years were less given to evangelistic effort and

more occupied with deepening and enlarging the spiritual life of Christians. But while he undoubtedly lent his influence too much to the Pietism of the Keswick school, yet the man himself was above all the distinctions of creeds. With perfect simplicity he professed to be unable to understand fine distinctions and so it happened that his name was never involved in partisan controversy. He preached only the truths that he was certain of and they were the fundamentals of the Gospel upon which all true Christians could agree. He was a great preacher, and none will ever know how great who have not heard him. He was generally a disappointment to Southern audiences, but he had not learned to adapt himself to the people here as he had in the North and West. But his sermons were effective everywhere.

And now the great heart is still and the eloquent tongue is silent. His institutional work at Northfield and at Chicago will scarcely survive him long. His greatest service has been to the Church in bringing thousands of souls within its pale and in teaching it the great lessons of Christian unity and unprofessional service. That work can never die. God gave him many souls for his hire. The Spirit blessed his labors abundantly and the Church in America and England will long feel the impulse of his holy zeal.

His last moments were full of peace and comparatively free from pain. His last words were about his work. He had been a faithful servant and his reward is great.

---

Rev. Maltbie J. Babcock, D. D., goes to the Brick Church, New York City, succeeding Rev. Henry Van-Dyke, D. D., who takes the professorship of English Literature in Princeton University. Rev. George T. Purves, D. D., professor in Princeton Seminary, and pastor of the First Church, Princeton, takes the Fifth Avenue pastorate. Rev. Donald Guthrie, D. D., of the Second Church, Richmond, goes to the First Church, Baltimore.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

HONEY FROM MANY HIVES.—Gathered by Rev. James Mudge, D. D.  
New York: Eaton & Maine; Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings. 12 mo.  
Pp. 331. \$1.00.

This book has no scientific value whatever. It was prepared for the closet, not for the study. It is designed to stimulate meditation, and so to quicken religious feeling. There is nothing original in the book; it is simply a compilation from other authors—"the cream of many centuries"; the "honey from many hives." The quotations are from Kempi's Imitation of Christ; Rodriguez's Christian Perfection; from the writings of Francis of Sales; from Jeremy Taylor's Holy Living and Dying; from Fenelon, Faber, Upham, and Goulburn. The book is prettily prepared by the publishers, and would make a neat gift-book to one in whose devotional growth you had peculiar interest.

THEIR SHADOWS BEFORE.—A Story of the Southampton Insurrection, by Pauline Carrington Bouve. Pp. 202. Price \$1.20. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston.

WHITE AND BLACK UNDER THE OLD REGIME.—By Victoria V. Clayton. Pp. 195. The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee.

JOHN BROWN.—By J. E. Chamberlain. Pp. 134. Price 75c. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston.

THE PHILADELPHIA NEGRO.—A Social Study. By W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, Ph. D. Pp. 520. Price \$2.50. Grim & Co., Boston.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO.—By Booker T. Washington. Pp. 244. Price \$1.50. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston.

These five volumes, whose names are given above, present us not only with different phases of the Negro's life in America, but also with the different views entertained by those living among them and those to whom distance has lent enchantment. "Their Shadows Before," is, as its title would indicate, a story of the times in Virginia when the Southampton Insurrection casts the shadow of an awful fear over the entire slaveholding section.

The heroine is the precocious daughter of a Virginian planter who early develops abolition tendencies, and who becomes in some way connected with Nat Turner, the insane head of the insurrection.

A tutor from Boston appears on the scene and together with the heroine carries off the honors of the occasion, and the tutor actually carries off the heroine herself.

The story is a very sweet one, and barring its decided New England idea of slavery, it is a book to have in one's library. We do not wish to be understood as saying that the book is one-sided, for it is not. On the other hand it is remarkably fair to the South, in fact far more so than we could expect.

The idea that runs through the book is that the Southampton insurrection was the shadow of the great Civil War.

The next book on our list is the "White and Black Under the Old Regime." This is a simple story of a Southern woman who, living in her old age in the North, writes for her children and friends a faithful account of plantation life in Alabama. The writer makes no pretensions to literary merit, but simply tries to give her Northern friends a true picture of life before the war.

Those of our readers who are old enough to recall those happy days will at once recognize the truth of the picture, while the Northern reader must be impressed with the truth of what has often been asserted that the hardest working slave on any plantation was the mistress of the house.

Such books by their tone of evident sincerity ought to do much to set the South right before men, especially when they are published and read through the North.

If coming events do indeed cast their shadows before, then John Brown, as set forth in this Life by Mr. Chamberlin, was really the substance of which Nat Turner was the shadow. This Life is a short one yet it gives in a graphic way the leading incidents of this man who has been more abused than any living man.

The author is the son of an abolitionist, with all the New England antagonism to slavery, yet we must confess that in the main it is an impartial story, which recognizes the weakness of Brown as well as his conscientious devotion to the cause that he thought right.

We of the South have been accustomed to regard Brown as a fiend in human shape, while they of the North have canonized him as a saint.

The truth of the matter is that Brown was neither—but only a man, such as the world has more than once furnished, who inheriting intense convictions upon moral subjects, became warped in his moral nature and finally arrived at that condition in which he could see only one side of the question.

If man be the creature of his surroundings as well as the product of heredity, then Brown was bound to be what he was.

The long lines of Puritan ancestors inclined him to espouse the cause of those who seemed to be oppressed and this inclination was directed and further strengthened by his early surroundings and associates, the abolitionists of that period.

His sojourn in Kansas amid the bloodshed of that country, in which he himself took no small part, even to murdering men in cold blood and stealing mules and cattle, all under the conviction that he was doing the Lord's work, and upon which bloody deeds he always asked the Lord's blessing, prepared him for the final act in the drama when under the shadow of the mountains at Harper's Ferry he tried to inaugurate a movement which, if successful, would have been the most awful in the history of modern times. Condemn the deed we must, for it could have no palliation, yet we cannot withhold our admiration of the man who

faced death calmly, and when cut and battered, lying on a pallet, still was calm and clear in his answers to the court, and bravely faced death on the scaffold, confident in the belief that his death would do for the slave what his life had failed to accomplish. Governor Wise said of him, "They are mistaken who take Brown to be a madman. He is a bundle of the best nerves I ever saw, cut and thrust and bleeding and in bonds. He is a man of clear head, of courage, fortitude and simple ingenuousness. He is cool, collected, and indomitable."

First the shadow, then the substance, and then the awful struggle that it inaugurated. The Blacks were freed, given all the rights and privileges of the highest citizen of the land, but still the Black does not come up to the expectation of his friends.

In the volume issued by the University of Pennsylvania, "The Philadelphia Negro," we have the result of freedom, not only from 1863, but from the time when fugitive slaves were harbored and protected by the pious Quakers. The book and study is an exhaustive one, over 500 pages of solid matter, giving the results of the most systematic and thorough analysis of the man in black that has ever been made.

We have statistics and comparisons, confession and repentance, eulogy and blame, but after all the picture is a sad one and through it runs a note of hopelessness.

Here in the City of Brotherly Love, among a Negro-loving people, whose ancestors spent fortunes in protecting those who fled and encouraging others to flee, the colored brother has made a failure in proving the truth of these words of Emerson, delivered in 1844 at the anniversary of the emancipation of the Negroes of the British West Indies. "I esteem the occasion of this jubilee to be the proud discovery that the black race can contend with the white; that, in the great anthem which we call history, a piece of many parts and vast compass, after playing a long time a very low and subdued accompaniment, they perceive the time arrived when they can strike in with effect, and take a master's part in the music. The civility of the world has reached that pitch that their more than moral genius is becoming indispensable, and the quality of this race is to be honored for itself."

Place these words of prophecy besides the result of this study in black, and you will at once see that even a philosopher, when he turns prophet, may sometimes be a fool. In view of Emerson's prophecy and the Northern professions of love for the Negro, the following conclusion of the author of this Study of the Philadelphia Negro is rather refreshing to Southern ears: "It is a paradox of the times that young men and women from some of the best Negro families of the city—families born and reared here and schooled in the best traditions of this municipality—have actually had to go to the South to get work, if they wished to be aught but chambermaids and bootblacks."

The last book before us for examination marks the last and most hopeful phase of the Negro question. "The Future of the American

Negro," by Booker Washington, is marked by the common sense of the author, who has in his own life given a practical illustration of what the American Negro can be, if he will only eschew politics and the fine arts and give himself wholly to industrial pursuits.

Booker Washington is not only an illustration of what the Negro can and may be, but he is a living refutation of all the charges made against the Southern people that they were too blinded by prejudice to give the Negro a fair chance. Here is a man who is a Republican in politics, who is honored everywhere in the South, and who has the respect and confidence of Democratic governors and legislators.

He believes that the Negro's future lies along skilled industrial lines, and that as soon as he acquires property he will also acquire the respect of his white neighbors.

It is a long stretch of time between Nat Turner and Booker Washington, but the difference in time is no greater than the difference between the half-insane slave and the colored gentleman of education and refinement and sanctified common sense.

We of the South love the Negro race, and it is our prayer that the coming generations may be modeled after the latter.

J. R. BRIDGES.

**BLACK ROCK.**—A Tale of the Selkirks. By Ralph Connor, with an Introduction by Prof. George Adam Smith, LL. D. Pp. 327. Price \$1.25.

**THE SKY PILOT.**—A Tale of the foothills. By Ralph Connor. Pp. 300. Price \$1.50. Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago.

The identity of Ralph Connor has not yet been revealed, but the literary world, both secular and religious, has realized that a new star has arisen in its horizon. The field is an entirely new one, that of the vast West with its rough miners, cowboys, lumbermen and saloon-keepers, among whom the home missionary moves as a messenger from another world.

These two stories are in some respects alike, the power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as preached and practiced by one of his devoted followers, in changing wild men into heirs of grace, and in bringing comfort and joy to stricken hearts; yet in other respects they are entirely unlike. Black Rock is the story of a lumber camp and mining town, situated in British America, where lust and drunkenness reign supreme, where men are fast being changed into brutes, and into which there comes a strong, sturdy young Presbyterian, who by his manliness and courage wins the hearts of one after another, till there is effected a transformation that is wonderful. There is a pathos and humor running through the book that is real and bears the trade-mark of the cowboy's camp. The humor could never be manufactured, but was born around the campfire, with the stars gleaming in the clear sky overhead.

The Sky Pilot is a story of the Foothills of our own West. The name is given in derision to a frail young Home missionary who, as the rough cowboys had said, had come to pilot them to heaven. He gradually wins

his way into their affections, and when he dies, they assemble from every quarter to do honor to his memory.

The following extract can only be fully appreciated by those who have mingled with the cowboys, yet even the uninitiated must recognize the peculiar talent that can picture such a scene.

Bill, the bronco-buster and a leader among the cowboys, had become a strong friend of the Pilot, and one night, when a quiet mood had fallen upon the camp, Bill broke the silence.

"Say, Pilot, where was it that the little chap got mixed up into the riot?"

"Riot!" said the Pilot.

"Yes; you remember when he stood off the whole gang from the stairs?"

"Oh, yes; at Jerusalem."

"Yes, that is the spot. Perhaps you would read that to the boys. Good yarn. Little chap, you know, stood and told 'em they were all sorts of blanked thieves and cut-throats, and stood 'em all off. Played it alone, too."

Most of the boys failed to recognize the story in its new dress. There was much interest.

"Who was the duck? Who was the gang? What was the row about?"

The Pilot here'll tell you. If you'd kind o' give them a lead before you begin, they'd catch on to the yarn better." This last to the Pilot, who was preparing to read.

"Well, it was at Jerusalem," began the Pilot, when Bill interrupted:

"If I might remark, perhaps it might help the boys on to the trail mebbe, if you'd tell 'em how the little chap struck his new gait." So he designated the Apostle's conversion.

Then the Pilot introduced the Apostle with some formality to the company, describing with such vivid touches his life and early training, his sudden wrench from all he held dear, under the stress of a new conviction, his magnificent enthusiasm and courage, his tenderness and patience, that I was surprised to find myself regarding him as a sort of hero, and the boys were all ready to back him against any odds.

As the Pilot read the story of the arrest at Jerusalem, stopping now and then to picture the scene, we saw it all and were in the thick of it.

The raging crowd hustling and beating the life out of the brave little man, the sudden thrust of the disciplined Roman guard through the mass, the rescue, the pause on the stairway, the calm face of the little hero beckoning for a hearing, the quieting of the frantic, frothing mob, the fearless speech—all passed before us. The boys were thrilled.

"Good stuff, eh?"

"Ain't he a daisy?"

"Daisy! He's a whole sunflower patch!"

"Yes," drawled Bill, highly appreciating their remarks of approval.

"That's what I call a partickler fine character of a man. There ain't no manner of insecs on to him."

The writer is not only a master of the humorous and pathetic, but he has the power of making the different scenes stand out vividly before you.

No description of a prize fight by the most talented writer of the Associated Press can surpass the account in *Black Rock* of the Gracure encounter with the burly saloon keeper, Slavin, and Rider Haggard himself can not surpass the description of the defence of the barricade when Gracure and Connor held back the drunken crowd.

Those who have ridden the broad prairies amid the flowers and sunshine of spring, who have gazed upon the purple mountain tops and breathed the pure air, who have stood in solemn awe in the beautiful canyons, will at once feel a tugging at their hearts to return to that free life, and to mingle with nature unadorned.

The old Adam is not only in us all in the form of original sin, but also in our love of the earth, and the next best thing to living such a life, is to see it through the eyes of Ralph Connor, the unknown author of these books.

We have not considered the exact theology of these books, whether the author did right in not consigning Bruce to the uncovenanted mercies of God, instead of landing him in heaven, for really we have never been able to sympathize with that critical dissection that can find something wrong even in the death of Dr. MacClure.

We always remember the thief on the cross, and if we were even confronted with a dying sinner such as Bruce, we feel that we would do as the Pilot did.

No man can tell how far down the love of Christ will reach, and until we do know, we prefer giving the sinner the benefit of the doubt.

J. R. BRIDGES.

THE MESSAGES OF THE BIBLE.—Edited by Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University, And Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University.

A new series in which emphasis is placed upon the concise, forcible and realistic interpretation of the Bible. The purpose of the series is to enable any reader of the Bible to understand its meaning as a reverent scholar of to-day does and in particular to receive the exact impression which the words as originally heard or read must have made upon those for whom they were delivered. This series is not a substitute for the Bible but an aid to the reverent, appreciative and enthusiastic reading of the Scriptures, in fact it will serve the purpose of an original and popular commentary on the Bible. Arrangement of volumes.

I. The Messages of the Earlier Prophets. II. The Messages of the



Later Prophets. By Profs. Sanders and Kent. (Now ready.) III. The Messages of the Law Givers. By Prof. C. F. Kent. IV. The Messages of the Prophetical and Priestly Historians. V. The Messages of the Psalmists. VI. The Messages of the Sages. VII. The Messages of the Dramatic Poets. VIII. The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers. IX. The Messages of Jesus according to the Synoptists. By Prof. Thomas C. Hall, D. D. X. The Message of Jesus according to John. XI. The Message of Paul. By Prof. George B. Stevens, D. D. (Ready December. XII. The Messages of the Apostles. By Prof. George B. Stevens, D. D.

The first volume of this series, *The Messages of the Earlier Prophets*, is before us as we write. It consists of a paraphrase of the Prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah and Habakkuk. To the whole is prefixed an introduction treating of Hebrew Prophecy in general, and there is also a brief special introduction to each of the prophets whose books are paraphrased.

I. The first thing that strikes us about the volume before us, is that it is the joint production of Messrs. Sanders and Kent, professors in Yale and Brown Universities, respectively. Now we are far from saying, "Can any good thing come out of New England?" At the same time it is rarely possible for a man—and least of all a professor in a New England University—to escape the influences of his environment. And we are pretty sure that such an environment as besets Messrs. Sanders and Kent calls for scholarship "up-to-date." We have also a strong impression that in their latitude nothing could be considered up-to-date scholarship which does not accept most of the dicta of the Radical Criticism. This impression is greatly strengthened by what we already know of these gentlemen themselves. Prof. Kent is known to fame as the author of *Kent's History of the Hebrew People*, and its companion volume, *A History of the Jewish People*; in which the entire Old Testament history is taken to pieces and put together again, according to the latest methods imported from England, Scotland and the Continent of Europe. Prof. Sanders also is fast achieving a reputation by his conduct of that department in the *Sunday School Times* known as the Senior Bible Class; in which, by the use of suggestive questionings and skillfully framed innuendoes, he finds a wide open door for the dissemination of the latest critical views. This strong impression from what we already know of our authors' critical bias, deepens into certainty, when we turn to the last pages of the book before us. In the appendix to *The Messages of the Earlier Prophets*, we find ourselves referred to such books as Prof. George Adam Smith's, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*—"the best aid to the interpretation of the Minor Prophets to be purchased in English;" "The excellent commentary" of Prof. Driver on Joel and Amos; "The most available commentary on Hosea and Micah," by Prof. T. K.

Cheyne in the Cambridge Bible series; "The admirable commentary written for that same series by Prof. A. B. Davidson on Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah." Under the light thus thrown backwards on the whole book from the appendix, we have suggested a documentary hypothesis of our own, in which Profs. Driver, Cheyne, G. Adam Smith, figure as the original sources, Messrs. Sanders and Kent as editors or redactors, and The Messages of the Earlier Prophets and other books of the forthcoming series appear as a polychrome product.

And so, from what we know of the authors of this book, and from a careful examination of the book itself, we feel safe in saying that here is one of the many industrious efforts made by the school of Radical Critics to foist their wares upon a Christian public. And we give a cheerful advertisement to the entire series of which this is the initial volume, as an illustrious exposition of the principles of the Destructive Criticism.

2. Turning from the authors to examine more closely their handiwork, we note that this is not a commentary or an exposition, but a paraphrase.

Why our authors have put their "original and popular commentary on the Bible" into this shape, we will let them tell us in their own words.

In their introduction pp. 16-17, they say: "A paraphrase is a re-statement of a passage in literature which gives the exact sense of the original, in other words, for the sake of making it clearly understood. To one who desires to grasp with clearness the thought of these books of the Bible, and lacks the time or training or tools for making a painstaking study of each, a paraphrase may be invaluable. The prophetic books are obscure for a variety of reasons. The reader who takes up the Bible and turns to the Book of Isaiah, cannot easily put himself into the situation which occasioned the message he may begin to read. In the absence of this historical context, however, the passage will probably fail to awaken his interest, or to suggest a distinctive and helpful idea. . . . The terse and technical language of the prophet is another cause for obscurity. The Old Testament makes free use of a vocabulary which requires explanation to one not accustomed to it. . . . A third source of obscurity is the necessity for the rearrangement of prophetic passages before a student can perceive the true connection and sequence of ideas. Without this perception no comprehension of the constructive thought of the prophet is attainable. . . . For all these reasons a paraphrase may be of supreme service as an introduction to the study of prophecy.

Granted that these points as to the obscurity of the prophetic writings are well taken, and that they render necessary such "aids to the reverent, appreciative and enthusiastic reading of the Scriptures" as only devout scholarship can furnish, the question still remains as to whether such aid should take the form offered us in the Messages of the Bible series. Let the task our authors have set before themselves be clearly understood. They have undertaken, not to retranslate or go give a new exposition of

the books of the Bible, but to rewrite them. It is true that we are naively assured that we have here not a substitute for the Bible, only an aid to the appreciative study of it; but it is also true that when we come to examine the book before us, what we find is, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah and Habakkuk, rewritten by Frank Knight Sanders and Charles Foster Kent.

These prophetic writings have been decomposed according to the principles of literary analysis already applied by one of our authors to the historical books; they have been recomposed in the light of their supposed historical setting, and in language untrammelled by the traditional dogmas of inerrancy and verbal inspiration. The result is not what the prophets did write, but what they would have written had they possessed the clear insight into their own historical surroundings, and the advanced ethical and intellectual development enjoyed by the two New England Professors who have undertaken to do their work over again. Does any one stagger at the boldness of such a proceeding? Well why not? Why should not the prophetic writings and all the Old Testament Scriptures be revised and rewritten by modern scholarship if in their present shape they are the work of post-Exilic editors and redactors? The idea that direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost gave finality to the canon of Scripture being brushed aside as a piece of antiquated traditionalism, then why should it not be reserved for the "reverent scholarship" of our time to give the Bible its final and most perfect form? If we were to suggest that this modest hope animated the authors of *The Messages of the Early Prophets*, we would probably be doing them an injustice. It may be that what we have said will apply better to a still more radical development of higher critical principles which is yet to come, rather than to the book before us. This much is true, however, that such a design is thoroughly in keeping with the critical school to which our authors have allied themselves, and harmonizes with the plan upon which their present work proceeds.

But we have another objection which lies partly against the form of this book, and partly against the doctrinal views of the authors of it. We are sure that any devout reader of the Scriptures who goes over these paraphrases will find them strangely lacking in that spiritual element which constitutes the chief value of any part of God's Word. It goes without saying that this element is what makes the Bible the book for all mankind, of every race and every age. Now the professed object of the book before us is to bring out the messages of the prophets to the people of their own race. "The prophet was a preacher to his generation. Nearly every word that he uttered had a practical relation to the life of his day." Introduction, p. 15. This is true, but it is by no means all the truth. That which distinguishes the discourses of Isaiah and Jeremiah from Demosthenes on the Crown, or Cicero against Verres, is that the words of the Hebrew prophets are a divine message which comes home to the hearts of men just as directly in A. D. 1900, as in 709 or 600 B. C.

As we have intimated, it is the absence of this universal element which strikes us in the work we are criticizing. In these paraphrases the predictive element is minimized, the Messianic element is reduced to the vanishing point. Isaiah, in the hands of Messrs. Sanders and Kent, is "the grand old Gospel prophet," no more. We make a fruitless search for the things which "Esaias said, when he saw his glory and spake of him." And what is true of Isaiah is true of each of the prophets paraphrased. In vain do we strain our ears for the "exceeding great and precious promises," which have been familiar to us since childhood. We look to little purpose for the things "written aforetime for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of Scriptures might have hope." The work before us may have some literary and historical features; it certainly cannot be commended as "profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." How much of this capital defect is due to the shape in which this work is cast; it may be hard to determine. Some of the most precious elements of Scripture truth are inseparable from the form of expression in which they are clothed. Change that expression and the truth itself is eliminated, or at least obscured. In a paraphrase, therefore, where the professed object is to give the meaning in other words than those used in the original, all truths inseparably connected with the wording of the original must of necessity disappear. More than this, the writer of a paraphrase may introduce into it just as much or as little of the sense of the original as accords with the purpose he has in view. Supposing that he is a man of latitudinarian views paraphrasing the books of Scripture, the result is likely to be just what we find in *The Messages of the Earlier Prophets*, and what we expect to see in succeeding numbers of the forthcoming series.

3. We have left ourselves little space to remark on this series as a whole. But what we have said of the initial volume will doubtless apply throughout. *Ex uno disce omnes*. The tactics of the advance guard, will no doubt characterize the main army. Whatever else our friends, the Radical Critics, may lack, they are not deficient in the art of war. Their plan of campaign in the present instance may be seen at a glance, if the reader will look once more at the prospectus which forms the starting point for this article. *Divide et impera!* The inspired Word of God is to be divided into *The Messages of the Prophets*, *The Messages of the Law-givers*, *The Messages of the Dramatic Poets*, *The Messages of Christ*, *The Messages of Paul*—and so on. When God's Word has thus been split into these twelve human fragments, and put together again by the hands of American University professors, what will we have?

Greenville, Va.

R. A. LAPSLEY.

#### FISKE'S DUTCH AND QUAKER COLONIES.

[\* *The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*. By John Fiske: In two Volumes. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1899.]

In reading these charming volumes one is struck by three things at

once—Mr. Fiske's personality, the new way of writing history, and, looking at the contents, the success the Anglo-Saxons have had in reaping where they have not sown.

The president of the Massachusetts Historical Society in a recent address declared that Macaulay is only a raconteur, although the chief of raconteurs. Parkman doubtless pushes him hard, in his peculiar field. The lamented Winsor, with his enormous learning, heavy sentences, but illuminating views, ranks in a different, perhaps a special, class. Mr. C. F. Adams, however, tells us that Thucydides, Tacitus and Gibbon are still the great historians of the world. It may be so. Where his friend Mr. Fiske may rank, Mr. Adams does not indicate, but we venture to say that it is more in Macaulay's class than Gibbon's. Mr. Fiske shows his personality in his histories. A delightful personality it is, to be sure. If there is a chance to banter a local historian for claiming too much, or a tribute to be paid such men as Washington Irving or some very human incident to record or side light to be furnished; it is all there, in the right place, and in the happiest vein. He lets us know by an occasional "I" who is writing the book, but he never recalls the old story on Dr. McCosh (itself of course an exaggeration) that the printers were delayed on getting out the "Institutions" from having to wait for extra fonts of that capital. One is sure that to know John Fiske is to love him. But then, why in reading history should we love any one but its own heroes? History is impersonal. When the author's style is suggestive more of the essayist than of the historian, does not the muse become a little gossippy?

And yet he is a master of the new method of historical writing. It has become recognized that the field is too vast for any one to study everything. In special or local history it is still possible to discover and exploit new sources. But historical societies and local students pretty well exhaust these fields. A general historian, whether of a country, epoch or institution, works largely at second hand, combining in new lights or in new generalizations facts already brought out by others. Mr. Fiske does this. He leaves annals for the local historian. He gives us, it is true, dates and individual facts; but they are incidental. What we notice especially and remember best are his sketches of the rise of the Netherlands, of the great Dutch commerce that made a passage to India necessary and thus stumbled on the discovery of Hudson river, of the way the Iroquois became friends of the Dutch rather than of the French, the growth of English emigration, Puritan or Quaker, because of its insular origin, and the contrasting story of the stagnation of the Dutch colonies after the Thirty Years' War and contests with Louis XIV had absorbed the energies of the home government in European struggles which might threaten its existence. American history is not regarded either as a branch of European politics, or as an independent development of white communities conquering savages and a wilderness. Both views have been maintained, and both have elements of truth. But the

Ohio statesman who asked "what have we to do with abroad" would have been laughed off the platform by Mr. Fiske. No one has a clearer conception that the American commonwealth originated more like limbs of a European banyan tree, stooping to take root, than like the winged elm seed, wind-borne far from its old home. We Americans have our own field and function, but we are yet members of the great family of nations. And so were we always. At first it was as children of that family, and during our first century we passed through that stage of rudeness and self-assertiveness not uncommon in youth. But we now better realize that we are parts of a common whole, and that whole the world.

And this book helps us see this. It is an important link in the series by which Mr. Fiske shows how Great Britain made this part of the world her own. Logically first comes, of course, his "Discovery of America," and then the volumes he only lately published on "Old Virginia and her Neighbors," showing the first English settlement, becoming effective at Jamestown in 1607, and developing in about a century into Maryland, the Carolinas and Georgia also. Next belongs the "Beginnings of New England," dear to every descendant from the Pilgrims of 1620, and important in every way. But between the Old Dominion and New England the Dutch settled four years after 1609, that eventful year when Hudson explored the river that bears his name, when Champlain's defeat of the Iroquois attached his name to his lake, the year, too, when John Smith bought the site of historic Richmond. The Dutch on Manhattan never flourished, but one of the great cities of the world still looks back with fondness to its Knickerbocker times. Government by an absolute Director for a trading company was not a happy condition, and the perfidious seizures fifty years later even by Charles II. was not a bad change. The place was recaptured by the Dutch, it is true, but from 1667 has been English, or, rather, cosmopolitan. The origin of many places and names local to New York, but familiar to us all, is given, and with Stuyvesant, Van Twiller and the patroons we become almost as much at home as in Irving's less veracious pages. Among other things we learn that both the famous order of the Golden Fleece and the woosack of the Lord Chancellor come from the Anglo-Netherland trade in wool, that worsted was named from a Norfolk town, and that Wycif's stronghold was in the eastern counties among the weavers; that in the time of Henry VIII. civilization was further advanced in the Low Countries than in France or England; that the growth of the Low Countries dates largely from the decline of Venice and Genoa in the 16 century, when the Turks had closed up the Mediterranean routes of Asiatic trade; that the English and Dutch East India companies, with their far-reaching influence were founded but two years apart, in 1600 and 1602; that the Dutch introduced tea and coffee into Europe from China and Arabia, and soon cultivated these plants in Formosa and Java and established their own varieties; that the French in 1540 were the first to build a fort where Albany now stands; that the versatile John Smith saved Virginia, named New England, and

gave Hudson the information which led to the settlement of the Dutch at Manhattan; that it is incorrect to write New Netherland as plural and that the Dutch official is a "stadholder," without the "t" generally inserted in the first syllable; that the Dutch built a Fort Nassau opposite the site where was to be Philadelphia and Fort Good Hope where Hartford now stands; that Manhattan (of twenty-two thousand acres) was bought for the equivalent of one hundred and twenty dollars (sixty guilders) in beads and ribbons, and that the name of its tribe denotes "islanders;" that Bowery means a farm, of which the Dutch had many on the island; that the patroons date from the company's charter of Privileges and Exemptions in 1629, granting immense estates to those bringing fifty agriculturists,—somewhat like the French and Spanish grants in the Mobile and New Orleans colonies; that two years later a great ship, the New Netherland, of eight hundred tons and thirty guns, was built at New Amsterdam; that Governor's Island is named for Van Twiller's little speculation in that real estate; that most every one could read and write in Manhattan, although it was not so in Holland; that Brooklyn is named for the pretty village of Breuckelen near Utrecht, and Yonkers from Jonkheer (young lord) Vander Donck, a would-be patroon; that when Bogardus preached against Kieft (misspelled Keift on p. 191) that governor had his soldiers beat drums at the door and five cannon at the fort, but without silencing the Dominie; that the Bayards are descendants of Stuyvesant's sister; that,—but we must not run the risk of violating the copyright of the book by giving too much of its contents.

England drove the Puritan to New England, the Catholic to Maryland, and the Quaker to Pennsylvania. The origin and growth of Penn's movement is told, and perhaps more fully, and the state of England at the time is vividly portrayed; but in some way New Amsterdam and its people attract one more. Perhaps it is because it is so different from what we see about us now. And Mr. Fiske promises us soon another link in his series, the French Colonies. This will bring us down to 1765 and mark the full absorption by the omniverous Anglo-Saxon of the Latin civilization also. But it will also bring us to the time when absorption gave way to development, when the Stamp Act pointed forward to the time covered by that other book of our author, "The Revolution." Mr. Fiske threatens to lay down his pen and leave us where national history begins. But is this fair? It is true that thence on we have many authors. The Rough Rider has given us the Winning of the West; Goldwin Smith, with the clear eye of an Englishman for faults of every country not his own, can compress the United States into one volume; Woodrow Wilson—our Tommy, of North Carolina and Princeton, too—has painted "Division and Reunion" with a master hand. And there are others, too, of note. But have we any other John Fiske?

Mobiie, Ala.

PETER J. HAMILTON.

SIN.—By Randolph S. Foster, D. D. LL. D. New York. Eaton & Mains, Cincinnati. Curts & Jennings. Cloth, 8vo. Pp. 308, \$3.00.

This is the sixth volume in the series of Studies in Theology now being issued by Bishop Foster of the Northern Methodist Church.

A glaring fault of this writer is his incorrigible conceit. He opens his section on Adam with a sweeping stupid fling at all "the most learned and able thinkers in the departments of philosophy and theology."

"The wild dream of Milton, has not simply furnished almost the entire staple of the popular superstition but also the substance of the grave teachings of the most eminent theologians. They have put forward the merest fables with assurance as well-established verities." P. 3.

The picture of Adam presented by this un-Miltonic Bishop is laughable.

Eden is a work-a-day, unparadisaical sort of a place, hunger and want struck Adam the first day he lived on the earth, he was able to know, but he had no knowledge whatever; had to find out the time to look for the sun, and when to look for its setting; the moon's coming and going; the seasons to plant and to harvest; the means of protection from the rigor of weather, heat and cold; the ores and metals, how to make tools and how to use them; what was good for food, and how to capture it and prepare it—everything; he would doubtless make mistakes; but this new created being, in matters of duty, had, as we have now, an ever-present inward and infallible monitor to guide him; this infallible creature, however, had neither holiness nor righteousness, but began his career a moral blank. P. 3-13.

Think of a naked fool suddenly dropped into this earth without a morsel of knowledge or an hour's experience! He would kill himself tasting foods to see if they were poison; he would freeze to death before he could find out what was the matter with him, or how to build a fire! This is the prosaic and un-Miltonic fool which God made out of the dust of the earth! And what is the animus of the un-Miltonic Bishop in thus dispelling from all historic theology the wild dream of Milton; To pave the way for a theological tenet of Modern Arminianism, that native depravity is misfortune, but not sin in the sense of blameworthiness. He is going to root the fall of the race in that un-Miltonic start which it had on the earth, and he is going to deliver to us the doctrine that original sin is simply an un-Miltonic state of nature, thoroughly prosaic and unpoetical, but certainly not culpable. He pulls down Eden to get a start and uproots Calvary to get a stop.

The un-Miltonic Bishop says a great many biting and bitter, and even smart things about those whom he does not like. But he poses as the only unpoetic and un-Miltonic theologian, and his opponents must expect plain and unpoetic language. He calls the God of the Pelagian a "toy," and the God of the Calvinist a "Moloch" the God of the one is a play-thing, and the God of the other is a monster; but his God is unpoetic and un-Miltonic.



In the administration of the Bishop's un-Miltonic God, what was the effect of Adam's sin upon himself? It was two-fold: (1) it made him guilty and exposed him to death; (2) it became the occasion of the withdrawal of the favour of God from him.—P. 236.

Then what was the effect of Adam's sin upon his posterity? They 'inherited his degenerate and corrupt nature—his tendency to evil; a tendency so deep and radical that it would, unhindered, inevitably carry us to utter death.' Would such a fate be just to posterity? The Bishop tells us that it is inhibited by both "justice and mercy. To counter-check this natural result from inherited depravity, God was in both justice and mercy compelled, either to prevent the reproduction of the race, or to provide universal redemption by the incarnation and death of his son. In this dilemma, in which the Deity was caught by his own arrangement, he chose the horn of providing universal redemption. In Jesus Christ, now our restoring head, the entire human race are born to a heritage of eternal life." This heritage is forfeitable and forfeited only "by personal transgression." P. 238.

"The entire race exist in Jesus Christ as a redeeming head; in no other way do or could they exist; and in him they must remain as redeemed until they take themselves personally out of his hands at the point where law meets them and personal disobedience severs them." P. 240.

So we see that Adam began his career with an undegraded and holy heart, and was damnable if he committed an act of personal disobedience; but Adam's children begin their careers with a congenital depravity, and are damnable if they commit a single act of disobedience. Their case is harder than his. How then has the redemption of Christ helped them? His atonement carried away the guilt of their depravity, according to the theory; but it did not carry away the power of their depravity. Where is the justice and mercy of the Bishop's un-Miltonic God, who takes away the guilt of death, but leaves Adam's posterity under the power of death?

How can justice and mercy be vindicated in leaving the heart of those who have been redeemed by Christ still depraved; a depravity which confessedly shuts from the "communion of God;" a depravity which carries in its train the manifold and multiform evils of this life; a depravity which, confessedly, carries in its bosom the power of eternal death, if unhindered?

The Bishop sees the difficulty; sees that, if Christ is a true restoring head of the race, he must not only take away the unjust and unmerciful guilt of Adam's sin, but he must also take away the unjust and the unmerciful depravity which Adam's act entailed upon his posterity. Guilt and depravity are the twin effects of sin; the Bishop's scheme attempts to remove the guilt of Adam's sin from his children, but confesses that it does not touch the depravity of that sin. Now he must show how God is just and merciful in leaving, to flow down to Adam's

children, one half of Adam's sin. The fall made the race both guilty and depraved; the atonement carried away just one-half of the effects of the fall, according to the un-Miltonic Bishop's own showing. He sees it, and confesses his failure at the end of the discussion.

"It is conceivable that we might incur even serious disadvantage, and real temporary harm, under a perfectly just and equitable system." Page 240.

Can a "just and equitable" government put its innocent subjects at a "disadvantage" so serious as that of an evil heart? Can such a government "harm" its innocent subjects? Finally, he says, "It may turn out, after all, that our loss is our gain." P. 242.

Throwing off "the wild dream of Milton" which has held dominion over the minds of his predecessors, the Bishop flounders until he lands square in the heart of a wild supposition: Maybe man's loss is his gain; maybe the loss of Eden is the gain of heaven; maybe the loss of life is the gain of life; maybe sin is a good and not an evil; maybe it was on the whole better that Adam fell; better that sin entered the world. Starting with the premise that original sin is not sin in any true and proper sense, he ends with the suggestion that it may be an unspeakable blessing.

R. A. WEBB.

ROYAL MANHOOD, by James I. Vance, D. D., author of "The Young Man Four Square," "Church Portals," "College of Apostles," &c. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago, New York, Toronto.

It will be noticed that the list of books, by which our author is pointed out, is growing long. On general principles, we are not disposed to encourage book-making. We could wish that much of the energy expended in that direction were diverted into other channels. The supply is already greater than the demand. Many books have appealed in vain for buyers and readers, and have lain on the shelf as a dead loss to publisher, or author. Many others have appealed successfully, that ought to have appealed in vain, for they have been worse than a dead loss to buyers and readers. Ordinarily if one should ask our advice as to whether or not he should write a book, we should unhesitatingly say, "Don't, if you can possibly help it. Spare the public. Deny yourself for the general good." But we would make exceptions. Precious little of the gray matter of the brain that ripens in the South is being embalmed in books. We know little of our fathers except from oral tradition. Our children will know little of us. It is a grief to us that the world at large hardly takes account of the South. There is an impression that we have not yet reached that stage of culture which expresses itself in the creation of a literature. We have a slowly growing number of essayists who are admitted to the standard magazines; a few writers of popular fiction; here and there one who can command attention by his pen, in the journals of the learned professions; and at long intervals a poet whose sweet, but variable and uncertain note, reaches to quite a distance. We hail with sincere pleasure and sectional pride every good

book born of Southern brain and heart. We hail with even greater pleasure, and with both sectional and denominational pride, every good book with the name of a Southern preacher on the fly-leaf. This peculiar pleasure comes to us but rarely. We feel like thanking Dr. Vance for adding to his lengthening list. We are glad that he is both seeking and finding a larger audience through such use of the press.

The fruit of Dr. Vance's pen gets better as it gets riper. "Royal Mauhood" is a thoroughly wholesome book, glowing with moral earnestness and glittering with bright epigrams. Its ideal of manhood is high, its tone manly, its style animated and trenchant. It crowns its ideal with all the sweet and beneficent graces of religion, but paints into the picture, in clear and deep colors, every natural virtue that goes to the make-up of a well rounded, rugged and robust character. There is no suggestion that piety is wedded to paleness, or saintliness to softness. Health of body, vigor of intellect and force of will are the essential substratum on which to rear a manhood that will command our highest admiration. The ideal is true Christian manhood at its best, strong of limb, clean of life, tender of heart, dauntless of courage, and inflexible of purpose. The book, with logical and steady movement, leads onward to Christ in its last chapter, in whom it finds embodied in perfect measure all manly excellencies. "Just Christ, only Christ, on to Christ, up to Christ, must ever be to royal manhood creed and ritual, goal and glory."

The book has twenty chapters, ranging in length from nine to nineteen pages. Each chapter is headed by a striking motto. These mottoes are for the most part new, and are evidently of the author's own finding. These, as well as many happily chosen illustrations, intimate that Dr. Vance spends his leisure time in the company of the best writers and knows how to make their company profitable. He brings away from these delightful interviews rich souvenirs, and displays rare skill in using these to adorn his own work.

The chapters are not sermonic in form, and yet one gets the impression that the bulk of the matter has been made to do duty in the pulpit. The style is oratorical. The words were chosen and the sentences framed for the purpose of storming "Mansoul" through "Eargate." Dr. Vance has a rare talent for handling language, but his main business is to use it as an instrument of the tongue, rather than the pen, and he is not careful to note that there should be a difference. Hence, while his book is none the less readable on this account, yet it indulges in a little larger liberality of mellifluous adjectives and ornate phrasing than comports with the best written style. One is charmed with high-sounding epithets and musical periods when these come flowing from the orator's lips, suffused with the warmth of deep feeling, but when they are put in cold type and we sit down to read them, they seem to be a little strained and overwrought. We think the author would do well to tone down the coloring slightly, and subdue the tumultuous current to a more placid

flow. This is meant for suggestion rather than criticism. We feel constrained to go a little further and express positive censure on one feature of the style. Dr. Vance allows himself occasionally to fall into a vein of slap-dash badgering that trenches hard on the verge of ribaldry.

Perhaps it is worth while to make my meaning plain by quoting a paragraph in point from page twenty-eight: "Where in all the sweep of freaks and failures, of mawkish sentiments, and senseless blather, can there be found an object to excite deeper disgust than one of these thin, vapid, affected, dwindling little doodles, dressed up in men's clothes, but without a thimbleful of brains in his pate, or an ounce of manhood in his anatomy? He is worse than weak; he is a weaklet. What can he do? He can squeak with his little voice, strut with his unathletic members, and gabble diluted twaddle. He can sigh and pose and outclass the monkey in his apish arts. This specimen of man tells us that he is tired of life, but of work he can never grow tired, for to that he is a stranger. He resembles nothing so much as a jumping-jack, whose entire repertory of motion is limited to a few flops and straddles when the string is pulled." This is out of keeping with the dignified tone, and the earnest purpose which pervade the book as a whole. We also note the presence of one or two anecdotes that are not worthy their setting, nor do they deserve the distinguished honor of transmission to posterity. We feel the more free to note these blemishes, because the many and great merits of the book dwarf them into insignificance. We can commend the book most cordially to all classes of readers; and we are sure that no young man could read these stirring appeals to all that is best in his nature without having his soul lifted into grand resolves, and stimulated to noble endeavors.

R. C. REED.

HISTORY OF RELIGION.—A Sketch of Primitive Religious Beliefs and Practices, and of the Origin and Character of the Great Systems. By Allen Menzies, D. D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of St. Andrews. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world."—Acts xv:18. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 153-157 Fifth Avenue. 1897.

The Science of Religion, Dr. Menzies says, is new. It was first called Comparative Religion, and confined itself to the collection of materials and the specifying of the similarities and dissimilarities of the various faiths. It is now commonly recognized as having entered upon a new stage, and is known as the History of Religion, aiming at arranging the materials so as to show them in an organic connection. This latter is his conception of the science.

Dr. Menzies is an evolutionist and applies the principle to Religion; all the various forms of which he regards as essentially one, differing only in their degree of development. He defines Religion as "The worship of higher powers from a sense of need." This would exclude Buddhism, which does not worship any higher powers. There are three stages in the growth of Religion, according to our author: 1. The material needs are supreme; 2. The Nation's interests are paramount; 3. The

Individual realizes his own value and develops a personal ideal as his chief end. This last may also be called the Universal.

He outlines the history and conducts the discussion as follows: I. The Religion of the Early World; including the beginning of Religion and the earliest objects of worship, belief and practice. II. The Isolated National Religions; that is, those which have not influenced the general development of Religion; including the religions of Babylon and Assyria, of China and of Ancient Egypt. III. The Influential National Religions: The Semitic religions of Canaan, Phenicia, Israel and Islam; and the Aryan group, embracing the Teutonic, Grecian, Roman, Indian and Persian. IV. Christianity, the Universal Religion.

Only a few items of special interest can be noted. First, as to religion in general, Dr. Menzies holds that religion is an element of civilization, and that "the original religion of every country must have been a religion of savages;" moreover, that as to the "classes for whom the struggle against material hardships still continues, no lofty religion can be attained by them any more than by savage tribes." That is, Religion in itself and in its degree is a stage of spiritual development attained by every age, nation, family and individual for itself or for himself. It is clear that Menzies and Paul do not agree on this; for Paul teaches that by the grace of God he attained his religious development, that faith is the gift of God, that not the wise and noble but the poor of this world are chosen of God. Facts seem to confirm Paul's view, for piety prevails to-day rather in the humbler than the higher walks of life; and Christianity is adapted to babes, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

Again, Dr. Menzies denies that man was originally civilized and humane and fell from this primitive state; on the contrary, man was originally a savage. It is manifest that Dr. Menzies and the Old Testament are at variance on this point.

As to the Old Testament and Judaism, Dr. Menzies teaches that the several tribes and each family had their special gods; that Jehovah was probably the God of the most powerful tribe, was probably a nature-god, and was worshiped sometimes in the form of a serpent, and sometimes as a bull; that the sacrifices, including the passover, were meals at which Jehovah was believed to be present and to partake with the people; that we do not have the Old Testament as originally written; that Moses did not write the Pentateuch; that the Levitical code is post-exilian; that an unknown prophet wrote the latter part of Isaiah; that the Servant of Jehovah is not the Messiah but the inner Israel; that the religion of the Old Testament, outside of the teachings of the later prophets, is primitive and crude; that the later prophets first saw the true spiritual nature of religion; that the Israelites, when they entered Canaan, were, in civilization and religion, inferior to the inhabitants of the land; and that Old Testament Judaism at its best is henotheism;

that is, that Jehovah was only a national god, superior to the gods of the other nations.

As to Christianity Dr. Menzies holds that it is the highest development of religion, the outcome of its predecessors, and destined to become universal; that its chief points are: "Christianity is a religion of freedom, it is a system of inner inspiration more than of external law or system, it is embodied in the living person of its founder, in which alone it can be truly seen; and the founder is one who is living himself in the relation to God to which he calls men to come, and feels himself called and sent to be the Saviour of men;" that Christ saves as a teacher and example. In his discussion of Christianity, he ignores the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, the atonement and deity of Christ, regeneration, miracles, the Bible, the church, and the sacraments. Dr. Menzies is clearly a rationalist of the advanced school, and his position in the established Kirk shows the degree of toleration which it practices.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Washington and Lee University.

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 Carlyle's and others, while it will be invested with a charm unequalled by any of them.

MOSES DRURY HOGE: LIFE AND LETTERS. By his nephew, Peyton Harrison Hoge. Pp. 518. Price \$3.00. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

Whatever comes from the press of Whittet & Shepperson, and bears the imprimatur of our Committee of Publication, is always worthy of the highest praise as concerns the paper, type and binding, and this volume is no exception, unless we might object that the binding is rather too light for a volume of its size. The paper is clear and white, without that glaze that is so trying on weak eyes, and the type is large enough to make reading a pleasure. When, however, we turn from the mechanical part of the book to its matter, we feel keenly the task that is assigned us.

The author we have known and loved since early youth, and that affection would naturally bias our judgment. While the subject of this Life before us has been so entwined with our history and life that we cannot recall a time in the past when he was not in some way exerting an

influence over those dear to us. Among the colony that followed him in the organization of the Second Church, over which he presided for fifty-four years, was she who first taught these lips to pray and even in infancy dedicated this life to the ministry of our Lord. In early childhood, as we sat in the tall Gothic pews and solemnly watched that spare figure in the tall pulpit, he seemed a man like Saul, head and shoulders above other men, and as the years have rolled by since then, years of change of war and trouble, he has grown larger in our eyes, as his many-sided character unfolded itself to our maturing mind, till now, as we look at him through the long vista of past years, and then compare him the man so beautifully drawn by the loving hands of a nephew, we feel that, even allowing for that bias that love and association may give our judgment, he has not been overdrawn, simply because such a man is too great for human measurement, much less for human exaggeration. The author has allowed his subject, as far as possible, to relate his own life, and from his letters we get a view of his inner life, such as no biographer could give us.

Biographical writing is by no means easy. You are given, a great mass of letters, reminiscences, public addresses and newspaper clippings, and from them you are to write a sketch, orderly in the arrangement of facts and exact in the order of time.

Only a genius can avoid mistakes, and it is therefore no mean compliment to Dr. P. H. Hoge to say that he has performed his labor of love well, giving us a faithful picture of his uncle, yet at the same time he himself has stayed as far as possible in the background. The only exception that we would make to those words of commendation, and possibly many may object to the objection is the question of the good taste of a biographer in arguing in favor of a movement to which the Church at large is clearly opposed.

We refer to the argument on page 408 in favor of a liturgy, in which he argues from Dr. Hoge's preference for a moderate and flexible liturgy, and seeks to convince the Church that we ought to make use of such.

The author should have remembered that whatever Dr. Hoge's views on such subjects, he never publicly argued in favor of them, and that he would have been the last man to have sanctioned such an argument in his biography.

The day may come when the moderate liturgy and the gown may be in general use in the Church of our fathers, but we do not believe that this generation will see it.

Barring this question of taste, this biography is a charming one, and we need not look to the excellent pictures to see the "old man eloquent" as he used to charm our college days with his matchless wit and silvery voice, or when as a member of the Synod of Virginia we followed him in growing admiration as he led us along the paths of literature in his

famous impromptu address on Publication, or melted our hearts with the simple story of the Gospel.

We have read the book with the warmest interest, and we expect to read it often, for to us he was not only a friend, but almost a father, for he always followed his preacher boys, as he called us all, with the tender interest of a father, and often upon the floor of Synod he would proudly call the roll of young preachers his Church had sent out. When we think of his eloquent voice, his varied learning, his marvelous tact, his wide sympathy, his life so entwined with the history of Richmond and the Old South, that his Church was the more honored because of him, we wonder who will supply his place.

Yet the work is the Lord's, and he will furnish the workers.

J. R. BRIDGES.

---

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.—A Plea for Children and Other Helpless Sick. By Wm. A. Purrington, M. D. Pp. 194. Price \$1.00. E. B. Treat & Co., New York.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, OR THE FALSE CHRIST OF 1866.—By Wm. P. McCorkle, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Graham, N. C. Pp. 321. Price \$1.25. Presbyterian Committee, Richmond, Va.

These two books deal with this new science, falsely so called, from different points of view. One is from the pen of a physician, a lecturer in the University and Bellevue Hospital Medical College, while the other is from a Christian minister of our own denomination. One regards the new science as encroaching upon the province of his own profession, and which, if once established as true, is bound to destroy the noble profession of medicine, while the other regards it from the point of view of a Christian minister, who recognizes in it a deadly foe to religion and to the existence of a God.

Mr. Purrington deals with it in its legal aspects, and, while recognizing the danger to which adults are exposed from its spread he especially pleads for the children, who are so often its victims when they have no choice in the matter. He seems to imply that when a man or woman voluntarily puts himself into the power of such quacks, they deserve no sympathy from their fellows. But in the case of children it is different, and he pleads for some laws to protect them, and in doing so he deals some hard blows at the science.

The quotation from the Preface to *Miscellaneous Writings* by Mrs. Eddy, will give an idea of the thrusts. "Christian Science demonstrates that the patient who pays whatever he is able to pay for being healed, is more apt to recover than he who withholds a slight equivalent for health." One is reminded of those famous lines from John Gilpin :

"Though on pleasure he was bent,  
He had a frugal mind."

The work of Mr. McCorkle is one of far more scholarship and research, and it gives evidence that our ministers still find time for study.



We cannot speak in too high terms of the general make-up of the book. It bears upon the binding and every page evidence of the excellent work of our Committee.

The appearance of the book just now is timely, for this new science is creeping into our churches and undermining the faith of many. An elder of one of our vacant churches recently said that the session had a letter from one pastor in Georgia who wished to leave, as his church had been ruined by Christian Science.

When in these pages of Mr. McCorkle we read of the absurdities of Mrs. Eddy we may wonder where the danger is. Yet there are women and men in our churches to-day who are giving up gradually their faith in God's word as inspired, and are following after this new god.

We congratulate Mr. McCorkle upon his work, and congratulate the Southern Presbyterian Church upon having such scholarly men within its ranks.

---

#### A CONFEDERATE GENIUS.

There are three stages in the literature of the civil war.

The first is represented by the many books on both sides, issued soon after the conflict was over; books which, whether from Northern or Southern pen, were too strongly partisan to be valuable as history.

The second stage came when the narratives of various generals, Union and Confederate, appeared. These contributions, while being a decided advance in the display of a historical spirit, were nevertheless written too much from a personal point of view, the writer appearing too much as a special pleader.

The third stage is that of the present. We are now removed from the heat and passion of the conflict by the thirty odd years, and we can therefore weigh calmly the evidence of disputed questions.

To this third stage belongs the life of N. B. Forrest, whose publication has created some excitement and adverse criticism. The author is a busy physician, who with increased labor and no little skill, has sifted the official reports and gathered together the testimony of the survivors, and then with affectionate impartiality has woven them all into a story that will cause us of the East to wonder at our ignorance of this "Wizard of the West."

During the past summer the Southern reading public was surprised to find in Harper's Monthly a series of articles on General Forrest, that not only showed decided literary merit, but also presented this soldier of the "Lost Cause" in a new light, all of which causes some surprise, but the greatest surprise was in the fact that it was found in Harper's Monthly. These articles were very favorably commented upon and also endorsed by more than one Federal soldier.

Recently the book of which these chapters were merely advance-sheets, has appeared, and amid the generous praise that has greeted it, there has been one discordant note at least, from the Interior, a journal

widely taken in the South, but which now and then shows that in Chicago at least the war is not over. The writer, as we have said, is a busy physician in New York City, who spent the last two years of the war in an Alabama regiment which had once been under Forrest.

Hearing from these former soldiers of Forrest such marvelous reports of his exploits, he became interested in his life and has spent many years in collecting reliable data.

Every fact has been sifted and as far as possible has been verified either by the official report or by the testimony of some survivor. His faithful labors have not only presented us with a history that is a model of its kind and a monument of industry and research, but he has made out of it a story as thrilling as "The White Company" or "Ivanhoe."

We began the book with a desire to know something more about Forrest than our reading had given us, but as we read our interest deepened. The hours flew by unheeded, tasks important were neglected, and when the end was reached, we turned back to see if it were of some hero of romance we had been reading, rather than a matter-of-fact man of the 19th century.

His forceful personality, burning energy, uncontrollable temper, iron will, pure morality, tenderness for children and deference for women, together with unique military genius, formed a rare combination of striking contrasts, and stamped him in the opinion of Johnston and Sherman as one of the greatest soldiers of the civil war.

He is first introduced to us as the son of a blacksmith, living in a rude log cabin in Middle Tennessee, contending with poverty from the beginning, and at an early age, through the death of his father, having thrust upon him the care of his mother and children.

Dr. Palmer once said that no great man ever had a fool for a mother, and the truth of this saying is confirmed in the case of Forrest. His mother was a woman of strong will and remarkable determination, and she left the impress of her will power upon her son. As illustrating the character of this worthy woman, the following story is related :

After the death of her husband, the father of Nathan, she married again, and when the war broke out her eldest son by this second marriage was a young man of 18 years of age, living as a clerk in Memphis. Enlisting in one of the volunteer companies, he paid a visit home before marching to the war. When he appeared one night at his mother's home, arrayed in grey and gilt, the old lady, before retiring, ordered him to take a sack of corn to the mill in the early morning as he had been used to do. The next morning when he sent her word that if she wished her corn taken to the mill she must send a nigger, she arose in her wrath, dragged him from the bed, trimmed him down with peach switches, sent him off to mill and then quietly remarked as she resumed her task at the breakfast table, "as long as I live my children must obey me."

This scene comes up before the reader's eyes when later in the book

he reads that Forest caught a private fleeing from battle, panic stricken, and dragging him to the side of the road, he soundly thrashed him with a brush and then sent him back into battle, saying, "You may as well let the Yankees kill you, for if you come back here I will kill you." This incident found its way North, and one of their illustrated papers had a picture of the scene with the words, "General Forrest's way of administering discipline."

Such was the boyhood and ancestors of the man who, entering the army in 1861 as a private, rose to the rank of Lieutenant-General before it closed. He was utterly destitute of book learning and never mastered the intricacies of spelling, yet no man could dictate stronger and more beautiful addresses and official reports.

He had never read a book on military tactics, knew nothing of what other soldiers had done in similar instances, yet his native genius and sound military judgment enabled him not only to do the right thing but to do just what his opponent had no idea he would do.

Several years after the war General W. T. Sherman said, "After all I think Forrest was the most remarkable man our civil war produced on either side. In the first place he was uneducated, while Jackson and Sheridan and other brilliant leaders were soldiers by profession. He had never read a military book in his life, knew nothing about tactics, could not even drill a company, but he had a genius for strategy which was original and to me incomprehensible. There was no theory or art of war by which I could calculate with any degree of certainty what Forrest was up to. He seemed to know always what I was doing or intended to do, while I am free to confess I could never tell or form any satisfactory idea of what he was trying to accomplish."

As a fighter he believed in the use of the revolver rather than the sabre, and fought with his men dismounted oftener than in the saddle, and except in battles where he had a large force, engaged, he was always found in front, fighting hand to hand with the enemy. It is said that during the four years' fighting he had twenty-nine horses shot under him, and that he placed hors de combat thirty Federal officers or soldiers fighting hand to hand. At the time of the taking of Fort Pillow, Forrest was accused of massacring the prisoners, burying men alive, and gaining a more advantageous position while under the protection of a flag of truce.

Our friend, the Interior, nearly went into hysterics over this charge, and then piously expressed the hope that he repented before he died.

The limited space of such an article will only permit a brief summary of the defence. Those who wish to study the question in full will find it amply discussed in this *Life*, or in the September number of *Harper's Monthly*. The following are the facts: He surrounded the fort, having taken the outer line of fortifications, and then demanded its surrender. A flag of truce was raised, and they were discussing the advisability of such a step. Just then a steamer approached loaded with troops for the

relief of the fort, and disregarding the flag tried to reach the wharf. To have permitted the landing would have been to abandon all that they had won, so Forrest ordered his lines to extend and thus he checked any further progress of the steamer. The violation of the truce by one necessitated the violation of the truce by the other. The enemy in the fort refused to surrender and the flag was never lowered till Forrest ordered it cut down to stop further bloodshed, and every man killed was slain with a gun in his hand. After Forrest's withdrawal the Union forces buried the dead, and therefore whatever wrong was done was committed by them.

All the foregoing facts are established, not by the testimony given by men in the bitterness of war, but by men living 34 years after.

The temper of Forrest was fearful and when aroused men trembled before him. He was also a man addicted to the silly as well as sinful habit of profanity, and his faithful biographer paints him as he was, with no attempt at concealment. But in other respects he was a man of beautiful morality, a lover of children, always deferential to women, pure in thought and speech and never tasting strong drink except once or twice in times of sickness.

As he grew older, he became softer and gentler, and he assured his friends that his wife's prayers for him had been answered. He grew in the estimation of the rulers, and now he stands in the minds of soldiers as the great soldier of the war. General J. E. Johnston regarded him as the great central figure of the war. Jefferson Davis said that he had never understood the greatness of Forrest's generalship till it was too late. General Wolsley, commander-in-chief of the British army, said of him: "It would be difficult in all history to find a more varied career than his, a man who, from the greatest poverty, without any learning, and by sheer force of character alone, became the great fighting leader of fighting men, a man in whom an extraordinary military instinct and sound common sense supplied to a very large extent his unfortunate want of military education."

But after all, these extracts and this cursory review gives but a poor idea of this extraordinary man. Aside from its intense interest and literary merit, it is a book that should be found in every home in the South, and when your children would read some thrilling romance, let them turn its pages and learn of what heroic stuff their forefathers were made.

J. R. BRIDGES.

TALES OF ADVENTURE FROM THE OLD BOOK.—By Rev. Thomas Champness. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association. 1899. 16 mo. Pp. 121. Paper, 15c.

These are fairly good homilies, by an English Methodist minister (we presume). Prepared, apparently, for children and youth. Eighteen Biblical stories, mostly from the Old Testament, are told somewhat paraphrastically, with practical lessons, sometimes good, sometimes quite common-place. There is scarcely enough snap and point, of sparkle and originality, to greatly interest those whom it is most desired to interest.

D. J. B.

THE DRAGON, IMAGE, AND DEMON; or the Three Religions of China, Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism; giving an account of the Mythology, Idolatry, and Demonolatry of the Chinese. By Rev. Hampden C. DuBose, Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1899. 12mo. Pp. 468. \$1.00.

Our first feeling, on receiving this volume, was one of gladness, because this book had reached a new edition. It comes to us in a new dress, and is copyrighted in 1899. But closer examination shows that the Preface is the old one of 1885, and on the Title-page we are told that the author has been a missionary in China for fourteen years, when, as a matter of fact he has been there twenty-eight years. Furthermore, we are not told anywhere that this is a "new edition," and collation reveals a page for page, word for word harmony with the edition of 1886. One is a little puzzled to reconcile matters and understand the situation. The same plates have been used, the same errors occur that are found in the former, even to displaced letters. We will call attention to the errors at this point, as we have never seen them noted. Page 8, line 23, "every Christian boy that reads it like a policeman" amuses some, owing to lack of punctuation. P. 329, line 6, and again, p. 421, line 20, Sze-chuen is misprinted; elsewhere spelled correctly. P. 321, line 8, should read "never" for "ever." P. 340, line 3, the heading of the paragraph furnished the most unfortunate error, which reminds one of Dr. Schaff's charge of "sheer printer's devilry." While the plates are the same, the print is perfectly clear, the paper good, and the binding neat and durable. The book is embellished with 187 illustrations.

This is a thoroughly good and interesting book, and a copy of it should be in every Christian home. It is packed full of information about China's three great Religions, and along with that, of course, gives us much information about the Chinese themselves. It is one of the most useful books on Religions in China. The illustrations add much to the interest. There is a full index, and full-face paragraph headings increase the facility of reference.

One thing we wish for our own part, though others might differ with us. We wish that the author had given the translation of the names of the many, many gods described. We suppose that the names all have a meaning, and it seems to us that every reader would be interested to know this meaning. It would be suggestive, it would help the memory.

It may seem a bit hypercritical, but when we are told that "China is the only country in the world where three systems could stand side by side without one expelling or superseding the other," we at once think of Japan and Korea, where the same is measurably true.

With all its value, the book is quite inexpensive, and we heartily commend it to our people.

D. J. BRIMM.

# Union Theological Seminary

RICHMOND, VA.

---

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.

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

---

NO. 52==APRIL, 1900.

---

## I. THEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE.

Our age, on its religious side, has been characterized as an age of doubt. We are constrained to admit that there is a propriety in this characterization. Doubt with regard to religious matters is more widespread at present than it was in days gone by. This is not saying that the Christian religion has not a stronger hold upon men to-day than ever before, for it has. The mustard seed sown in the ground and springing up into an herb is growing yet, though already the greatest of all herbs. The leaven hid away in the meal is still permeating the mass, and will continue till the whole is leavened. The doubt of our age does not furnish sufficient ground to justify the believer in entertaining pessimistic views of the future. But there is none the less a widespread spirit of questioning and uncertainty concerning things religious. It is not confined to the student's cloister, but is found among the masses. It appears in a good deal of the popular literature of the day, and tends to create for itself a congenial soil, if that be not already found. But as has been remarked by those observant of the trend of theological thought in our day, while doubt is more general than it was in a former age, it is not of the same intensity. It is not so much a positive denial as it is an enquiry. A century ago unbelief was very sure of itself. It sneered at faith, and assumed a happy, even a lightsome attitude. But such self-complacency has largely disappeared from the theological world, and in its place there is more of earnest investigation.

Doubt is now serious rather than gay, really desirous of knowing the truth instead of confidently professing to have it already and disdainng to seek it further. It is not altogether honest doubt, but more than erstwhile earnest. Its spread in recent times has been due to the distinguishing character of modern thought. That thought is at once higher and lower, better and worse, than the thought of a bygone age. It is higher in that it seeks for realities instead of resting content with forms; and it is lower in that having been concentrated on physical realities it fails to feel the force of things unseen. In the activity of the modern mind there has been undertaken a general reconsideration of the grounds of faith. All proofs have been subjected to the scrutinizing review of a critical age, and called upon to vindicate themselves before the bar of an enlightened and untrammelled reason. In some cases the arguments which satisfied a former age have been declared inconclusive, and the demand is made for others newer and better than they. The very foundations of belief have been exhumed and submitted to a re-examination. All this indicates not only renewed mental activity, but in some measure a change in the mode of that activity. There is no question that the modern mind works, to a certain extent, in a way different from the old. And there is no question that also to a certain extent that difference indicates improvement.

An illustration of this is found in a comparison of the view taken of miracles in ancient and in modern times. In a former age the miraculous was expected. Men looked for it as a sign and proof to them, and if God was to teach them, and convince them that the teaching was from him, it was necessary that he adapt himself to them. This is necessary if there is to be any intercourse between the human and divine, for the simple reason that man cannot adapt himself to God. And so Christ wrought miracles in evidence of his divine character and mission. But he did it reluctantly, because the need for it indicated a low capacity for the appreciation of evidence. He gladly used his divine power for the relief of human suffering, but simply for evi-



dential purposes it was with reluctance that he wrought. Of the people who were thus to be convinced he said, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign," and "except ye see signs and wonders ye will not believe." But of a future time of human progress under the power of the Spirit he said: "Hereafter ye shall see the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." Hereafter ye shall rise to such power of insight into the truth that ye shall see me, not the worker of signs and wonders, but the divine nature manifest in the flesh, and the divine character exemplified before men. In a better, future age there shall be the uplifting of your very intellectual faculties so that ye shall see in me, the Son of Man, the establishment of communication between God and man, and union between heaven and earth; and seeing me rather than the signs I give, ye shall believe me not because of what I do or what I say, but because of what I am. And how far soever our age may be from the capacity for looking upon Deity and recognizing what is seen, it yet doubtless marks some approach to such a power. And so it comes about that miracles, the very thing which the ancients demanded in order that they might believe, seem to our age the chief difficulty in the way of believing. And while in former days men believed the moral truth taught because of the miracles accompanying it, we believe the miracles because of the moral truth. Our acceptance of miracles of course rests on evidence that they occurred. But the point here is that we vindicate the miraculous because of its relation to a divinely given system of truth, while a former age vindicated the moral truth because of its relation to the miraculous. With us the truth needs no vindication, the miraculous does; with them the miracles needed no vindication, the truth did. And so the argument for the divinity of Christ which grows upon thoughtful minds is Christ himself. Men grow, however slowly, in the capacity to see him; and seeing him they are convinced, however reluctantly, that in him they see the Father. This growth in a capacity to appreciate a higher

form of argument than that which appealed to a more primitive mind has naturally led to dissatisfaction with old modes of thought; and before the enquiring mind in its transition from the lower could grasp the higher, it finds itself in an attitude of uncertainty and doubt.

But while in one aspect the thought of the present is an advance upon that of the past, viewed in another light an element is seen which marks a retrogression. This consists in a failure to feel the force of truth which is purely or largely moral, metaphysical, or transcendental. So impressed has the modern mind been with facts of the physical world, that it has almost lost the power of perceiving that there are facts of a metaphysical world. The *Zeitgeist*, as the spirit of the age has been personified and named, demands that he be fed on facts. And we find moreover that this giant is somewhat inclined to accuse the theologian of a failure to supply him with his favorite diet. Says he, "I go with the chemist into his laboratory, and he gives me facts to eat. I go with the geologist among the rocks, and he feeds me on facts. I go with the zoologist among the bugs, and again I am feasted on facts. I go with the botanist among the plants, or with the astronomer on an excursion among the stars, or with the historian among the records of the past, and always these worthy gentlemen supply me with facts. And now if I am to go with the theologian, he also must feed me on my favorite diet; otherwise I shall have nothing to do with him except to mark him as a relic of a bygone age, who has outlived his usefulness and his time." What answer is theology to give to this demand of the *Zeitgeist*? We must concede the right of our giant to demand facts for his food. And more than this, we must admit that in theology as in other spheres facts are the only really wholesome and substantial diet for him. Theology must therefore justify her right to a place in the thought of the times by facts; and if she cannot do this she must relinquish her place. There is therefore the effort on the part of some of the best Christian thought of our day to meet this demand of the times for facts in what we may properly

term a radically Christo-centric theology. The theology of the past has been Theo-centric. It has regarded the idea of God, the infinite and eternal Spirit, as a valid idea. It has regarded the conception of Deity in the human mind sufficiently supported to be taken as the fundamental idea in the system to be erected, and so it has made that idea its starting point. It has come then to God revealing himself in Christ as an idea subsequent logically and chronologically to that of a divine existence. The moral teachings of the system have been then grounded in the ultimate truth of God, and not in the subsequent truth of Christ. But the spirit of the times complains that this is too metaphysical a process. It is not willing to accept that fundamental idea of God as anything more than an idea. It cannot lay hold upon any reality corresponding to the concept. So it says to theology, "Do not talk to me intangible metaphysical doctrines of arguments for a divine Being and a categorical imperative and other things which do not impress me as realities; but present to me something definite and tangible—something which I can see is of the nature of fact."

"Very well," it is answered, "we will comply with your request. We will present to you a theology of fact, and nothing but fact, and fact of such character as you will recognize to be fact. Just eliminate from your mind every metaphysical element. Take away all your conceptions of an unseen Deity. Repudiate all ontology, and all cosmology, and all teleology and all intuition. Cast away all conception of morality as law, and of an ethic based on a metaphysic. The mind thus being cleared of all transcendental and intangible rubbish, and having been made a perfect vacuum, we begin the erection of a purely positive theology. We take Christ, an historical fact, and make him our ultimate foundation. He is the idea, and the only idea, with which we start. Through him we rise to the conception of a God, and on Him we rest our belief in God. Through him we reach all our ideas of religion. From him we obtain all our conceptions of morality. We do not ask you to have any theology, or any religion, or any morality, except as it is

made visible and tangible in him. Every vestige of metaphysics having thus been eliminated, we yet have these all conserved, and answered in factual form. You object to a Theo-centric theology, we offer you one which is Christo-centric. You object to a religion of an unseen Deity, we offer you the religion of a person. You object to an ethic based on a metaphysic, we offer you the ethic of a holy life."

This is unquestionably a fitting answer to the difficulty which the thought of our age encounters in the sphere of theology. The demand is made for facts. The justness of this demand is recognized, and facts are furnished—definite, tangible facts. And this answer emphasizes that particular fact which our age most needs to have emphasized. Jesus Christ is the supreme fact for ours as for every age. It is indeed he who is the solution of present day doubt, and it is he who is the abiding saving fact for the future. The religion of the future even more gloriously than the religion of the past will indeed be the religion of a Person, one historical, personal, Christ. For it is he on whom the angels of God are already ascending and descending in that communication which he has established between heaven and earth.

Admitting that the objection raised is answered in this tendency toward a radically Christo-centric theology, it may be asked, have we really established thus an abiding foundation for future theological thought? Is it true that a Theo-centric theology is invalidated by an invalidity of the mental conditions and processes involved? Is the theology of the ages to be reconstructed, even to its very foundation, and made to start from a new ultimate concept and proceed by a new and reverse method of procedure? And have we in this answer to the doubt of our age, something which is final, something on which we can stand in future years? Contrary to the trend of some of the most wide-awake thought of the day, it must be contended that we have not. Both the objection and the answer to it seem unconscious of the deeper truth involved. The *Zeitgeist* demands facts. The demand is complied with and facts are furnished such

as he himself must admit are facts. But the *Zeitgeist* sadly needs some wholesome instruction as to what are facts. He needs to learn that there are not only those which are physical and historical, but those which are metaphysical and moral as well. Our modern thought has been so concentrated on physical truth that truth which is metaphysical does not impress it as being truth at all. And this is the chief inadequacy. For it is that very truth which our age fails to recognize as truth which constituted the foundation of all truth. In very large measure the agitation in the theological world of to-day is in its last analysis a revolt against the metaphysical element in the theology of the past. This revolt is not to be wondered at. It was but natural that such a revolt should come. It was impossible that it should not come. And when the dust raised shall have cleared away, doubtless in some respects it will appear to have been a good thing that it did come.

For truly metaphysics have been the bane of theology all through its history. Not only was it so in the days when schoolmen quibbled as to the number of angels that could stand on the point of a needle. And not only was it true of a later day when New England divines held heated controversy over the question as to whether one ought to be willing to be damned for the glory of God. But even yet there is emphasis placed on metaphysical elements which were better placed elsewhere. Granting all this, however, it yet remains that the complete elimination of metaphysics from ethics and theology is an impossibility, and the construction of a purely positive system is a dream. The idea of God unincarnate is a pre-requisite to the idea of God incarnate. The conception of God unrevealed is not reached by, but is necessarily prior to, the conception of God revealed. And if the idea be invalid because transcendental, the historical manifestation will fail to remove the invalidity. For a metaphysical element is involved even in historical and physical truth; and the elimination of all metaphysics would mean not only the elimination of all theology and all ethics, but of all history and all

physics. To take away completely that element from our conceptions of facts and truth would be to take away the very capacity for those conceptions. Theology is not naturally or logically Christo-centric, and cannot be made so. It is impossible to make the mind a vacuum, then begin with the historical Jesus and through him reach the idea of God unseen. We must first have that idea as a condition of a right belief in an incarnation. We must begin as the Scriptures begin, and as the thought of the ages has begun with God unrevealed, and come afterwards to God manifest in the flesh. We must begin with morality as law conceived in the mind, and come afterwards to morality as fact realized in life. Call it a metaphysical, transcendental procedure if you will, we cannot ignore it, and we cannot reverse it, and we cannot cast it away. Our age marks a retrogression when it undertakes to find some other ultimate foundation or starting point for its theology than the idea of the absolute and eternal unseen. We cannot have an ethic without a metaphysic. We cannot have a religion without a theology. We cannot have a Christ without a God. This truth the Lord Jesus recognized and taught long centuries ago. In words the wisdom of which the age has yet, but poorly comprehended, he would lay the only foundation of theology for all the ages, "Believe ye in God." And then on this abiding foundation, he would build the faith of man's redemption, "Believe also in Me."

ARCHIBALD FAIRLY CARR.

St. Louis, Missouri.

## II. REVELATION XX AND THE MILLENNIAL REIGN.

The twentieth chapter of Revelation, especially that part of it which describes the binding of Satan and the millennial reign of the saints, has for ages proved of extraordinary interest to Bible students. At the same time it has presented some of the most difficult problems of interpretation, and has given rise to two widely different schools of interpreters, with minor divergences of opinion too numerous to mention. Our understanding of this passage is necessarily affected by our idea of the general character and plan of the book. A failure to grasp this plan may be as disastrous to the conception of this passage as would be the attempt to treat it as an isolated passage, without regard to the scope of the book in which it is found. Both these errors have operated to warp the interpretation, giving us on the one hand a spurious literalism yielding results at the farthest possible remove from the real meaning of passages, or on the other a figurative interpretation purely fanciful, which has proved to be just about as satisfactory as the effort to understand a writer in a foreign language by the process of guessing at the meaning of the individual words. The multiplicity and variety of interpretations thus arising have led some to despair of ever attaining to any satisfactory results in the understanding of the book.

One writer, after telling us that one passage teaches a personal reign of Christ on the earth, cites by way of comparison certain Scriptures which seem to contradict this idea; but instead of rectifying his interpretation in the light of these clearer passages, simply comes to the conclusion that it is utterly impossible to reconcile passages which seem so contradictory. He says, "It is not within the power of man to tell us now what may or may not be inclosed within the truth and fact of the Lord's second coming. Only the future can determine."\*

---

\* See Butler's Bible Work in loco.

It is refreshing to find a writer who is willing to acknowledge the difficulties of his own position as this one does. An interpreter who is willing to face a blank contradiction between passages of Scripture is certainly not to be accused of either lack of courage or honesty, whatever we may think of his discretion and judgment. A proper figurative interpretation of the Revelation passages would relieve the whole difficulty, but this writer is so in love with his literalism that he seriously addresses himself to the task of reconciling the conflicting interpretations in such a way as to make them both true. He seriously suggests that there may be two literal or personal second comings, or, if you please, three personal advents instead of two. Premillennialists are not usually accustomed to face the difficulties of their interpretations in this way, but the dilemma is one which really attaches to their position; it will therefore be profitable to hear this writer express the matter in his own way.

One writer says, "Many passages in both Testaments connect Christ's advent with the establishment of his kingdom on the earth; and it is taught in the nineteenth chapter of this book that he will be revealed from heaven with attendant saints before the millennium; that he will then subdue his enemies and introduce a reign of righteousness and peace. There are however many other passages, of equal authority, which describe our Lord as coming with flaming fire to judge the world; and the last judgment is certainly after the millennium (vs. 11-15.)" He then goes on to say. "The prophecy regarding Messiah in the Old Testament seemed to intimate only one advent for all purposes; but we now perceive that it covered a double advent, a coming in weakness, and a coming in power, a coming to suffer and a coming to reign. There is no reason why the prophecy in the New Testament regarding the second advent may not unfold a double import; the more so that the language touching the resurrection of the dead, though often seeming to point to one event, unfolds a double import, a resurrection of the just and a subsequent uprising of



the unjust." Now it is well to notice that the fact of Christ's premillennial coming is thus based upon a literal interpretation of chapter nineteen, a passage which can be shown by a particular inspection of its own language to be unquestionably figurative. Then in support of this interpretation which yields a blank contradiction with the unmistakably literal passage which teaches the Lord's advent in connection with the end, he addresses another of the gratuitous interpretations of premillennialists, viz: that there are two resurrections instead of one, that is to say, that a long interval separates the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked. Besides this the writer's reasoning from a mistake of Old Testament interpretation to a similar possibility of a mistake of New Testament interpretation may not appear to the reader to be very conclusive. The suggestion that the prophecy of Christ's return to the earth may turn out to be a prophecy of two future advents, certainly cannot be considered to gather much force from the fact that Old Testament prophecies which once appeared to allude to a single advent are now understood to refer to two advents, for if there are two advents still future, we shall have three personal advents instead of two, a contingency which very few premillennialists will be prepared to admit. Our author does avoid this difficulty of two second comings, by supposing that the first of these will be only partially visible to the world. He has no doubt about the fact of his premillennial coming, but only as to whether it shall be generally known. He says, "It is clear that Christ will come to quell his adversaries, reward his servants, and bring in millennial peace; but it is not clear whether or not that appearing will be visible to the world at large. Enough that it will be quite appreciable by his saints.\*"

He will interpose in such a way that they who follow him in the great battle of God Almighty will know right well who it is by whom they are led, and to whom the victory is due; and they who reign in life upon or over the earth

---

\*Does this mean that he will be recognized only by the saints?

will know well who it is with whom they reign as kings and priests to God." This is guarded language, but it must either be taken to mean a literal appearance, or be in direct contradiction to the language quoted above. He goes on to say, "But this does not exhaust the prophecy of his appearing. At the last great day he will come in his glory, seen by every eye, to judge the quick and dead." This will no doubt strike the reader as a curious exhibition of the weakness of the premillennial view of the advent, but we employ it here to show the danger, nay the impossibility of constant literal interpretations in the Apocalypse.

We approach the study of our chapter then with a prepossession in favor of a figurative interpretation. Such prepossession is to be gained by the study of the book as a whole, as well as the particular study of all the foregoing chapters. It is a book written in symbols, the key to which is not to be gotten out of the imagination, but out of the Scriptures themselves. All the numbers of the Apocalypse are to be taken as symbolic, that is to say, as having other than a mere literal significance. We have in the book itself a hint of the character of the writing, in that a number of the symbols are interpreted for us. The deeper we go into the study of the book, the stronger becomes the presumption in favor of figurative interpretation. A symbol is nothing more than a figure of speech crystalized, so to speak, into a visible representation.

The book of Revelation presents to us the grandest historical subject that was ever conceived. It is nothing less than the carrying out of the great plan of salvation of a lost and rebellious world through Christ the Redeemer. The active work of saving men is carried on through the instrumentality of God's Church, in the preaching of the "everlasting Gospel," aided by God's providential government of the world. It presents to us the true drama of History, the drama of the ages, the drama of life. It shows us God behind the shifting scenes of life, thus giving us the true philosophy of history. To give the subject in the language of the book itself, it presents "the mystery of the

seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks." These symbols being interpreted for us, we understand that the book gives us the history of the church in regard to the success of her great work of preaching the gospel and saving men. The triumph of the church over the world, and the punishment of the wicked is the great climax of the movement of the book. It is all viewed from the standpoint of God's Providence. The stars are in Christ's right hand, and the church is simply his agent. He is the governer of the world, and his authority is represented by the two edged sword which proceeded out of his mouth. We may say therefore that the book gives us the Drama of God's Providence in the carrying out of the plan of salvation. This is more clearly seen in the plan of the book, dominated as it is by its three systems of numbers, the Seals, Trumpets, and Bowls of divine wrath. These give us God's providential agencies in carrying out his purpose to subdue the world unto himself; so we have prominently presented to us the grand contest between good and evil in the world. It is the conflict between the church and the world, between Christ and the Devil. Its result is the protevangelium fulfilled; Christ is conquerer over death, hell and the Devil, and his kingdom is finally a completed, accomplished fact. Our chapter is a part of the climax of the action of the book, or as we may say, the catastrophe of the drama. It gives us the discomfiture and downfall of the great arch-enemy of mankind, in which he is turned into hell together with all the nations that forget God.

There are three parties which are kept prominently before us in this life drama, the World, the Apostate Church, and the Devil, the head and leader of the God-defying combination. In the first set of numbers, the seals, we have Christ wielding his providential agencies, by which he remonstrates with and chastises the world in order that he may bring men to himself. We may call it *The Drama of God's Providential Judgments*. In the next series of numbers, the trumpets, we have the drama of *God's Special*

*Providential Judgments.* In this series the symbols separate the God-defying world into the three great enemies before mentioned, the World, the Apostate Church and the Devil. The last series of numbers, the bowls of divine wrath, present to us in symbol, *God's Last Providential Judgments*, in which there is also a hint of the final judgment of the wicked, the same three enemies being represented. Chapter 19: 11 and Chapter 20 give us a fourth drama which is to some extent a repetition of the last. It presents the triumph over the same three enemies, but this time the final judgments are made more prominent. It is important to note this identity as well as difference, because herein is the real key to our passage.

It is impossible within the limits of an article to bring to bear upon one passage the light which is only to be gotten from a careful study of the whole of the foregoing chapters; we can only state results, instead of putting the reader in possession of the processes of interpretation of these passages. In the third drama of Chapter 16, the three great enemies are clearly indicated in symbol, while they are swept from the stage in a common catastrophe in the downfall of the World City in its three parts. We have it in this language: "And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell; and Babylon the great was remembered in the sight of God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath." Here the three statements are practically synonymous, perfectly so as to the party on whom the judgment falls, viz., the wicked world, but it is to be noticed that the expression, 'the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath' contains an unmistakable hint of the final judgments, that is, the final punishment of the wicked in hell, as well as the triumph of Christ's kingdom in this world, represented by the downfall of the great city, Babylon. After having interpreted Chapter 16, we see that we have in Chapter 19 and 20, in alternate symbolic representation, the downfall of the same three great enemies of righteousness; this time the final judgments being made more prominent. We have the

same three personages, and the same two events, the downfall of the wicked world, considered as a God-defying power, and the final punishment of the wicked, under the figure of 'casting into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone.' In Chapter 19 the scene is undoubtedly symbolic, or as we have no objection to saying, dramatic. In Chapter 19 only two of the three enemies are eliminated from the plot; that is, the world, under figure of the beast, and the Apostate Church, under figure of the false prophet. We have the completion of the catastrophe in Chapter 20, in which the Devil himself is swept off the stage. (V. 10) We see then that we cannot divorce the two chapters without the mutilation of what is really an organic whole.

By way of analysis of chapter 20, we may say, that the first six verses, which depict the binding of Satan and the reign of the saints, give us the result of the triumph of Christ's Kingdom over the wicked world, which is nothing less than the dominance of righteousness in the world. In verses 7-10 we have the last vestige of wickedness swept from the earth, and the great arch-fiend comes in for his share in the final judgments. The scene of the general judgment (vs. 11-15) further emphasizes the idea of the final judgment of the wicked, giving us in alternate symbol the meaning of the casting into the lake of fire.

The triumph of Christ's Kingdom in this world is inaugurated by the binding of Satan. The language is to be taken figuratively. We are not to understand that this scene is ever to be enacted in reality or that Satan and an angel are to be given incarnate form for this purpose. All the concomitants of the scene, the key and the chain, the shutting in and sealing of the abyss, all go to form a scenic or dramatic presentation of a single truth, that the Devil shall be deprived of his power to pursue his accustomed work of evil in the world. The angel himself may be but a part of the drapery, and would not necessarily teach that the angels, or an angel, is to be employed, to accomplish the object, but his coming down 'out of heaven' indicates that the power proceeds from God's throne, whether exercised mediately or immediately,

It would be out of harmony with the symbolic or figurative nature of the passage to take the 'thousand years' period of Satan's binding as strictly literal, but it must be understood as a period of time of considerable length. An effort has been made to eliminate the idea of time altogether, and to take it as indicating merely the completeness of Satan's binding. But while it is granted that the numbers of the Apocalypse are none of them to be taken literally, this particular symbolic significance has nothing to sustain it. It must be remembered that the idea of time does not depend upon the number one thousand, but inheres in the expression "thousand years" and while 'years' is not to be taken literally, we cannot eliminate the idea of time without rendering it meaningless, and in fact destroying the significance of the whole scene, for the idea of time inheres in the very succession of the binding and the loosening. Besides this it is easy to see that the reign of the saints is contemporary with the binding of Satan, and to eliminate the idea of time from the expression 'thousand years' destroys that reign entirely and renders the whole passage inane.

The millennial reign is introduced to us in language which appears to be intentionally indefinite. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them." The question at once arises, What thrones and where, and who sat upon them? Are they thrones in this world or in heaven, and to whom does the pronoun "they" refer? Why, in the light of the book they can be none other than the saints. This is the result towards which the whole movement of the book tends. Where then are the thrones and how many of them? We have had thrones in the book before, the twenty-four thrones of chapter four. These were a part of a highly figurative passage. Thrones are symbolic of power and a reign. In chapter four it was glorified saints who sat upon the thrones, but here it must be the saints on earth. The contest which has been depicted was a contest in this world; moreover it was a moral and spiritual contest; the victory therefore is a spiritual victory, and the reign a spir-

itual reign, that is to say, the reign of righteousness in which all Christ's people alike participate. Of course, then, the thrones are not literal thrones, set up in this world, but they stand for the dominance of righteousness over wickedness in the world, the success of Christ's spiritual kingdom. We need only attempt to answer the questions asked above, upon the supposition of a literal interpretation, in order to find that the difficulties of such interpretation are insuperable.

Premillennialists are accustomed to talk about the reign of the martyrs as if this were the whole of it. They ignore the pronoun "they" altogether, and dream of resurrected martyrs reigning with Christ personally on the earth. The martyrs are an additional class to the "they;" nor should we take the description as applying merely to the martyrs. John saw "the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand." This summarizes all the saints in glory, and we are told that they participate in this "reign with Christ." There is no difficulty in this, upon the interpretation which has been given, and in fact no other interpretation is compatible with the language used, and with the foregoing context. Saints on the earth and saints in glory reign alike "with Christ." But there is no hint here of a personal advent of Christ to the earth. It is a reign "with Christ" because the triumph of righteousness is Christ's triumph, it is the accomplishment of his kingdom upon the earth. This interpretation which makes the glorified church to participate in Christ's triumph over the world and the devil is in perfect harmony with a former representation according to which the martyrs, representing the church in glory, were seen "underneath the altar," longing and praying for this very result.

Now if we take the thrones as figurative, how are we to understand the phrase, "and judgment was given to them?" In the same sense in which it is used in the seventy-second psalm, and many other places where David prays, "Give

the King thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the King's son," where the words "judgments" and "righteousness," used in parallelism, mean practically the same thing, signifying the blessings of God's salvation. We have the same idea in verse 4, "He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy." Judgment is given to the saints in the sense that they enjoy the results of God's judgments upon and victory over wickedness, which means salvation to the world.

What now are we to understand by the clause, "The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished?" The rest of the dead are the same "rest" spoken of in the twenty-first verse of the last chapter, the phrase "of the dead" being a descriptive phrase applying to the wicked. We are taught here that there is to be a brief re-appearance of wickedness just before the end. This note anticipates what is afterwards described in vs. 7-10.

The next clause, "This is the first resurrection" we understand as a descriptive note, alluding to the scene of the saints reigning with Christ. Since the "dead in Christ shall rise first" it is equivalent to saying, This is what Christ's people, the righteous, shall enjoy. It cannot be taken literally, because it is a descriptive phrase and there has been no account of a literal resurrection to which the demonstrative pronoun "this" could apply. The next sentence really explains the meaning. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; over these the second death hath no power." The next clause which forms a part of the explanatory note is partly a repetition, and it shows that the clause, "This is the first resurrection" is descriptive of the millennial scene, in which, let it be remembered, all Christ's people without exception participate.

The last clause is descriptive of their holiness: "But they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." The priest was the symbol of holiness, representing those who have access to God, so here we are simply told that Christ's people shall be a holy people. It describes them as having a complete salvation, and this is a



representation of that perfect salvation of which the song of the living creatures and the twenty-four elders (ch. 5) was the prophecy. "Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth." Note the change in this revised reading; not kings and priests but a kingdom and priests. This is a kingdom in which each individual subject has a throne!

The millennial reign is the shadow and symbol of the eternal reign in glory, which means eternal life. It is really the beginning of the everlasting reign, because the little appearance of evil at the end does not destroy the established kingdom. It is short-lived, and as a last effort of Satan to gain supremacy is abortive. It ends in his speedy and everlasting overthrow.

LUTHER LINK.

Evergreen, Ala.

### III. THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

An oriental legend relates that on one occasion the Destroying Angel was commissioned to destroy with pestilence five thousand of the inhabitants of a certain city. When the pestilence had passed it was found that ten thousand had perished. On being asked why he had exceeded his instructions, the Destroying Angel replied, "I slew only five thousand; the rest died from fright."

Upon the truth which this story illustrates—the power of mind over body—the theory and practice of Christian Science is based. Mrs. Eddy has seized upon this truth, published it in exaggerated form as a new discovery in philosophy, and a new revelation in religion; and now cries aloud to a suffering world: "Buy Science and Health (copyrighted); sure cure for rheumatism, dyspepsia, neuralgia, nervous prostration, toothache, and all the ills which flesh is heir to. Price three dollars, with eighteen cents added for postage. Beware of imitations! Accept no substitutes advertised as just as good!"

Before examining the claims of this new system of religious therapeutics, let us notice a few facts which may go far to account for its present vogue:

(1) Diseases often cure themselves. The majority of diseases are neither fatal nor chronic. Nothing is needed to effect a cure but the recuperative power of nature, and the recovery is in many cases surprisingly rapid. It is quite possible for the recovery to take place in connection with some method of treatment—mental or medicinal, which has not the slightest influence upon the result, and yet for the patient, arguing *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, to be enthusiastic in his testimony to the efficacy of the supposed remedy. Were it not for this natural power of the body to throw off disease without, or in spite of medicine, the services of healers and patent medicines, would be at a discount.

(2) The mental condition of the patient is an important factor in the cure of disease. Every physician knows that

the confidence his presence inspires is often of more value than the remedies he administers. To tell the despondent sufferer, "You are going to get well. Say to yourself, 'I will conquer this disease,' and banish from your mind every suggestion to the contrary," may often supply just that stimulus to the will that is needed to save the patient from chronic invalidism. Now if you base your injunction to get well—your suggestion of health—upon a metaphysical doctrine, the convalescent may quite naturally regard his cure as a proof of your philosophy, whereas the two things may have no causal connection

(3) Many diseases are purely imaginary. They are of a nervous or hysterical character; the sufferer thinks that he or, generally she, is ill, but there is no corresponding organic disturbance. Expel the belief, the delusion of disease, and the cure is effected.\* In these cases the theory that disease has no extra-mental existence will work like a charm. The only danger is that the same theory, applied to cases where the disease is not imaginary, may benefit only the "healer" and the undertaker.

(4) Another fact kindred to that mentioned under (2) is the indirect influence of the mind of one person over the body of another through the principle of (hypnotic) suggestion. Dr. Albert Wall in his work on hypnotism regards it as a therapeutical agent of great value, and goes so far as to say that to the physician psychology is as important as physiology. Prof. William James says, "Changes in the nutrition of the tissues may be produced by suggestion. \* \* \* There seems to be no reasonable doubt that in certain chosen subjects the suggestion of a congestion, a burn, a blister, a raised papule, or a bleeding from the nose or skin produce this effect."† There can be no question

---

\*Every reader, probably, will recall cases of this kind, where if the cure had been effected through the agency of a "mental healer" it would be regarded as a "Miracle of Christian Science."

†Principles of Psychology. Vol. II., p. 612. Prof. James, by the way, has been frequently quoted by Christian Scientists as favoring the free and unrestricted practice of their methods in the interests of sci-

that this principle has been made use of by mental healers of various schools, and often to the benefit of the patient. It is obvious, again, that the cures thus effected can readily be used to accredit a system of doctrines, philosophical and religious, with which they have no connection.

(5) There is to-day a reaction against the undue dependence upon drugs in medical practice. The court physician of Prussia voiced the protest against an excessive reliance on medicines in the cure of disease when he advised people, at a recent medical congress, to "avoid drugs and specialists." The best physicians to-day administer drugs less frequently and in smaller quantities than formerly. The aphorism of Hippocrates, "*Melius remedium dubium quam nullum*" is no longer accepted. Because medicines unscientifically administered often do more harm than good, and because there exist to-day rival schools of medical practice at sword's points with each other, it is easy to conclude that all medicines are useless.

When to the facts here mentioned we add the craving which undoubtedly exists to-day for novelty in religion, it is easy to see how rich a harvest is prepared for an ingeniously-contrived medico-theological system which discards the use of drugs, uses only mental agency in the treatment of disease, bases itself upon an idealistic philosophy, claims to be a revival of primitive Christianity, and offers itself to a suffering world as the only panacea for all the ills of the flesh and spirit.

---

tific discovery. Prof. J. Mark Baldwin, on the contrary, says: "The principle of suggestion is so obscure in its concrete working that the most practiced and best-informed operators find it impossible to control its use or to predict its results. To give countenance, in this state of things, to any pretended system or practice of mind-cure, Christian science, spiritual healing, etc., which leads to the neglect of any ordinary medical treatment, is to discredit the legitimate practice of medicine and to let loose an enemy dangerous to the public health. \* \* \* The parent who allows his child to die under the care of a "Christian Science healer" is as much a criminal from neglect as the one who, going but a step further in precisely the same direction, brings his child to starvation on a diet of faith." Baldwin. "Story of the Mind." Pp. 120-121.

The creed of Christian Science is summarized in four fundamental propositions which are declared by Mrs. Eddy to be to her "self-evident," and which "even if read backward, will be found to agree in statement and proof."

1. God is All.
2. God is Good. Good is Mind.
3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter.
4. Life, God, omnipotent Good, deny death, evil, sin, disease. Disease, sin, evil, death deny Good, omnipotent God, Life. \*

On these four propositions hangs all of Science and Health. Their invertibility is their distinguishing merit, for the metaphysics of Christian Science, like the rules of mathematics, prove the rule by inversion. For example: There is no pain in truth, and no truth in pain; no matter in mind, and no mind in matter, etc.† We are tempted to add that, as there is no Christian Science in sense (only error as we shall see), there is no sense in Christian Science.

Of the four propositions above, the first and second may be taken respectively as major and minor premises, and the third and fourth as the conclusion. Unless the first, "God is All," be taken in a strict, i. e., pantheistic sense, it will plainly not support the conclusion that "nothing is matter." Mrs. Eddy, however, repudiates "Pantheism," which she defines as "a belief in the intelligence of matter."‡ What specially concerns us here is not, however, her theism, but her doctrine of the non-existence of matter.

There have been idealists of various kinds and degrees from Plato down to Hegel, but the idealism of Mrs. Eddy, we soon discovered, is not that of the schools. As an idealist, she resembles the traditional Prohibitionist who had imbibed too freely, in being "not a bigoted one." Theoretically, all matter is non-existent; but practically only mat-

\* Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures, p. 7. The references in this article are to the edition of 1895.

† Ibid.

‡ p. 23.

ter organized in human bodies or put up in prescriptions for the cure of its diseases is banished from the realm of reality.

Take two or three examples of this dualism in Mrs. Eddy's system. To establish her doctrine she wields the ancient and familiar weapon of pyrrhonism. "The senses deceive us."

"The earth's diurnal rotation," she says, "is invisible to the physical eye, and the sun seems moving from east to west, instead of the earth from west to east. Until this false testimony of the eye was rebuked by clearer views of the everlasting facts, it deluded the judgment and induced false conclusions. \*

The inference would seem to be that the appliances of science have led us to clearer views of the facts, but the one really drawn is that "thus matter will be finally proven to be a mortal illusion." † Where does the trouble lie? The earth with its rotation is first spoken of as one of the "everlasting facts," and then dismissed as a "mortal illusion." The trouble must be with the facts, for we are repeatedly assured. "In this volume of mine there are no contradictory statements." ‡

The question of food, it would seem, would be a difficult one for Mrs. Eddy. In consistency she should reverse the epicurean motto, and say, "Let us neither eat nor drink; for the body has no existence and we never die."

She does indeed admit in theory that food "does not affect the existence of man," \*\* and that "gustatory pleasure is a sensuous illusion," †† but her modesty steps in to correct the rigor of her logic, and she artlessly declares that it would be "foolish to stop eating until we gain more goodness and a clearer knowledge of the living God. In that perfect day of understanding we shall neither eat to live, nor live to eat." ‡‡

An advertisement which recently appeared in the *Christian Science Monthly* may show us how this "more goodness" can be attained. It reads :

\* p. 15.

† p. 19.

‡ p. 291.

\*\* p. 387.

†† p. 117.

‡‡ p. 387.

"Christian Science Spoons—On each of these most beautiful spoons is a motto in bas-relief that every person on earth needs to hold in thought. Mother requests that Christian Scientists shall not ask to be informed what this motto is, but each Scientist shall purchase at least one spoon, and those who can afford it, one dozen spoons, that their families may read this motto at every meal and their guests be made partakers of its simple truth.

MARY BAKER G. EDDY."

To the student of philosophy, "wearied (as Mr. Balfour says we are) with centuries of metaphysics," there is about Mrs. Eddy's teachings a *naivete* as unique as it is refreshing.

The name of Bishop Berkeley has been frequently given to the Christian Science doctrine, but this is to do injustice to the philosopher. Berkeley, it will be remembered, argued that as the color and taste of objects—the so-called "secondary qualities" of matter—existed only in the mind of the percipient, so likewise their "primary qualities," their extension and impenetrability, were purely mental products. Material things have thus no existence except as they are perceived. *Esse est percipi* is his theorem. Now to the questions, "Why do I see the same things when I open my eyes as before I closed them?" "What becomes of buried treasures, for instance, which lie concealed for centuries and are then discovered?" Berkeley replies that things exist potentially for us because they exist actually in the mind of God. Their existence is still ideal, their *esse* is *percipi*, but they exist as ideas in the mind of God who "imprints" them, on occasion, upon finite minds.\*

Mrs. Eddy holds, with Berkeley, that material things have no extra-mental existence. Matter is an "illusion of mortal mind." But when asked the origin of this illusion, or the reason why it is so uniform and consistent in the case of the individual, or why it is the same for everybody, she has no reply to offer. The heavens were once supposed, even by Bishop Berkeley, to be the product of divine intelligence; it now appears that they are the creation of "inverted thought" or "mortal mind." Berkeleyism at its best has its difficulties, but Berkeleyism with the bottom knocked out is probably as wild a theory of the universe as mortal

---

\*Principles of Human Knowledge. 248.

mind has ever invented. The truth is that Hindu mysticism, with its doctrine that all finite being is an illusion, has more claims than any school of Western philosophy to be called the father of the Christian Science speculation.

The nonentity of matter is made to support a twofold conclusion: the uselessness of medicine, and the indispensableness of Science and Health, in the cure of disease. But here again difficulties confront us. For instance, we read:

"A Christian Scientist requires my work on Science and Health for his text book, and so do all his students and patients. Why? First: Because it is the voice of Truth to this age, etc."\*

Holding this in thought, now, for 30 pages we find it written,

"Corporeal sense defrauds, lies, cheats. \* \* \* How then can this sense be the channel of blessing or understanding to man? \* \* \* The corporeal senses are the only sources of evil or error."†

To the logic of untempered realism this looks like a real dilemma. To reach truth, we must read Science and Health but in reading it we must exercise "corporeal sense" and so inevitably be led to error. Here is a situation which would have delighted the Greek logicians, and is worthy to become classical. What is to be done about it? Plainly before we can enter the temple of Christian Science we must renounce realism and all its works such as tests and criteria of truth, and laws of contradiction, and excluded middle. Let us close our eyes, hold in abeyance the processes of mortal mind, and piously exclaim. "Let God be true, and every [material] man a liar"‡ which means of course, Let Mrs. Eddy be true! What we need is the *fides informis* of the theologians which believes what it cannot understand—Anselm's "*Credo quia impossibile est.*" "If 'Mother' says so, 'tis so if 'taint so!"

To prove that medicines do heal, Mrs. Eddy must show that poisons do not kill. Here is her argument :

---

\* p. 441.

† p. 473.

‡ p. 455.



"If a dose of poison is swallowed through mistake, and the patient dies, even though physician and patient are expecting favorable results, does belief, you ask, cause this death? Even so, and as directly as if the poison had been intentionally taken. In such cases a few persons believe the portion swallowed by the patient to be harmless; but the vast majority of mankind, though they know nothing of this particular case and this special person, believe the arsenic, the strychnine, or whatever the drug used, to be poisonous, for it has been set down as poison by mortal mind. The consequence is that the result is controlled by the majority of opinions outside, not by the infinitesimal minority of opinions in the sick chamber." \*

You, gentle reader, who believe that arsenic is poisonous, must then be held partly responsible for the death. This is majority rule with a vengeance. Opinion, when in the majority, even though it is mistaken in supposing poison to be *per se* injurious, even though it is mistaken in supposing poison to be an entity at all, is nevertheless able to produce the death of a victim entirely unknown to itself. To prove this statement is of course as impossible as it is to prove that the moon is made of green cheese, or as it is to parse grammatically the first sentence of Mrs. Eddy's book, "Leaning on the sustaining Infinite, to-day is big with blessings." We must accept it, if we can, on the *ipsa dixit* of the author.

Mrs. Eddy entertains a high opinion of our ancestors. She says:

"If a random thought, calling itself dyspepsia, had tried to tyrannize over our forefathers, it would have been routed by their independence and industry. \* \* \* Damp atmosphere and freezing snows empurpled the plum cheeks of our ancestors; but they never indulged in the refinement of inflamed bronchial tubes, because they were as ignorant as Adam, before he ate the fruit of false knowledge, of the existence of such things as tubes and troches, lungs and lozenges."

"Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," says the English poet. †

It must be admitted that the views of our ancestors as to

---

\* p. 70.

† p. 68.

the cause and cure of disease were nearer to those of Mrs. Eddy than to those of latter-day scientific men. But, it may be asked, were the minds of forefathers when they held these beliefs, truly in a "state of nature;" or were they, as Mr. Bogebat says they were, "tattooed all over with superstitions?" The Eddy theory is that which has been held by savage races in all ages, namely, that disease is produced by occult spiritual agencies and not by material causes, and that it is to be cured by some sort of incantation or exorcism, crude or refined, and not by a change in the material conditions.

A friend of the writer's living in the South, recently took into his employ a young colored man who showed a tendency to stoutness. When asked why he had left the family where he was previously employed, he said he had been before of a slender and graceful figure but "the cook hoodooed him and made him grow stout." This is precisely Mrs. Eddy's theory when she says, for example, "A child can have worms, if you say so, etc."\* The suggestion that increased dimensions were caused not by occult mental agency, but by mush and molasses, would probably be independently "routed" both by Mrs. Eddy and by the colored man in question.

Mrs. Eddy says somewhere that bathing and rubbing do not alter the secretions of the body† and that "the scientist takes the best care of the body when he leaves it most out of his thought." ‡ It is a case of "where ignorance is bliss." Ignorance of the sanitary condition of Santiago would doubtless have been bliss to General Wood, but would have prevented his cleaning up and the consequent largely-diminished death rate.

Another passage must be quoted for the light which it throws upon Mrs. Eddy's method of reasoning.

"What an abuse of natural beauty to say that a rose, the smile of God, can produce suffering! [What an abuse of natural beauty to say 'No rose without its thorn,' but such

---

\* p. 412.

† See p. 381.

‡ This clause is suppressed in the latest edition.

is the painful fact!] The joy of its presence, its beauty, its purity, should uplift the thought and destroy any possible fever. It is profane to fancy that the sweetness of clover and the breath of new-mown hay may cause glandular inflammation, sneezing, and nasal pangs." \*

This explains what would otherwise be inexplicable in Mrs. Eddy's reasoning. Her thought moves, not in the region of ontology strictly speaking, but in the more refined and ethereal realm of æsthetics. The eternal fitness of things is her only criterion of reality. Her poetic spirit spurns the low plane of things as they are, and soars into the realm of things as they ought to be. Whatever is right, is; whatever is wrong, is not. Thus, "accidents are unknown to God," or "under Providence there can be no accident, since there is no room for imperfection in perfection." † How profane to suppose that the gentle breeze which fans our cheeks and rustles in the tree-tops can ever become the desolating cyclone! We see here Mrs. Eddy, the poet. The world to her is Utopia, not the world of gross materialism with its unyielding facts. What a pity that she could not have been present when things were created!

We are not surprised to find that the problem of evil, which has troubled philosophers from Job and Zoroaster down to Mr. Fiske, is disposed of with a jaunty airiness by Mrs. Eddy. She solves the problem by denying that there is any to solve. Evil simply does not exist. *Le diable est mort*. There is no evil principle, personal or impersonal, for "Can evil be derived from Good? Impossible!" ‡ There is no sin, for "The real man cannot depart from holiness. Nor can God, by whom man was evolved, engender the capacity or freedom to sin." \*\*

Unfortunately, the devil refuses to be dismissed from the universe in this summary manner. Driven out of the window, he comes in at the door in the guise of mortal mind and its illusions, the fruitful cause of sin, sickness and

\* p. 68.

† p. 421.

‡ p. 320.

\*\* p. 471.

death. Original sin reappears as the belief in matter, and total depravity is shown in the refusal to accept Mrs. Eddy's teachings, which, it is intimated, will be punished with many stripes. How the errors of mortal mind and its belief in matter originated in a world where there is neither devil nor capacity to sin, we are not told. The only statement we have found is a confession of ignorance, veiled by the following striking metaphor:

"The conventional firm, called matter and mind, God never formed. Unerring and eternal Mind destroys this imaginary copartnership, formed only to be destroyed, in a manner and at a period as yet unknown." \*

"The word Adam is from the Hebrew Adamah, signifying the red color of the ground, dust, nothingness. Divide the name Adam into two syllables, and it reads, a dam, or obstruction. This suggests the thought of something fluid, of mortal mind "in solution," etc., etc." †

This certainly suggests that the mortal mind which conceived this exegesis was "in solution," and incidentally sheds light upon the claim of Science and Health to be a "key to the Scriptures."

Our author expects to be misunderstood, partly on account of "the inadequacy of material terms for metaphysical statements," ‡ and partly because of the lack of spiritual discernment in her readers. Her final appeal in support of the truth of her doctrines is to the utility of her therapeutical method:

"One who understands Christian Science can heal the sick on its Principle, and this practical proof is the only feasible evidence that one understands Christian Science."\*\*\*

"The charge of inconsistency, in Christianly Scientific methods of dealing with sin and disease, is met by something practical, namely, the proof of the utility of these methods; and proof is better than mere verbal arguments, which evince no spiritual power." ††

Mrs. Eddy first formulates a philosophy to support her

---

\* p. 170.

† p. 233.

‡ p. 9.

\*\* p. 291.

†† p. 300.

mind-cure method, and then appeals to the success of the mind-cure in proof of her philosophy. This is of course perfectly legitimate, provided the two things have any necessary connection with each other, and provided the success of the mind-healing is striking and uniform enough to prove anything. As a matter of fact the cures performed in the name of Christian Science are paralleled at Lourdes, at the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre, at Quebec, at Dr. Dowie's Chicago "Zion," at the Rev. Mr. Simpson's "Berachah Home" at Nyack, N. Y., and Mr. Sanford's "Temple of Truth" in Maine, showing that no one system of doctrine can claim a monopoly of the proof which the cures, real or alleged, afford. The notorious failure of the Christian Science treatment in numberless cases of course makes the claim of miraculous attestation absurd. In the only class of cases where a real test of the theory could be made, i. e., surgical cases, Mrs. Eddy herself confesses failure. We are instructed, indeed, that "bones have only the substantiality of thought which formed them,"\* but are advised that

"Until the advancing age admits the efficacy and supremacy of Mind, it is better to leave the adjustment of broken bones and dislocations to the fingers of a surgeon, while you confine yourself chiefly to mental reconstruction, and the prevention of inflammation or protracted confinement."†

When Christian Science has demonstrated its power to restore so insubstantial a thing as a tooth, we shall begin to believe it.

Whatever be the fate of the sect founded upon it, Science and Health will always hold a high rank among the curiosities of literature. As a collection of the "antitheses of pseudonymous knowledge" it stands without a rival. It teaches a religion which copyrights its Bible and engraves its texts upon souvenir spoons; an idealism whose *raison d'etre* is the welfare of the body; a science which virtually

---

\* p. 421.

† p. 400.

adopts the "hoodoo" theory of the cause of disease and the incantation method for its cure; a theology which holds that mankind, until the advent of Mrs. Eddy, has been suffering untold miseries from belief in a monstrous error, and all in a world where there is no devil and no free-will, and "God is Good, and God is All."

If the most exaggerated claims of Christian Science be true, and it should prove to be the panacea for all manner of diseases, it may be doubted whether the blessings of universal health would compensate for the impairment of the reasoning powers and the loss of the sense of humor which its general adoption would involve.

Danville, Ky.

WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON.

## IV. TWO CURRENT FALSE PHILOSOPHIES.

### MATERIALISM.

Philosophy, the investigation of principles or ultimates, has two departments: Epistemology and Ontology. The former inquires into the origin, nature and limits of man's power to know. As to the origin of human knowledge, we have the rival schools of Empiricism and Intuitionism; on the basis of the nature and limits of man's cognition, there are Skepticism, Dogmatism and Criticism.

Ontology, which in a sense is Philosophy proper, asks the question, What is; what really is, as distinct from what apparently is. Nihilism, or Phenomenalism, answers: Nothing is, beyond or beside Phenomena; and Substantialism replies: There is a reality beyond the appearance; Substance is. The Substantialists are Monists or Dualists. Monism divides into: 1. Idealism, or better called Mentalism, which says: Mind alone is, there is no Matter, except as phenomena; 2. Materialism, which asserts that Matter is and that Mind is but a mode of Matter; and 3. Absolutism, which affirms that Mind and Matter are both mere modes of the one basic Substance.

Dualism is that doctrine of Ontology, which holds that the universe contains two distinct kinds of Substance; mind, on the one hand, and matter on the other; each exclusive of the other, as being essentially different. This is the view of all intelligent persons who are not philosophers and probably of a majority of those who are.

Materialism is that form of metaphysics which teaches that everything in the universe is some kind of matter; that mind and matter are substantially the same; that mind is but a mode of matter. The mentalist, or idealist, denies the reality of matter, affirming that it is a mere appearance to the mind, or a thought of the mind, an illusion to the philosopher and a delusion to the vulgar. The materialist does not deny the reality of mind, nor that it differs from ordinary matter; he merely avers that the dif-

ference is not essential and that mind is a kind, the highest kind, of matter.

There are, however, two radical schools of materialism. 1. Its lower or gross form boldly asserts that mind is nothing but nervous matter, usually confined to the brain; and that thought is the secreted product of the brain, just as saliva is of the glands of the mouth and bile of the liver. Buchner represents this view. 2. Higher, refined materialism repudiates these extreme tenets; avers that mind is not a substance at all, but merely a force residing in matter; mind belongs to the family of correlated forces, which includes the physical, chemical, vital, mental, moral and spiritual. Prof. Huxley, though confessedly a Nihilist, advocated this latter doctrine of materialism.

A. Is materialism true? I. We first note some special objections to the gross form, which identifies the mind and the brain. 1. What is the principle of differentiation, which leads us to believe that one thing differs from another essentially, in kind, as well as in degree? It is confessedly this, that all those things which possess the same essential qualities are of the same kind, or class; and that those which do not possess all the essential qualities of the class do not belong to it. What are the essential qualities of matter? They are all deduced from the fact that matter occupies space. Matter thus is extended, divisible, has figure, etc. Is the mind extended? Has it length, or breadth, or thickness? Can we divide the mind into halves and quarters? Has the mind shape? is it spherical, cubical or pyramidal? To ask these questions is to answer them, as every one without a theory will confess.

2. But, replies the gross materialist, my answer is easy: The brain has extension and figure and is divisible; and the brain is the mind; the brain produces thought. Let us see if this is credible. The brain is the mind; the brain loves, hates, wills, remembers, reasons. Milton's brain, apart from any immaterial mind, produced the *Paradise Lost*; Shakspeare's brain composed his dramas. The brain sees, hears, smells, tastes, touches, knows its fellow



material objects. It knows its own hands and feet and body. It knows the hairy, skin-covered, bony casket in which itself lives. Now does it know itself? Has it any knowledge of its own existence and characteristics? Would one, that had never been told, and that had never opened the skull of an animal, know or even suspect that he had a brain? Is it credible that a thing which knows other objects does not know itself? We can understand that a finite intelligence may not know many other objects, possibly may know no other objects; but we cannot see how an intelligent being can be absolutely ignorant of itself; the brain is ignorant of itself, therefore the brain cannot be an intelligence.

3. Material causes can produce only material effects; because no effect can be greater than its cause. Mind, as the greater, may produce matter, as the less; but matter, the less, cannot produce mind, the greater. The brain then, as a material cause, must produce effects which are equally material; thought, feeling, purpose, the alleged effects of brain, must then be material. The essential qualities of matter are extension, divisibility, figure, etc., have thoughts, feelings, and purposes these qualities of matter? All matter is cognizable by some one or more of the senses; can we see, hear, smell, taste, or touch thoughts, feelings or purposes? You can take the salivary glands, the stomach and the liver, and see, smell, touch, taste, and even hear the saliva, the gastric juice and the bile which they produce; but no chemist ever took a brain and got from it a thought, cognizable by the senses.

II. Special objections to the higher form of materialism.

1. The refined materialist will doubtless acknowledge the force of these objections to the cruder doctrine, but will assert that they do not apply to that form of materialism which makes mind not a kind of matter but a force of matter. This finer view is, at least, as old as Zeno, the founder of Stoicism. As held and taught in our day, it asserts that mind is not a substance at all, not a distinct being, but is like heat, light, electricity, a form of force. In accordance

with the accepted doctrine of the correlation of forces, it is said that, as light, heat and electricity are not different kinds, but simply different forms, of force, so mind is not a distinct species, but simply one of the forms which force assumes. The philosophy is clear: There is but one substance, matter, and but one force. As matter presents itself under various forms, notably the radical ones of gas, fluid and solid, so force is Protean in its manifestations, but is essentially the same in its nature. Mind then is force, and is the same as heat, light and electricity. Force sometimes appears as heat, and then becomes electricity, and then light; the very identically same force becomes successively each of these three. This is not here denied, but is by the writer believed on the authority of scientific men. Now the dynamical materialist avers, that this one force, sometimes heat, sometimes light, and sometimes electricity, is also sometimes mind, or thought, or feeling or purpose.

A companion doctrine to the correlation of forces is the conservation, or persistence of force or energy. As no element of matter is finitely destructible, much less naturally perishable, so force is absolutely persistent; when it disappears in one form, it has merely passed into another form, or other forms, unchanged in nature and unimpaired in degree. This is not a mere supposition; the scientist can follow force through all its metamorphoses, and measuring it demonstrates the above truth. If mind is a form of force, it can be experimentally shown, that force has disappeared in some other form to reappear as mind; and when mind ceases to manifest itself at death, it can be shown that the force which has thus disappeared as mind still persists and its presence can be scientifically demonstrated. Will some scientific patron of this view undertake both or either of these experiments?

2. There is, however, a simpler and more effective way of dealing with this school of materialism, all the more dangerous because it is more refined than the other. There are many wonderful metamorphoses in nature, some of which require the strongest evidence, if not our own obser-

vation, to be believed. Still these changes have their limits, beyond which it is not credible that they can go. Let us see exactly what is asserted by the materialist: it is, that the thought of the human mind is identically the same thing as heat, light, electricity; that the heat in a coal of fire and the thought in your mind are exactly the same kind of thing; that your love for your mother and the light of your lamp are one and the same kind of force; that Washington's resolve to devote his life to his country is identical with a flash of lightning. It is not merely asserted that these things are analogous, or alike, but that they are the same; at one time, force shows itself as heat in a furnace, at another that identical force is the sorrow of a mother at the grave of her only child. No one but a philosopher can believe that; and his theory is the green glass through which he looks.

III. There is another objection, which is of decisive character and which relates to both schools of materialism. No two persons can appropriate and use at the same time the same material object, or the same material force. This is as impracticable and impossible as that two material objects can occupy the same space at the same time. The food that I eat, the water that I drink, the air that I breathe, no one else can at the same moment eat and drink and breathe. The heat that warms my body, the light that enters my eye, the electricity that shocks my frame, cannot warm, illumine, or shock any one else at the same instant. Everything that is material, whether objects or forces, is capable of absolutely exclusive appropriation. It is otherwise with the immaterial. The same thought, the same desire, the same purpose may and often does animate a thousand, a million minds at the same instant. A speaker is addressing a crowded auditorium, and every soul receives the same truth and is excited to the same feeling at absolutely the same moment. A million persons each day read the same dispatches in our daily papers, and form the same opinion on the facts stated. There is no patent, there can be none on truth. No man can exclusively appropriate it.

No one has a monopoly of a thought, an affection, a resolve for even a single second. Matter and its forces have limited, spatial relations, by reason of which they cannot exist in two even contiguous places at the same time. It is not so with truth, with thought, with emotion, with volition; any one of these can coexist in a limitless number of minds contemporaneously. Even light, or sound, so subtle, so attenuated that they may fall simultaneously on thousands of eyes or ears, yet do so by virtue of their radiating divisibility; so that no two eyes receive the same light, no two ears receive the same sound. Each eye and each ear receives a part of the light and sound. Not so with the truth seen on the printed page or heard from the open lips; this truth is not divided into infinitesimal particles, of which each mind receives its quota, but the truth remains whole and is received by each mind in its entirety. A drop of material poison may kill an animal; the same drop divided among a thousand is not perceptibly hurtful. But an error that is fatal to one mind has power to ruin millions, and yet its strength remains unimpaired.

For any one and for all these reasons, we are justified in declaring that materialism, whether of substance or of force, is untrue, and that mind differs from matter both essentially and dynamically.

B. So much for the direct argument against materialism. We now consider its consequences, in its application to other important lines of thought. In these we may find additional reasons for discarding it.

I. Its relation to Theology. Many minds fail to see the logical consequences of their philosophy; for this reason, there have been and are materialists that are Christian theists. Tertullian held that God had a material form, so did Priestly, and this is the belief of the Mormon Church. It is none the less true, however, that the materialism of substance properly leads to Atheism, as a material God is a manifest impossibility, both inconceivable and incredible. We accordingly find that the gross materialists, as a class, deny the existence of the Deity. The materialism of force

as logically leads to Pantheism; the one all-prevading, universal, immament force is God.

II. Materialism has an important connection with ethics, for two reasons. 1. It is inconsistent with the immortality of the soul. "Nihil interit," nothing perishes, is not true of organized, or even compound matter. Elementary matter is finitely indestructible. If the materialist held that the mind is a primary substance, or a material atom, he might consistently teach its imperishability. When, however, he asserts that it is a compound, organic substance, the brain, he excludes the natural possibility of its permanence. We can actually see the brain dissolve, become reduced to its elements; and these elements we can see entering into new combinations. The brain has manifestly perished; if the brain be the soul, then the soul has perished. If it exist again, it must be by virtue of some power capable of restoring it. This we do not deny to be possible; we simply assert that there is no room for such a thought in scientific materialism in the grosser form.

The case is no better with the materialism of force. This doctrine provides indeed a kind of immortality for the soul. If the soul be but a form of the one universal force, and this force, while changing its form, never loses its being, then the soul never perishes as a force. It persists as force, but perishes as a soul; it has become gravity, light, heat, or electricity.

We must ask, how much is lost to practical morality, when man becomes convinced that death is the end? A few high spirits, like Shaftesbury and Kant, would continue to practice virtue for its own sake. But for the mass of men, what restraining influences on the one hand, and elevating, on the other, belong to the belief in a personal, conscious, moral immortality?

2. Materialism does not consist with the responsible freedom of man. If the mind of man is but a piece of organized, refined matter, then it is subject to material laws, and is no more morally accountable than the falling tree which breaks your bone. The brain, in secreting thought and

feeling and purpose, is just as responsible as the liver in secreting bile, and no more so. The brain that plans and causes the hand to execute a murder is no more accountable than the avalanche.

If the mind be a form of material force, the same condition of moral irresponsibility pertains to it. Does anyone consider heat and light, or electricity morally accountable for their acts and efforts? If not, then the mind, as but a form of the same force, cannot be regarded as a moral, responsible agent. The fact that each sinning soul holds itself guilty, visits moral condemnation on itself for its wicked acts, shows that the soul is conscious of its own freedom, is the author of its own acts, is a free, moral agent, and not a piece of matter nor a form of physical force.

As materialism exists as a basis for practical life amongst the people, and as a theoretical creed in medical, scientific and philosophic circles, it is hoped that the discussion here given may aid some to free themselves from its influence and others to extricate their friends from its toils. The purpose has been to treat the subject with simplicity and clearness. May our country and our age be saved from the baneful power of what Fichte called "The Dirt Philosophy."

#### AGNOSTICISM.

There are two radical philosophies of knowledge: 1. Dogmatism, which holds that man has the power of positive knowledge; that he has faculties by which he really knows things. 2. Skepticism, which denies or doubts that man has such powers of knowing. The dogmatism, or the skepticism, may be more or less universal. No dogmatism, however, has reached the extreme of asserting man's capacity to know the entire universe; confessedly all allow that there are many things, which man neither does nor can know in his present state. Any one is so far a dogmatist as he asserts man's ability to know anything; and is so far a skeptic as he denies, or abridges, or doubts man's power to know. Cicero says that Arcesilas taught that "we can know nothing, not even the fact of our inability to know."

Others have doubted the statement of Cicero; universal skepticism seems to annihilate itself.

Skepticism, as it prevails to-day, takes the name of Agnosticism, and had its origin in the critical philosophy of Kant. Kant taught that there is probably a real world, the noumenal world, but that of this we have no knowledge; man's knowing is limited to the apparent, the phenomenal, which does not reveal the real. Kant's principle applied to our knowledge of God is religious agnosticism, which we propose briefly to discuss.

Theological agnosticism teaches that there may or may not be a God, but, in either event, it is impracticable to prove that God exists, and impossible for man to know him as he exists. It chiefly takes the latter form, a denial of man's power to know God's nature, though convinced of his existence. It is so held by Kant, Hamilton and Mansel. Even Herbert Spencer admits that we are obliged to suppose a first cause, and are driven by an inexorable logic to conclude that he is infinite and independent. These all, however, agree with the Neo-Platonists, that God is to man unknowable. Those old philosophers had a strong way of expressing their agnosticism, when they asserted that God is nothing, the non-existent; meaning that to the human mind he is nothing, because utterly incomprehensible.

The ground of God's being unknowable, according to agnosticism, is not his non-existence, nor his withdrawal from observation, but is due to man's inability to know him. The sun exists and shows himself to the healthy eye, but the blind cannot see him. The agnostic asserts that man is God-blind, as some people are color-blind. The reason of man's inability is said to be partly in the nature of God as the Absolute, the Unconditioned, and partly in the impossibility of the finite comprehending the infinite. Let us examine each of these.

A. God is the Absolute, the Unconditioned; therefore man cannot know him; because man's knowledge is limited to the relative, as opposed to the absolute; and because it

is the very nature of thought to condition, or rather to note the conditions of its object. I. Man's knowledge is limited to the relative; is this true? In the three applications of the relativity of knowledge, made by Sir William Hamilton, we think it is true. Man's knowledge is limited to qualities, or attributes, as distinct from substance; to those qualities or attributes for which we have appropriate cognizing faculties; and, further, man's knowledge is limited in its purity to the more or less perfect conditions attending his faculties. We believe, however, that the qualities known are qualities of the thing, by which its nature becomes known to the human mind.

These limitations do not apply to the case before us. We do not need nor mean to assert that man has a direct knowledge of the substance of God; we are content to believe and affirm a knowledge merely of each of the divine attributes as man's acknowledged faculties can discern; and will admit whatever of imperfection that pertains to a fallen as well as a finite creature. This limits the sphere and perfection of man's knowledge but does not annul its reality.

I. But is God the Absolute? Philosophers and theologians have asserted this so continuously and universally and confidently that it seems rash to deny it, but we venture, nevertheless, to do so. God is not the Absolute, in the sense of the Unrelated; on the contrary, he is the Universally Related. Many of these relations man sees and knows, such as the generic ones of creation, providence and redemption.

If, however, by the Absolute, as applied to God, is meant the power of self-existence, and his actual sole existence prior to all other beings; it is true that God is the Absolute. He exists, however, also as the Universally Related; as such it is of chief importance that we should be able to know him; and we do know him in knowing his relations. As the Absolute of existence, we believe that He is and must be self-existent and the prius of all other beings.

II. It is alleged that we cannot know God, because to know is to think, to think is to condition, and God is the



Unconditioned. We freely assent to the first premise of this argument ; it is true that we cannot think of anything, but under its conditions, the very nature of thought is to bring its object before the mind in its general or its special conditions. We cannot think of horse, but as we think of its essential qualities, and these qualities are its conditions, or, as we think of its relations, and these relations are its conditions. The same is true of God ; we cannot know him, or think of him, apart from the conditions of his nature and his relations to his universe.

As we have seen, it is a figment of the philosophic brain, unjustified by fact or sound common sense, to assert that God is the Unconditioned. There is not, nor can there be, such a being as the Absolute, the Unconditioned. If there were such, he could not be known by man, angel, nor devil ; if there were such, he could not be God, who is the very hub of being, the very center of existence, the Father, the Ruler, the Saviour of men, the Creator, the Governor of the Universe.

B. We are told that the finite cannot know the Infinite. It is natural for an empiricist to assert this ; for the finite cannot experience the Infinite, by original, repeated, nor associated sensations.

I. A word about the Infinite, another subject around which there is a metaphysical haze, in which mathematicians as well as philosophers have become beclouded ; Kant and Sir William Hamilton suffered themselves to be sadly befogged. There is no such thing as the Infinite, absolutely considered ; everything in the universe of thought or being has limits. God is the nearest approach to the absolutely infinite ; but God has limits and must have them. He has moral limits ; he cannot do wrong, it is impossible for God to lie. He has limits of relation, as Creator, Judge, Redeemer. He has limits of nature, which separate him from his created universe. He has the limits of selfhood, of personality. His limits are all of them perfections, and are self-imposed, but are none the less real.

Besides God there are only two other infinities in the

universe, space and time. Space is negatively limited by the want of all moral and mental qualities, and has only one quality in common with matter, extension. This quality of extension is single, double, or triple ; there are accordingly an indefinite number of infinite lengths and infinite planes, while space itself is the single triple infinite extension. Time is the most limited of infinities, and is simply duration that neither begins nor ends. These three infinities are intimately connected ; as space is the infinite where and time the infinite when of God's infinite being.

II. The agnostic affirms that the finite human mind cannot know the infinite God.

1. There are degrees of knowledge, both in quantity and quality. By my eye I know the shape and color of the horse before me, but may be utterly ignorant of other facts about it. The horse may be so near to me that I see it distinctly ; or, it may be so far away that my view is dim. In all these cases, however, I have a real knowledge of the horse ; though it may be very partial and very obscure. So the question is not, Can we know all about God ; nor, Do we know anything perfectly about him ; but, Do we know anything about him that can be called real knowledge, as distinct from mere conjecture or hypothesis ? Yet more precisely, it is now, Can we, do we know anything as to God's infinitude ?

We will admit that there are elements of God's infinity, infinite attributes that belong to his essence, of which we have not the faintest conception ; just as there may be qualities of matter of which we are totally ignorant. Thus our knowledge of God's infinity is probably deficient in quantity. We will still further admit that the facts of God's infinite nature which are revealed to us, we do not know perfectly, we do not at all adequately comprehend them. We are like a little child, who very imperfectly understands its father's wisdom, or knowledge, or plans ; and so our knowledge is deficient in quality also. Nevertheless we know that love is an attribute of God's character ; we

know that his love is infinite ; and we know, partially, what is meant by infinite love.

I stand at St. Louis and see a few rods of a telegraph wire, which stretches from New York to San Francisco ; can it be truthfully denied that I have any knowledge of that wire, because my eye is unable to follow it either east or west to its terminus ? By my eyes I know the few rods that are manifest to them, and from other sources I know that the same wire stretches continuously from the Atlantic to the Pacific seaboard. If this be common sense truth, is it not equally true that we can directly perceive the finite manifestations of God's nature, and know that the attributes thus revealed to us are infinite in their excellence ? If God's attributes were not homogeneous or simple, then there would be propriety in affirming that a finite or partial knowledge of any one of them was not a real knowledge of its infinite entirety. As, however, the infinite depths of his nature, which lie beyond our vision, are exactly like the shallows we can fathom, we are justified in believing and affirming that we have a real, though limited knowledge of his infinite excellence. The finite cannot comprehend the Infinite, else it would itself be infinite ; it can, however, apprehend the Infinite. To this the Scriptures agree, when Paul writes to the Ephesians, 3 : 18-19, that Christians "may be strong \* \* \* to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge ;" the knowledge is real, though partial and inadequate.

2. There is a technical distinction between faith and knowledge. It is a distinction often ignored by practical writers. Strictly speaking we know that which we immediately perceive, we believe that which is mediately perceived. Drawing this distinction, can we be said to know God? Have we a direct cognition of Him? Drs. Hodge, Dabney, Stearns, and others so believe and preach; holding that God manifests himself directly to the human spirit, so that he may be and is intuitively cognized. This immediate vision of the Deity is not limited to the renewed soul,

but is said to be a fact in the experience of all. We are sure that this view is not in accordance with facts.

Do we know one another's minds? if so, how? Each mind has the power of expression, it utters or manifests itself, its existence and characteristics. In the direct cognition of these manifestations, we know the minds making them. We have a similar knowledge of God, who utters himself in nature, in providence, as also in the scriptures, in and by Jesus Christ, and by his spirit. From these direct revelations of himself, we are led to believe many other things as to the character of God. These inferences of the unseen from the seen are matters of faith. The infinity of God is, therefore, an object of faith, as distinct from knowledge. It is, however, an intelligent faith, because it is based upon a knowledge of God as revealed. For the same reason, it is assured by faith, so that we can properly say with Paul, 2 Tim. 1:12, "I know him whom I have believed."

C. Agnosticism says God is unknowable, therefore he is ignorable. If God were utterly unknown and unknowable, it would not be possible to believe in his existence or to come into any personal relations with him. But God is known to exist and is known in important excellences of his nature and relations to man. This imperfect, though real knowledge obligates man, for his own sake and for God's, to fulfill the duties growing out of the relations he knows that God bears to him, and to seek still further to know him, whom to know aright is everlasting life. Invincible ignorance as to the unknowable in the relations of a subordinate to his superior does not exclude nor even weaken obligations which arise out of facts and relations which are knowable. The young child cannot understand either the physiology or the psychology of its father's nature and is under no obligations, so far and so long as these are unintelligible, in any matter which depends upon this knowledge. But this does not free that child from those duties which arise out of those facts in its father's nature and relations which it can and does know. Moreover, vincible ignorance does not justify but condemns itself. We are not

bound to know what by no effort we can know; but we are bound to know what we can and especially that which concerns the most important relations that we sustain.

Ignorance of God is the most lamentable of all kinds of ignorance, as he is the being most worthy of all knowledge. So far as it is unnecessary, we are grossly culpable that we allow it to be and to continue. So far as it is necessary, we must be humbly submissive to the conditions of our finiteness so far as this ignorance is to be perpetual; and so far as it is limited to our present imperfect state, in which we know in part and see through a glass darkly, we are to be patiently hopeful of the change when we shall be like him and shall see him as he is.

JAMES A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

## V. THE PRESBYTERIAN SYMBOLS, AND THE PERSONALITY AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

There has been an evident revival of interest among Evangelical Christians within the last few years, touching the Third Person in the Trinity. Much has been written and many books published of late, as to his presence in and power with the church, and the pulpit has seemed to arouse itself from an apparent lethargy touching this potent agency in the kingdom of grace. So marked has been this revival that the question has arisen whether during all the centuries past the people of God have not been grieving the Holy Spirit by their neglect, and whether now, that we have been awakened to a sense of duty, there may not be confidently expected an unprecedented outpouring upon us of the Spirit's power, as upon the disciples at Pentecost, together with a speedy inauguration of the glorious millennial day.

It may, without doubt, be safely conceded, that at times, during the past, the Father and the Son, the other persons of the Godhead, have held, in some quarters, a more prominent place in the estimation of the church, and absorbed for a time the thoughts of the worshipers; yet it would not be correct to affirm that the evangelical churches, or the orthodox pulpits, have so far forgotten or neglected to honor the Holy Spirit, as to provoke him to withdraw his presence, or withhold his blessing. With an open Bible in the possession of God's people, with its constant recognition of the Third Person in the Trinity, and with its emphatic teaching touching his constant presence with his church and his essential agency in conviction, regeneration and sanctification, how could such forgetfulness be widespread or continuous? In this, no doubt, as in every other Scriptural duty, there have been individual instances of marked departure from the faith; but, on the whole, the Protestant communions of all lands cannot, with justice, be charged with serious culpability in this regard.

So far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned, it is within the memory of most, that when an attempt was made a few years since by the Church North to revise the Westminster Confession of Faith, the somewhat elaborate amendment offered touching the personality and work of the Holy Spirit, failed to meet approval; the inference being that the church was entirely satisfied with the Confession as it is. And this conclusion is certainly warranted, for, on investigation, it will be found that in no less than forty-nine distinct instances does that venerable symbol make specific reference to the personality, and the indispensable agency of the Holy Spirit in the affairs of the Kingdom of God.

The scripturality and comprehensiveness of these confessional references will be seen by the following specification of particulars.

1. Under the head of "The Holy Scriptures," chapter first, the Confession declares that "our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof is from the work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts." And again. "We acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word." And yet again in this first chapter we read: "The supreme judge by which 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."

2. Under the head of "The Holy Trinity," chapter second, the Confession says, "In the unity of the Godhead, there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

3. Under the head of "God's eternal decree," the Con-

fession declares that "they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season: are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation."

4. Under the head of Creation, chapter fourth, it is said, "It pleased the Father, Son and Holy Ghost for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning to create or make of nothing the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good."

5. In the eighth chapter, which treats "Of Christ the Mediator," we find not less than five distinct references to the Holy Spirit and his efficiency in the work of salvation. By him the human nature of Christ was prepared that the Second Person might become incarnate. By the Spirit Christ was sanctified and anointed above measure. Through the eternal Spirit Christ was offered up upon the cross, the one all-sufficient sacrifice for sin. By the Spirit Christ persuades his people to obey the gospel, and by his Word and Spirit he controls and governs them.

And thus we might go through the pages of this admirable compendium of doctrine and duty, and find in the fullest and clearest manner possible the personality and efficiency of the Holy Spirit set forth. To him is ascribed our effectual calling and the extraordinary work in the salvation of infants. Our justification is ascribed to him and by him we receive the spirit of adoption whereby we are enabled to cry "Abba Father." His is the work of our sanctification, carried on in all the departments of our spiritual being; and we are enabled to believe, trust, and glory in the promises of God, through him, to our peace and joy. Through him, and him alone, we are enabled to do good works and thus demonstrate the reality of our regeneration. Our perseverance in the divine life, our ability to resist the allurements of the world, the power of the flesh, and the temptations of the devil, are rightly described to him. Without him we can never arrive at assurance of grace and salva-



tion; for he is the earnest of our inheritance whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption. Prayer with thanksgiving, to be acceptable, must be by the Spirit, "with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love, and perseverance," which are graces wrought in our hearts by his power. The ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, as given to the visible Church for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, are made effectual by the Holy Spirit alone. The fellowship we have with Christ in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection and glory, and the communion we are enabled to hold with other Christians, as fellow-heirs of eternal felicity, we owe to the Spirit. The benefits we derive from baptism and the Lord's Supper, from the reading of or meditation upon the Divine Word; from prayer in the closet, at the family altar, or in the sanctuary, are all due to the presence and power of this blessed Being. To him, in short—according to our Confession of Faith—we are indebted for every scriptural blessing and for all our Christian efficiency in this present life; and, in the resurrection of the just, our bodies even shall by him be rescued from the power of the grave, crowned with honor, "and be made conformable" to Christ's "own glorious body." (C. F. chap. 32, sec. 3.)

But this is not all, for to these forty-nine distinct recognitions of the Spirit in the Confession itself are to be added ten that are found in the Shorter Catechism and thirty-eight in the larger, so that in the symbols of our Church we have the Third Person in the God-head recognized in his personality and divine functions no less than ninety-seven times, enough surely to exhonorate the noble men who framed those documents from the charge of undervaluing or overlooking this glorious Being and his work.

It is not to this numerical fact alone that attention is now called, significant as this may be. We would refer further.

First of all to the wisdom and discretion displayed by the framers of our Standards in the treatment of this important matter. This will be seen when we consider the facts that by adhering closely to Scripture they avoid the

error of those who, in contemplating the personality and work of the Spirit, seem to lose sight of the Trinity, and accord an undue exaltation to the Third Person over the Father and the Son in redemption. A careful consideration of the language of the Confession will indicate that the framers of that document never lose sight of the fact that the Holy Spirit is one of a three-fold Godhead. We are never by them left to forget that God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are present and working in union and co-operation, though the efficient worker in the specific transaction mentioned at the time be the Spirit. Thus they use such language when speaking of the Third Person as the "Spirit of God," and the "Spirit of Christ," connecting him thus with the other persons of the Trinity. They say, "We acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word." They speak of the Holy Ghost as "eternally proceeding from the Father and Son." Of the elect they say, "They are called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season." Touching the work of creation they say that "It pleased God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom and goodness," etc., not their "eternal power, wisdom and goodness." Of God's covenant with man they say that "The Lord was pleased to make a second (covenant) commonly called the covenant of grace; wherein he freely offereth to sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith," etc., "and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit to make them willing and able to believe." And thus we might go through this wonderful compendium of divine truth and mark how in almost every instance care is taken to keep before us the three-in-one Jehovah, glorifying the Father and the Son, while mentioning specific works wrought by the power and for the glory of the Holy Ghost.

And this is pre-eminently scriptural, and in marked contrast with much that we see written on the subject, for many seem to consider that to exalt the Spirit they may

innocently exclude from their thought, for the time at least, the other persons of the Godhead. Surely nothing can be more offensive to the Holy Spirit than this. We must never forget that where one person of the Godhead is, there the others are also, otherwise many portions of the divine Word would be inexplicable. When Christ says, "If ye love me keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth," he proceeds immediately to say, "If a man loves me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." Here are the Spirit, the Father and the Son, dwelling unitedly in the regenerate soul, while the Third Person is named as its special comforter and sanctifier. When again Christ says, "Behold I stand at the door and knock, if any man will hear my voice and open the door I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me," he by no means intimates that he alone as the Second Person will be in his people "the hope of glory," but that with him the entire, undivided Godhead will be present in the regenerate soul.

This then is the safe, and scriptural presentation of this important matter made by the Westminster divines. The Trinity is always present with the true believer and should be thus recognized in thought.

Secondly. The wisdom of the framers of our symbols is indicated by their maintainence here, of a scriptural position which is an equal remove from Deism on the one hand and religious mysticism and antinomianism on the other.

Deism, while it concedes the existence of a Supreme Being, the Creator of all things and the author of the laws by which all things are governed, shuts God out of any further interference with the affairs of earth, leaving to the established laws of matter and of mind, the further issue whatever it may be. To second causes everything is referred—these are the only providence the Deist recognizes. His views of God are indistinct and visionary. To him there is no Trinity. Humanity has no living Father, no

redeeming Christ, no sanctifying Spirit. Socinianism, Arianism and Unitarianism are only modified phases of Deism. They belong to the same family, and are closely related to rationalism and materialism. All this, so utterly unscriptural, our standards condemn.

On the other hand the religious mystic, while shrinking with abhorrence from a heartless Deism; exaggerates the relation which God holds to man. Recognizing the Bible doctrine that the Holy Spirit is with man and in man, he so far magnifies the power that the Spirit exerts, as to cause every man blessed by his presence, to recognize himself as virtually inspired. "Filled with the Spirit," every man becomes a God to himself. A written revelation from God becomes therefore largely, a useless thing. With truth directly communicated by the Holy Spirit, who is always present and speaking to the soul of each person, what is the need of a Bible? Sacraments, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper to the mystic, become an impertinence. Objective rites and ceremonies and ordinances are not needed by the man with whom the Holy Spirit abides from day to day, and in whom he acts with more than sacramental efficiency. "These things might have had their uses in the early periods of the church's history," say they, "but now, that Christians have learned what it is to be filled with the Holy Ghost, and how to profit by his presence and power these things can be, and ought to be dispensed with."

This phase of mysticism, though not at the time entirely new, came to prominent expression with George Fox in England, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and has spread into this and other lands, as a leading characteristic of the body known as "Friends" or "Quakers." Fox claimed for himself direct communication with God, so that he had, in reality no vital need of Scripture. The things revealed in Scripture, he says: "I saw in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God by whom the Holy Scriptures were written." Robert Barclay, in his "Apology

for the Quakers," a work published in 1775, and regarded by the "Friends" as an authority, and republished, and largely used and circulated by them in this country, affirms that to all true Christians the Holy Spirit imparts new and immediate revelations, or as he expresses it, "teacheth the righteous immediately, objectively and continually." As a logical consequence of this view he says that "the Spirit, and not the Scriptures, is the foundation and ground of all truth and knowledge and the primary rule of faith and manners." (P. 77.)

Enlarging upon this thought, and enforcing it as a principle which differentiates between the "Friends" and other professing Christians, and one which justifies the separate existence of that body, Barclay further says:

"Through and by the clearness which the Spirit gives us, it is, that we are only best rid of those difficulties that occur to us concerning the Scriptures. The real and undoubted experience whereof I myself have been a witness of, with great admiration of the love of God to his children in these latter days; for I have known some of my friends, who profess the same faith with me, faithful servants of the Most High God, and full of divine knowledge of his truth, as it was immediately and inwardly revealed to them by the Spirit, from a true and living experience, who not only were ignorant of the Greek and Hebrew, but even some of them could not read their own vulgar language, who being pressed by their adversaries with some citations out of the English translation and finding them to disagree with the manifestation of truth in their own hearts, have boldly affirmed the Spirit of God never said so, and that it was certainly wrong; . . . which when I, on this account seriously examined, I really found to be errors and corruptions of the translations." P. 86.

Holding these views, whatever value may be set upon the Scriptures theoretically, they must occupy a secondary place in the esteem of the Christian. This is seen in the case of the "Hicksites," as they are called, who, breaking with their brother "Friends," have become rationalists.

Following a supposed "inner light"—a favorite form of expression with them—each man has become a law unto himself. Supposing himself to be led by the Spirit, he is simply led by his own unsanctified nature, and the outcome is rank fanaticism; and that this phase of mysticism is not confined to the body known as "Friends," may be seen by reference to the word of James M. Campbell entitled "After Pentecost, What?" published during the year 1897 by the Fleming H. Revell Co., being a series of lectures delivered before the summer school of the University of Chicago, and hence not confined to a corner. This evidently earnest and eloquent lecturer in setting forth the significance of Pentecost declares that "it was the culminating act in the process of redemptive activity, 'the final descent of the divine into the human.'" In his comment on 1st Cor., 12: 8-11, he says: "To one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom, that is, the gift of spiritual illumination and intuitive perception, which enables him to apprehend truth at first hand, and becomes the organ of its revelation" and he adds as the legitimate conclusion from this view, "the men of to-day are inspired for the work of to-day." In his fervid chapter on "Spiritual Operations," he says: "We have been afraid to think that we might be inspired, afraid that the Spirit of God might have something to say and do through us. Inspiration is unquestionably a perpetual fact, and experience. It is not something that was for the ancient Hebrew, and is not for the modern Anglo-Saxon." "He is inspiring men to-day to declare God's message." The mysticism here is undoubted, and the effect of such views in dethroning God's Word must be apparent. How far the advocates of what is called the "higher life" or "entire sanctification" or "holiness" are dominated by these views, or how far what is popularly known as the "Keswick movement" tends in this direction it might be difficult to determine. What this portends time will reveal. At all events it is easy to see that the conservative, Scriptural position of the Confession is a safeguard against this perilous extreme. The Spirit takes of the things of Christ, those things already given of Christ

and his inspired apostles, and "shows them" unto us. He it is who according to Christ's promise brings all things to our remembrance, whatsoever the Scriptures contain for the enlightenment and salvation of men. No new, or immediate revelations may be expected—none are needed.

Thirdly. To the framers of our Confession was manifestly unknown, what seems to be a favorite hypothesis with some at the present time called a "second baptism of the Spirit for service." By whatever name known, or in whatever light presented, this peculiar manifestation of the Holy Spirit's power, seems to want support from the scriptures. If it had been there it is hardly probable that the Westminster Assembly would have failed to find it. The Spirit's influence in special directions, and for special emergencies, is fully recognized by them. All our Christian activities are through the Spirit's promptings. Ministers are by him called to their high duties. He moves his people to the exercise of their Christian gifts and graces. He puts the desire into the hearts of missionaries to go to foreign fields, and he leads others to "spend and be spent" at home. He opens eyes to see the fields ripening for the harvest, and he enables those chosen of God for the service to thrust in the sickle and reap. All this has been known, believed and proclaimed by evangelical Christians throughout the centuries. They have recognized no need to wait for a second baptism for service. Like Paul they have heard the call immediately upon regeneration. The first cry of redeemed souls has been, like his, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do." Their sphere of duty may have been the family circle, or the Sabbath schools, or the Bible class, or the neglected prayer meeting; but somewhere or somehow, in making a public profession of Christ, or in urging that duty upon a friend or neighbor, or in giving of his substance to the Masters cause, genuine converts are prompted by the Spirit from the first to do something, however little it may be for one who has done so much for them.

To say that this demands a second baptism is manifestly unscriptural and hurtful. It tends to engender procrastina-

tion in entering on the Lord's work. It leads men to wait for what they have already, to refuse to believe, under a false impression, in the possession of a blessing already bestowed. It grieves the Spirit, and so long as it is indulged, may provoke him to delay the manifestation of his power and grace in sanctification.

If to the above it should be replied that Christ enjoined his disciples to tarry at Jerusalem until the Spirit should be poured out upon them, we reply that we do not now stand where the disciples stood before the day of Pentecost. That day is past; the Spirit has been sent; Christ's promise has been fulfilled, and since Pentecost no command has gone out to any soul to wait for the baptism of the Spirit for service. Did Paul, a post-Pentecostal convert, or such notable workers as Silas, and Timothy, and Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucas, and Manaen, have a command to wait for this special blessing? Indeed does any minister of the gospel, whatever his hypothesis may be upon this matter, ever say to converts, "you have received the Spirit in regeneration, but you need another baptism. Wait, therefore, until you receive the Spirit for service, before you undertake work for Christ?"

That the framers of the Westminster Confession held and taught no such doctrine is clear. In chapter 16th, section 3d, they say of Christians, "Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ, and that they may be enabled thereunto, besides the graces they have already received, there is required an actual influence of the same Holy Spirit to work in them to will and to do of his good pleasure, yet are they not thereupon to grow negligent as if they were bound to perform any duty, unless upon a special motion of the Spirit; but they ought to be diligent in stirring up the grace of God other than what they now possess. It is the grace that is already within them that they are to be diligent in "stirring up."

Fourth. To the Westminster divines the world is largely indebted for the clear and explicit teaching as to the Holy



Spirit's direct efficiency in the whole work of regeneration and salvation. Conceding as our symbols do the Spirit's agency in creation, in imparting understanding to man, in enlightening his mind in regard to his duties toward his fellow-men, and in enabling him to discharge those duties; it is after all the transcendently important prerogative of this glorious being to convince the sinner of his lost condition by nature, to bring him to repentance, to reveal Christ to him as the only Redeemer, to impart faith in him and all other Christian graces, to abide in him and with him day by day, to lead him on in all the work of sanctification, to be with him, to comfort him in the hour and article of death and to land him at last in triumph within the pearly gates, in the immediate presence of his Saviour. This, all this, is in no credal symbols so clearly, fully and emphatically set forth and insisted upon as in the Westminster Confession of Faith and its Catechisms, Larger and Shorter. If this should be doubted, let a comparison be made between these Augustinian expositions of Bible teachings and other creeds.

If now there should be disclosed a need for a revival of correct views touching the Holy Spirit, either as to his personality, or his work in the scheme of salvation, let the Westminster Standards be taken as a guide. Let them be studied in the light of their supporting Scriptures, and let prayer, in the Spirit, be offered to God, as never before, assured as we are that the Spirit "maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered."

WILLIAM WILLETT HARSHA.

Omaha, Nebraska.

## VI. A POINT OF COMPARISON BETWEEN THE OLD THEOLOGY AND THE NEW.

Theology is not a stationary science. Like Astronomy or Botany or any other science, it may, and should, make continual progress. No astronomy has ever exhausted all the secrets of the starry heavens. No botany has ever discovered and classified all the facts of the vegetable kingdom. So no system of theology has ever given an exhaustive exposition of all the truths and facts of Divine Revelation. There are some things, it is true, which have been forever settled. There are some articles of our faith which are no longer open for revision. The great headlands of religious truth are fixed and immovable, and clearly discerned. But between these there remains much territory to be explored and possessed. Not yet has the Spirit made known to the Church, or to any section of it, all the things "which are freely given to us of God." There is always room for setting old truths in new lights; for detecting new relations between known truths, and for discovering new meanings in Scripture which old, and long-accepted human statements are unable to hold. "Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the Kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." (Matt. 13:52) Hence it should excite no prejudice or mistrust on our part if the theology of the present essays an advance and improvement over the theology of the past. This is what should be expected and desired. A lack of it would be a sure indication of stagnation and decay. The proper attitude for the Christian student to maintain toward every such attempt at progress is one of candid and open-minded inquiry. He should beware, on the one hand, of being led away by every attractive setter-forth of some new doctrine; and on the other hand he should seek deliverance from that dull conservatism to whose taste old teaching, like old wine, is always better than that which is new.

He should "prove all things," and "hold fast that which is good," whether it be old or new.

Within the present generation theological teaching has, in many quarters, taken on a new phase. The "New Theology" is a recognized fact. Some welcome it as a fresh champion on the field of religious thought, and expect it to render valiant service to the cause of truth. To others it seems, like Hamlet's ghost, to come in most questionable shape, and they have serious misgiving as to its origin and mission. Perhaps it will appear at last that neither the expectations of the one class, nor the apprehensions of the other are wholly warranted; but that, like most other movements of the sort, it contains a mixture of truth and error.

It is not the purpose of the present essay to attempt a critical examination of the New Theology, or even a definition of it. Indeed, it is doubtful if in its present stage it admits of definition. Definition presupposes completeness; whereas, according to its advocates, the New Theology is as yet in the formative state. One who confesses that his sympathies are profoundly with it, says: "For want of a better name, the New Theology designates a tendency of theological thought at the present time, a spirit that characterizes an increasing number of thinkers and writers on theological subjects, and a sentiment that widely prevails in the Christian Church to-day." Accepting this statement I propose in the present paper to compare the old and the new teaching as they bear on a single article of Christian faith, viz: the union between Christ and his people. The reality of this union, and its importance, all will admit. It is the supreme fact in Christian experience; the fact set forth in both sacraments of the New Testament, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. What is the nature of it? What is the relation into which the believing soul is brought with the crucified and risen Christ? The answer given to this question largely determines the character of one's theology as well as his Christian experience. It involves an interpretation of the cross which is the heart of a true theology and of a true religious life.

In the New Testament this union is set forth under a variety of aspects, and through a variety of figures. These representations will be found, I think, to fall into three classes, according as they present more or less distinctly three different aspects of the union; first, as representative or federal, second, as ethical and practical, and third, as spiritual and vital.

1. Every believer is one with Christ by virtue of a union that is representative or federal. This truth runs like a thread of gold through all Scripture. It is set forth in the Old Testament through types and shadows, and in the New through the plainest didactic statements. It is the view so fully expounded by Paul in the first part of his Epistle to the Romans, and in his Epistle to the Galatians. Christ stands related to his people as Adam stood related to his posterity. He is the second Adam. He stands as the federal head, and representative of his people. He acts, and is acted with, in their behalf. He takes their place under the law, and answers all legal demands against them. In the eye of the law he is one with them; they are "in him." His relation to them is such as makes this right and even necessary; just as the husband's relation to his wife is such as makes them one before the law, and carries with it the necessity of his answering certain legal demands against her. By the obedience of Christ his people "are made righteous." They are "accepted in the beloved." In every part of his redeeming work they were judicially identified with him. They were crucified with him. In him they passed through the darkness of the "Lama Sabachthani;" in him they came out into the serene light of the "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." They were buried with him; with him they rose from the dead, and ascended, and are seated in the heavenly places. From the standpoint of this truth the gospel is expressed in terms that are strongly forensic. God is viewed as a righteous Judge. Sin is a transgression of law. Sinful men are shut up under condemnation. The work of Christ is a redemption from the curse of the law. It results in the justification of the

sinner ; he becomes a fellow citizen of the saints, and is adopted into the household of God.

2. No less clearly do the Scriptures teach that the union between Christ and his people is an ethical union; one in which the moral powers of the believer's soul are engaged. A union which involves the soul's choice of him as the true and the good; its surrender to him as Lord; its acceptance of his will and example as a rule of life; its participation of his spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice; its determination to live no longer unto self, but unto him. This view of our oneness with him is made prominent in the teaching of Jesus himself. Into such a union he summoned Philip, and Matthew and the other disciples when he said unto them: "Follow me." The same summons is extended to us all when he lays it down as the universal law of discipleship, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."

To this view of the union Paul turns in the sixth chapter of his Epistles to the Romans in order to guard the great doctrine of "Justification by faith" which he had expounded from an anticipated abuse. He asks, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" "Shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace?" "God forbid" is the emphatic answer, and then he proceeds to show that our identification with Christ means and ensures deliverance not only from the guilt of sin but also from the love and practice of it, not only from its condemning power but also from its reigning power. As we are one with him in his death, so we are one with him in his resurrection-life. We are joined to his living person. By our souls' choice we have become one with him in Spirit and purpose and aim. We are therefore to "reckon ourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ;" as a true wife influenced by love and spiritual affinity makes all of her husband's interests and aims her own, and cleaves to him with a choice so exclusive that she becomes as dead to all others.

From the standpoint of this truth the gospel is expressed

in terms that are domestic, as in the parable of the Lost Son. God is the Father. Sin is a great wrong against his goodness and love. The sinner is a wanderer from the Father's face. His salvation consists in his coming to himself; in his penitent return to his Father's house, and submission to his Father's rule.

3. In the third place the union between Christ and his people is represented as a vital union—one involving a common life. He is the Vine, they are the branches. They are the members of his body. He is the Source of their life. Because he lives they live. It is no longer that they live, but he who lives in them. Their spiritual life is derived from him and sustained by him. As he is one with the Father and lives by the Father, so they are one with him and live by him.

When viewed under this aspect the truths of the Gospel find appropriate expression in terms that are biological rather than forensic or domestic. God is the Fountain of spiritual life. Jesus is not only the Way and the Truth, but the Life. Sin is spiritual disease or spiritual death. The sinner is "dead in trespasses and sins." His salvation consists in his being quickened by the Holy Spirit, and made partaker of the life of the risen and glorified Christ. He is a son of God because he is one with the only-begotten of the Father, and a sharer of his life; a son not by adoption simply but by spiritual birth. By virtue of this union he grows in grace, becomes increasingly fruitful in good works, and is more and more conformed to the image of Christ who is the Type of his new life.

Now the mind of God on this important subject is truly reflected only when all these views are grasped and held in proper scriptural proportion. This proportion has not always been observed. Theologians have divided into different schools according as they have emphasized one or another of these aspects of truth. In the older theologies great stress was laid on the first or legal view. This was true of the Latin Fathers, probably because this view lent itself more readily to Latin modes of thought which were

eminently juristic. They were closely followed in this respect by the theologians of the Reformation, and the theology of the Reformed churches has ever since distinctly borne the same stamp. A significant hint of this is seen in the fact that Dr. Charles Hodge in his "Systematic Theology" devotes a chapter of nearly a hundred pages to the doctrine of Justification, while he gives no separate treatment of the doctrine of Sonship. Evangelical preaching has emphasized the same phase of truth, and this has been esteemed its crowning excellence. But may it not be that this aspect of the believer's union with Christ has been dwelt upon too exclusively, and that the effect, in some measure, has been to encourage the abuse which the apostle deprecated of turning the grace of God into license? An intelligent Scotch preacher expresses the opinion that the marked tendency to liberalism among Scotch theologians and preachers in recent years has been due to a strong recoil from a type of orthodoxy which did not lead to holiness of life. And what evangelical pastor has not found among his members some who held sound doctrinal views as to the ground of our justification before God, and were ready stoutly to defend them, but who were not careful to maintain good works? Certain it is that any truth, even the most precious, when emphasized out of the proportion of faith, and at the expense of other related truths, may have the practical effect of error.

On the other hand the tendency among those who are recognized as exponents of the New Theology is to lay emphasis upon either the ethical or the vital union which exists between Christ and his people. Were this done within scriptural limits, and only to the extent of restoring the balance of truth, we should welcome it as a helpful and timely service. But, unfortunately, the emphasis has been excessive, and has gone to the length of underrating or denying altogether our legal oneness with Christ. Some openly repudiate this phase of the truth, and assail it as dishonoring to God, and immoral in its influence upon men. They either explain it out of Scripture by a juggling exe-

genesis, or they see in it a Pauline modification or perversion of the teaching of Jesus; as if Paul had made a false claim when, in defending his apostleship, he said, "we have the mind of Christ;" as if the early disciples had made a mistake when "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine," supposing, simple souls, that by so doing they were continuing steadfast in the teaching of their Lord; as if nineteenth century doctrinaires were better qualified to interpret the true mind of Christ than were the Apostles whom he chose and ordained, and trained, and endued with the Spirit of truth for this very purpose!

Others are less radical, and are chargeable, not so much with making war against the truth in question, as with ignoring it. It seems to have no place in their conception of the gospel. The late Prof. Drummond was conducting a question-box exercise at one of the Northfield Conferences. One of the questions propounded to him was: "How do you present the gospel to young men so as to win them?" He answered, "I call them to enlist under Jesus Christ as their king." A minister in the audience then asked, "Do you think any one ever enlists under Christ as king who has not first apprehended him as an atoning and pardoning Priest?" After a little reflection, he replied, "I suppose not." Apparently he did not deny the truth for which we are contending, but certainly he, and others of the same school, are justly chargeable with omitting all notice of it where fidelity to scripture would demand its notice.

Such teaching we cannot but regard as insufficient and dangerous. A gospel which does not recognize the provision made through the atoning death of Christ for removing the guilt of his people—the satisfaction which he rendered in their behalf to the holiness of God and the claims of a broken law—so that they are legally accepted in him, justified on the ground of his merit, and forgiven for his sake is not, we are bold to say, the full gospel of the grace of God. Under pretense of vindicating the love of God such a gospel sadly obscures it. "God is love," some men tell us, "and therefore did not need to be propitiated." But the



beloved disciple says, God is love, and therefore has provided a propitiation. That provision is the one supreme, convincing proof of his love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." (1 Jno. 4:10.) That is the only gospel which fully reveals the love of God, or fully meets the need of man. No other can give perfect rest to souls that are burdened with a true sense of guilt.

It is said that the late Dr. Berry, of England, was saved from an ultra-liberalism in theology by a pastoral experience. In his early ministry he strongly inclined to the New Theology. But on one occasion he was called to the bedside of a young woman who had led a life of sin and was dying of rapid consumption. He began to give her his ethical view of salvation, and to tell her how a wasted life might be retrieved, and a broken-down character restored. But the poor creature only looked at him with wide-eyed bewilderment and despair. He saw that such a gospel would not meet the case, and fell back on that which he had heard at his mother's knee, telling her of a Saviour who died on the cross in the room of guilty sinners, and whose precious blood cleanseth from all sin. This was the water of life for which her soul was thirsting. She eagerly drank it in and was at rest; and this, as the story goes, was the end of Dr. Berry's liberalism. Through this old-fashioned gospel the church has won all her triumphs in the past, and through it alone can she hope to win like triumphs in the future.

One other feature of the believers' union with Christ must be briefly noticed before we close, viz: that it is established by the agency of the Holy Spirit through faith as its instrumental bond. The relationship is not natural but gracious in its origin. We enter it, not by natural birth, but by the new birth. All men are not partakers of it, but believers only. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." A basis is provided for it through the incarnation of Jesus Christ, and his assumption of federal oneness with his people, but it is realized and becomes actual only when the

soul is united to Christ by a living faith. This obvious truth is much obscured, if not wholly repudiated by the teaching of the New Theology. A doctrine of the Divine immanence is taught which ignores the wide breach which sin has caused between God and man. It postulates for all mankind a natural relation of sonship with God—a sonship which needs only to be recognized to be saving. The incarnation of Christ is simply a revelation to men of their native sonship. "The belief of the Church that men as fallen and sinful must become the sons of God by regeneration and adoption," is said by one with rare modesty, to be "no longer preachable or credible among thinking men." Dr. Washington Gladden writes in a recent number of the *Congregationalist*: "And now let me say what was said in the Council, only more deliberately and with a still deeper conviction of its truth, that the one central, inclusive, fundamental fact on which the kingdom of Heaven is builded is the fatherhood of God; the fact that God is the Father of all men, not of some men; that he is their Father not figuratively but really, the statements implying other relations being figurative; that we become his children not when we are converted but when we are born, &c." One is at a loss to see how such a statement, however deliberately and solemnly pronounced, can be reconciled with this statement of Jesus Christ to certain Jews who claimed to be the children of God; "If God were your Father ye would love me. . . . Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." (Jno. 8:42, 44.) Or with this statement of John; "But as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John 1:12, 13) Or with these of Paul; "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:26.) "When the fullness of the time was come God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. 4:4, 5.) That there is a natural fatherhood of God grounded in Creation and Provi-

dence has always been recognized by conservative theology. But this falls infinitely short of that high and blessed relationship into which the soul is admitted who is united to Christ by faith. Such a one receives a sonship which is far more real and precious; which involves a participation of the nature, and life and Spirit of the only begotten Son, and joint heirship with him to all that the Father hath.

J. F. CANNON.

St. Louis, Missouri.

## VII. THE ORIGINAL FACTS OF CHRISTIANITY ; or, MRS. HUMPHREY WARD AND OUR GEN- ERATION *versus* PAUL.

[*The Outlook* of March 3rd, 1900, draws attention to a correspondence going on in the *Liverpool Post* on the subject of scientific study in the Anglican church. Mrs. Humphrey Ward takes part in the discussion, addressing questions to "A Curate."]

It seems strange to see the author of Robert Elsmere knocking at the door of the church and pleading for the right to enter its communion. It is the more difficult to explain, since she does not profess to have undergone any change in her views. Is it her woman's heart, ever more susceptible of religious influences than man's, drawing her toward the church as a haven for the soul? Or, is this another of the many examples of the meeting of extremes—skepticism merging into superstition? Her sun is westering, the evening is drawing on, and it may be that she is saying, with the inevitable awe of the thoughtful in looking to the future, "The night cometh;" and then, "What of the night? What experiences may it have for me?" The church may seem to her the likeliest place for calming rising fears and hushing anxieties.

It is to be noticed, however, that, in writing to "A Curate," so far from disavowing, she reiterates her unbeliefs. She seems to take as infallible the conclusions of the most radical rationalistic scholarship about the great facts and doctrines of Christianity, and yet thinks it a great hardship that she and such as she should not be welcomed to the communion of believers. She cannot see how the gratification of this yearning could do any harm. She holds that "the relief thus afforded to an educated minority would not in the least interfere with the beliefs of the majority."

But, what is most interesting in Mrs. Ward's case is the absolute certainty which attaches, in her mind, to the conclusions of the historical school to which she gives her adherence. "Germany, avers Mrs. Ward, still possesses the only scientific and only organized study of theology in Eu-

rope." (I am quoting from *The Outlook* of March 3rd.) "Mrs. Ward holds that, through the growth of the modern study of history, our generation has come nearer to the original facts of Christianity than the generations between us and the Synoptists have ever been; nearer even, it may be, than St. Paul himself."

Now when Mrs. Ward thinks it possible that "our generation" has come nearer to the original facts of Christianity than Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, she, of course, embraces under the wide phase "our generation" a very small company, a wonderfully favored few, of our contemporaries, and these, of course, are those who think with her.

It is well to remember just here that while radical criticism has made so much noise in our day and has laid claim to so much scholarship as to leave none for anybody else, and while Germany is always thought of as the land of the new infallibility, from whose fountains one must drink or famish in his ignorance, the radical critics are in the minority, even in Germany. Says Dr. Behrends in a notable article in *Christian Work*, written more than two years ago, "Among the most famous theological faculties in Germany are those of Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Griefswald, Halle, Konigsberg, Leipsic and Tubingen. In these universities there are seventy-three theological professors, of which number thirty belong to the radical school, while forty-three belong to the moderate and conservative ranks. Every one of these men is at home in the literature of his department, and is supposed to be an independent and well-equipped scholar. He could not hold his place if he were not." \*

So we see that by no means all the well known scholars of Germany itself acknowledge the infallibility of this "only scientific, and only organized study of theology," the exclu-

---

\* See also Ruppercht in his "Wissenschaftlicher Handbuch der Einleitung in das alte Testament," Introduction, p. 506, sq.

"Then, too, the number of theologians in England, America and Germany who are taking this conservative view with reference to Biblical criticism is constantly on the increase." The full quotation, which I take from the *Literary Digest* of March 25th, 1899, goes into particulars, and mentions prominent critics.

sive ownership of which Mrs. Ward allows to their country. Now, it would be very unwise and even wicked, for any church, especially in our day, of all times, to set itself against scholarship. This talent she has no right to fold in a napkin and hide, especially in these times of progress and of widening views in every department of learning; and if these scientific methods have really done for those who employ them, what Mrs. Humphrey Ward thinks they have, we ought if possible to adopt them and use them. The real facts about the coming, the character, the work, the death and resurrection, and especially, the person of Christ, are what, of all things, it is our highest concern to know; and if by the use of these scientific methods of investigation, we, with these favored ones of our generation, can really come "nearer to the original facts of Christianity than the generations between us and the Synoptists have ever been; nearer even, it may be, than St. Paul himself," then surely we should lose no time in joining the ranks of those who lead in this new renaissance, that we may gain a consummation so devoutly to be wished. If "our generation" has found a retrospective glass that will enable them to look over the heads of all intervening generations and will give us a clear view of these great facts of such surpassing interest to our world, we are surely to be much blamed if we do secure this wonderful optical instrument. What are all the telescopes that sweep the glorious fields of space and reveal the wonders of "the spacious firmament on high," and all the microscopes that open to our vision the arcana of the earth beneath, and of the waters under the earth, compared with this which will open to our view the great facts of Christ's embassy to our lost world? Just think of getting a clearer view than ever Paul had! Let us remember what sort of a person Paul was, and what sort of qualifications he had for investigating these facts, and what opportunities were presented to him for doing so. As to his mental abilities and moral character there can be little doubt. Perhaps no man within the past nineteen centuries has made so deep an impression upon our world. Its very physical features are

monuments to perpetuate his fame, and Geography is a witness of his greatness. Not only the natural features of the earth but political divisions, and cities bear his name. It is echoed from our beautiful St. Paul in Minnesota to the far off Sao Paulo in South America, while all the world over, thousands of churches, from the great Cathedral in London to the humble chapel of our far western wilds, record, in their names, their obligations to St. Paul, whose gospel to the Gentiles they have received and are still sending on to those who have not heard it. Every generation since his time—and ours is certainly no exception—has in many ways perpetuated his memory. This does not happen to considerable men.

But we do not have to rely on such an inference even as this to form an estimate of his competency as a witness. A few letters were written, some of them probably under the depressing influence of long and unjust imprisonment, which though written to people of a very different sort from us and with surroundings in marked contrast to our environment after eighteen and a half centuries, and these letters are in our hands today.

Every thinking man who reads them understandingly is impressed as Coleridge was with their wonderful depth and force. They have undoubtedly exercised an immense—an almost immeasurable—influence on the world's thinking and on its morality, through these many ages. In innumerable Christian households they are still guiding the faith and strengthening the character, and consoling the sorrows of young and old, of rich and poor, of learned and ignorant, of prince and peasant. A great tide of an ever increasing volume of literature has swept by and around them for ages and then passed out of sight, only a work of unusual genius, here and there of all the vast number, lodging and staying on the shore, while these little epistles stand with the permanency of an immovable rock which promises to endure as long as the world in which it is embedded.

When we come to examine these letters, we find the evidences of the clearest insight, the calmest judgment, the

noblest courage, and the utmost truthfulness and candor in the author. These qualities no one can deny to the Apostle Paul. We feel as sure of his character as we do of that of a father or a mother.

Now with all these qualities of a reliable witness, Paul was a contemporary of Christ. It may be said that he was not a personal witness of the acts and deeds of Christ, though a contemporary. On the other hand, however, he was an enemy of Christ and his cause. He had the very qualification which is most highly valued by the radical critic. He did not believe in the supernatural element in his words and works. So sure was he of the absence of anything divine and supernatural about "this way" that he persecuted the advocates of it, following them even to strange cities, and in doing so, thought that he did God service. It is well known that in that school of scientific theology to which Mrs. Ward refers, whatever may be the differences between its various divisions, there is one thing on which they all agree, the absence of the supernatural. Whenever they come to measure and estimate the facts of Christianity there is one little foot-rule carried by every member of the fraternity—a very simple little thing with the very long name, anti-supernaturalism. If about any of these facts there is a claim that it is miraculous, that condemns it; for their postulate is that the miraculous is impossible. The "scientific theology" reduces everything to the realm of the natural.

A miracle then, is thrown aside without further examination as no fact, or a distortion of some natural fact; and if any writing contains a prophecy which has been fulfilled, that fact proves to the advocates of scientific theology that it was written after the event said to have been predicted, because real prophecy is in the realm of the supernatural. Now, Paul had just this qualification so dear to those who have come so near to the "original facts of Christianity." How is it that they have gotten at them so accurately? Why, by simply applying to them this rule and by measuring them carefully, stripping off all the supernatural garb



in which they appeared to the wondering eyes of ignorant and unlearned men, and in which they have come through the intervening generations to ours which has applied to them this little instrument, and divesting them of their disguise, presented them in the nakedness of mere naturalness. This none of the former ages have had either the courage or the skill to do. But are we to forget that Paul began his investigation with this wonderful instrument of the scientific theologians? That he had the courage and the ability to apply it to the facts, no one can deny; and these facts were very near at hand. They had occurred in his own day as he was coming to the full maturity of his powers.

He has, for us, an additional qualification as a witness in that he was not associated with Jesus so as to have his judgment warped by any personal influence. He first appears as a determined opposer who would not stop even at the shedding of blood to stamp out what he believed to be not divine and supernatural, but so pestilent a heresy, that he was justified in taking part even in the death of its advocates. We see this man who was to win the world to Christ, perhaps in larger measure than any other, with the clothes of the hostile witnesses lying at his feet while they stone Stephen, Christ's first martyr, to death. He begins his critical examination as a hostile witness, and as fully divested of any idea of the existence of the supernatural about Christianity as Mrs. Ward or any of our favored generation can be, and yet he came to believe the supernatural facts of this religion, spent his life in proclaiming them and laid it down in attestation of them.

This most decided disbelief of the truth of Christianity and of its supernatural origin and character was overcome in a strange way. It was by a most startling experience of the supernatural presented to his own sight and hearing.

Peter, as he was about to "put off this tabernacle"—an honest time with most men—took special pains to assure those for whom he labored that in respect to all the wonderful things he had told them about our Lord Jesus Christ—and we can well believe that his reminiscences were given

very vividly—"We did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and presence (marg.) of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty; for he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice from the excellent glory, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased,' and this voice we ourselves heard come out of heaven when we were with him in the holy mount." (R. V.)

Paul had a somewhat similar experience, beholding Christ, not, as in this case, in anticipatory presentation of the glory to which he was going; but in a return from it to the earth which he had left. Many questions may be asked about this event which we are unable to answer. There are insoluble mysteries in the natural world, and greater ones may be expected in the realm of the supernatural. Whatever else may be said, it is certain that Paul believed that he had been face to face with Christ, that he had "seen the Lord," and was therefore a competent personal witness of the cardinal fact of Christianity, that Christ, who was crucified, dead, and buried, had risen from the dead. He had no more doubt of it than he had of his own existence. He was a changed man from that moment. Through long years of toil, suffering, danger and destitution he testified of this Jesus whom he had persecuted in the persons of his followers, as the divine Saviour to whom every human being is invited to look for eternal life. He witnessed before the people of various lands and languages, before kings and councils, of the reality of what he had seen and heard, and attested the truth of what he asserted by giving up all that, up to that moment, he had sought with intense eagerness—his high position as a distinguished counsellor and leader among his own people, all earthly ease and emolument, and hardest of all, that way of obtaining the favor of God and salvation in which he had believed with all the intensity of his fervid nature.

He now became thoroughly convinced that through Christ alone was the way of salvation, and through all the many years of varied experience, and of calm thought, he

never wavered in his testimony. After all the life of labor, sacrifice and suffering, after all the journeys and imprisonments, when he had stood his trial before Cæsar's judgment bar, "the trial ended, Paul was condemned and delivered over to the executioner. He was led out of the city with a crowd of the lowest rabble at his heels. The fatal spot was reached; he knelt beside the block; the headsmen's axe gleamed in the sun and fell; and the head of the apostle of the world rolled down in the dust."

Such is the vivid portrayal of the event as it presents itself to the imagination of Dr. Stalker. We may doubt in some points the accuracy of the picture, but the event itself no one doubts.

Ah! it is hardly probable that with all the paraphernalia of the modern school of scholarship, our generation has gotten quite as near the main facts on which Christianity is founded as the Apostle Paul, Mrs. Ward herself being witness; for she insists on "personal experience" after the manner of Ritschl, as the only absolutely reliable evidence. "The recovery of the primitive fact; the return to the undenyng realities of conscience, love and faith; the replacing of the argument from miracle and Scripture and tradition by the argument from moral and personal experience," etc.

Paul had the "personal experience;" but it was not only that of "the realities of conscience, love and faith," but a personal experience of miracle and the fulfillment of Scripture, too.

When we come to the facts of our Saviour's ministry, his works and words, I think we can hardly conclude that Mrs. Ward, or any of our generation enjoys quite as near an approach as Paul. It is indeed probable that he was absent from Jerusalem and from Palestine during our Saviour's ministry and at the time of his trial and death. But it is certain that he was in the midst of the scene where the most stirring events had occurred, very shortly after the crucifixion. It is quite probable that he had graduated from the celebrated school of Gamaliel before the beginning of our Saviour's public ministry, and gone back to Tarsus, his

father's home, "no mean city," and a celebrated seat of Greek learning and culture, where in his youth he had unconsciously received many touches that moulded him for the great work he was to do and the great place he was to fill in the world's history. It is not improbable that the distinguished young scholar was called to the synagogue of his own city of Cilicia as its rabbi. At any rate, when soon after the crucifixion, probably not more than two or three years, when we first hear of him in Jerusalem, it is in connection with the synagogue of the Cilicians, among others there, that his name is mentioned. He may have been one of these first accusers of Stephen, relying on the testimony of others who were witnesses. "At all events, when the argument of logic was exchanged for that of violence, he was in the front. When the witness who cast the first stones at Stephen were stripping for their work, they laid down their garments at his feet. There, on the margin of that wild scene, we see his figure standing a little apart and sharply outlined against the mass of persecutors unknown to fame. The pile of many-colored robes at his feet, and his eyes bent upon the holy martyr, who is kneeling in the article of death and praying, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."\*

Here was another proof presented to his very eyes and ears, of the power of this new and hated religion, not only to sustain in death with a most blessed hope, but to replace natural revenge and hatred with tender love for enemies, and to fill dying lips with words of prayer for them—an experience which doubtless had its weight in the decision to which he was finally brought, though it had no immediate influence on his conduct.

Stephen had gone, it would seem, from synagogue to synagogue in the city proclaiming Christ as the Messiah, "and they were not able to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake." In his arguments he must have given the evidence of the fulfilment of the prophecies in Christ, by

---

\* Stalker,

telling of the miracles and teachings by which He did the work of His ministry, and then, of His death and resurrection by which he accomplishes the atonement. Paul, the alert scholar, so prominent at Stephen's martyrdom, probably having given his vote for his death in the Sanhedrin which condemned him to death, and then witnessing in such a way as he did the execution of the sentence, could hardly be supposed to have been ignorant of these disputations. He, in all probability, took a prominent part in them.

Of these arguments of Stephen we have what may be considered a specimen in part (though it bears the additional character of a defence) in his address before the Sanhedrin recorded in the 7th chapter of the Acts. The question naturally arises, "From whom among those who heard it did Luke receive the report of it which he gives?"

Paul seems to have been present and, if so, heard it.

Was it his report that Luke has preserved? We cannot know with certainty; but when we consider that Luke was Paul's companion in labor and in suffering, and the recorder of that account of his missionary labors which we have in the Acts of the Apostles, and that Paul's argument from the Old Testament, like that addressed to the Jews at Antioch in Pisidia, bears a striking resemblance to that of Stephen, it seems highly probable that this argument on this occasion of Stephen's trial before the Sanhedrin, and others in the synagogues, remained in the retentive memory of Paul his opposer, and though at first rejected, were afterwards accepted as thoroughly convincing, when the appearance of the glorified Saviour had broken down the barrier of his unbelief.

Now, to this testimony of Stephen about "the original facts of Christianity," it would seem that Paul was nearer than Mrs. Ward or any of our generation can claim to be.

But we are not by any means to suppose that Paul had no opportunities of learning from personal witnesses of the original facts of Christianity except those which were furnished by his coming in contact with the followers of Christ whom he persecuted while he "made havoc of the church,

entering into every house and haling men and women, committed them to prison." During this time he must have heard many noble testimonies, as we know he did that of the first martyr, if, as a member of the Sanhedrin, he sat in judgment on Stephen and took part in dooming him to death. After that personal experience on the way to Damascus by which his unbelief was replaced by the faith which endured, faithfully "kept," till he laid down his own life for Christ, Paul made visits to Jerusalem. After a period of preparation for his great works in Arabia, he visited Jerusalem, and especially went "to see Peter." At least five times after his conversion we find the Apostle of the Gentiles at Jerusalem, but this first visit to the scenes of his student life, and of his subsequent cruel career as a persecutor, must have been in some respects the most interesting and important of all. We may not be able to say just how the fifteen days with Peter were spent, as to all particulars, but we may be sure that he to whom these two had given their hearts and devoted the service of their lives was not left unmentioned in their conversations, which could not fail to have been long and earnest. Paul could not fail to have told Peter of the revelation of Christ to himself, not simply as in some vision of the night, but with blinding glory to his very eyes and with audible voice to his very ears; and we cannot imagine the warm-hearted Peter as keeping silence about the words and deeds of him whom he with the fullest conviction had acknowledged as "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

It is true that Paul did not need, and did not seek, that Peter, or any of the apostles, or all united, should "add anything" unto him to give him apostolic authority. He had been ordained by his Lord and "not of men neither by man." Yet he doubtless learned the great facts of Christianity by the use of his mental faculties in the ordinary processes of investigation. There need be no "revelation" to him of those facts which he could learn of from many witnesses, though he was doubtless divinely guided in his selection and arrangement of them in preaching the gospel.

Luke, his companion in many labors and journeys, and sufferings, was, as we believe, divinely guided in writing his Gospel, and yet he himself tells us that he used the greatest care in ascertaining the facts of Christ's life and work of which his gospel gives the account. Divine inspiration does not preclude the use of the ordinary sources of knowledge and means of investigation.

One of the most interesting of Moody's discourses contains his very vivid and moving conception of the events of this visit of Paul to Peter. Many readers will, perhaps, remember how he told of Peter's suggesting to Paul to take a walk with him, and how they went down through the valley of the Kedron and to the garden of Gethsemane, and how Peter told, with deep emotion, of all the events of that sad scene in the garden where the Saviour was bowed in agony unutterable under the burden of the terrible sorrow that was drawing on, and how, afterwards, they walked together to Calvary, the scene of the "World's Tragedy," and how Peter, with tears flowing again, as they did in his bitter grief outside the High-priest's palace, told of his base denial, and following afar off, and how the innocent Sufferer endured alone, apparently deserted of God and man, that agony at which even nature dimmed her light and shook with strange throes. Memory does not fully reproduce Mr. Moody's vivid word-paintings, and this is not necessary for the present purpose. As his strong common sense concluded that during this fifteen days visit to Peter, Paul, who had received his call as the Apostle to the Gentiles would certainly not fail to visit each scene of interest connected with the wondrous life and death and living again of him whom he was to proclaim as the Saviour of a lost world, so we may safely conclude that Paul became thoroughly informed about "the original facts of Christianity" which it was to be his life-work to tell others, as well as the foundation of that faith and hope which upbore and carried him through all the dangers and difficulties of that great career, which to its tragic and yet glorious end, is a standing witness of the truth of Christianity.

Historians, if possible, visit the scenes amid which the events they relate took place, and the biographer of Macauley gives us a vivid picture of his earnest investigations on the spot where a siege was long resisted, or on fields where great battles were fought. But Macauley walking repeatedly around the walls of Londonderry enjoyed small advantages as a historian compared with those of Paul in learning "the original facts of Christianity." Even after centuries have rolled by, and besom after besom has swept with destructive force over the holy land, so that though once flowing with milk and honey, a land of olive groves and vineyards, it has become almost a desert, yet even now this country so illustrates the events narrated in the Gospel that many cross the ocean to gaze on its hills and valleys, and especially its Jerusalem, that they may have brought more vividly before them the events of that most wonderful of lives which was lived

"In those holy fields  
Over whose acres walked those blessed feet  
Which [many] hundred years ago were nailed,  
For our advantage, on the bitter cross."

Paul was familiar with the land and the city, and there, the scenes of our Saviour's life, unchanged—for that life had been laid down but five or six years before this visit—could all be pointed out by those who witnessed his deeds and heard his words.

Luke's narrative, so careful and accurate in its distinct statements of the dates of events of the titles and functions of civil and military officers, under the complications of imperial and provincial government, and the many changes of administration, is very suggestive of the accuracy of Paul's information. From all the circumstances, we can hardly doubt that he knew all that Luke knew about "the original facts of Christianity." Indeed, it is probable that he knew more than is recorded by Matthew, Mark and Luke, while he must have had from the mouth of the beloved disciple some of those profound discourses which he alone could reproduce. These seem clearly the probabilities of the case. But reduce them to one-half or even one-hundredth, and we



think that even then we should find Paul nearer the original facts of Christianity than Mrs. Humphrey Ward or any who like her rejects the accounts in the Gospels. Whatever may be doubtful in the case, there are three things about which there can be no doubt. One is that Paul had the highest reasons for knowing these facts thoroughly. Another is that he had the fullest opportunity to give the information; and the third is that he had a mind of unusual perspicacity and logical acumen for the investigation of testimony. These three things being certain, there can be little doubt as to his knowledge of these facts. Add to these his moral honesty and truthfulness, and we have in him a witness whose testimony is unimpeachable.

Strong as these probabilities are, however, we are not dependent on them for our conclusion as to Paul's knowledge of the "original facts of Christianity." We have more direct evidence.

We may point in passing to the address which he made, according to the account of the accurate and careful narrator, Luke, before Festus and King Agrippa, before he, as a prisoner who had appealed to Cæsar, and Luke with him, set sail for Rome. Does the speech indicate an ignorance of these facts on the part of the speaker? Could such an argument from the fulfillment of the prophecies of the coming of the Messiah have been made to prove that Jesus was this Messiah, and that before a royal personage who well knew the prophets, if Paul did not know the facts about Christ which constituted the fulfillment? To ask the question is to answer it. But we have the answer, too, on the very face of the narrative. Not only the speaker, but the hearer, also, knew of these things. "The king knoweth of these things unto whom I speak, for these things were not done in a corner." If they were so noised abroad that King Agrippa knew them, can we imagine Paul saying this, and yet, not knowing them himself? But in this speech, Paul mentions the two most important of all these facts. Doubtless he had mentioned many others in his vivid and moving presentation which so agitated Kin

Agrippa and led the ignorant heathen Festus to attribute his fiery earnestness to madness. Christ's suffering and the necessity for it, ("must suffer"), and then his resurrection, are presented to his wicked, and yet deeply moved, audience. He announces that after the meeting of the first necessity, there is a second in order to the accomplishment of his work as the Messiah. He "must suffer;" but, after this suffering unto death as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, "He first, by the resurrection from the dead should proclaim light both to the people (of Israel) and to the Gentiles."

But there is more direct evidence of Paul's knowledge of these facts than such reports as this of his companion, Luke.

To use the words of Dean Howson, "In the wide waste of waters which modern criticism believes itself to have spread over the firm and fruitful ground of Divine Revelation there stands an island, the solid foundation and clear surface of which are not questioned. This is the portion of the New Testament which consists of the Epistles written to the Corinthians, the Galatians and the Romans."

He proceeded to point to the well known fact that while Baur and his Tübingen school have rejected almost the whole of the New Testament as a collection of genuine productions, there is an exception they have been constrained to make.

The first four epistles of Paul, even the skeptical Renan, who has so dared to travesty the whole Gospel account with his remarkable gift of speech and descriptive powers, says of these four Epistles of Paul, that they are "indisputable and undisputed," and that "the most severe critics, such as Christian Baur, accept them without objection."\*

Now, it is well known that there has been a remarkable recession of these waters of late. Even Harnack, the Ritschlian and former leader in the Tübingen ranks, has felt constrained to take, as he expresses it, "a step in the 'reac-

---

\*See Howson's "Evidential Conclusions from the Four Greater Epistles of St. Paul,"

tionary direction,' even beyond that which is considered the middle way in modern criticism." In the introduction to his late work, "Die Chronologie der alt christlicher Literatur." (The Chronology of Early Christian Literature), he says, "The presuppositions of the Baur school can now fairly be said to have been entirely discarded."

His conclusion is, "In the entire New Testament there is probably but a single pseudonym writing in the strict sense of the word—namely, Second Peter." (It is difficult to see on what ground he makes this exception when we see how early and how frequently Second Peter is quoted.)\*

Mrs. Humphrey Ward puts close questions to the "Curate" as to whether he has read certain books—Harnack's History of Dogma among them. One would like to ask her, "Have you read Harnack's 'Die Chronologie,' and Zahn's "Einleitung," in which the two great leaders of opposing schools come together in the conclusion that the positions of the Baur school, which Mrs. Ward, Tolstoi, and other popular writers seem to consider infallible, are entirely false and without foundation ?

All who are well informed know that the waters of this flood have receded and left the fruitful ground free to bloom and bear its fruit again; but many writers seem to be under a spell which causes them still to speak in a diluvian, if not antediluvian way. But this flood, at its highest, left these four hill tops uncovered—Romans, First and Second Corinthians and Galatians.† Now can any one open these Epistles and read them, and imagine that the writer, whom even the skeptics agree to have been the Apostle Paul, the contemporary of Christ, the persecutor of his first disciples, and

---

\*Zahn dates it before First Peter.

†From the four principal Epistles of St Paul.

"Baur says, in his Apostle Paul, (i. 8): 'Not only has no suspicion of the authenticity of these Epistles (Romans, I and II Corinthians and Galatians) ever arisen, but they bear so incontestably the seal of the originality of Paul, that one cannot comprehend for what reason critics could raise any objection to them.' "

"Holtzmann (Einleit. in's. N. T. p. 224): 'These four Epistles are the Pauline Homologoumena (books universally received) in the modern

then the devoted preacher of his gospel, and martyr to his cause, did not know accurately and truly "the original facts of Christianity?" It is impossible. We find in these four Epistles, to go no further, that which everywhere presupposes these facts as their back-ground, and as the very reason for their production.

We find in these Epistles such cardinal facts as the death of Christ by the Roman capital punishment of crucifixion.

We find this continually referred to and dwelt on. We find the fact of Christ's resurrection not only spoken of but emphasized as essential to the believer's salvation—without which faith would be vain—(1 Cor. xv. 11-20).

We find doctrines as well as facts which bind these Epistles of Paul to the original facts as given in the four Gospels. For instance, justification by faith is the great theme of the greatest of these Epistles. It is through that very crucifixion and resurrection of Christ of which the Gospels speak that the possibility of it is gained; and all that Paul says about it is but an expansion of the Saviour's own words when he directed the eyes of Nicodemus back to the serpent lifted by Moses on the pole in the wilderness, and then forward to the cross where the Son of man should be lifted up "that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life."

The doctrines of the Trinity, of Redemption, culmination in the Resurrection of the Saints, of the Work of the Holy Spirit, of the Second Advent, to speak of no others, all presuppose the facts and promises contained in the Gospels.

Then when we come to examine into the idea of Christianity as a life, in these four Epistles of Paul, we find, in

---

acceptation of the word. We can realize with respect to them, the proof of authenticity undertaken by Paley against the free-thinkers of his time.' "

"Weizsaecker (Apost. Zeitalter, 1886, p. 190): 'The letters to the Galatians and the Corinthians are, without doubt, from the hand of the Apostle; from his hand also come incontestably the Epistle to the Romans.' "

Renan and DeWette are quoted to the same effect,

fuller development, as in the case of the doctrines, the same duties inculcated as the Gospels represent Christ as teaching. The things about these duties which are distinctively Christian, and different from the conceptions of the heathen and of the Jews of the day, are presented in the Epistles as well as in the Gospels. New motives, as well as new actions, and a different course of life from that led by the unregenerate—the triumph of love over self-seeking, the superiority of the worship of the Spirit to that which is tied to times, places and external rites—the spiritual nature of all holiness as the fruit of the Holy Spirit's work and indwelling, these and other traits, we find in the Epistles, as widening streams flowing from springs in the Gospels.

Then, as Dean Howson so well points out, the persons mentioned in the Epistles and Gospels have such recognizable traits of identity, as in the cases of Peter, James, John and others, that we find in the persons other links between the Gospels and these Epistles, and evidences of Paul's acquaintance with the facts of Christianity.

There is one person who is the chief subject of both the Gospels and the Epistles, and the portraiture in the one set of writings is identical with that in the other. The Epistles present Christ chiefly, as a crucified, risen, reigning Saviour, while the Gospels deal chiefly with his work and teachings on earth culminating in his crucifixion and glorification. But the Christ is the same in both.

When those who reject the Christ of the Gospels and imagine they can get back to the "original facts of Christianity," divested of the supernatural garb in which these appear in the Gospels, and give their portraiture of Christ, they lead us to say "Ye have taken away my Lord." The Christ of modern socialism, the shadowy Christ of Strauss, the merely human and erring Christ of Unitarians and radical critics, or "the hero of a village idyl" of Renan, is not the Christ whom Peter acknowledged as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God," and to whom Paul pointed as occupying the sublimest of all positions—"Head over all things for the Church." To this Christ, Paul, like Peter, bowed as

to his Lord. To him he devoted his whole being. He rejoiced to call himself his "servant," his "bond-servant." For him he laid down his life. Would Paul have done this for a mere phantom, or a mere man, or a village hero?

For further proof there is no space, and surely no need. I think every one must agree that Paul must have had a nearer and a truer view of "the original facts of Christianity" than Mrs. Ward or any of our generation who decline to receive the testimony of the contemporaries and closest companions of our blessed Lord.

It is no small comfort to know that one whose character is so well known to us as is that of Paul—as well known as that of one's father or mother—a contemporary of Christ and of about the same age, of the same race, associated with those who personally knew most intimately the facts of Christ's ministry and death and resurrection and ascension, wrote letters in which the great facts are set forth—letters acknowledged to be his by "the most severe critics"—and that we have these Epistles in our hands? We may be very sure that in these matters, in which his own eternal interests were so deeply involved, he would be a competent and faithful historical witness.

The confidence and joy we experience in all this is by no means lessened when we are assured that Paul's portraiture is drawn with the guidance of divine inspiration and the enlightenment of divine revelation, so that his testimony concerning our Lord becomes a part of the Word of God which cannot be broken."\*

As to the reliability of the "scientific theology" to which Mrs. Ward refers, two notable tests which have been made quite widely known may be referred to; namely, the mistake of Dr. McGiffert of Union Seminary, New York, in accepting the fraudulent "Acts of Pilate" as a document of a very early age, and superior to other frauds of the same

---

\*For the evidence which these four Epistles, universally acknowledged as Paul's, afford of the genuineness of the other Pauline Epistles, see Dean Howson's *Evidential Conclusions from the Four Greater Epistles of St. Paul*.

name; and the revival, not long since, by a German critic,\* of the absurd story of the determination of the New Testament Canon by the Council of Nice.

This "Acts of Pilate," made the occasion of a lecture to his class on the "Pilate Literature" by Dr. McGiffert, proved to be the trick of a fallen minister, afterwards a western hotel keeper, who had used it in connection with other similar matter to fill his pockets at the expense of the ignorant and gullible for many years; and the story of the formation of the Canon repeated lately by a German Critic, is absurd, since the Council of Nice did not deal with the question of the Canon, and his scientific historical method allowed him to repeat an old, long ago discredited story, originating late in the ninth century at the earliest, and revised by Pappus of Strasburg, in the 16th.

Ritschl's claim was that he had "shelled Christianity out clean and rejected all the chaff of human speculation which has, from the beginning, surrounded it and hid its real character from sight."† It is surely a good thing to strip off all the husk which Romanism, or Platonism, or a false theology or philosophy of any kind, may have covered it with; but it is a very different thing to go back to the testimony of the original witnesses, and assuming that God would accompany his great intervention for the salvation of lost men with nothing of a miraculous kind, to proceed to strip off all that savours of the supernatural in their testimony. Transferring into the figure the corn with which we are best acquainted, under that name, we would say, "Ah, dear friends, you who treat the works of Apostles and Evangelists not as the Word of God, but as your 'sources,' are doing a sad business for a famishing world. You are not only stripping off the husk, but shelling off the grain and leaving us nothing but the dry cob of your conclusions." This is poor eating, not sweet in the mouth, and the digestion, we fear, will be something indescribable.

---

\*See *The Bible Student* for January, 1900.

†See Dr. B. B. Warfield's reviews of *The Ritschlian Theology*, *Pres. and Ref. Review*, Jan. 1898, p. 181.

No, we do not believe the stripped and manipulated facts are the original facts of Christianity. We believe Christianity to be supernatural and feel that it was reasonable and fitting that its introduction and establishment should be heralded by supernatural accompaniments. These original facts, fully witnessed by the most unimpeachable testimony, have come down to us through the ages robed with the royal livery of the King and bearing to us the sweetest sustenance and brightest cheer. They have gladdened the sad world wherever they have come, and filled with blessing every heart that has received them. A glorious train, they still go forth to every dark land and radiate the light of a new happiness and confer a new impulse and power for righteousness.

These unbelieving critics could strip off the robes with which the King has adorned them and send them forth naked, shivering, lifeless shadows, powerless to gladden or to save. These cannot be the original facts. They are simply the deceptive caricatures of them which skepticism could give to mock a lost world.

When the sun is westering, the evening is drawing on, and the shadows begin to fall, the glorious facts of our Christianity surround, sustain and soothe us. In them we find illumination for the dark valley, sustenance for the trying journey, weapons for the last conflict, assurances from the voice that never deceives, and the support of our Beloved who will lead us up out of the dark conflict to the peace and joy of his marriage feast.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

Bethesda, Maryland.



## VIII. THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY A STUDY OF THE MODES OF REVELATION.

We derive our knowledge of God from the manifestations he has made of himself in the works of Creation and Providence; in the written Word; in the person and work of the Redeemer; and in the work of the Holy Ghost. Some of these modes of revelation are natural, others supernatural, while one at least combines both elements. As revelations they are neither independent nor unrelated, and all are no doubt necessary to a full display of the perfections of the Godhead. It is not our purpose in this article to discuss any of these forms of revelation, but to give expression to some reflections suggested by their character and relations.

All Protestants agree in teaching that "the Word of God, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The infallibility and divine authority of the Scriptures are due to the fact that they are the word of God; and they are the word of God because they were given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. No better definition of inspiration can be given than this from Dr. Charles Hodge: "An influence of the Holy Spirit on the minds of certain select men which rendered them the organs of God for the infallible communication of his mind and will." It is thoroughly scriptural. The sacred writers do not pretend to speak in their own names; nor do they demand assent or obedience to their teachings on the ground of their having discovered the truth, or their ability to defend it. They speak always as the messengers of God, and claim for their messages divine authority. The Prophet under the Old Testament, as the name imports, spoke for God. When Paul was criticised at Corinth because he did not conform to the rules of rhetoric his reply was that he received both the truth he communicated and the language in which he conveyed it, from the Holy Ghost. Further than this we have not time to deal

with the nature of inspiration. That the sacred writers claim it in this sense there can be no reasonable doubt. But how is the claim sustained? What proof is there that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost? It may be said that the claim itself is sufficient proof. That the writers are the best witnesses in the case. They certainly knew under what influence they wrote; and their honesty was attested both by the quality of their writing and the sufferings they endured in consequence of their authorship. Or it may be said that the unity of the Scriptures is a demonstration that the human authors were inspired. That so many books, written at intervals through so many centuries, in so many different countries and languages, developing the vast scheme of human redemption, while teaching collaterally of the greatest variety of minor subjects—that these books should each fit into its place in one organic whole is an impossibility on any other supposition than that they were all the products of one mind, and that one omniscient. Or it may be said again that the effects which have attended the scriptures, wherever they have been known and heard, show that there is a divine power connected with them. These and other considerations are not without force. But they would not fit the case in the first instance. How could a Jewish Assembly know that Isaiah was commissioned to speak for God, or how could a Gentile city know that Paul was an Apostle? Certainly not by their mere assertion. Nor would the unity nor effect of Scripture avail, for the reason that these as yet were not apparent. Nor are considerations such as these we have mentioned the ground on which the Scriptures rest the doctrine of inspiration. When the age of Theophanies was closing and the day of inspiration was at the dawn the Lord gave Moses a commission to deliver his people from their bondage in Egypt. When Moses objected that neither Pharaoh nor the Elders of Israel would believe that the Lord had sent him, the Lord said unto him "thou shalt take this rod in thine hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs." Of the preaching of the Apostles it

is written, "God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his will." Here emerges a relation in this series of revelations which first of all we wish to emphasize. The word written is made to depend for its proper attestation upon God's revelation in nature. The reason for the arrangement is not hard to discover. May we not say it is obvious? Creation was God's first form of manifestation. This revelation is addressed to the reason of man. This is what the Apostle says of it in Romans 1:19. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them." What it teaches of God is said to be specifically "his eternal power and Godhood." Here is a book which the mind of man can read, and which carries its own credentials. The mind of man is so constituted that an inspection of this volume necessarily awakens the convictions that there is a God, and that he is Almighty. Nature is present to the view of all men in every age. Here, then, is a witness understood by all, and whose testimony is unimpeachable. We say its testimony is unimpeachable because it is never given except at the command of God. Rational creatures can acquaint themselves with the laws of nature, and by submitting to them, make them subserve their interest; but God alone can control what he has made. The miracle is the work of Almighty power. It is this fact that constitutes the value of this form of testimony. A miracle wrought in attestation of a divine commission was the seal of the Almighty. The greatest miracle was the resurrection of Christ, and of this it is written that he "was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." But all of our Lord's miracles attested his divine mission, and in the same way did the Lord confirm the preaching of the Apostles. Nicodemus expressed the common sentiment when he said to our Lord, "We know thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." We have been surprised and pained to notice the

position assigned to the miracle as proof of inspiration by some able and conservative American theologians. Rev. Francis L. Patton, D. D., in his little work, "The Inspiration of the Scriptures," says: "Whether the Bible is a supernatural production or not, it certainly does constitute, in its main features, a record of divine communications." Rev. Basil Manly, D. D., in his "Bible Doctrine of Inspiration," says, "To this argument (internal evidence) is added in some cases the peculiar seal of miracles." Dr. Charles Hodge, under the head of "General Considerations in Support of the Doctrine," remarks, that "On this point little need be said." We are not disposed to call in question the position of the first and second writers mentioned that the testimony of the sacred writers as to the influence under which they wrote should be admitted. Nor do we take issue with Dr. Hodge when he says that the business of the theologian is to set forth what the Bible teaches. But the questions will suggest themselves. Do the sacred writers testify to nothing but the fact that they were moved by the Holy Ghost? And does the Bible teach nothing concerning inspiration but its nature? It is said to be well to learn from an enemy. Certainly those who have assailed the inspiration of the Scriptures have directed their main assault upon the miracle. The English Deists questioned the credibility of miracles, and the modern German Rationalists have impugned their reality. Nor is this a recent device of the enemy. We find that the Pharisees felt the pressure of the miraculous deeds of Christ during his public ministry. Not being able to discredit them as facts, they ascribed them to Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. In regard to this matter the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. It seems to us that the Bible is as careful to state the proof of inspiration as it is to unfold its nature. And we find those who reject the proof upon which inspiration is made to rest in the Scriptures either deny the doctrine or explain it away. Hence it is that we feel pained when good and great men, such as we have mentioned, made so little of the mira-

cle as a proof of inspiration. Some of our readers no doubt remember a small volume which created a sensation when we were in course of training for the ministry. As we remember, the title was "The Christ of History." It proposed to do great things for the Lord. Leaving out the miraculous elements in the life of Christ, it would show from what was left that such a life was impossible under the circumstances except on the supposition that Christ was more than a man. Many of us read the book and applauded the author, He was the hero of the hour. A champion of the faith had appeared who could hold the fort without firing a cannon. We think differently now. Experience has taught us that God is the best judge of the kind of evidence needed to establish the truth of his Word.

The design of inspiration is to secure infallibility in teaching. So far as the Scriptures are concerned, it appertains to the record. Revelation has a different design. It is intended to communicate knowledge. Inspiration is broader in its scope than revelation. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. As a record, the whole Bible is inspired, because holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But, when we consider the matter of the Bible, we find that, while some of it could be known only by means of supernatural communication, much of it comes within the scope of ordinary observation and experience. This latter element is not strictly speaking revealed truth; but, being attested by the Spirit of inspiration, it stands in the Bible on the same basis with the supernatural element. Both are received by faith, because both rest on the direct testimony of God. Here then we have a revelation made to faith covering the same ground as that which in nature is addressed to reason; and we have, in addition, an element in this revelation which transcends reason. Bishop Butler has found a basis here for his immortal Analogy. He says: "The design, then, of the following treatise will be to show that the several parts principally objected against in this moral and Christian dispensation, including its scheme, its publication, and the

proof which God has afforded us of its truth ; that the particular parts principally objected against in this whole dispensation, are analogous to that which is experienced in the constitution and course of Nature." Origen had observed that "he who believes the Scripture to have proceeded from him who is the Author of Nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it, as are found in the constitution of Nature." To this Butler adds : "And in a like way of reflection, it may be added, that he who denies the Scripture to have been from God, upon account of these difficulties, may, for the very same reason, deny the world to have been formed by him." But this comprehensive feature of the Bible has generally been regarded in a way very different from that taken by Butler. As is well known, this common ground of reason and faith has furnished the field of battle to the friends and enemies of supernatural revelation. Every new science in modern times has been employed as an instrument in an effort to convict the Bible of error. Not only so, but, from the conceded function of reason in the sphere of natural religion, liberty has been taken to claim for it the right also to judge in the realm of the supernatural. Indeed a ground has been discovered in this comprehensive feature of revealed religion for the professed friends of the Bible to stand upon and wage interminable theological strife. From the days of the schoolmen at least, two sets of opposing theological views have been attended invariably, each by its own philosophy of moral agency. Into this wide field we have neither time nor disposition to enter. We have sketched it only that we may indulge in a few general reflections. In the first place, Bishop Butler has shown true discernment in finding in the structure of the Bible means of defence rather than of criticism. Either element of Scripture can be shown, in a way different from that of Butler, to point in that direction. We are aware that those who treat of the office of reason in regard to revelation assign to it only a negative judgment in natural religion. If, for instance, true science should be

able to show that the Bible, correctly interpreted, teaches error there could be but one conclusion. Reason would decide against the claims of such a revelation. We have no sympathy with erroneous theories of inspiration which have been invented to save the credit of God's word. They are not needed. And, if they were, they would not avail. If the Bible is inspired in the sense claimed for it by the sacred writers, then it rests upon the direct testimony of God. Error is inconsistent with such a claim. And there can be no doubt of the right of reason to judge whether or not the Bible does not contradict known truth. It is also true that the mere fact that a pretended revelation teaches known truth is not proof of its claim. And yet Butler shows that analogy may establish a probability that nature and Revelation have the same Author and Cause. If now we connect with Butler's suggestion the history of the true religion, we have a strong probability. It is certainly suggestive that, while false religions have been exposed by this native function of reason, the Word of God has thus far remained unimpeached. That it should have been associated with all the varied forms of philosophical opinion and escaped responsibility for the errors they contained, inclines one to ascribe it to a divine source. If now we turn to consider that element of Scripture which is in the strict sense revealed truth we will find ourselves led to the same conclusion. Here we find the function of reason reversed. It can affirm, but is unable to deny. That it can affirm the truth which it cannot discover is, we think, a certainty. "As we demonstrate, in natural theology, the being and perfection of God from the order and beauty of his works, and infer the relation which he must sustain to the worlds he has made, so the scheme of Providence, disclosed in revelation, may, in its majesty and grandeur, its harmony, beneficence and purity, contain such memorials of Deity as to render skepticism little less than madness. In the case of Christianity, for instance, the glory of God is so conspicuously displayed in the provisions of the Gospel that to the called it would be as easy to doubt the shining of the sun in the

heavens as the divine mission of Jesus. Redemption is its own witness." To this testimony of Dr. Thornwell we may add the following on the same subject, regarded from another point of view: "Such transcendent elements as the Trinity, the incarnation of the Son, the work of the Spirit, personal election and particular redemption are not the ingredients which man was likely to use in devising a system of religion."

Passing, however, from this protest against the war the enemies of supernatural revelation have forced upon its friends, let us view for a moment the far more unseemly strife within the field. Historical theology is a history of controversies. Behind these controversies over the doctrinal teaching of the Scriptures we generally find certain conflicting philosophical principles. The respective parties to the debate have come to the study of the Word of God armed with principles of interpretation drawn from the armor of speculative reason. The common domain of reason and faith is again the pretext. But in this case there is really no excuse for the heat of the conflict. Both parties claim to regard the Scriptures as the Word of God. Both claim to be seeking to know what they teach. It would seem, in advance of the result, that both parties would be willing to take their philosophy, as well as their theology, from the Bible. The Author of redemption is also the Creator of man. The provisions of grace are intended to meet the necessities of the sinner. The Bible does not formally teach ethics or psychology; but it assumes all that these controversialists are fighting over. And the assumptions are always in accord with sound philosophy. Possibly there is some compensation for the weariness of debate in the fact that God raises up now and then men like Edwards, Alexander and Dabney to show how beautifully harmonious is the plan of salvation with the actual constitution of the human soul; and how well adapted to its depraved condition. It is certainly a comfort to know that plain Christians are not troubled with these speculative difficulties.

There are some very striking points of analogy between



the written and the incarnate Word of God. When David says, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path," we understand him to speak of the Written Word. When John says, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," we understand him to refer to the Incarnate Word. But, so close are the resemblances, that there are passages in which it is difficult to say which is intended. No man was more genuinely human than Christ, and yet the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him. The Son of God became man by taking to himself a true human body and a reasonable human soul. In like manner, in the Scripture we have the union of the finite and the infinite. God's mind and will are clothed in the dress of human speech. We may go further, and find an analogy in the genesis of the respective manifestations. The human nature of Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin; and the words of Scripture were given by the Holy Ghost, but written by holy men of God. Close as the resemblances are, however, the Scriptures make a wide difference between the written and the incarnate Word as modes of divine revelation. Without disparaging the written word in the least, or any of the other forms of divine manifestation, the Incarnate Word is celebrated as the only full and complete manifestation of the perfections of God. He is called "the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15), and "the express image of his substance" (Heb. 1:3). Such terms are never applied to nature, providence or the written word. In the nature of the case they could not be. They are applicable only to a person constituted as Christ was. They imply his consubstantiality with the Father, his separate personality and his incarnation. If Christ was not the same in substance with the Father he could not be said, in a real sense, to be the image of that substance. If he was not as the Son, a separate and distinct person, he could not have received the image. And, if he had not been made in the likeness of man, he could not have expressed that image to us. These declarations concerning him bring before our mind all that is involved in the wonderful

constitution of his person. The manifestation of God made in Christ was full and direct. In speaking of it to Philip he said, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is the boast of Dr. Dörner that "the Person of Christ has again come to the front in its exegetical, historical and dogmatic sides, and has been seized by a more profound movement than at any time since the early centuries. The most vital need is widely spread, to gain a true and living view and knowledge of the person of Christ. The conflict of theological and ecclesiastical parties moves increasingly around the person of Christ, as an earnest battle may finally gather around the person of a general." Said of the person of Christ in the Scriptural sense, these would be inspiring words. But let us hear him further: "As the gain of the more recent science since Schelling, the knowledge that finite and infinite do not exclude each other has been demonstrable. Human nature is not finite merely, but has something infinite in it, at least in the form of receptiveness. That which is of infinite value—the moral and the knowledge of the truth originally resting in God alone—does not transcend the idea of man, but belongs to his reality, though derivatively. . . . With this knowledge of the internal relation or coalescence of the Divine and human according to their essence. . . . the spirit of the more recent speculation again turned with delight to the problems of the Trinity and the Incarnation of God." This part of the quotation detracts materially from the value of the other. An impulse to speculate on the person of Christ that arises from the doctrine of the Oneness of God and man—whether that phrase be used in a Theistic or Pantheistic sense—is not a matter of congratulation. In either case, the Scripture doctrine of two natures united in one person is destroyed. And in either case, the satisfaction of Christ—the great work for which he took our nature into union with himself—is rendered impossible. "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt" was criticised on the ground that it ignored the Work of Christ: That would have been a pertinent objection if the work had been sound on the person of Christ.

The person of Christ is not a gospel for sinners apart from his work of mediation. But criticism that called attention to the connection that obtains between hazy views of the person of Christ and inadequate conceptions of the necessity and nature of the atonement, would have been more appropriate. May our Southern Presbyterian Church never forget how to answer the question, How did Christ, being the Son of God, become man ?

It was our intention, when we began to write, to include in this article some reflections suggested by the other two modes of revelation—Providence and the work of the Holy Spirit. It is the misfortune of a busy man, however, that he has not time to be brief. The article has already expanded beyond the orthodox limit. Prudence demands that the remainder of the discussion be suppressed, at least for the present.

W. T. HALL.

## IX. MARTIN LUTHER, THE HERO OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

In presenting to the readers of the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY a picture of the greatest German, I intend to confine myself strictly to the consideration of this great man as a reformer. He certainly has endeared himself to his countrymen in many respects, but the Christian world at large is attracted to him by the great work he has accomplished by the grace of God, and which gives us the right to place him among the reformers of the sixteenth century. I do not intend to describe the whole career of his eventful life; my aim is to collect and to group those facts and events which enable us to understand Luther's place in the history of the Christian Church. I desire this to be understood from the outset: Luther is great in many respects; he indeed belongs to the great heroes of mankind. A biography of this remarkable man is a fountain of instruction; the study of this rich life is to be recommended to all who desire to have a correct and deep insight into the development of the Church of Christ and the history of civilization in the sixteenth century. And I venture to prophesy that the last and best biography of this great man is not yet written.

The task before me is more modest, but it has its peculiar difficulties. I have to limit myself to one point of view—Luther's place among those men whom God used to bring about the reformation of the church in the sixteenth century. Presupposing in my readers a sufficient knowledge of Luther's life and times, I desire to set before them Luther as a man of God, who ranks among his brethren, who may outshine him in some aspects, as the hero *par excellence* in that heroic epoch.

In order to appreciate Luther in his work as reformer, we stand in need of a good definition of reformation.

Reformation and revolution are terms often used as synonyms. This, however, is incorrect. A revolutionary

movement aims at the subversion of existing conditions and the introduction of an entirely new order of things. The old, which is obsolete in the estimation of a revolutionist, has to be annihilated and to be replaced by something which is entirely new. The historical development has come to an end, a catastrophe has first to make *tabula rasa*, before a new historical structure can be raised. The Gordian knot cannot be untied; it has to be cut through by the sword. No wonder that every attempt to patch up the old, as it is called, is ridiculed by radical revolutionists, who are bent on carrying through their schemes at any price. They delight in destruction in order to build of the debris an edifice of their own. Instead of evading conflicts, whenever this might be possible, they invite them and rejoice in all kinds of complications as means to bring about their cherished plans. A revolution ignores existing rights, principles of right and wrong and the continuity of historical development. It breaks down in order to rebuild on new foundations in an arbitrary manner.

A reformation is of a different nature. It is truly conservative in its character. It endeavors, as the etymology of the word indicates, to reform deformed conditions. A reformer of the genuine kind has no ideas of perfection of his own, but noticing the deformed state of things, returns to the beginning of the development, where he finds the original form, traces thereupon its historical growth, finds out the causes of deformation and endeavors to eliminate these causes by returning to the underlying principles, which are the foundation of the whole structure. In the historical development of things he finds elements of sound progress, but also deviations from the correct line of the principles. The thing itself is not entirely corrupted, but its form is out of harmony with its nature. The nature of the thing he tries to preserve, the form he endeavors to re-establish in its simplicity and purity. He is not a surgeon, delighting in amputating limbs, but a physician whose aim it is to preserve and to restore to health.

I do not want to give the impression that reformers are

always conscious of the process of development of the reformatory idea, but viewed by those who are able to pass judgment upon the work of reformers, and to distinguish between a genuine reformatory movement and the arbitrary endeavors of self-styled reformers, it is easily seen that a reformation bears the character indicated above. Reformers are led by God step by step. They grow apace with the expansion of their work. They do not begin their work with a plan ready made. Reformers are by no means politicians and demagogues. They are carried on by a higher hand, who uses them as his instruments. And the same hand, God himself, guides the events which necessitate them to change, not their principles, but their position from time to time.

What I have said may be applied to any kind of reformation, but especially to the reformation of the Church of Christ in its visible organization. It may be that revolutionary methods under certain limitations and conditions may be unavoidable in the realm of the State or society; but with regard to the Church of Christ I assert that reformation is the only legitimate method of reconstruction. Reformation is an ecclesiastical term *par excellence*, revolution in the domain of church life is separatism and sectarianism. The Anabaptists of the sixteenth century are an example of a revolutionary movement in religious circles. They wilfully severed their connection with the existing churches, and in their fanatical zeal tried to build a new politico-ecclesiastical structure upon a new foundation. They considered the reformers to be servants of the letter; they themselves were led by the Spirit, who is a spirit of fire, burning all the hay and stubble in order that the pure gold might appear in the fulness of its glory.

Luther was not a revolutionary zealot, but a reformer by the grace of God. He is indeed the hero of the reformation of the 16th century. I do not say that he was in every respect the greatest man of his age. Other men, whom God has used in carrying out the glorious work of the reformation, excelled him in many respects. Melancthon

was undoubtedly a greater scholar than he, and Calvin's mind was certainly deeper than his, but as a reformer, contending with extraordinary difficulties and doing just the thing that had to be done in the right moment, regardless of friend or foe, he had no superiors, yea, no equals. God in his inscrutable wisdom singled out this obscure worker to open a new era in the history of the Church and the world. All the glory be to God. Luther was a servant of Christ for us. As such we honor him by giving him the place in history which by right belongs to him.

Allow me now to prove that God really raised up his servant Luther and that he made him the hero of the reformation.

First of all, I call your attention to the fact, that Luther as a reformer was undoubtedly the right man in the right place.

Truly God had placed Luther in the right place in order to effect a reformation of the Church of Christ. Germany at the beginning of the 16th century was the center of power and influence in the life of European nations. The ruler of Germany was emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, of the German nation. In order to understand the importance of this title we must remember the views of the middle ages concerning the power God exerts in the world. Hildebrand's idea was deeply rooted not only in the hearts of the Roman hierarchy, but also in the people, however unwilling the political powers might be to acknowledge the correctness of this idea. According to Hildebrand's system, Christ is king in a threefold realm. He reigns supreme in the realms of nature, grace and glory. The pope is his viceregent on earth. The Roman hierarchy is the great spiritual power, which dominates everywhere, indirectly however in the State, which has to be hallowed by the sanctifying influence of the spiritual power of the Church. The crowning of the German kings by the pope sanctions the establishment of the empire as the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, the embodiment of Christ's sovereignty in political matters. The Roman emperor, there

fore, is the ruler of the world in the name of Christ and in harmony with the wishes of the Roman pontiff, who is Christ's viceregent. The Church and the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation are, or at least ought to be natural allies. They together lord it over God's heritage. God in his wisdom placed his servant Luther among the Germans, where the seat of power and influence was found. He was indeed put in the right place. Italy, under the immediate power of the pope, was not the place where a reformer could be prepared for his great work. He would have been crushed before he could begin to exert an influence deep enough to stir the people. Comba's book *I nostri Protestanti* proves very clearly that every effort to reform the Church in Italy was nipped in the bud. Switzerland was too insignificant a country and on that account would not be the centre of a new life at the start of the movement, however great its influence afterwards may have grown under the leadership of the great Calvin. Besides it was at the same time, politically considered, too radical in its principles for the slow and steady development of a reformatory movement, which needs a conservative element as well as a liberal amount of enthusiasm. England was far too remote from the seat of political power to be considered as the theater that had to be chosen for the reformatory movement in its initial stage. Germany was the right place. In that country Luther appeared.

He was sent by God at the right time. It may seem paradoxical, when I supplement my remarks about the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation by the question, whether, after all, the idea embodied in it was beneficial to the success of the reformation of the 16th century. We think of former times and we behold the German emperor a willing tool of the Roman pontiff. It is true sometimes the German emperors chafed under the humiliation of being ruled over by a priest, but as a rule they were but too ready for political reasons, to hold the stirrup of the pope and to kiss his slipper. We must not forget, however, that the condition of things was different at the beginning of the



16th century from what it had been in the palmy days of the middle ages. Although the idea of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation still lingered in the memory of the people, the German emperor himself was no longer the arbiter of the nations of Europe. Several independent nations had sprung into existence since the immigration of the peoples. France had become a mighty rival of the empire and had outstripped it in civilization; Great Britain in its insular position never had felt its influence; parts of the empire itself as Switzerland, Burgundy, the Low Countries, had already severed their connection with the mother country, or were on the point of doing so. The emperor himself was more interested in his personal dominion over Austria, Spain and the newly discovered countries beyond the seas, than in the honor connected with the idea of being emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation.

The old empire was doomed to fall, while the semblance of glory remained. While the idea still lingered in the consciousness of the peoples, the reality of its power was weak.

No better time for the reformation could have been chosen than this transition-period, wherein the nations of Europe became conscious of their independence and inherent strength and Europe had to face a fearful crisis. Germany was still, as I have said, the center of power and influence, but it was not strong enough to check the progress of the reformation. Charles Quint was at times willing enough to crush the new movement, but his power was invariably checked at the right time by his many enemies, who, although they themselves were opposed to the reformation, were the means in the hand of God, to further its interests. Sigismund was able, a hundred years earlier, to send John Huss and Jerome of Prague to the stake and to crush the revolt of the Hussites. Charles Quint on the contrary, although a far greater man than Sigismund, was unable to walk in the footsteps of his imperial predecessor.

God's time to deliver his people had come; at the right time he sent his servant Luther to execute his purposes.

He made it difficult for him to execute his task, but he gave him gifts to bring out the qualities of a hero and shaped the conditions in such a manner, that he succeeded in his work as a conquering hero.

God did not make a mistake—I say it with reverence—in the choice of his instrument. Why did God place Luther at the helm and not Melanchthon; why was Luther the central figure of the reformation-period, and not Zwingle or Calvin? These questions will be answered when we approach the question of questions: Was Luther indeed the right man?

His education prepared him for the arduous task of a soldier of Christ, who is called upon to suffer hardships in the cause of his Master. Luther was the child of poor parents. He belonged to that class of men of whom the Saviour says: "I thank Thee, O Father of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." God chose his servant not from the ranks of the cardinals or other high dignitaries of the Roman Church, he did not set apart the humanistic Erasmus or Reuchlin and he did not deign to enlist the champions of liberty, Von Hutten or Von Sickingen, but he stooped down in order to single out for the carrying out of his purposes the son of the poor miner, Hans Luther. Martin's parents kept him under the strictest discipline and prepared him thereby for the hardships he had to suffer in the execution of God's will. Whether his parents always dealt wisely with him I dare not say, but that they, wisely or not, moulded the hero of the reformation, is certain. His education at home could not have been better considering the purposes of God with the lad.

It is a circumstance of great importance to notice that Luther, when he grew up, intended to study law. The knowledge of law is almost a necessity for a man whose work is to be the reformation of the church. He may not be called upon to be an organizer, yet the knowledge of the law is indispensable for a leader of the people. From the study of the law he was called by God to the study of

theology. He became a monk. In his connection with the characteristic features of Roman Catholic church life, he had many opportunities to become acquainted with the life and the conditions of the church which had to be reformed. I can only give a mere sketch, but it would not be difficult to show how much Luther gained by his intimate knowledge of the secret working of the machinery of the Roman Catholic Church for the work entrusted to him. He became the most loyal Roman Catholic in order to be able to reform the church heroically, but also in a spirit of love and devotion.

His character predisposed him for the work of a reformer. He had a choleric temperament, the special gift of God, as it seems, to almost all truly great men. He had to wrestle with melancholic tendencies, the natural result of the continuous strain upon his nerves. His happy disposition, a humorous vein, which made him a man of great social capacities were an antidote against his melancholic moods. He was intensely popular, but he did not gain his popularity by becoming a slave of public opinion. He had a deep insight into the nature of man and an abundant amount of common sense. He was modest and courageous; he combined the simplicity of a child with the wisdom of a philosopher. He had immense reverence for the church, but was willing to be a martyr to his own convictions of truth and right. He honored all men, but he trusted in God alone. He knew and practiced the art of silence, but in all his utterances he was sincerity and uprightness itself. In short he was an Israelite in whom there was no guile; a hero independent of man but lying prostrate before his God.

Such a man, although of humble birth, enjoying comparatively few advantages, was cut out for the arduous task of a reformer. Indeed Luther was the right man in the right place and in the right time.

Let us now proceed to take into consideration his relation to the Roman Catholic Church. Of what nature ought this relation to be? Do you think that a man who has no sympathy with the church, which stands in need of reformation,

can become its reformer? People, who cling to the church of their fathers, are not in touch with a man who clearly manifests in his position that he has no heart for that church. Luther was a loyal son of the church of his fathers which he loved with filial devotion. In the beginning of his career as a reformer, he undoubtedly was the most genuine Roman Catholic of all his contemporaries. In all the ranks of the hierarchy, from the pope down to the obscurest chaplain in the rural districts, not one could be found who might be placed next to Luther as his equal in his devotion to the church. When the eyes were gradually opened to see the defects of his mother, when he noticed the scandals which were perpetrated in his name, he was filled, not with anger, but with pity. Love, not a censorious spirit, moved him in undertaking to reform the church of his fathers.

But did he really undertake to reform the church? Did he enter upon his work with a plan made ready, being conscious of being called by God to do such thing? Such kind of reformers are found nowadays in great numbers. Our country is full of them. Luther does not belong to this category. His outraged conscience cried out against the nefarious traffic of Tetzal. When he affixed his 95 theses to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg, he really did not realize what this step meant in the history of the church. If he could have foreseen what was to follow, he would perhaps have hesitated to set out on such a perilous undertaking. God meant him to be a reformer. He was blind, but God's eyes were open. God was his leader and he followed with the simplicity of a child. When a few years later at Leipzig he said to Dr. Eck in the course of the important discussion held there, "All the doctrines of Huss are not heretical," he again did not know what a step in advance this bold assertion was. I cannot enter into details in order to show how Luther was led from step to step, until at last he delivered the churches from the bondage of ignorance, superstition and hierarchical despotism, but the personal history of Luther's life is a demonstration

of the great fact that God himself reformed the church, using Luther as his servant, whom he wisely led from stage to stage in the development of his purposes.

God himself reformed the church, I said. Indeed he did. We see this especially in that episode in Luther's life, wherein he seemed doomed to inactivity. I refer to his seclusion on the Wartburg, after his heroic defence of his conduct as reformer before the Diet at Worms. He was taken away out of the midst of important work. And yet how necessary was this seclusion for the development of the reformation! What would have become of the movement if the Word of God had not been the rule of all reformatory actions? On the Wartburg he had not only an opportunity to examine himself with regard to his motives and purposes, but he also had ample time to lay the foundations for that wonderful version of the Holy Scriptures, which even in our times still has the affection of the German people. The time of seclusion shaped to a considerable extent the character of the reformation. The subjective period of Luther's "Sturm and Drangperiode," if not entirely overcome, was at least modified and regulated by the Word of God. His captors, who transformed for a time the reformer into "Junker George," had no idea what an important service they rendered to the cause of the reformation. But God knew why he did it. He had a work to do for his servant, a work for the time being more necessary than his thundering voice and active interference in the course of events. Let us now endeavor to bring out the remarkable qualities Luther manifested in the prosecution of his work.

Very prominent among these qualities is the reformer's childlike faith. Have you ever read the prayer he uttered, before he faced the emperor and all the dignitaries, temporal and spiritual, assembled at Worms? We thank the Lord that this prayer has been preserved to us as a precious legacy. His prayer shows us the source from which he filled his thirsty soul with strength and vigor. Listen, and then tell me whether you have heard anything equal to it, our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane excepted: "O almighty

and everlasting God! How terrible is this world! Behold, it openeth its mouth to swallow me up, and I have so little trust in Thee! . . . How weak is the flesh, and Satan how strong! If it is only in the strength of this world that I must put my trust, all is over! My last hour is come, my condemnation is pronounced. . . . O God! O God! . . . O God! do thou help me against all the wisdom of the world! Do this; thou shouldest do this. . . . Thou alone! . . . for it is not my work, but thine! I have nothing to do here, nothing to contend for with these great ones of the world! I should desire to see my days flow on peaceful and happy. But the cause is thine . . . and it is a righteous and eternal cause. O Lord, help me! Faithful and unchangeable God! In no man do I place my trust. It would be vain! All that is of man is uncertain; all that comes of man fails . . . O God! my God, hearest Thou me not? . . . My God, art Thou dead? . . . No! Thou canst not die! Thou hidest Thyself only! Thou hast chosen me for this work. I know it well. Act Thou, O God! stand at my side, for the sake of thy well beloved Son, Jesus Christ, who is my defence, my shield and my strong tower."

Out of such depths Luther's soul cried unto God, whilst he had to prepare himself to meet his foes, bent on his destruction. But his child-like faith grappled with his doubts and the assaults of the archenemy, and at last he launched out into the calm waters of peace. "Lord," he continued, after moments of silent struggle, "where stayest Thou? . . . Come! come! I am ready! . . . I am ready to lay down my life for Thy truth . . . patient as a lamb. For it is the cause of justice—it is thine! . . . I will never separate myself from Thee, neither now nor through eternity! . . . And though the world should be filled with devils;—though my body, which is still the work of Thy hands, should be slain, be stretched upon the pavement, be cut in pieces . . . reduced to ashes . . . my soul is thine! . . . Yes! Thy word is my assurance of it. My soul belongs to Thee! It shall abide forever with Thee! . . . Amen! . . . O God! help me! . . . Amen!"

This prayer, says Merle d'Aubigne, explains Luther and the reformation. Indeed it shows us, that the reformation is born in a crucible, where its champion was prepared for his work. Such a child-like faith, which rests upon the everlasting rock of God's Word in the midsts of the most fearful doubts and the hottest assaults of the wicked one, was necessary for the work. Such a faith overcometh the world.

Luther, who was a humble child in the presence of his God, was a true hero when he had to meet his foes. He was not bold, but modest in his demeanor towards his superiors. His was not the boldness of anarchists, who despise dignities, but the courage of a man, who honors God in all his institutions and thereby is enabled to meet all, to whom God has given places of honor and authority, as an humble servant of God and as a sovereign in his own sphere. When he was called upon to give an account of himself and his work before the Diet at Worms, he felt the solemnity of the moment. He himself tells us: "I was in a great perspiration, heated by the tumult, standing in the midst of princes" The account he gave of himself and his work in modest language, but with great warmth and firmness, did not satisfy his judges. The chancellor of Treves, the orator of the Diet, indignantly said: "You have not answered the question put to you. You were not summoned to call in question the decisions of councils. You are required to give a clear and precise answer. Will you or will you not retract?" This was a great moment; the success of one of the greatest battles of the spiritual war hinged upon the answer Luther was to give to this question. Luther did not hesitate, when the time had come to speak. The courage of his faith, his true heroism, shone forth in matchless brilliancy, when he said: "Since your most serene majesty and your high mightinesses require from me a clear, simple and precise answer, I will give you one that shall have neither horns nor teeth, and it is this: "I cannot submit my faith either to the pope or to councils, because it is clear as the day, that they have

frequently erred and contradicted each other. Unless, therefore, I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture, or by the clearest reasoning—unless I am persuaded by means of the passages I have quoted—and unless they thus render my conscience bound by the Word of God, I cannot and I will not retract, for it is unsafe for a Christian to speak against his conscience." And then, looking round on this assembly before which he stood, and which held his life in its hands, he said: "Here I stand, I can do no other, may God help me! Amen."

His courage grew apace with the requirements of the work. When in the seclusion on the Wartburg he heard of the disturbances, caused by the new prophets and fanatics, he determined at once to reappear on the battlefield, whatever his friends might do to dissuade him. Although he was an outcast, exposed to the wrath of his enemies, he ventured to show a bold front to all of them. At this occasion he wrote a characteristic letter to his friend and protector, the Elector of Saxony, which explains why the reformation was bound up within him. The letter is as follows: "Grace and peace from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ! Most serene Elector: The events that have taken place at Wittenberg, to the great reproach of the Gospel, have caused me such pain, that if I were not confident of the truth of our cause, I should have given way to despair. Your Highness knows this, or if not, be it known to you now, that I received the Gospel not from man but from heaven, through our Lord Jesus Christ. If I called for discussion, it was not because I had any doubts of the truth, but in humility and in the hope to win over others. But since my humility is turned against the Gospel, my conscience compels me now to act otherwise. I have sufficiently given way to your Highness by passing this year in retirement. The Devil knows well that I did so not through fear. I should have entered Worms had there been as many devils in the city as tiles on the housetops. Now Duke George, with whom your Highness frightens me, is yet much less to be feared than a single devil. If that which is



passing at Wittenberg were taking place at Leipzig, I would immediately mount my horse to go thither, although (may your Highness pardon these words) for nine whole days together it were to rain nothing but Duke Georges, and each one nine times more furious than he is. What does he think of in attacking me? Does he take Christ my Lord for a man of straw? O Lord, be pleased to avert the terrible judgment which is impending over him! Be it known to your Highness that I am going to Wittenberg under a protection far higher than that of princes and electors. I think not of soliciting your Highness' support, and, far from desiring your protection, I would rather protect you myself. If I knew that your Highness could or would protect me, I would not go to Wittenberg at all. There is no sword that can further this cause. God alone must do everything without the help or concurrence of man. He who has the greatest faith is he who is most able to protect. But I observe that your Highness is still weak in faith.

But since your Highness desires to know what you have to do, I will answer with all deference: your Highness has already done too much, and ought to do nothing at all. God will not and cannot endure either your cares and labors or mine. Let your Highness's conduct be guided by this.

As for what concerns me, your Highness must act as an elector, you must let the orders of his imperial majesty take their course in your towns and rural districts. You must offer no resistance, if men desire to seize or kill me, for no one should resist dominions except he who has established them.

Let your Highness leave the gates open, and respect safe conducts, if my enemies in person or their envoys come in search of me into your Highness's gates. Everything shall be done without trouble or danger to yourself.

I have written this letter in haste, that you may not be made uneasy at hearing of my arrival. I have to do with a very different man from Duke George. He knows me well and I know him pretty well."

Luther's sovereignty was of a higher order than that of

an elector or an emperor. It was the sovereignty of a true child of God, conscious of his intimate relation to his Almighty God and Father in Heaven. In this strength Luther went in and out as a hero, who did not fear the face of any man. What Bismarck some years ago boastingly said of the Germans, that they feared no one but God, may in truth be said of Luther, the man of God. Such a man the reformation needed; the scholarship of Melanchthon, of great use certainly in building up the churches of the reformation was not sufficient for the laying of the foundation of this great work.

In critical moments the courage of a leader is needed, a courage which is not only the equivalent of personal bravery, but a courage of the heroic kind, undaunted, but at the same time tempered and guided by wisdom. That Luther's courage was of such a type came clearly out in his dealings with the new prophets of Zwickan, who had succeeded in enchanting the subtle mind of Melanchthon. The prophets had declared that they were certain of Luther's approval of their course. At last he was in their midst. He really did not care to have a discussion with these fanatics, but as they had desired an interview, he could not well refuse it. The conference took place. Stuebner opened the proceedings, explaining his method of reforming the Church and transforming the world. Luther listened to him with great calmness. "Nothing you have advanced," he replied at last gravely, "is based upon Holy Writ. It is a mere fable." At these words Cellarius could contain himself no longer; he raised his voice, gesticulated like a madman, stamped with his foot and struck the table with his fist and exclaimed in a passion, that it was an insult to speak thus to a man of God. Upon this Luther observed: "St. Paul declares that the proofs of his apostleship were made known by miracles; prove yours in like manner." "We will do so," answered the prophets. "The God whom I worship," said Luther, "will know how to bridle your gods." Stuebner, who had preserved his tranquility, fixed his eyes upon the reformer, and said to him with an air of inspiration: "Mar-

tin Luther! I will declare what is now passing in thy soul. Thou art beginning to believe that my doctrine is true." Luther, after a brief pause, exclaimed: "God curse thee, Satan!" At these words all the prophets were as if distracted. "The Spirit! the Spirit!" cried they. Luther, adopting that cool tone of contempt, said in his cutting and homely language, so familiar to him: "I slap your spirit on the snout." Their clamor now increased; Cellarius in particular distinguished himself by his evidence. He foamed and trembled with anger. They could not hear one another in the room where they met in conference. At length the three prophets abandoned the field and left Wittenberg the same day. (The description of this scene is taken from Merle D'Aubigne.) Simple faith then, heroic courage and wisdom in critical moments are the trio of glorious qualities which dwelt together in the heart of the man of God, who was appointed to lead the Church out of its Babylonian captivity. There were great men in those days, and some great men followed him, but he is undoubtedly the hero of the reformation.

The question may be asked: Do you not put Luther on too high a pedestal? I admit it seems as if my description of Luther's character and adaptation to his special work as reformer allows of no limitations, as if he is to be looked upon as the greatest of all the men whom God raised up in the 16th century. This, however, is not the impression I desire to make. He had indeed many limitations. Great men, as a rule, have great faults. Luther was no exception to this rule. It must also be said that he was inferior in some things to several of his fellow-reformers. God knew the limitations of his servant. Therefore he gave him Melancthon who not only was the complement of Luther's character, which was too impulsive, but also a scholar who was able to be the theological guide of the movement. In Bugenhagen Luther found an organizer who was able to grapple with the questions which came up when the Protestant churches detached from the commission of the Roman Catholic church had to be built up on a new ecclesiastical foundation.

But, and this we maintain emphatically, in breadth of mind and heroic leaderships, Luther had no equals. Matters of detail he had to leave to the consideration and care of his coadjutors, but with the keen eye of an angel he surveyed the whole field. He was, as it were, a Moses, his helpers, the Aarons and Hurs. He was not only a pathfinder, but he knew how to lead others in the path he had discovered. He built the house, the finishing part of the work he left to others. Melanchthon might write the Augsburg Confession, but Luther was the spirit that lived in that document. Justus Jonas might preach with fiery eloquence; the inspiration, humanly speaking, came from Martin Luther. The influence of his genius was felt everywhere. Take Luther away, and a Melanchthon, a Justus Jonas, a Bugenhagen, are impossibilities. They all belong to the system, but the centre of it is Luther.

An objection is sometimes raised against Luther's reformation, that it was not radical enough. On this account the Swiss reformation and the later developments of the reformatory movement in Scotland and America are praised and exalted above that of Germany.

Comparisons are odious, but we cannot help comparing the German with the Swiss reformation. It is true, the reformation in Scotland was more radical than the German movement. Politics and religion were mixed in Zurich and Basle. I do not now wish to enter into the consideration whether this is so be praised or blamed. For argument's sake let us take the position that it may be commended. No one, however, will deny that we must first be convinced of the expediency of mixing politics with religion under given circumstances. It certainly cannot be claimed to be a principle, which has to be carried out at all hazards. In Switzerland, a small country where there was no central government, strong enough to crush such a movement in one or the other of the small cantons, the magistrates of the cities and villages were left to their own devices. The city council was not disturbed, if it decreed, that henceforth the gospel should be preached and everything ordered in harmony with the new measures.

In Germany such a course was impossible. It is always wrong to judge about things in the abstract. In order to form an equitable judgment about Luther's work in this respect, we must take into consideration Germany's condition. If it had been Luther's aim to bring about a thirty years' war in the sixteenth century, he ought to have taken Jusirgle's course. But as far as we can judge, he would thereby have jeopardized the work of the reformation in its beginning. The tender plant could not have withstood these storms in the spring of its existence.

Luther was sorely tempted to join hands with the Hutton's and the Sickingen's, once full of burning patriotism, who desired to make Germany free from pope and Cæsar at the same time, but let us give thanks unto God, that Luther overcame the temptation and limited himself to the reformation of the Church. I think Luther's wisdom was very great in his humble self-limitation. Goethe says of such men: *In der Beschraenkung zeight sich der Meister*, i. e. freely translated: It is the mark of a master, if a man knows to limit himself. Luther was not foreign to temptations to overstep this boundary line, but he conquered himself in abstaining from all ambitious schemes, which could not be realized in Germany at that time. The Germany of the sixteenth century was not ripe for political development in the line of freedom and self-government. Other nations had to take the lead in this direction. On England, and not on Germany was bestowed the gift of free government. Calvinism was set apart to work as a ferment in the political life of the Netherlands, Britain and America. It is evident that Germany's time for political development had not yet come, when Luther was called to strike the keynote of the reformation. That Luther clearly saw this and acted accordingly, is a sign of the heroic surrender of this great and noble soul to the limited work of the reformation of the Church.

It is also said that Luther was dissatisfied with the outcome of his life work at the end of his career. His life was in his own estimation a failure. I do not doubt for a

moment that he had in his later years moments of depression. It is very natural. The more a man grows the vaster the field before him becomes. Men without any ideals never feel discouraged. Oxen and sheep are satisfied, as long as they have good pasturage. No true reformer, who has grown up with his work, can be pleased with that which he has accomplished. His ideal has not been realized. Hence he is dissatisfied with himself and his achievements.

But let us remember that Luther was in his death a triumphant child of God. He firmly stood by what he had preached, commending his soul into the hands of his Heavenly Father, in whose redemption he gloried until his eye closed and his voice was hushed in death. The heroic reformer was a hero in life and death.

If Luther in his own strength after a preconcerted plan had begun this work he might well have been dissatisfied, for the development of the reformation was, as everything on earth, imperfect; Luther's ideals were in part realized. But being led by God Himself, he has conducted himself in the main in a noble manner with heroic courage and implicit faith in everything whereunto God had called him. Some things he did, which have to be deplored, especially in his controversies with the Swiss brethren, but love covers these sins. On this account I have not mentioned them in my essay. He has been a faithful servant, who found his greatness in the carrying out of the will of God. As man he had his limitations, in his character he had his weaknesses, but as a reformer he certainly has had no superiors, he was—and this title belongs to him by the grace of God—the hero of the reformation.

Orange City, Iowa.

NICHOLAS M. STEFFENS.

## NOTE.

### A SIGNIFICANT CONFESSION.

The leading article in the *Homiletic Review* for January is an exceedingly interesting and instructive one. It is written by William M. Ramsay, D. C. L., L. L. D., Professor of Humanity, Aberdeen, Scotland. It is on the subject of the historical trustworthiness, and the date of the composition of the Acts of the Apostles.

He tells us that "twenty or fifteen years ago there was a large body of learned opinion in Europe which regarded the question as practically decided and ended, with the result that the Acts was a work composed somewhere toward the middle of the second century after Christ, by an author who held strong views about the disputes taking place in his own time, and who wrote a biased and colored history of the early stages in Christian history with the intention of influencing contemporary controversies. The opinion was widely held in Europe that no scholar who possessed both honesty and freedom of mind could possibly dispute this result." We would naturally suppose that the learned opinion, to which the writer here alludes, must have had a very solid foundation for its decision. Nothing but a very solid foundation would seem to justify such a radical departure from the hitherto unchallenged tradition of the Church. We cannot believe that a learned opinion would impeach the veracity of a writer without being driven to do so by strong, if not indeed by irresistible, reasons. The book of Acts bears on its face the character of an artless and exceedingly interesting narrative. It is written in a style marked by simplicity, naturalness and directness of purpose. The author discloses his aim in the outset, viz., to supplement a previous narrative addressed to the same friend Theophilus, to whom he addresses this writing. He had given his friend a carefully prepared account of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was taken up;" and he evidently

means it to be inferred that he proposes to trace the movement which Jesus inaugurated to a further stage of its development. In keeping with this aim he mentions the course which Christ had mapped out for the movement to take. By appointment of Christ, the disciples were to witness for him in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Now, it has seemed to the readers of the book, in all ages of the Church, that the author stuck to his theme, and described in simple yet graphic phrase the marvellous beginning of apostolic labours in Jerusalem, and then the ever-expanding circle of their activities and influence, over Judea, over Samaria, and out into the limitless field of the world. He writes as an eye and ear witness of much that he tells, and his tone is ever that of an honest and earnest soul. Why not accept the book for what it purports to be? Do we not feel the need of just such a narrative to put us in touch with the apostles? to account for the beginnings of the church? to bridge over the gap between the departure of Christ and the history of the church in the second century? Certainly the scope of the book as defined by the author was a worthy one, and the book, if it can be regarded as veracious history, is a valuable one. But the learned opinion of Europe felt constrained to reject the author's own account of his work, to charge him with a covert purpose regarding the controversies that were dividing the church, and with coloring the history, i. e., falsifying the history, in the interest of this covert purpose. So confident were those, representing this learned opinion, in the justness of their conclusion that they made it the test of fairminded scholarship. "If you do not agree with us," they said, "it is either because you are ignorant, or dishonest, or hampered by tradition."

On what ground was this very dogmatic and revolutionary conclusion based? The chief interest of Mr. Ramsay's article is in the answer which it furnishes to this question: "For many years critic after critic discussed the question of imperial persecution of the Christians, examined the documents,



rejected many indubitably genuine documents as spurious, and misinterpreted others, with the result that with quite extraordinary unanimity the first idea of state persecution of Christians was found in Trajan's famous "Rescript," written about A. D. 112 in answer to a report by the younger Pliny. Now observe the result. If there never was any idea of state persecution before that year, then all documents which allude to or imply the existence of state persecution must belong to a period later than 112. At a stroke the whole traditional chronology of the early Christian books is demolished, for even those which are not directly touched by it, are indirectly affected by it. The tradition lost all value and had to be set aside as hopelessly vitiated. Here then is the reason for such positive denial of the historic veracity of Acts. It represents the Christians as persecuted by the state until the reign of Trajan. Hence the writer of Acts lived after Trajan's reign, and ascribed to the early period of the Church about which he wrote conditions which did not exist till later. How did learned opinion arrive at the conclusion that "the first idea of state persecution of Christians was found in Trajan's famous Rescript." By "rejecting many indubitably genuine documents as spurious, and by misinterpreting others." This is Mr. Ramsay's explanation of the matter. It is not surprising that he should characterize the unanimity of these critics as "extraordinary." It is somewhat remarkable that even one scholar, deserving the name of a critic, should reach a conclusion by such a method. It can be nothing less than extraordinary when a number unite in that conclusion, especially when they proclaim it and make it the touchstone of scholarship. Gibbon has been regarded as none too credulous touching the documentary history of the early Christian church. But Gibbon was credulity itself compared to these critics who reached their conclusion by "rejecting many indubitably genuine documents."

After quoting the familiar passage from Tacitus, describing the persecutions of the Christians by Nero, Gibbon says "the most sceptical criticism is obliged to respect the truth

of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus." Obviously Gibbon was not acquainted with the most "sceptical criticism." It had not yet developed. It was reserved for Christian scholars, for high and reverend dignitaries of the church to show the possibilities of sceptical criticism.

But how stands the matter now? Has the learned opinion of twenty or fifteen years ago persisted to the present time in the conclusion that the book of Acts was written about the middle of the second century? By no means. "Such extreme opinions are now held chiefly by the less educated enthusiasts, who catch up the views of the great scholars and exaggerate them with intense but ill-informed fervor, seeing only one side of the case, and both ignorant and careless of the opposite side." So says Mr. Ramsay. The learned opinion that was once the badge of scholarship has now come to be the badge of ignorance. How did this happen? Have any new documents been discovered? Any new light thrown on the subject from outside sources? No, indeed, and yet, according to Mr. Ramsay, "it is now universally admitted, as the fundamental fact in the case, that Pliny and Trajan treat state persecution of the Christians as the standing procedure. Pliny suggests, in a respectful, hesitating, tentative way, reasons why the procedure should be reconsidered. Trajan reconsiders it, and affirms again the general principle; but in its practical application he introduces a very decided amelioration." Note that learned opinion has not only abandoned its conclusion, but has done so for the reason that a right interpretation of the documents, on which it rested, overthrows it.

The critics "with extraordinary unanimity rejected many indubitably genuine documents as spurious" in order that they might make Trajan's famous "Rescript" the solid, immutable basis of their critical theories. Now the critics find that this same famous Rescript furnishes no basis whatever for their critical theories, but on the contrary furnishes a solid and immutable support for the many indubitable documents which they had rejected. Having read

thus far in Mr. Ramsay's article we are beginning to lose our respect for learned opinion. Still it may be possible to find an apology for the critics. May it not be that Pliny's letter, and Trajan's reply are easily liable to misinterpretation? That their natural, and obvious meaning would justify the interpretation of the critics? And that the critics are not, therefore, much to blame for their mistake? Mr. Ramsay gives us an answer to these questions. "The only marvel is that any one could read the two documents and not see how obvious the meaning is. Yet a long series of critics misunderstood the documents, and rested their theory of early Christian history on this extraordinary blunder. Beginning with this false theory of dating and character, they worked it out with magnificent and inexorable logic to conclusions which twenty years ago the present writer, like many others, regarded as unimpeachable, but which are now seen to be a tissue of groundless fancies."

I think we are entitled to regard this as a significant confession on the part of Mr. Ramsay. It is not his object to discredit the critical school by showing them up in a bad light. He belongs to that school, and is regarded as an expert touching the early history of the Christian Church. He is in sympathy with the spirit in which they conducted their studies even in this particular case. "We honor many of those whose views we treat as so mistaken more highly than we do some whose opinions seem to us to approximate practically much more closely to the truth, but whose spirit showed little of the enthusiastic devotion to historical method which characterized the great critical scholars." Yet he confesses that those men whom he admires for their "enthusiastic devotion to historical method," and he along with them, rested their conclusions on what are "now seen to be a tissue of groundless fancies." They did this after careful and repeated scrutiny of the questions in debate. They did it with extraordinary unanimity. They did it with a dogmatic assurance which did not hesitate to brand dissent with the accusation of dishonesty or ignorance.

They did it when "the only marvel is that any one could read the two documents," on which their conclusions were based, and not see that they destroyed, instead of supporting, these conclusions.

It would be manifestly unjust and irrational to say that this one blunder of the critical school, however extraordinary, and absurd it may be, should destroy absolutely our confidence in all other results of this critical school, when those results differ from traditional views of Scripture. It is not a case where the legal maxim holds, *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. But certainly this one blunder, considering the painstaking deliberation with which it was arrived at, the persistency with which it was held, the dogmatic offensiveness with which it was paraded, and withal the preposterous character of it, should make us unwilling to follow this critical school with a bandage over our eyes. Certainly again, this one blunder should palliate our sin if we refuse to be enamored of a historical method that conducts its enthusiastic devotees to such results. These erudite critics have, by the confession of one of their own number, shown themselves capable of "rejecting many indubitably genuine documents as spurious, and of misinterpreting others" in order to maintain a theory which is now seen to rest on a "tissue of groundless fancies." They may not have done the like of this in any other case. They may never do the like again. But they have done it once, and this justifies us in saying to them, "Gentlemen, we can not trust you implicitly. You must be at pains to point out your reasons. You must also be patient with us if we are not always satisfied with the reasons that govern your own minds. You have shown that you are sometimes easily satisfied. You still have the faults for which you chide us. At one time, you are too skeptical; at another too credulous."

Are we not justified from this confessed blunder to draw the inference that freedom from the trammels of a traditional faith does not certainly secure one from falling into errors, arising out of preconceptions? Macaulay, in his

essay on History, mentions as the fault of certain historians that "they arrive at a theory from looking at some of the phenomena, and the remaining phenomena they strain, or curtail to suit the theory." Is it not evident that the historians of the early church, belonging to the critical school, are capable of committing this very fault?

One other use we would make of this significant confession. Learned opinion is intolerant of dissent. As Mr. Ramsay tells us it brands dissent with accusations that are hard to bear. No one who aspires even to a modest measure of scholarship is pleased to have learned opinion rate him as dishonest or ignorant. When we find that this same learned opinion can blunder as egregiously as ignorance itself, this should rob its verdict of at least a part of its terrors. This blunder is clear demonstration that it may be more to our credit to fall under the ban of learned opinion than to follow blindly its lead. R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

## EDITORIAL.

### WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.

Born at Groveville, near Princeton, January 27th, 1825, matriculated at Lafayette College at twelve, graduated with honors before he was sixteen, two years tutor there, graduated at Princeton Seminary in 1836, appointed instructor in Hebrew the same year, and remaining in the same department and the same institution for fifty-four years (1849-1851), when he was pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia—such are the external facts in the life of the great Biblical scholar, who has so recently gone to his reward, at the ripe age of seventy-five.

Two or three of the facts above stated might make the impression that he was a precocious and brilliant man, to whom hard tasks were easy. This was not the case. Dr. Green's career is one of the best contemporary illustrations of the immense results that can be accomplished by definiteness of aim, steadfastness of purpose, and hard work. He had a clear, strong, well-balanced mind, but he was not a genius, in the usual acceptance of that term. He became the greatest Biblical scholar in America, not by natural superiority of intellectual endowments, but by devout and strenuous study. When preparing for college he insistently and earnestly begged to be excused from the study of the languages on the ground that he had no aptitude whatever for them. This incident in the life of a man who became a world-renowned linguist is commended to the attention of those who are pushing the fixed curriculum to one side to make place for optional or elective courses on the supposition that boys at college best know what their own aptitudes are.

The real secret of young Green's perfect recitations in the class room, and of his leisure for chess playing and the reading of Tasso in French, lay in his fidelity and his systematic habits. He was not only prompt at every recitation, but he never missed college prayers in the chapel at five

o'clock in the morning, summer and winter. He made conscience of work. He was a servant of God in study. He early perceived the spiritual value of earnest intellectual toil and the truth of the exhortation which one of the early instructors in Princeton College used to address to his pupils: "Gentlemen, you will find the best preparation for death to be a really thorough knowledge of Greek grammar."

When he became a teacher the same high and serious temper made him intolerant of indolence and lack of conscientiousness on the part of a professed servant of God, and gave him the respect of all his students. The permanent regard of students is not to be won by indulgent and easy-going methods, by expecting little of them, but by inciting them to tasks that will develop their powers and by setting them the example of conscientious application. Dr. Green was not unjust, but he was exacting, and, though teaching the least attractive and most difficult part of the seminary course, the part that sometimes develops those mysterious diseases of the eyes which about the third or fourth week of the Junior year suddenly convince the candidate that he will never be able to see well enough to master Hebrew, he succeeded in making most of his men work harder for him than for any other professor, not by oburgation or passionate denunciation of idleness or stupidity, but by "the simple weight and insistence of his personality"—a modest, earnest, firm, hard-working, scholarly Christian man. One of his former pupils says: "There was often a prevailing sense of short-coming. In many *points*—we offend all." But they kept at it. The man in the chair was a splendid example of what could be done by keeping everlastingly at it. And they knew that, great as were his own attainments and uncompromising as were his demands upon them, he was not a mere scholar and they were not mere students of a language. He never forgot and never allowed them to forget that they were preparing to preach the Gospel, and that the measure of their faithfulness in the seminary would be the measure of their faithfulness in the ministry.

Moses Stuart, Addison Alexander, William Henry Greer—these three. But the greatest of these is Green. Because talent is better than genius in the class-room. Alexander's brilliant mind acquired knowledge with an ease and swiftness as of intuition, and hence, as has been said, he appeared to have no consciousness of a process in his appropriation of a language or its literature. The result was that it was not easy for him to set forth a methodical process of acquisition for the average man. In the lecture room he was copious, rapid, overpowering—too much so for the average man. Only the choice few could keep up with him. As the French officer said of the charge of the Light Brigade, "It was magnificent, but it was not war." Addison Alexander was undoubtedly the brightest star that ever shone in the Princeton constellation, but he was not the greatest teacher. It was Green who introduced method and system there in the study of Hebrew, and showed his students how any man of intelligence and industry could get a secure working knowledge of the language and become an expounder of God's Word at first hand.

"The great thing about William Henry Green," says Dr. Cuyler, "is the beautiful combination of docility and courage that has distinguished all his career." His modesty impressed everybody. I shall never forget the flutter into which I was thrown one day while teaching a class of ministers in Hebrew at the Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, when the door opened and the two greatest Biblical scholars in America walked quietly in and sat down—Philip Schaff and William Henry Green! I suppose I gasped. I know I felt as Dr. Peck said he did when Edwards A. Park entered his church in Baltimore and seated himself to hear him preach. I felt as a young lieutenant would have felt who, when descending to his comrades on the art of war, had seen Napoleon Bonaparte and the Duke of Wellington join his little circle of auditors. I knew them both, and they had always treated me in the kindest and most cordial manner, but I was abashed, dismayed, scared. With an effort I recovered my composure and proceeded with the



work in hand. I knew that Dr. Schaff was nervous, inquisitive, aggressive, and that knowledge did not allay my agitation. But when my eye fell on the quiet figure of the Princeton Coryphaeus there was something so modest and sympathetic in his expression that I was reassured and braced. When a discussion arose, and I appealed to him for his opinion, and he supported in a quiet word or two the view which I had taken, I began to feel some measure even of comfort. I think that even if he had expressed a different view I should have been helped, so quiet, strong and gracious was his manner. I had long known the scholar. That day I began to know the man, and in all my subsequent meetings with him the impression deepened of his manly modesty and courage.

Dr. Green's courage was rooted in his faith and his zeal for the truth. When a graduate of Yale Theological Seminary talking to Archibald Hodge at Dr. Cuyler's table tried to make game of Princeton as fossilized, Hodge said to him: "The trouble with you Yale theological professors is that you only teach your students to think. Thinking sent Adam out of Paradise. In Princeton we let God do the thinking, and teach the students to believe." It was the great goodness of God to Princeton that, at the time when the central subject of theological debate was shifted from the domain of systematic theology to that of Biblical criticism, he gave the seminary in this department a man who believed with all his heart in a supernatural revelation, and who at the same time saw clearly that the conservative position must be defended by scientific processes. And perhaps the most valuable of all his eminent services to the church was his fearless use of the higher criticism. The careful words of Dr. Charles M. Mead are none too strong: "It cannot be doubted that among the higher critics who, with patient toil and profound scholarship, lead in the maintenance of sound views of the Bible and aim to strengthen the foundations of a reasonable faith, will always stand the name of William Henry Green." Six of the fifteen volumes which he has published deal with these problems exclusively. His

masterpiece in this line is his work on "The Unity of Genesis." Besides these fifteen volumes, he has published nearly two hundred review articles and pamphlets, philological, exegetical, critical, not counting the Expositions of the International Lessons which for nine years he contributed to the Sunday School Times. These figures will give some idea of his prodigious industry.

His courage was not less clearly shown in his occasional adoption of new views of interpretation than in his sturdy defence of old views as to the trustworthiness of the scriptures. He knew that his suggestion that the flood was not universal in extent, but only universal in the sense that it destroyed the whole human race, except the family of Noah, would seriously disturb many good people. He knew that his rejection of Usher's chronology of the pre-Abrahamic period, and his contention that the Bible gives us no information as to when the world was created or how many thousand years ago man appeared on the earth, would give pain to many. But, having satisfied himself that Usher and his followers had misinterpreted the fifth and eleventh chapters of Genesis, that links were omitted from these tables, and that they were never intended to furnish the basis of a chronology and could not be used for that purpose, he stated his conviction candidly and supported it with his customary wealth of learning and fairness of argument.

The estimation of his ability and general scholarship by those who had the best opportunity of knowing him was shown more than thirty years ago by his election to the Presidency of the College of New Jersey, which, on being declined by Dr. Green, was tendered to Dr. McCosh. What the faculty of Princeton College continued to think of him to the end, is shown in its congratulatory address at his fiftieth anniversary as a professor: "As an advocate of the higher criticism, his eminent learning has been ennobled by intelligent reverence for the Holy Scriptures and by true spiritual discernment in connection with that linguistic tact, literary skill and historical research which are requisite in the study of all ancient literature. The result is that he has

not disturbed the faith of the unlearned, while commanding the respect of scholars." The estimation of his character and learning by other scholars in the same department may be inferred from his selection as Chairman of the American Old Testament Committee. The estimation of his talents and attainments, by scholars abroad is indicated in the publication of some of his works in German and Spanish, and was fully and warmly expressed in the multitude of greetings sent him on his fiftieth anniversary from the great Universities of Europe. Many of these scholars did not agree with him in his critical views, but they could not withhold admiration for the simplicity and sincerity of his character, the greatness of his attainments, the courtesy and ability of his discussions, and the unity and power of his life—as scholar, teacher, author and man of God.

W. W. M.

## THE DIGNITY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The dignity of an institution like the Presbyterian Church is as valuable as its peace. Loss of respect either from enemies or unruly children means loss of power. The hesitating and apologetic way in which our sister church to the North of us has dealt with the McGiffert case has bred contempt. Following hard on the announcement that Dr. McGiffert would withdraw from the church—Dr. Birch having appealed to the Assembly—Dr. Hillis, a member of Chicago Presbytery, not having taken the trouble, first, to ask for a letter of dismissal to a Congregational Association, thus caricatured and abused the church whose creed he had sworn to adopt and whose peace and purity he had vowed to study. The occasion was a sermon from Plymouth pulpit, Brooklyn:

"To-day one of our greatest denominations still includes that tremendous statement in its Confession of Faith, saying that certain men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death, being 'particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished,' and every young man who enters the Presbyterian Church has to solemnly swear to believe and

teach this fruitful view. And every attempt to revise and expel that statement from the creed has been successfully combatted by a majority that wishes to retain the doctrine. It would seem that if men believed it, reason would be shaken to its foundation. It would seem as if a man would prefer to be burned at the stake rather than hold, or assert, or charge such infinite cruelty upon the all merciful and all loving God. The day the scholastics wrote that chapter in the Confession of Faith they got the devil confused with God. What! Read the story of Christ's life, love, suffering and death, and then charge God with 'particularly and unchangeably designing' the majority of his children to eternal torment? I would rather shake my fist in the face of the Eternal, and fling every vile epithet towards his stainless throne, where eternal Mercy sits with the world's atoning Saviour, than lift my hand with that creed towards God's throne and affirm that I taught or believed it. For the man who does believe that hideous doctrine the hour of judgement has now come. His sun is already darkened; his moon is turned to blood; his stars have refused to give their light. But, for the common people driven toward utter denial and atheism by such false theology, there has risen the light of science to reconcile contradictions, to enforce righteousness, to convict of sin and to recover men unto belief and love for God revealed in our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

The Presbyterian Church had better drop its present apologetic habit towards heretics within its pale. It should deal with them with a sure hand. Presbyterian law is one of the most powerful and unerring engines that was ever set in motion. The Church ought to so rebuke all such offenders as McGiffert and Hillis as to win back the respect, which it has undoubtedly lost, and which any organization without the courage of its convictions must inevitably lose.

---

The next issue of the QUARTERLY will contain reviews of the great Ecumenical Council of Foreign Missions, the Northern and Southern General Assemblies and the other important annual ecclesiastical meetings.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

**DIFFERENCES.** By Hervey White. Pp. 311. Price \$1.50. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston.

No man can pretend to read all that is published in the way of light literature, and yet every well informed man wishes to keep abreast of the times in being informed on subjects widely discussed. Under the garb of romance we have history and civil questions discussed, and many writers use romance to air social theories, and the thoughtful student of social questions will often find in these books not only an interesting discussion of socialism, but the concrete cases that have confronted him in life he often finds discussed with ability.

Thomas Hardy, the English novelist, some years ago endeavored to give voice to his social views in the story of "Jude the Obscure," but the realism of the story shocked the sense of propriety that is natural to English and American minds.

Many of these objectionable features of Mr. Hardy's book are eliminated from Mr. White's, and no one need fear to be shocked.

It is a strange story, dealing with the relations between the rich and the poor, and the artificial distinctions that money creates. A rich, cultivated girl gives up the comforts of a home because she has not earned them, and turning from a suitor of her own rank, she marries a laboring man of talent, but who is destitute of education and culture.

The story itself is commonplace, but it is well told and the characters are strongly drawn. If you have a corner on your shelves for social questions, by all means get this book as a concrete illustration of the subject.

**TO HAVE AND TO HOLD.** By Mary Johnston. Pp. 403. Price \$1.50. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

Long, long years ago, when novels were forbidden, a little boy found *Ivanhoe*, and away in the garret he buried himself, forgetful of dinner and passing time. Years after, when he was living amid rolling drums and waving flags, he found *Scottish Chiefs*, and forgot the world and its woes for the time. Since then he has wondered if he could ever reproduce those experiences, and in reading a book, forget all else.

Recently *To Have and to Hold* was given him for review, and though the weakness and discomforts of an approaching illness were already upon him, he forgot all else; he lived over a hundred years ago; and the world about him became peopled with powdered men dressed in stockings and knee breeches; the forests became swarming with savages; and for a time the existence of Virginia hung in a balance.

To attempt to give the story seems a sacrilege, so skilfully is it told, and to try to reproduce the setting would be like an attempt to paint a sunset. We can only say that nothing in the field of romance can excel

it in all that goes to make up a first-rate novel, while as history it is not to be despised. The local coloring, whether that of the settlement or that of the forest, is perfect, while the different characters are fully sustained.

What adds to the interest of Southern readers is the fact that Miss Johnston is a Virginian, having come from Buchanan, Va. She has been living in Alabama for some time, and in Birmingham her stories have been written. She is a domestic body, having charge of a household of motherless children, but amid the demands of her home she has found time to write two stories that have put her into the front rank of American writers. We can only hope that she will not follow the example of Cable and Page, and imagine that genius cannot develop South of the Mason and Dixon line.

THE CARDINAL'S MUSKETEER. Pp. 357. Price \$1.25. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

We are great believers in the historical novel—not that it teaches the exact facts of history, but because it cultivates a taste for history, and and gives at least a historical setting to the story. Among the times especially suited are those of Richelieu with his many intrigues. One of the cleverest writers of the historical novel is Miss Taylor, who has already written "On the Red Stair Case," and "The House of the Wizard," which are now supplemented by "The Cardinal's Musketeer."

A simple soldier becomes involved in the countless intrigues of Cardinal Richelieu, that wonderful priest, soldier and statesman of Louis XIII. It is a thrilling story of those times when history was being so rapidly made, and to those who prefer to take their history in such shape and are not sticklers for historical accuracy, it is a book to be recommended. We would by all means have it for our boys.

JOAN OF THE SWORD HAND. By S. R. Crockett. Pp. 436. Price \$1.50. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

There is a charm in the name of Crockett, whether that one who was always sure that he was right and then went ahead, or that one whose book is before us, a name suggestive of "The Stickit Minister," "The Raiders" and "The Men of the Moss Hags," stories that are pure in purpose and such as we can safely place in the hands of our children.

When we recall these stories our only great regret in reading them is that we can never read them again with the deep interest of the first time. The time has passed when the youthful thirst for adventure can be satisfied with dry, meaningless books, such as our forefathers had to be satisfied with.

Our children demand something more attractive, and we are glad that they do. The wise parent ought to stock his shelves with such books as we have mentioned, else his boys will find the yellow-back novel with all of its abominable details of crime.

If we had our way we would have in each pastor's library a shelf de-

voted to such books where the boy of the house can find something suited to his taste, and where even the parson himself can rest his mind awhile by making excursions into the field of romance and history.

"Joan of the Sword Hand" is a romance of the fifteenth century, filled with adventures many and exciting.

The name of the author is proof enough that nothing but the best and purest will be found in it.

**RAMSAY'S EXPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER.**—An Exposition of the Form of Government and the Rules of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, by Rev. F. P. Ramsay, President of Fredericksburg College, Virginia. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

It is gratifying to note that the Presbyterian Committee of Publication is doing its publishing work so creditably. Both in the character of the books published and in the details of their manufacture, the Committee deserves the approval of the church. President Ramsay's Exposition of the Book of Church Order exemplifies both these facts.

As stated on the title page and in the preface, the work is limited to exposition, and does not undertake to criticize nor to defend any provision of the Book of Church order. Those who know President Ramsay would expect these comments to be intelligent, acute and discriminating. Such they are; moreover, they are clear, concise and judicious both in thought and expression.

On Ecclesiastical Commissions he holds that, except for the ordination of a minister, the commission of a Presbytery may consist of a single person; that, on this principle, an evangelist can ordain and organize churches; and that a majority of the Commission appointed to ordain a minister, any three of the four, is a quorum competent to discharge the duty.

On offences which are the proper object of judicial process, he says, "If she [the church] should be on the point of judicially prosecuting for something contrary to the standards indeed, but not to the Word of God, she must not enforce the standards as law rather than the Scriptures; for only the Scripture is law in this Church."

As to extraordinary cases for licensure, Dr. Ramsay says, "The exception is not an exception from attainments, but from the ordinary conditions of getting the attainments." That is, the candidate need not have gone to college nor studied two years under some approved teacher of theology, provided he can stand the examinations on the college and seminary studies prescribed. This is not the usual interpretation.

May a Presbytery then license a candidate who cannot stand the examinations on the branches required? According to President Ramsay the Presbytery may do so. He says, "Whenever a Presbytery perceives that Christ has qualified a man for the office of the ministry who is ignorant of one or more of these branches of learning, the Presbytery

ought not to refuse to recognize the manifest will of the King, and issue the license."

There are two valuable indexes: 1. Analytical of the chapters and sections as they occur in the book; 2. Alphabetical of topics, quite complete and accurate.

This little volume of 298 duodecimo pages will doubtless take its place along with Dr. Beattie's Exposition of the Confession and Dr. Alexander's Digest, as a standard of our Church.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

THEODORE BEZA.—By Henry Martyn Baird. Pp. 376. Price \$1 50. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

Putnam's Sons have been giving the reading world the lives of illustrious men in the different departments of life, and in pursuance of this idea they have begun the Heroes of the Reformation—naming each one, according to the role he played.

Luther is named the Hero of the Reformation. Melancthon, the Protestant Preceptor of Germany; Erasmus, the Humanist in the service of the Reformation; and Beza the Counsellor of the French Reformation.

Among these heroic men Beza is one of the most attractive. His life was long and brilliant, and for years he was the recognized Counsellor of the Reformed Church in France, and its leader in time of peril.

For years he was the friend and advisor of Henry IV, and thus exerted an influence that was great.

His career is as full of dramatic incidents as one can well imagine; especially his appearance at the Colloquy of Poissy when for the first time Protestantism secured a hearing before the King and royal family.

In the rush of the closing years of the 19th Century we are apt to forget the services of these heroes whose sufferings and steadfastness in the right made possible the liberty we now enjoy, and we therefore hail it as a promising sign that such a firm as Putnam's Sons should publish a series of Reformation Heroes.

JUDEA FROM CYRUS TO TITUS.—By Elizabeth Wormeley Latimer. Pp. 382. Price \$2.50. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago.

Dr. John Leyburn once said in his pithy way, "I have great admiration for the Jews in general, but very little use for them in particular." This remark describes not only the feeling of many to these remarkable people, but it is a fair description of these people themselves.

In general, they are a remarkable people, calculated to win the admiration of the world, while in particular they will not bear close inspection. There can be nothing more picturesque than this people, springing up under Abraham, when other nations were unknown, and preserving their peculiar identity through ages of persecution and oppression, never changing in physical characteristics, no matter under what sun they live and always manifesting the same mental trials whether as the peddler with his pack, traversing the country fields, or the Rothschilds controlling the markets of Europe.



But when we come in close touch with them and make individual study of them, the glorious seems to fade away, and all the petty meanness of human nature comes to the surface.

This book before us will impress us with these two contrary impressions, according as we look at the Jew in general or in particular.

Beginning with Cyrus who has conquered Media, Persia and then Babylon we are introduced to Zerubbabel, the Prince of Judah, a lineal descendant of David, who was then living in Babylon, whom Cyrus selected to lead the Jews back to Jerusalem, having appointed him governor of Judea.

In the meantime Cyrus dies and his son Cambyses succeeds him, who commits suicide and is succeeded by Darius.

When Zerubbabel reaches Judea, he finds that the Jews of the mixed race who had lapsed from the purity of Mosaic Judaism wished to help in building the temple.

When their overtures were rejected, there began the great schism between the the Orthodox Jews and those tainted with foreign blood.

After a time the building zeal languishes and the people become indifferent. Joshua and Zerubbabel seek to rekindle the religious enthusiasm and call to their aid the two prophets Haggai and Zachariah,

The first prophesies about the future glories of the incomplete temple, while the other gives forth a series of Apocalyptic visions.

The temple is finally completed seventy years after the destruction of the first temple.

Now Zerubbabel disappears and his fate is unknown. He has served his purpose and now withdraws from the scene.

After the dedication of the temple Judea for 35 years passes out of sight.

It is during this period that Darius makes his famous expedition against the Thracians and Scythians, and fights the battle of Marathon.

Many great men of the world figured on the pages of history during the same time Aristides, Themistocles, Leonidas and Pericles, and there were also fought the battles of Thermopylae and Salamis.

In Judea social questions were springing up, the strict party favoring no allegiance with outsiders and the Zadokites favoring an opposite policy.

Even the priests and rulers belonged to the liberal party and led the way to strange marriages, contending that the other policy had kept the country back in her progress.

Questions of worldly policy as interpreted by the most religious men among them were found to be at variance with the direct commands of Jehovah, and in consequence morality sank to a low ebb, and men began to see the need of reform.

At this time a reformer in the person of Ezra arose a man who had been reared in Babylon and had been given a commission to come to Jerusalem in order to strengthen the colony sent out by Cyrus.

His vigorous measures soon offended many and caused as before the formation of two parties, the Liberals and the Strict Constructionists.

While such was the state of affairs in Jerusalem, Nehemiah the cup-bearer of the King met in Susa a kinsman from Jerusalem who gives him a gloomy account of affairs there.

Artaxerxes sends him to Jerusalem to rebuild its walls, and upon his arrival Ezra appears before him and persuades him to begin his favorite reform relating to foreign marriages.

Upon the return of Nehemiah to Susa, three enemies of the reformers come to the front, Tobijah, Sanballat and Geshem. After twelve years Nehemiah returns to find that his deputies have all been set aside, and from this time we see no more of Ezra.

Into the history of the Jews the great world conqueror, Alexander the Great, now comes, and to them he shows unusual favor.

It was in Alexandria that the Synagogue first arose, and after the division of the empire among the generals of Alexander the real sorrows of the Jews begin.

Then out of the West there comes a new power, that of Rome, that constantly grows, till it overshadows the world. Judea comes under its influence, and becomes subject to it.

The rest of the story is familiar, with a series of outbreaks and cruel suppressions, culminating in the siege and downfall of Jerusalem.

Through this history as thus outlined, there appear here and there characters unsurpassed in the history of the world, but the nation as a whole is on the downgrade.

One turns from the sickening details of bribery and murder, to that Jew who is the light of the world and who shall be its king.

Miss Latimer is painstaking as a historian, though her work is rather that of a compiler than that of an original historian.

Those who seek to be familiar with the period between Malachi and Christ will find in this book much to instruct. J. R. BRIDGES.

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS AND THE STRUGGLE OF PROTESTANTISM FOR EXISTENCE.—By C. R. L. Fletcher, late Fellow of All Souls College. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

It is even more true now than when the ancient philosopher uttered it that there is no royal road to learning. But this is nevertheless the age of popularization of knowledge, of compendiums of all subjects, and this often by great authors or by apt scholars much of whose information is acquired at first hand. In no branch has this work gone further than in history, and among the most valuable series are to be ranked the the Epochs of History, the Stories of Nations, and the newer set, the Heroes of the Nations. The first is by Englishmen, the second and third by Englishmen with an occasional American, and all are good. They have value not only in giving a correct general view to those whose time does not permit a closer study, but also in furnishing a clear review

to others who are in danger of losing a grasp of the whole in study of the details.

Fletcher's *Gustavus Adolphus* is a good example of the "Heroes" series. Written by an Englishman, he has mastered the subject in the books, original and derivative, and in a study of the ground. His style is clear and his sense of perspective admirable. The picture of the man and times is full of interest.

Gustavus was a hero of his own Sweden and of Germany too. A portrait given represents him as standing in full armor, with sword in hand and the book in the other, across its face "Pro Religione." And yet he was no Mohammed born out of due time. His two aims were to make Sweden mistress of the Baltic, a successor of the decadent Hansa, and to deliver his fellow Protestants in Germany. He was born in 1594 and died in 1632 at the battle of Lutzen, younger by six years than Napoleon when he fought near by the battle of Leipzig, the beginning of his end. Gustavus succeeded to a troubled throne when but a boy of seventeen, and his most trusted adviser was Oxenstiern, himself a youth of 28. It was a fortunate association, for, to use their own figures, the chancellor acted as a drag, and prevented the King's fiery activity from consuming him. The first problem was the war with Denmark, which ended shortly in the reacquisition by Sweden of Kalmar. Norway was not yet taken, but left as before subject to the Danish crown. Sweden's expansion was for the time to the southward, on the Baltic. Then came the turn of Russia, which had to cede all her Baltic provinces. But it was in the less decisive Polish struggle from 1620 that Gustavus got his best experience, promulgated his famous articles of war, and found his generals Horn, Baner, Torstenson and Wrangel. As a general result of it all Sweden had acquired both shores of the Baltic down to the German coasts, and Swedish they remained until the erratic Charles XII. lost them by Russian and Polish enterprises which had no real interest for Sweden.

But all this was preparation for Gustavus' greatest work. The growth of Sweden led him to a broader outlook.

The Thirty Years' War was truly "the struggle of Protestantism for existence." There had been religious wars in Germany during Luther's life; but thanks to the victories of Maurice they had ended with the recognition at Passau of the principle that certain states should be Lutheran, certain Catholic, according to the faith of the ruler. Of the seven members of the electoral college who chose the emperor, the elector of Saxony, the prince of the Palatinate, and the margrave of Brandenburg were Protestant, the king of Bohemia and the archbishops of Mainz, Treves and Cologne were Catholic. This ensured that the emperor and the imperial influence remained Catholic. In France the Reformed or Calvinistic church had a longer struggle, but finally acquired a better position through Henry IV's edict of Nantes in 1598. Rochelle remained a sore spot and the royal power was Catholic, but the king was powerful

and the nation in general a unit. It was far otherwise in Germany. The emperor had little power and that little not fairly directed. The several principalities were practically independent states, jealous and in religious matters mutually hostile.

And it is well to remember the religious situation. Luther died at Wittenburg in 1546, Calvin at Geneva in 1564, Ignatius Loyola in 1556, and their immediate successors were also at rest. The Council of Trent had been held and with it and the growth of the Jesuits had come the Catholic Reaction. Catholicism had been to some extent purified, and to a large extent strengthened at the very time that Lutherans and Calvinists were contending together and breaking up the force of Protestantism. And this in Germany, which is erroneously thought of as then and now essentially Lutheran. The Rhine principalities were generally Catholic, except the Palatinate. Saxony, Brandenburg and the northeast was Lutheran. Bavaria was Catholic; but Bavaria was then small, and the greatest prince of the South, if not of Germany, was Frederick, the Count Palatine. Frederick had married Elizabeth, daughter of James I of England, and with his country was of the Reformed faith. So, too, were the great free city of Nuremberg and other important districts, while Bohemia, which adjoined the severed upper Palatinate, was Hussite, restless under a Catholic ruler.

The great Thirty Years' War was begun in 1618 by the revolt of Bohemia, which expelled its Catholic king and elected Frederick of the adjacent Palatinate. The result was a counter-league of Catholic princes, as well as a war with the emperor. Frederick was driven out of Bohemia and even deprived of his old domain and its electoral vote. This last went to the energetic Maximilian of Bavaria, and Maximilian also got the Upper Palatinate. Philip II of Spain intervened far enough to take possession of the Lower Palatinate, with Heidelberg the capital, the pick of Frederick's dominions. Frederick and his charming Elizabeth were fugitives, seeking aid of father-in-law James and every other Protestant ruler, but all in vain. The Reformed power was broken in the South. Mansfeld was not able to prevent Tilly from checking Denmark's interference and the imperialist Wallenstein even subdued much of the Baltic coast. To the mind of Gustavus the Emperor Ferdinand and Maximilian of Bavaria would soon re-conquer all Germany for Catholicism, and the Baltic was in danger. Sweden, in his words, must meet the emperor at Stralsund, or the emperor would meet her at Kalmar. Gustavus' first object was to secure a "bastion" on the continent, and that led to intervention in the whole field. The first of the three divisions of the great war was over. The Palatine and Danish epoch had passed. The Swedish had come.

From 1628, when Gustavus' soldiers relieved Stralsund besieged by Wallenstein's troops, to the king's death, was but four years. Of this half was spent in reducing the Baltic territory and negotiating with his co-Protestants, the electors of Brandenburg and Saxony. The former

was his brother-in-law, the latter in great danger from the enemy; but their aid throughout was half-hearted. They were saved against their own will. Gustavus' personal career in Germany was from his landing between Stralsund and Stettin in June 1630 to Lutzen in November, 1632. He would not have been able to maintain his army in well wasted Germany but for French aid; for Richelieu, though oppressing Protestant Rochelle from 1631 subsidized the Swedish army. Of course it was for political reasons, to oppose Hapsburg growth, and it ultimately resulted in French acquisition of Alsace—lost back only in our own day. Gustavus was no hireling. France wanted him to advance on Vienna through Silesia. But Madgeburg, Nuremburg and the Palatinate appealed to him more strongly, and he chose the more difficult route because it was the path of duty, where he could best aid the Protestants. His Baltic labors prevented him from saving Madgeburg, where his officer Falkenburg conducted a brave defence. Tilly stormed it, and of 25,000 people he left but 2,500 alive in the ashes of their homes. Gustavus fortified a camp at Werben. His first check had come. But he repulsed Tilly from Werben and followed him to Leipzig, whose plains have seen so many great battles. The village of Breitenfeld, where as a student I saw peasants binding their rich sheaves, knew in 1631 a bloodier harvest. Both leaders had cavalry on their wings and infantry in the centre. Pappenheim's impatient horsemen started the battle; but Baner broke them, and the superior mobility of Gustavus' troops and his immense artillery arm, interspersed among the infantry, finally decided the day. Gray-beard Tilly yielded the field to the young general.

For the Swedish army was arranged on a new model. The soldiers were regulars, uniformed—an invention of Gustavus—and under strict discipline. Trenching tools and cannon were among his specialties, and, while he better armed the calvary than before, he introduced cartridges, lightened the match, took muskets, and decreased as compared with musketeers the number of pikemen. His care of his men is shown by his creating field hospitals. He prevented pillage, so common in his day, and he more than compensated his soldiers in the care he took of them. Indeed, after every battle he was able to recruit his losses from among his prisoners. He levied the usual contributions in the enemy's country but he paid for supplies. Private property was respected, except that he confiscated that of the Jesuits as *hostes humani generis*, and the cathedral library of Wurzburg was sent to Upsala as reprisals for sending that of Heidelberg to the Vatican, and a ship carrying that of Mainz to Oxenstiern was lost in the Baltic. Protestants were restored wherever they had been evicted, but liberty was given to Catholics also to worship as they had before his advent. Gustavus would seem to have caught the spirit of the epochal book *De Jure Belli* published by Grotius in 1625; but his contemporaries did not.

Such was his general policy, for Breitenfeld was but the beginning of his success. It led to closer alliance with the northern Protestant prin-

ces and a liberating advance southwards through the heart of Germany. He entered Frankfort, where emperors were crowned, relieved Nuremberg, and captured Mainz from the Spaniards. There he took up his winter quarters. Bernard of Weimar and Swedish generals carried on the northern campaigns, while at Mainz, with his queen and Oxenstiern, Gustavus held court like Napoleon later at Weimar, the centre of European interest and diplomacy.

With spring came the march across Bavaria, and, after defeating Tilly at the Lech, he occupied Augsburg, the cradle of the Reformation. To Richelieu's inquiry when he would stop, he is said to have answered, "When my interests demand it." He was on the way to dictate peace in Vienna, Munich fell and Maximilian was in his turn a fugitive. But Wallenstein was again in service, and with an immense army sat down over against him at Nuremberg in June, 1632, to starve him out. Gustavus attacked unsuccessfully and then withdrew northwards on account of Saxon defection. Wallenstein followed, and in November they met at Lutzen, not far from Breitenfeld.

Prayers and Gustavus' battle hymn "Versage nicht du Hauflien klein" preceded the attack, and all day raged charge and countercharge across the broad fair pike from Leipzig to Halle. At noon Pappenheim and his cavalry arrived to reinforce the imperialists, and plunged into the battle, crying, "Where is the King?" In one charge Pappenheim fell, in another Gustavus himself, twice wounded. But it was left to cuirassiers to kill him. "Who is the man," they demanded. "I am the King of Sweden," he replied, "and seal the religion and liberty of the German nation with my blood." Their swords made his prophecy a fact, but the maddened Swedes revenged him. "No retreat," cried Bernard, "it is time for vengeance now," and the stripped and trampled body was recovered. Wallenstein was hurled back and the wreck of his army retreated from the field.

The Swedish period of Thirty Years War was practically ended. The third and last stage, that of open French intervention, soon began. But standing as I have beside that stone and Gothic canopy near the roadside, marking where Gustavus fell, one can but think Lutzen the turning point of the war. He said he died for Germany. Her liberation had been his aim next after the safety of Sweden. He had accomplished it in a part by a league of Protestant princes. But this must have shown itself only a provisional scheme. Had Gustavus lived, his two aims would probably have led to a third, the expulsion of Austria from Germany and Gustavus' own election as Emperor. This would have meant for Germany union and development more perfect than that of 1871. And there would have been no historical chasm in this. Ferdinand of Austria became emperor only by virtue of owning German principalities, while possessing separate hereditary dominions. If Scandinavian Sweden was not sufficiently German to pass for a member of a Teutonic

empire, Gustavus had conquered continental lands enough to make him eligible.

God works through history as clearly as in the life of his saints. Man thinks he is carrying out his own desires, and yet the philosophical historian looking back can see that through the ages one increasing purpose runs. Providence is as inscrutable in the one case as the other. When we think we have learned the course we find a break, a change, and we are confounded. But Providence is not. There is only a new unfolding of the divine plan. It has been said that God determined the American Union should be restored without slavery and with a fusion of Northern and Southern elements to make a greater nation, and that to accomplish this he had to lay his hand on Stonewall Jackson. The same was even more true in this seventeenth century struggle. The divine will was that the Protestants should not drive out the Catholics of Germany, and to do that it was necessary that Gustavus die at Lutzen. The Catholic on the one side and the Protestant on the other may even yet wonder why the God whom each adores did not then and does not now permit the complete establishment of his faith. But God is wiser than either. He knows that each view of religion has its true side, that each method of worship appeals to a particular cast of mind. He has willed that both faiths, even each order and each denomination shall work over against each other, a mutual check and inspiration. What may ultimately come we know not. He may have some union or sublimation in store for the future. We only know that it is his work and that in due time as his own interpreter he will make it plain.

Meanwhile we may rejoice that there is now no counterpart of the great German civil war, and that the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, though years after Gustavus' death, substantially ratified his work. The German principalities were established in the form in which they remained until the time of Frederick the Great, if not of Napoleon. Swedish power was established in the form it preserved until the struggles of Charles XII and Peter of Russia. But these and other changes of the map of the world have been on a different principle. They have been for political, not essentially for religious reasons. The world then realized what the Master had said long before, that religion is not a matter of force, but of the heart. Religious toleration was reached only by finding that intolerance meant mutual destruction, just as political freedom was to come through the French Revolution and its wars. Toleration was the work of the religious struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and to none of the great men of those times was it more owing than to Gustavus Adolphus II of Sweden. No higher praise can be given Mr. Fletcher's book than to say that it is not unworthy of its subject.

THE LIVING AGE.—In these days of cheap magazines and light reading, this reliable old friend of our early days still retains its hold upon the popular favor, though to the mind of many its price is very high.

When we remember that by means of it each week there is spread before us the cream of European literature, making for the year two large and substantial volumes, the price really seems reasonable. No man who makes any pretension to scholarship can afford to be without it, as through it he keeps in touch with the brightest minds of Europe, and is always abreast of the topics of the world. It meets a want that no other magazine supplies, which explains the fact that for over 50 years it has held its place and that to-day it is stronger and better than ever before. As a specimen of the fare furnished each week to its readers, we would call attention to some of the recent and prospective subjects upon which they are to feed.

During March we had eight poems, translated from the French of M. Henri de Rignier, which were remarkable specimens of deft rendering from one tongue to another, with the least possible loss of the rare flavor of the original. During the same month Mr. Robert Buchanan very effectively paid his respects to Sir Walter Besant on the Hooligan question in the Kipling controversy, in an article entitled "The Ethics of Criticism." Mr. Andrew Lang has one of his spicy articles with the taking title "The Evolution of Literary Decency," while Julia Wedgewood, an intimate friend of Ruskin, has an affectionate yet discriminating consideration of him on his personal side.

In view of these tempting subjects it is no wonder that we turn to its pages when satisfied with the rapid writings of much of the so-called lighter literature.

THE NORTHWEST UNDER THREE FLAGS. By Charles Moore. Pp. 402. Price \$2.50. Harper & Bros., New York.

There are histories and histories. Some are written in a style that repels and only the ardent student will wade through its interminable pages, while others read like a romance, and it is a delight to lose oneself in their pages.

Dulness is by no means depth of mind, but it took historians a long time to learn the lesson.

Macaulay and Justin McCarthy have each shown us how history can be made a delight, and it is only fair to say that Mr. Moore in the work before us has fully equalled them in his charm of narrative.

The first flag that floated over the Northwest was that of France, but even then there were the conflicting claims of England, as in those days of geographical ignorance lands were bestowed bounded on the north and south by known bounds, but stretching out into infinity.

The French, however, by right of occupation were the first owners, and their traders reached from the St. Lawrence to the Mississippi, while their missionaries with a heroism worthy of a better religion traversed the frozen fields of the North and mingled among the tribes of the West.

We all know how the enterprising Saxon first settling in Virginia



stretched across the Alleghanies and soon came into contact with the French, and from this arose the French and Indian War with its awful series of massacres and burnings, at the end of which New France, that picturesque land of the romancer, disappeared from the map, never again to be mentioned save on the page of the novelist.

The English flag next waves over that vast region, but at the close of the Revolution it fell into the hands chiefly of Virginia, by whom it was afterwards ceded to the General Government.

The war of 1812 was fought mainly on this, and at its close American settlers poured in and took possession. From that time on till the present the history of the country has been that of war and burning on one side, and heroic defence on the other. Beautiful farms and crowded cities now stand where the Red man once hunted the deer, but they have disappeared to give place to the Saxon, who never relinquishes what he has once gained.

Nothing that we have read recently in the way of history has given us as much pleasure, as this charming book.

The matter is new and fresh, and it corrects a number of errors into which we have fallen, and gives us a new idea of the charm and value of this favored land.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, or the False of Christ of 1866. By William P. McCorkle, Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Price, \$1.25.

When Napoleon abolished the Holy Roman Empire he said that it was neither Holy nor Roman nor Empire. Rev. W. P. McCorkle, of Graham, has proved most conclusively that Christian Science is neither the one nor the other. His book, recently published by the Presbyterian Committee on Publication, is the most thorough treatment of the subject that has yet been written. So far as argument can go in demolishing such a system as that of Christian Science, the book is well adapted to its purpose. Perhaps ridicule will be found to be a more effective weapon, though the book we are discussing makes some "palpable hits." Mr. McCorkle has done great service to this generation.

There is much in words. The Mormon Missionaries have gained entrance to thousands of homes under the guise of ministers of the Gospel. "Christian" has an attractive sound to many sentimental ears on account of the name. The Irishman let a man through the toll-gate that was free to ministers upon his assertion that he was one. "But how did you know I was a preacher?" asked the traveler. "Because a preacher wouldn't lie," replied the Irishman. A great many unthinking people are led astray by the assumption of a good name and "Christian" is coming to be fearfully abused in this regard. The first task of our author is to show the un-Christian, unscriptural and generally irreligious character of this "Science." It is an enemy and an uncompromising enemy of the Gospel of Christ, of the Church and the ministry; and those who have been dallying with it on account of its name or its

supposed harmlessness, should note what they are doing. It is as certainly one of the lying wonders of Satan as any popish miracle worked for wringing money from deluded worshippers.

Our author is especially happy in the treatment of the second part of the volume, *Christian Science as a System of Mental Healing*. He gives the true philosophy of the healing which is sometimes effected, hypnotic suggestion, the action of mind on body and of body on mind, or as it is put in a later and more exhaustive treatment of this particular subject, the control of the functions of the body by the subjective mind. The Christian Scientist knows enough of mental healing generally to cure such diseases as lend themselves to this treatment and thus secures witnesses to the faith as well as ducats for the purse. But the fraud of it is just as outrageous. One difficulty about the whole business is that the "subjective mind" is impervious to argument, whether of logic or fact, and there is no mortar that has been discovered in which the dupes of Christian Science can be brayed. In the third part of the book the Doctrinal Contents of the "Science" are carefully exhibited. Its pantheistic ideas, its affinity for, if not identity with gnosticism and theosophy, are conclusively shown. This should be an especially valuable armory for the minister who has to face the superstition in his own congregation, sometimes in his own church. It helps us to have an error named. Then we are confident of our ground in attacking it and confident also of victory when we remember the defeat of its ancient counterpart.

The book is able and timely. It will be a surprise to many to know that there are probably as many as a quarter of a million adherents in the United States and Canada. That there should be that many people in these Christian countries, so devoid of a rudimentary intelligence, or so crazed by nervousness and hypochondria as to be deceived by this sham, and even in the words of the proverb, foolish enough to be "parted from their money" through faith in it and the notorious woman who is worshipped as the Head of the new church—is enough to make a philanthropist sit down and cry.

**THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH: Explained and Discussed for Protestants and Catholics.** By Frank Hugh Foster, D. D., Ph. D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 12 mo., pp. 366.

There was a place open for this book. The author saw it and filled it. Many, very many, books have been written on Roman Catholic doctrines and practices from a Protestant standpoint and many of them have been serviceable to the truth, but few writers have gone to the bottom of matters as this one has. He deals, as it was stated in the preface to be his design to deal, solely with the distinctive tenets of the Roman system. This is clearly indicated, as his design, in the title of the book. Sometimes, however, yea many times, preachers take a text and after that have little more to do with it; but our author cannot be charged with dereliction here. He sticks closely to his subject, and does what he leads the reader to expect from his announcement at the beginning.

In handling his theme Dr. Foster is very aggressive. He carries the war right into the camp of the enemy, and his sturdy blows fall thick and fast. He brings into the contest two mighty weapons, learning and logic, both of which he uses with a masterful hand. He is well acquainted with all of the strongest writers on the other side, Cardinal Gibbons, Perrone, Hase, Mohler, Heinrich, Hecker, Bellavine, and the whole list. He quotes extensively from the Catholic Dictionary, Catechism and other works designed to set forth the Catholic view, and with a powerful hand slays every foe. However one of the chief characteristics of this author is his evident desire to treat the enemy fairly; and while his logic is merciless his heart is kind and his feelings friendly towards those in error.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I. deals with the organic matters of the church. Part II with the doctrines of salvation. There are fifteen chapters and 184 sections in the volume. At the end there is a good index. Further analysis is unnecessary. We advise all Protestants and Catholics to procure this book and read it. This is the way to be informed. If we never read but one side we will always be one-sided. Let us have books on both sides. The writer of this notice has in his library a book about the same in size as this one written by Dr. Ricards, a bishop in the Roman Church, in defense of his church's views and practices. These two books will stand side by side on the same shelf—Bishop Foster against Bishop Ricards and in the reviewers mind there is no doubt about the result of the conflict between truth and error. Protestants have nothing to fear from a turning on of the light. Every one should be honest enough to seek the truth and stand by the truth. Certainly Dr. Foster's book will repay any one for his time and labor expended in the reading of it.

Just here I want to say it has always been more or less of a mystery to me how any intelligent man or woman can believe in many of the tenets of the Roman Church. Such, for instance, as a Pope and his infallibility, Transubstantiation, the worship of Mary and the Saints, etc.; especially the horrible dogma of Auricular Confession. Every one of these fearful errors is condemned in the Scriptures from which Romanists profess to draw them! But they discourage the reading of the Bible unless it be one of their own putting up, and, even then, they advise the people to let it alone; yea they often forbid it. But all these things are set forth in the book before us, and Dr. Foster handles them with unglowed hands. Along by the side of this excellent work we may place on our shelves Bishop Marvin's "Errors of the Papacy," Dr. DiSanctis' "Rome Christian and Papal," Onsley's "Old Christianity and Papal Novelties," and Dr. Smyth's work on Prelacy. With these, and the Bible, which should be first, we will have all that is necessary to confirm us in the Protestant view. We wish Dr. Foster's book could be in every family and read by every one. What more need be said?

HASSAN, A FELLAH. 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 Fellaheen or peasants of to-day. As a delineation it is interesting in the extreme, though filled with tiresome digressions. Mr. Gilliam 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.

CALEB WEST, MASTER DIVER. By F. Hopkinson Smith. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 12mo., pp. 378. \$1.50.

This story of a diver's life, written in Hopkinson Smith's interesting style, bids fair to be popular. As to the plot, it is good enough and somewhat out of the usual, but the romantic feature is exceedingly weak and must have a harmful tendency. In the character of the Major we have a rehashed edition of Colonel Carter, of Cartersville, but an inferior one, and a misleading caricature. Of the other characters, with the exception of The Diver and Capt. Joe, we catch only glimpses. Their portraits are dim and uncertain, not decided enough to arouse special interest, and we close the tale simply wondering.

THE GREAT SINNERS OF THE BIBLE. By Louis Albert Banks, D. D. Crown 8vo., pp. 329. Cloth \$1 50. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1899.

A series of twenty-eight sermons delivered by Dr. Banks during the autumn and winter of 1898 and 1899, in Cleveland, Ohio. An introduction discusses in a very practical way the subject of Sunday evening services and the means of attracting evening congregations, especially in downtown churches of the larger cities. It is Dr. Banks' view that the people are attracted by being preached to, dieectly, simply, earnestly, plainly, and that not through modern fiction or sociology, or scientific lectures, and such like, but from the word of God. He believes that the ministry which honors the message that God gives to deliver will be honored of God. The sermons gathered in this book are given as specimens of his own application of his principle. They will illustrate his exhortation to ministers, "Set your pulpit on fire, brother, with an earnest giving of yourself to save men, and multitudes of sinners will flock to see the flame."

ALONE IN LONDON—By Hesta Streten, Chicago. The Bible Institute Colportage Association. Paper. 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. Grether, 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.—Æneid, Book VIII. By Tetlow, D. Sc., Boston, Ginn & Co.

This is a small convenient handbook, 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.

# Union Theological Seminary

RICHMOND, VA.

---

**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.**

# THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

---

NO. 53--JULY, 1900.

---

## I. RACE PROBLEM IN THE SOUTH.\*

It is my purpose to speak dispassionately and for truth sake only. We have for discussion a question of vast importance to the nation, the understanding of which is of great import to a large section of our country, and of even greater consequence to the negro race. I speak as a friend of the negro, provided you let friendship mean a willingness to do for him that which is for his very best interests, and which would not be good if done for an equal number of white men living anywhere in this union. The best friend of the negro is he who recognizes that negroes and whites are not equal, and it is beyond the power of man to make them so. The reason is, a negro is a negro and a white man a white man. This distinction will appear absurd to you here in New England, while it will be satisfactory to any Southern man as intelligent and as kind as any citizen of your great Commonwealth. The failure to accept the dictum of your Southern white brethren has led to, what I consider, the greatest wrong ever perpetrated upon an inferior race, viz: the extension of the franchise to those helpless in the grasp of such a power for evil.

I shall undertake to account for the attitude of the public mind toward slavery that finally gave such a resultant. In doing so, I shall necessarily refer to that which is already familiar, but probably has never been considered by you in relation of cause and effect. Beginning with the Missouri

---

\*An address delivered before the Unity Club of New Bedford, Mass., April 27, 1900.

compromise in 1821, it is interesting to note that every public question of any proportions was directly affected in all discussion and finally settled in view of the apparently disassociated problem of American Slavery. From 1821 to 1854 it will be observed by all students of public events that there was no difference of opinion between the North and the South. The question then, as it has always been since, was handled with the view of its effect upon political parties in determining their success or failure, and never with a view of what was best for the country, the institution of slavery, or the negro race. There was not an utterance made on this subject nor an opinion held by a Southern Statesman, that did not find its parallel in a Northern Statesman.

It is significant that Mr. Emerson remarked about Mr. Webster, not about a Southern Statesman, "Every drop of blood in this man's veins has eyes that look downward." However many or few names prior to this time may be written down at the North as opposed to slavery, as it existed in America, an equal number can be written down at the South as opposed to slavery as an institution, with the difference that the Southern man was more than apt to be a slave owner, and the Northern man certainly not one.

A brief review may recall the political situation:—From the adoption of the Missouri Compromise in February, 1821, until January, 1836, slavery excited no serious discussion in congress. In May, 1833, Andrew Jackson wrote, "The tariff was only the pretext, and disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. The next pretext will be the negro or slavery question." The great political parties ignored the issue, but forces were at work beyond their control. Lundy and Garrison began the agitation which led to the formation of anti-slavery societies. In a convention held at Baltimore in 1826, eighty-one such societies were represented, of which seventy-three were in slaveholding communities. In January, 1831, Garrison began to publish "The Liberator" in Boston. In November the New England Anti-Slavery Society was founded. In 1833



the New York Anti-Slavery Society was formed, and a convention at Philadelphia established the American Anti-Slavery Society. A single sentence from the declaration of principles adopted by the American Society summed up their position:—"We also maintain that there are at the present time the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free states to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States." This was a clean cut statement of the issue, and it disclosed the fact that the public mind was by no means prepared for its reception, and that men at the North the equal in every particular to those advocating it, were bitterly opposed to it. It was the effort of a few private citizens with little influence and small means, grappling with a gigantic evil, supported by the political, social, and business powers of the country. Many Southern men were opposed to slavery, and acquiesced in a system which it seemed impossible to change without disaster, political and business. Edward Everett expressed the sentiments of many when he said "The great relation of servitude in some form or other with greater or less departure from the theoretic equality of men, is inseparable from our nature; it is a condition of life as well as any other, to be justified by morality, religion, and international law," and that it was right "to abstain from a discussion which, if not abandoned, there is great reason to fear will prove the rock on which the Union will split." Garrison was dragged through the streets of Boston, Lovejoy was killed in Illinois, and anti-slavery agitation was met by mob violence in almost every Northern State. Southern Postmasters took anti-slavery publications from the mails. The Postmaster-General, Amos Kendall, admitted this was illegal, but said "By no act or direction of mine, official or private, would I be induced knowingly to aid in giving circulation to papers of this description, directly or indirectly." From this period on, every public question of proportions was affected by slavery in its settlement. The struggle over the right of petition was caused by a petition praying Congress for

action against slavery. The twenty-fourth Congress on May 26, 1836, ruled that all petitions relating in any way to slavery, be laid on the table. Against this rule Mr. Adams waged unrelenting war, until, in the second session of the twenty-eighth Congress it was abandoned.

In 1845 the annexation of Texas was before the Congress of the United States ; it was a critical time and the debates were long and fierce ; the entire discussion turned on the question of slavery. The consequences of the admission of Texas were far-reaching. It divided the Whigs of Massachusetts into two parties—sometimes called the “Conscience Whigs” and the “Cotton Whigs.” In 1846, the contest between Mr. Winthrop and Dr. S. G. Howe was due to Winthrop’s vote on the Mexican War bill, which in turn was determined by his views on slavery. September 29th, 1847, Daniel Webster was a candidate for the next Presidential nomination. In a speech to the convention, he took ground against the extension of slavery, but was averse to affirmative anti-slavery action. His candidacy was seriously affected by this question, and he failed of nomination. Early in 1848 the Mexican War was ended by a treaty which ceded to the United States New Mexico and Upper California, in return for a payment of fifteen million dollars.

The question, “should this new area be free or slave soil,” had been raised early in the war. This was the most important question before the country. Whigs and Democrats alike recognized that a decided position would alienate some of their followers. The Democratic Convention nominated Lewis Cass on a platform which did not deal with the question, but denied the power of Congress to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the States. The Whig convention was even more diplomatic. It nominated Gen. Taylor, at once, a successful General and a Southern slaveholder, and adjourned without adopting any platform. This surrender of the Whig party was the immediate cause of revolt, and the purpose so to do was announced by Charles Allen and Henry Wilson in

convention itself. On August 9th, at Buffalo, a national convention nominated Martin Van Buren and Chas. Francis Adams; thus a new party, known as the "Free Soil" party, was formed, whose leading principle was opposition to the extension of slavery, and to its longer continuance wherever the national government was responsible for it. This stated the position soon to be taken by the Republican Party, and it is not necessary to trace the causes further leading to the formation of this great political body. We have now the issue squarely before us.

In 1845, in the autumn after the annexation of Texas, in many respects the greatest man the country has ever produced entered the arena; that man was Charles Sumner. Mr. Sumner was *sine cera*, one of whom, it might be said, behold a public man in whom there is no guile. He was pure and honest, a scholar and a thinker, a servant of truth and right, regardless of men and parties, as deadly in his invective against the North as against the South, whenever the one or the other struck at the principle of his contention. He was childlike but never childish. He often spoke and wrote in such way as to alienate his warmest friends and sting to the quick his enemies, and was as surprised as a child to think that anyone could possibly be offended at anything he had said, so completely did this truly great man rise above personalities in his attempt to conserve right. No nobler man ever lived than Charles Sumner. Nothing more to be regretted and more unjustifiable has ever happened to any public man than Mr. Brooks' cowardly assault upon Mr. Sumner, and the defense of the act by his own people of South Carolina and other Southern States, is only to be explained from the heated condition of the blood, incident to the incisive debate that had so long agitated the public mind. It is impossible to study this period of our national history, and be surprised at anything that happened.

Mr. Sumner defined his position thus: "It cannot be doubted that the Constitution may be amended so that it shall cease to render any sanction to slavery. The power

to amend carries with it the previous right to inquire into and discuss the matter to be amended, and the right extends to all parts of the country over which the Constitution is spread—the North as well as the South.”

This statement defines the limits in which Mr. Sumner's action against slavery was always confined. He is the only man, so far as I know, who discussed slavery always in the abstract up to this time, and never in the concrete; who discussed it independent of all political and business interests, who spoke for right and right alone. So powerfully did the man impress himself upon the country, that a convention in Kentucky, composed of delegates from twenty-four counties, pronounced slavery “injurious to the prosperity of the commonwealth, inconsistent with the fundamental principles of free government, contrary to the natural rights of mankind, and adverse to a pure state of morals,” and declared “that it ought not to be increased, and that it ought not to be perpetuated in the commonwealth.” A Richmond newspaper said, “two-thirds of the people of Virginia are open and undisguised advocates of ridding the State of slavery.” This latter we take to be untrue, but it at least shows that Mr. Sumner's influence was strongly felt.

#### ATTITUDE OF REPUBLICAN PARTY.

No party ever came to life through such birth-throes as the Republican party. With the country on the verge of internecine war and a great voice like Mr. Sumner's lifted in behalf of right, regardless of all consequences, it is not to be wondered that the party in its early life was guilty of faults for which it has not yet made atonement, and perhaps never can. When we remember that the party had control of the ship of state when the country had been engaged for four years in internecine strife, and that Lee's surrender brought to a close the greatest war of the world, we expect mistakes to be made, and in such disorder and confusion misunderstanding is certain to be, and injustice is sure to follow. In such times men do not understand each other and measures are adopted, with pure motives, that are dis-

astrous in their carrying out. In such times men do not understand God. It is looked upon as an inscrutable providence by the South, as well as the North, that Mr. Lincoln should have been taken away when he was, and in the horrible manner of his death. I must confess that the inscrutable providence of the times to me is, why Mr. Sumner was permitted so long to direct the party he had been instrumental in organizing. He was too abstract a man for confused times and when action was demanded. Such a man knows no concession, and without concession wise measures are impossible. During reconstruction times John Bright was discussing the extension of the franchise in the British Parliament, and Mr. Sumner's mind took no note of the difficulties in the way of applying this principle. He said, "the work of liberation will not be completed, until the equal rights of every person once claimed as a slave, are placed under the safe-guard of irreversible guaranties." Whatever may be said for or against President Johnston, to my mind he showed greater insight into the problem, when on the 29th of May he issued a proclamation of amnesty, and another providing for reconstruction in North Carolina, "by a convention to be chosen only by persons qualified to vote before secession," thus excluding all negroes from the electorate. Mr. Johnston had split rails with negroes, and as we say down South, "He sho' did understand a nigger." During the period of reconstruction men were controlled by passion and not directed by reason. That time to the South was Hell come upon the earth. No people, since the day that man was created upon the earth, ever endured such outrages and indignities, and had they not been starved out during four years of fighting, they would have taken up arms after '65, in an attempt to throw off the yoke of the conquerer. In illustration of the insanity of the time, I call attention to the utterance of a man who was regarded before his death as the greatest living preacher. Phillips Brooks, on the Sunday Mr. Lincoln's body lay in state in the city of Philadelphia, spoke as follows: "Abraham Lincoln was the type-man of the coun-

try, but not of the whole country. This character which we have been trying to describe, was the character of an American under the discipline of freedom. There was another American character which had been developed under the influence of slavery. There was no one American character embracing the land, there were two characters, with impulses of irrepressible and deadly conflict. This citizen whom we have been honoring and praising represented one. The whole great scheme with which he was ultimately brought in conflict, and which has finally killed him, represented the other. Besides this nature, true and fresh and new, there was another nature, false and effete and old. The one nature found itself in a new world, and set itself to discover the new ways for the new duties that were given it. The other nature, full of the false pride of blood, set itself to reproduce in the new world the institutions and the spirit of the old, to build anew the structure of the feudalism which had been corrupt in its own day, and which had been left far behind by the advancing conscience and needs of the progressing race." Only when reason is dethroned by passion can good men speak words so derogatory to a great section of the country, and which have been refuted every time the stars and stripes have been unfurled, and men have been called to their defence. The tramp of soldiers has been heard from the Rio Grande and the Gulf, and that tramp will be heard so long as the Republic stands.

SLAVERY AND ITS EFFECTS ON RIGHTS. THE FRANCHISE  
AND ITS EFFECTS ON RIGHTS.

November the 4th, 1845, in Boston, Mr. Sumner said: "The Government and Independence of the United States are founded on the adamantine truth of Equal Rights and the Brotherhood of all men, declared on the 4th of July, 1776, a truth receiving new and constant recognition in the progress of time, and which is the great lesson from our country to the world." We of the South concur in every word of this attempt to define our position, as a

nation, before the world ; and yet the greater portion of the meaning in Mr. Sumner's mind is not in ours, showing at least, that the question of rights is debatable, and the meaning of the language of the Constitution is by no means self evident.

We hold that slavery involves right in the constitutional sense, and that the franchise does not involve right, but involves the question of expediency. Up to 1835 in North Carolina free negroes exercised the right of the franchise. Gov. Graham was elected, the first time he entered public life, by one vote, and that vote was cast by a free negro. The agitation of the public mind in 1835 was such that it was expedient to debar the free Negro from the privilege of voting, thus early was this the doctrine of sections of the South.

#### SLAVERY.

I have no word too strong to express my condemnation of slavery as an institution. Its existence in the South was due to a sequence in cause over which the country apparently had no control after once the iniquity of slave trading had been touched by the nation. You at the North are, if anything, more to blame for its existence in America than we at the South. Of this condition of slavery I have no word of condemnation. It was the best form of it that ever existed since Adam was created. But the defence of slavery, as an institution, such as was given to it by many leading statesmen and pulpiteers of the South, may be set aside as absurd. It is useless to deny that slavery was defended as a divine right. Good men taught it. I was taught it by a man as pure as ever occupied a chair in an institution for the education of youth. When I remembered what the people of the South passed through during the war and during the period of reconstruction at your hands, I understood how prejudice and hatred blinded to the truth. It would have been strange if the teaching had been otherwise. Nevertheless slavery in any form, anywhere on the face of the earth, is damnable. It is a wrong against God and man. I have never seen an argument in its justifica-

tion that would not at the same time justify those things that by common consent are damnable. The Bible gives a history of slavery and polygamy, and the one as well as the other, can be justified with the arguments usually advanced for slavery. When the mind and body of a human being is controlled by a master, the question of right is involved, and no penalty is too great to pay for the settlement of where right begins and ends. The civil war was horrible, it saturated the land with blood, but if it helped in settling this question it was cheap.

#### THE GREATEST BLUNDER OF THE NATION.

It could hardly be expected that a political party, in power at such a time as that immediately preceding and following the war, should not make blunders; but to my mind the most egregious wrong ever perpetrated in the history of the Republic, was when the Constitution was so amended as to give equality of suffrage to the negro with the white race of this Union. The folly of this part of our history is being written now. It was a gross wrong to the white race; it was a greater wrong to the negro race.

A scrutiny of the condition of affairs will make clear the wrong to the Southern white. I wish to set this forth by analogy. I prefer to take my incidents from the New Testament, that I may give to the argument the force of being Christian. One of the noted men whom the Apostle Paul persuaded to embrace Christianity, was Philemon. This man was a slave-holder, and possessed a slave named Onesimus. Philemon seems to have recognized, even for slaves, a right of personal freedom in the highest sphere, and he did not force his slaves to become converts to Christianity, but, as was the manner of many slave-holders in the South, gave his slaves the opportunity of having the arguments for the new faith presented. Among the hearers of the great apostle was Onesimus. He heard Paul's exhortation, in which he called upon his auditors to stand fast in that liberty wherewith Christ had made them free. The theory of Christian liberty was as yet too subtle for



him, but the fact was patent and inspiring. Here was a religion which asserted in the most unqualified terms the equality of all men before God; which declared in the most uncompromising accents that with him there was no respect of persons; which maintained that in his sight all distinction was abolished between Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, freeman and slave. The two ideas of bondage and freedom took possession of him, heart and brain, and Philemon became to him as unbearable as if he had been the object of despotic tyranny. One day Paul was surprised, near the conclusion of his first Roman period, by a visit from Onesimus, with the information that he was a run-a-way slave, and that he had left his master because of the preaching of the great Apostle. This incident is of greater significance than many suppose. Paul had now to give the Christian answer, for the world, to Onesimus, on slavery, and at the same time give direction to the conduct of a man who was wronged by an institution without divine sanction, and un-Christian. Whether Paul understood, or did not understand, the tremendous issues dependent upon his answers to Onesimus, the direction he gave the matter is worthy of all imitation. He unhesitatingly taught Onesimus that slavery was wrong and that his right was to be free from Philemon, but that there were other considerations which should determine the exercise of that right. He taught Onesimus that the new doctrine was not designed to reduce men to one level, but to establish a new social grade. He knew well that, if society were made a plain to-day, it would be studded again with mountains to-morrow. He knew well that, however equal men might be in rights, they were, and always would be very unequal in merits.

The condition confronted was this: "Christianity had a right to proclaim the freedom of man as man. Nothing was simpler than to make such a proclamation. Paul had only to connive at the flight of Onesimus and to indorse the act by his own imprimatur; it would have been a signal to the whole slave population of the world that the

watch word of the new religion was emancipation from servile bonds. What would have been the effect of such a signal? Doubtless it would have instantaneously added to the numerical strength of Christianity; the kingdom of heaven would immediately have been taken by violence, and so would the kingdoms of earth. It is impossible to conceive a more perfect picture of anarchy than would have been created by a sudden and successful insurrection of the slave population. The numerical proportion of the bound to the unbound in the Roman Empire is a matter of dispute; probably the bond outnumbered the free. Figure anything approaching to such a proportion, and then to the quantity add the quality. Consider that the slave population represented at its worst that state which we designate by the name of Paganism—a name which embraces as its leading characteristic the predominance of the sensuous over the spiritual. It was Paganism without its restraints and without its refinements. What would have been the effect of the emancipation of these millions—the emancipation of an un-Christianized, unhumanized horde impelled by the fanaticism of a new watch-word, accomplished in a moment of time, and achieved by a stroke of violence? Could it have had any other result than one—the transformation of order into anarchy, the uprooting of that line of civilization on which Christianity itself had begun to move?

I have taken the picture ready made. With slight variation it describes the condition of the South. What the Republican party did, the Apostle Paul could conceive of no condition of servitude as justifying. By one act it lifted four millions of slaves to equal rights with their white superiors, and four millions in whom the sensuous predominates over all other qualities of heart or head. The only safeguard for the Southern white, was the kindness which the negro had received at his hands during all the history of Southern slavery; and if the malicious lie of general cruelty, on the part of Southern slave-holders, can find refutation nowhere else, let it find it here. When a great political party turned loose four million slaves with author-

ity and backed by power, to perform their will, they had to be led by corrupt white men, and driven by corrupt politicians to do even as badly as they did. Be it said here that the kindness of the negro race during the war, when every gun was at the front, and women and children unprotected on the farm, is without parallel in the history of man.

#### THE EFFECT ON THE NEGRO RACE.

Nothing ever done by the most malignant enemy of the negro has been as detrimental as the amendment of the Constitution, by which the right of a vote was given him. It was like putting a stick in his hands, and then compelling him to break his own back with it. The enormous power of the franchise in the hands of so many newly made citizens, was at once taken advantage of by unscrupulous white men, both North and South, and from that day to this the Negro vote has been a commodity on the political market, to be bought and sold for every manner and kind of corruption. For a long while, at least, it destroyed all hope in the South of accomplishing anything in the way of good for that section. It is not necessary that I should undertake to tell the manner of the doing. Thomas Nelson Page, in "Red Rock," has given the picture of an intelligent Northern man amid the scenes as they were enacted, and while the story is fiction, it is fiction founded on fact, and the conclusion of this intelligent Northern character as to the wrong of giving the power of suffrage to the negro race, is more than confirmed, under one of the modern wonders of the world—the speed of communication with all parts of the earth—when so many right thinking and just men, of the north, have seen with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears, things they once would not believe on the highest testimony. The period immediately following the war was fraught with influences that as completely changed the negro as if he had been put to school. The carpet-bag regime was indeed a school of training for outrage, and the negro succumbed to this influence. From a long term of servitude he had learned to admire author-

ity, pomp, and wealth. The war destroyed pomp and wealth. His former master was attired in rags, and his former mistress had laid aside her diamonds. The Federal government had destroyed the white man's authority by giving equal rights of suffrage to the negro. When he was told that he was as good as the white man, he could, at least, see that there was not the difference that once existed. Under this tutelage he was changed; his kindness changed to hate, his respect to contempt, his reverence to insult, his temperance to intemperance, his self control to rape. In a word, the Negro was brutalized. The result was that the whites organized into bands of various characters and names, and many negroes were killed. The result of this has been that to the present time the papers of the country have kept up crimination and recrimination. And I believe a paper called the *Independent*, published in New York, still keeps it up in the same old way, refusing to believe that things have changed at all.

I wish to show how thoroughly this school of out-laws trained the negroes. There is in Alabama a negro named Booker Washington at the head of an industrial school for the training of negroes. On February the 12th, 1899, he was invited by the Union League Club of Philadelphia, in commemoration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, to deliver an address, in which he said: "My first acquaintance with our hero and benefactor is this: night after night, before the dawn of day, on an old slave plantation in Virginia, I recall the form of my sainted mother, bending over a batch of rags that enveloped my body, on a dirt floor, breathing a fervent prayer to Heaven that "Massa Lincoln might succeed." If this was intended to give a picture of slave life in Virginia, it is very misleading. But what I apprehend Booker Washington wished to do was to express the opinion he thought his Northern friends had in their minds, and that they rather expected he would say something derogatory of slavery. Booker Washington is a great negro but not a great man, and he and all other negroes I have seen show this weakness when circumstances give the opportu-

nity of currying favor with their friends by obtaining sympathy through fiction.

The reason why the intelligent people of the North failed to understand the situation better, was due in no small part to "Uncle Tom's Cabin." This book has had a sale larger than all other books, with, perhaps, the two exceptions of "Pilgrim's Progress" and the Bible. In view of this, its great influence is understood. The plot of the book was conceived at Ripley, Ohio, in the house of a Presbyterian minister named Rankin. Mr. Rankin's house occupied the summit of the highest hill in that section on the banks of the Ohio River. It was the point known as the "Underground Railroad," where runaway slaves crossed on their way North and to Canada. Whatever cruelty attached to the slave system, she saw in its most exaggerated form.

Slave-dealers and those hunting slaves for the reward of their return were here. I suspect they were horribly treated. Mr. Rankin was recognized as an apostle to freedom, and I believe has erected to him in the little cemetery at Ripley, a monument with an inscription that states as much. Under these conditions, and a fertile imagination fired by prejudice, "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was a natural product; but when sent to the world as a correct exposition of the condition of slavery as it existed in the South, it was an enormous misrepresentation.

#### THE AMENDMENT.

After the endurance of outrage and insolence, from the negro race, for thirty-five years, the white people of the South have undertaken to deal with the question. Many people living at remote distances from the South are anxious to understand what is proposed, under the amendments to the State Constitutions; such, for instance, as is proposed to be voted on, in August next, in the State of North Carolina. I will say that the wise men in the South will have the negro's good at heart, as well as their own, in whatever measure may be finally decided upon. I am convinced that some action must be speedily taken—for the good of the

negro race. The best action would be for the nation to take from the Constitution of the United States the 15th amendment, stating it was put there in time of passion and under the pressure of misguided enthusiasm. By this one act all friction between the white and negro races would in time be removed. It would convince the negro that his outrages would not be tolerated by the government, and restore somewhat of the feeling of the ante-bellum negro who knew there was no escape from his wrong doing. This race cannot be controlled anywhere on the earth without some such fear of the consequences of its acts. If this cannot be accomplished, then the States must do the best they can.

#### THE REMEDY PROPOSED.

Before another generation of negroes is allowed to arise, worse, as we must see than the present, the people of the South must act. First they must remove the negro from politics—not, perhaps, forever—but certainly until the proper time. When such distant and alien advisers as the Philadelphia *Inquirer* can see what the following statement indicates, it is blindness that prevents the man on the ground from seeing. That journal, in a recent editorial (February 6th, 1900), says: "We have made many mistakes during the course of the century in the United States. What is called the 'Southern question' revolves almost exclusively around the ballot box. The freedom of the ballot box is altogether too free." To deprive the ignorant negro of the political liberty, which he now uses for license, will, by the immediate change it will bring in his relation to the white man, soon indemnify him for the seeming loss. It will, let us hope, soon bring again the old relations in feeling that existed between the races at the close of the war. If the change is long delayed, however, it will come too late; the young whites of the South, more familiar with the "new issue" than the old, have as we have seen but little of that sympathetic feeling for the race that their fathers had. The negro is to them a political menace only; they

have no cause to love him and in spite of their traditions they are beginning to hate him. It were better for both races that this should be changed, at the first possible moment.

Some one will say, "what about the negro's right to vote." The answer is that the question of right is not involved. It isn't anybody's right to vote. I accept Herbert Spencer's doctrine of rights. Voting, in this country, is a question of expediency for whites as well as blacks. It may not be expedient for you here in Massachusetts to vote; then you should not vote. Once upon a time you thought it was not expedient for a large number of the best citizens of this country not to vote, and you said so, and they did not vote. These were also South of the Mason's and Dixon's line. We say, on the ground of expediency, that the negro, in North Carolina, ought not to vote.

My fellow men, here in cold New England, it is expedient that he should not. It will be the beginning of great things for the negro, and without which redemption to good citizenship is impossible. Whatever else the Spanish-American war failed to accomplish, it did accomplish this: it destroyed all misgiving in our own minds, and convinced the world that this country is one. We are a union, and whenever we are attacked, whether here on this New England coast, or the Mexican border, we are a union against the world. Abraham Lincoln is reported to have intimated to the South, "Write the word Union, and you may ask for what you will, and it shall be granted." We write the word "Union," as we have written it in blood, and our request is that you let us deal with the race problem in the South. We of the South understand the negro. We love him. He is the best friend on earth when uncorrupted. By this amendment we are only trying to do what the wisest and best men in the South besought you to do in 1861. The Virginia Secession Convention of that year, in Section 7, of Article XIII, of its proceedings prayed, "The elective franchise and the right to hold office, whether Federal or Territorial, shall not be exercised by persons who are of

the African race." The condition of affairs in Wilmington, N. C., last year, was due to a failure in apprehending this restriction proposed to be put upon the negro race, and it may serve as illustration of the cause of riots elsewhere, and be prophetic of worse things in store for the negro, unless measures are adopted to hedge him about and protect him. This Anglo-Saxon race is long suffering, but it is the fiercest race on earth, and when the day of retribution comes, harrowing tales will be told. Disfranchisement is the remedy, for things will not continue always as they now are. I take this occasion to state that I have little patience with the harangues of politicians recently made in North Carolina and elsewhere in the South. They are unjust to the negro, and are not in accord with the thought of the best and wisest white men of that section. The question has merits, which, when presented in a dispassionate and dignified manner, will command a hearing, even from the negroes themselves, many of whom have said, "The measure is just; we do not need the franchise; we need that help that will fit us for its exercise." I have no sympathy for the man who needlessly abuses the negro. Every wrong the negro has perpetrated in the South is due to the short-sightedness of his supposed white friend. His record during slavery proves this. A correctly taught negro will take charge of the virtue and the wealth of your family, and neither will be molested. Ten thousand Southern white men will testify to the truth of this statement. The Spanish-American war incidentally emphasizes the wisdom of the Virginia resolution in 1861 in petitioning that no member of the African race be allowed to hold office. The incident of a negro officer in the volunteer army of the late war, reminding a private white soldier of "the duty of inferiors to salute their superiors," to which the white soldier replied, "All coons look alike to me," while humorous, is significant. The significance is deepened when we remember that the reply was not made by a Southern man. It means that a negro cannot be put in authority over a white man anywhere in these United States, and the negro's life



be safe. In the regular army, whatever good word may be said for the negro is due to the fact that in the regular army the negro is practically in slavery, and when managed properly, his equal for service is not easily found. But in the volunteer army, the Northern white volunteer saw the negro in all his insolence, and the most insolent being on earth is a negro in the paraphernalia of office, without the instincts of a gentleman or the qualifications of an officer. These Northern white volunteers have done more than all the newspapers published since the war in giving a correct estimate of the negro as a race, and they have taken this information to every State of the Union. The horrible crimes committed in the South in the way of killing innocent government officers, is due to feeling kindled by negro insolence at first, and has been fed until the drapery of office will render obnoxious the best negro in the land to many of the lower class of whites. I frankly admit that this is unjust; at the same time, I wish to declare that this condition is due to lack of judgment on the part of the government, in trying to force an inferior race to the place of rule over a superior race, when it is unfitted by inheritance and training, and lacking in merit for such position. When we remember the tremendous effort to arouse this country against slavery, and recollect that slavery went down in one of the bloodiest wars of the world, it is not strange that the North should have erroneous views of the negro race, and exaggerated ideas of his sufferings and wrongs, nor is it even surprising that the North glorified and deified the negro: but the time for visions is past, and the time of soberness is at hand. With purity of heart, sincerity of purpose, and soundness of mind, the South says the wrong to the white and the wrong to the negro will never be righted until the negro is relieved of the burden of responsibilities for which, as a race, he is unqualified. I could name several hundred negroes, in every way as well qualified for office and citizenship as the late Fred. Douglas, who, if they should ask my opinion of the attitude they should assume in this hour of the negro race's life, I should unhesitatingly say, "Re-

nounce your own right of emancipation for the sake of your race, which is unripe for emancipation."

#### THE CONDITION NOW.

Under present conditions I wish to discuss, first, lynching. I ask you to consider carefully these words from Hon. L. E. Bleckley, Chief Justice of Georgia: "A fundamental truth which certainly exists, and which ought to be recognized by all men everywhere, is that, according to right reason and just views of civilization, government and morals, provocation has nothing whatever to do with the right or wrong of lynching negroes. No kind or degree of provocation will justify or even mitigate it. Lynching is barbaric, anarchic and wrong per se."

I ask you to consider the following from the late Bishop Atticus G. Haygood, of the Southern Methodist Church:

"In a country unorganized and without government, individuals must punish violations of natural law; theirs is no other recourse. But this is not civilization; it is at best barbarism. In organized society, lynching is a crime against society. It is not a question of what the victim deserves; it is a question as to what society can afford. In organized society there is no higher civil or social duty than obedience to law; the lyncher is, of all men, the violator of law. Lynching is a crime against God and man. Lynching breaks the law, defies it, despises it, puts it to open shame. Punishment by government, according to law, represents the judgment of God; punishment by lynching is vengeance. Legal punishment educates men into respect for law; lynching educates them into contempt for law. Lynching does more to put down law than any criminal it takes in hand; lynching kills a man; the lyncher kills the law that protects life; lynching is anarchy."

There is no mistaking the meaning of these words, they describe the thought of all good men in the South, in regard to lynching. But we are trying to arrive at a conclusion by the way of facts. What are the facts? Legal punishment has been tried, yet the crime of rape increased. Shoot-

ing and hanging, without law, has been tried, yet the crime increased. Finally, mutilation and fire have been tried, and still the crime increases. Dr. E. E. Hoss, editor of the *Christian Advocate* published at Nashville, Tenn., in 1893, in an editorial article said, "Three hundred white women have been raped by negroes within the preceding three months."

Bishop Haygood further said, "I have been asked to explain the burning of negroes, not the killing of them. I give frankly my opinion; the people who burned them were for the time insane." Mr. Walter Page pooh-pooh's this idea, and undertakes to account for it by the "Southern Bully." I concur in Bishop Haygood's opinion, and I wish to describe three cases of lynching of which I was eye-witness.

I happened to be traveling in Texas the year the negro was burned of whom Bishop Haygood was asked to give his opinion on the manner of his death. It was in Paris, Texas. The mob assembled after the manner of all mobs; it looked like a crowd of curiosity seekers, while it was being ascertained if the right man had been apprehended. When this had been settled, resolution and determination took possession of the last man of them; the pile was prepared and the negro laid thereon; nothing but death could have stopped them; they were insane. The crime was this:

A big, burly negro had taken an innocent child, of a few years of age, and after trying to accomplish his purpose, had literally torn her limbs apart. In arguing the cause as insanity, Bishop Haygood says, "Had the dismembered form of his victim been the dishonored body of my baby, I might have gone into an insanity that might have ended never."

The next case was at Nashville, Tenn. Two young ladies living with a widowed mother, in a small hamlet not far from Nashville, had been outraged and gagged by a negro brute, afflicted at the time with a nameless disease. He was apprehended and lodged in jail in the city of Nashville. Farmers mounted on every kind and description of animals,

came into the city in great numbers, broke into the jail in broad daylight, took the negro to the foot-bridge spanning the Cumberland River, and hanged him thereon; then stood for half an hour and riddled his body with bullets. I was crossing the river in a canoe at the time, and my attention was attracted by the shooting; from where I was, so much lead being wasted on a man already dead, looked very insane.

In Bowling Green, Ky., some time between '94 and '96, a beautiful young lady of that section had been outraged by a negro. He was caught. The people controlled themselves long enough for a trial by law to begin, when, to my utter amazement, two hundred and fifty men, with Winchester rifles, marched to the courthouse at high noon, and took the prisoner from before the face of the Judge and hanged him by the neck until he was dead. If you can give any explanation for such conduct, other than insanity, I submit the case.

My fellow-citizens, the exasperations have been cumulative, as in continued doses of digitalis, and the effect has been insanity. As much as I condemn lynching—and I say it is the most damnable practice any civilized man can join in—and realizing as I do the awful consequences of not speaking soberly, in the fear of God and man, on this fearful subject, yet I must say it, and I say it deliberately—the cure for lynching is the stopping of rape. Unless assaults by negroes on white women and little girls come to an end, there will most probably be still further displays of vengeance that will shock the world. The law should take its course. Provocation cannot set aside law with impunity, but the difficulty contended with is the determination of the Southern white man that women shall not be dragged into court to testify in such cases.

#### REMEDY.

When this government decides to stop trading in negro votes and takes from him the right of suffrage, on the ground that a citizen that curses his race with such crimes

as his, is unworthy of its exercise, a step will be taken towards putting an end to rape, and the elevation of the negro, more advanced and promising than all the essays and papers and speeches ever delivered on the social and political status of the negro race since rape began. I say it, here and now, the negro must be controlled, for his own good, as well as for the safety of society. Bishop Haygood said he remembered to have heard of only one case of rape in all his life, while the negro was a slave, and he was burned. His disfranchisement by the Southern States will not affect his interests, social, business, moral, religious, or educational.

#### SOCIAL.

Sociology may one day be worthy of the dignified name of Science, and may be able to point out the way, by which, the clash between the classes can be avoided, but it will never devise a way of fulfilling the ideas of many intelligent Northern whites regarding the social position of the negro. There is a barrier, in the race itself, that prevents anything like an approach to social equality in the South. Not riding in the same railroad coach, stopping at the same hotel, going to the same school, worshipping in the same church, sociology may point out, but will never be able to remedy. When these things are so, why dream of a social position for the negro that would indicate the high plane of companionship? The mere fact that a Northern man will ask the question, "Why?" makes a Southern man despair of undertaking to tell him. To a Southerner it is like an intuitive truth, to be accepted through its own power of assertion; to a Northerner it is like the Gospel, to the Jew a stumbling block and to the Greek foolishness, and likewise, not unlike the Gospel, when once accepted; by living among the negro race, it creates such a zeal that the Southern friend has to keep the Northern friend from killing his once idolized pet. When a man like Joseph Cook, can even hint at amalgamation one is tempted to give up the task of presenting the social side of life as it must be observed by the negroes of the South.

I wish to produce the impression that the suggestion has never yet been made, nor the plan devised, by which whites and negroes can live together in the same section of the South, save as negroes and whites, in the sense that the Southern white man understands these distinctions ; which is identically that of oil and water, and as there is no law of chemistry that can force these fluids to be one, so there is no law of God or man that can force the white man of the South to sit down at the same table with the negro and say we are one. What God has joined together let not man put asunder ; the converse of this likewise must be obeyed. What God has put asunder let no man or government join together, for in the union is the death of the inferior.

If I have made myself clear, I wish now to state what will appear strange to any one unfamiliar with Southern life. While a Southern man will not associate with as an equal, nor permit his family to admit to his home as a guest, the most refined, best educated, wealthiest, most honored negro on earth, he will advise with, give all the privacy of his home life to, sit down by the side of in a railroad coach, let his children sleep in the same room with and let his wife take with her into the finest parlor car, or into the best hotel, any decent negro woman, provided she is, in every case, considered simply as a negress in the employ of her superior; or to change the picture, he will trade with, sell to, buy from, employ for work, or work for, any decent negro man, provided it is understood that he is a negro with no claims of equality with his white superior.

Not long since a negro, here in the North, wrote for one of the magazines an article, in which he created a condition of affairs which he said, by inference, existed in the South, and located the scene at Fayetteville, North Carolina. He undertook to show that prejudice was so great against the negro, that a young negro girl who loved her former mistress, was denied the privilege of looking upon her dead face, was kept from the church at the time of her funeral, and prohibited from entering the cemetery at the time of her burial, and so gave a bunch of flowers to a little

dog who placed them on the newly-made mound. Doubtless some tender-hearted Northern white has wept over this story, not stopping to think how such a cruel race could ever have so won the affection of this negress. The editor of the *Presbyterian Standard*, published at Charlotte, N. C., replied to this piece of idiocy, by saying: "The first funeral preached on my assuming a pastorate at Fayetteville, was that of an honored negro woman, and it was preached in the church of the white people; the main body of the church was reserved for the negroes, while the whites occupied the sides and galleries. The undertaker of the town was a respected negro and officiated at the funeral of every white citizen, and entered the cemetery on all funeral occasions. This negro was respected as much as any white man living in the town."

I have given this incident to illustrate my meaning. If this negro undertaker had assumed the air of an equal, or, in any way, showed that he regarded his office as breaking down the social barriers, the people of Fayetteville would have let the bodies of their loved ones rot in the sun and have left their bleached bones as a testimony to the impossibility of any such thing as social equality between the white and negro races.

To make the paradox more apparent, the negro may be placed in the finest drug store in the South, with every assistant a negro, and provided they are competent, the finest families will have prescriptions filled by them, and the most refined and elegantly dressed ladies will be served by them at soda fountains, and ice cream tables, provided they conduct the business as negroes. but if the store is to be run on the ground of equality of race, if plague was raging and drugs could be procured nowhere else, the white people of the South would die, rather than receive at a negro's hand the remedy for death, if social equality was thereby to be conceded. You say that is fool-hearted; be it so, it is nevertheless true. There is no enterprise or business in the South, for which a negro is competent, that is not open to him, as a negro. There is nothing in the South

for the negro but death, if he demands it, or his Northern white friends demand it for him, otherwise than as the Southern white man understands "as a negro" to mean.

To put the case plainer still—a leading Southern preacher told me he was put to utter confusion, when a boy, while on a visit to relatives in New Jersey. He was Southern born. A negro, whom he called Tom, was servant to the family he was visiting. Proposing to go fishing one day, Tom, negro like, offered to dig the bait and row the boat for the privilege of accompanying his white companion. Nothing suited a Southern white boy better than this, and an agreement was quickly reached. When they returned from fishing, where they had both sat on the same log, ate out of the same lunch basket, smoked the same pipe, to his utter amazement his relatives upbraided him for going fishing with a servant. When the boy recalled, that against his training and will, he had been compelled to attend church and sit together in the same Sunday-school class with this negro, the censure for going fishing with him produced such a mental impression that to this day, though advancing in life, he has never recovered from it. The fact is, the conditions were so completely reversed that his boyish mind could not take it in. We in the South will do anything to help negroes as negroes, but if they arrogate to themselves equality of race, that moment life is jeopardized. There is a boundary beyond which he cannot pass.

#### EDUCATION.

I have often been asked by intelligent Northern white men: "Does education benefit the negro." To which I give two answers. The first is after the manner of reply made by preachers, when asked if education helps a bad man; to which they reply, especially if they happen to be arguing for a church school, that without religion it enables him to be a more effective bad man. Education undoubtedly strengthens the mental faculties of negroes as well as of whites. But you will observe that the question is one of benefit; in its answer we must be guided by his



circumstances. The only thing gotten from the present system of negro schools, that sticks to the pupil throughout life, is an intense hatred for the white race, and false ideals of life. This is due to having negro teachers. Considering that the present generation of younger whites have little of that love and affection for the negro which marked the older generations, education is not beneficial, under these conditions, if both races are to dwell together.

The other answer is: If the younger negroes will take their places in a school distinctively for negroes, save only that they shall be directed by white talent, and the negro will lay aside all ideas of education being able to pull down the barriers between him and his white teacher, then education will broaden and elevate the negro to a fitness for citizenship and suffrage. The Southern white who does not admit this latter, is blinded by prejudice, and the Northern white who undertakes to contradict the former, either does not, or will not, understand the situation. The negro's lack of virtue, of honesty, of filial affection, of cleanliness, and likewise his tendency to revert to savagery, his lack of self-control, when fired by passion that leads to such death-invoking deeds as rape, have been, and will still be, affected by education when wisely directed. No money is wasted when spent by the State or the Nation for the better education of the negro race.

#### ECCLESIASTICAL STATUS.

It would seem that here, if nowhere else, with the declaration "that of one blood God has made all peoples that dwell upon the face of the earth," and that "with Him there is no respect of persons," the Southern white man would sit down by the side of his brother in black as an equal in every respect; but it is a fact that he will not—and the fact is what we wish explained—the Southern white distinguishes between the rights of a soul and the rights of a citizen. He knows that in God's sight a negro's soul is as good as his, that none of the benefits of grace which accrue to him may not likewise accrue to the negro; but he knows on the other hand, it is not a violation of any New Testa-

ment principle for him to recognize, in his worship, those distinctions of race, which God has made, and the observance of which is for the interest of good order, good government, the good of the negro and the safety of the body politic. If suffrage had not created such a relationship between the races, as it has, involving the social status of the white race, the old custom of parts of churches, for whites, being set aside for negroes, where, under the same preaching, they might worship God and join in communion at a common table, spread for a sin-cursed earth, might still prevail; but there will never be a church, in the South, of any denomination, that will allow negroes in its courts or within its walls as equals so long as the race question is involved. I give you the fact—ecclesiastics may argue it in what manner and in what way they please. But in the vernacular of Sam Jones, "When you meet a *fact* in the middle of the road, you might as well hitch your horse, get down and take out your lunch."

My friends, we might as well face the condition: It is not in the power of refinement, education, wealth, honor or title to break down the barrier between the negro and white races in the South. The measure that undertakes so to do is incapable of being carried out by the strongest government on earth.

I wish to say, the proposed methods of dealing with the franchise in the South will in no way be detrimental to the negro; his very best interest will be conserved thereby; and we who know the conditions, tell you, in the fear of God and man, that we believe a few years of trial will convince the negro of the good of the measure, and convince the world of the righteousness of the act.

The city of the South in which I live, contains about 30,000 people. It is the capital of Mecklenburg county, and the total population of the county is about 65,000. Of this population, about two-fifths are colored. The city is one of considerable activity, and in its population it counts many Northern men, who are respected and influential in the community.

In the suburbs of this city is located Biddle University, a large and flourishing Presbyterian College and Seminary for the colored race, in which colored men largely are teachers. This Institution is supported by the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church. There the colored folk are contented, happy and prosperous.

In the government of this city, the colored men take no part. We have not now, nor have we had for many years, any policeman or other officers connected with the city government except of the white race.

In the government of the county no colored man takes any part whatever. He does not sit on the jury, and members of his race, when charged with criminal offenses, are tried by a jury of the white race; and, if the property rights of any colored man are in jeopardy, men of the white race exclusively determine what his rights are.

In this city and county, where the government, by tacit consent, has assumed this phase, colored men being excluded from any participation therein, the rights of the colored man have, as I have been informed, always been, and are now, most safely guarded. His rights of property; his rights of person; the safety of his family, the sanctity of his home are as well protected in that county and in that city, as the rights, property and home of any white citizen. The colored man is there the absolute equal of the white man before the law. He is not his equal socially. He is not allowed the hope to be his equal socially. He has learned that neither the Southern man nor the Northern man, who has come to dwell amongst us, desires or will permit his domination in any governmental affairs, but he knows well that his rights are safe in every particular, and he is never discontented and never disturbed except when bad men, for their own selfish purposes, work upon his prejudices and ignorance, and either buy his vote for money, or else excite his passions and his fears by falsehood, in the hope that, with the assistance of the ignorant colored vote, men who could not otherwise hope to gain office may

succeed, by such means, in accomplishing their wicked purposes.

If any man in this audience desires to know how white men and colored men live together in peace and amity under these circumstances, I invite him to come to the community where I live, and I will introduce him to men who, but a few years ago, were ignorant of the Southern ways and Southern ideas upon this subject, but who have learned, by close contact with our people, that we are not only merciful and kind to the black man, but that we are, what is better for him and for us, absolutely just towards him and his.

The white men of the South say to the colored race, in all kindness, "You shall not govern us," and, in the same breath, they say to that race, "Our government of you shall be kindly and just."

In the Hawaiian policy, already adopted by the government, there has been a refusal to extend the franchise on account of race. The color line, in this instance, has been the governing principle, and a line has been drawn at blacks, browns and yellows. This measure is eminently wise and will save the government great trouble in future.

The silence of the Republican party on the Porto Rico and the Philippine question, as forecast in the platform indicated by Mr. Hanna, is very significant. Its significance will save both the party and the government a criticism of inconsistency.

The expansion plank in the Massachusetts platform is worthy of study by those who like to observe a high political somersault. It has taken the Republican party 35 years to make the turn, but here it is, down on both feet with its face where the back of its head was.

"By the Treaty of Paris, a number of islands formerly held by Spain have come under the dominion of the United States, and by the terms of the treaty the duty of providing for their government and of determining the civil rights and political status of their inhabitants has devolved upon the Congress of the United States. As a result of these acquisitions, races of people have come under the protection of the American flag who have been so long degraded by tyranny as to have very inade-

quate conceptions of the true spirit of liberty and of the responsibilities of self-government, and who have been so impoverished and weakened by the exploitations of their oppressors as to be unable to defend themselves, unaided, from the greed of foreign conquest.

“No greater trust than the uplifting and educating of these defenceless people has ever been imposed upon the United States. The Republican party believes it to be the high and solemn duty of the nation to accept and execute this trust, with all the responsibilities it involves, by retaining the islands, and by providing for their adequate government upon the principles of liberty and humanity. It believes that to abandon them to local anarchy or to the lust of the invader would be cowardly and dishonorable, and a betrayal of its trust, impossible to be contemplated by a great, free and enlightened nation.”

The measure proposed would be admirably suited to meet the requirements of all wants in the Union. The South, in the effort now being made in the attempt to amend the several constitutions of the States, looks to no better attainment for that section than this paragraph from the above forecast of the Republican platform.

It is a curious fact that in the government's effort to alleviate human suffering, in the only war in the history of the world which was fought solely for the relief of the oppressed, it has hit upon a difficulty, the solution of which brings to the front the mistakes made by the Republican party 35 years ago. Whether we will or not, the race question in this country has assumed such proportions that it will not down. It would be very embarrassing to the Chief Executive and to the Federal Government to have the Constitution of these United States guaranteeing certain rights to, and keeping certain privileges from, those of her citizens dwelling in the isles of the sea and yet under the protection of the American flag, and at the same time having in her very bosom all rights guaranteed to, and no privileges excluded from, the race, in many particulars, more vicious and as incompetent for the exercise of the franchise as the brown and yellow-skins of the Hawaiian group.

In concluding the discussion on this great subject, we are confronted by a fact; and that fact is the citizens of one part of this Union ask you to deal as fairly and as sincerely

by them, as the whole Union is dealt with, when you consider the inabilities of the citizens in newly acquired territory.

The old question when Mexico and Upper California were admitted to the Union, is now before us. That question was: "Shall the new territory be free or slave soil? The question now is changed only to this extent: "Shall all of the new citizens have the right of franchise, or only those competent to use it?" The government has answered, on the ground of expediency, that the franchise shall not be extended to those incompetent for its intelligent exercise. We ask for nothing more. Either way, if the government is to be consistent, the 15th Amendment of the Federal Constitution must be stricken from that document. If this shall be done friction is at an end, and the negro race may eventually give to this country a sturdy, intelligent citizen.

Charlotte, N. C.

JOHN W. STAGG.

## II. ETHICAL APPLICATION TO MATERIALISTIC PROBLEMS.

Since the time of Thales—but perhaps since the time of man's first advent upon the earth—men have been seeking in more or less scientific ways to discover the reality of things or the unity of thought, matter and essence. Primitively, water, air, light, or the indefinite and immaterial substance of which each of these is but a manifestation, in turn served as explanations. The Ionic, Doric, Eleatic schools, as well as the Atomists, have contributed their share with more or less earnestness towards this solution. Ancient Philosophy concerned about Cosmology; Mediæval Philosophy concerned about Theosophy; and Modern Philosophy concerned about Ontology, has each sought diligently to unify in some way the apparently diverse worlds of mind and matter, and the problem therefore necessarily touches upon all knowledge, all science and all faith. Between Materialism and Spiritualism the pendulum is constantly swung. On the materialistic side the question has been a serious one from the time of the Ionic school with its crude physical features, to Darwin and Spencer with their subtler biological theories, and with their sub-organic, organic and super-organic evolution. Natural Science during this century has added much to the discussion—to its complication in every way—Biology, Physiology, Chemistry, Physics, Geology and Astronomy have been literally born again, and results have been claimed reverently and irreverently in explanation of Sociology, Ethics, Religion, as being greatly modified by, yea, revolutionized through, this renaissance of science. Psycophysics and Pneumatology coming face to face with super-organic evolution are seeking to discover soul essence, and possibly to express it in terms of biological formula or a chemical equation, for the physical evolution of the ancients is far cruder than the chemical and biological evolution of the moderns.

To-day, all society, literature, religion—not to mention science—are colored with materialistic experience. Matter, movement, mind, are merged into each other. What is reality? The mind is so constituted that it seeks one First Cause, and cannot rest without some conception of the unity of existence, but what is that Cause? Is it mind or matter? The latter is to some unthinkable. But we must return to the former question.

Reality is of two kinds, noumenal and phenomenal, or, noumena and phenomena. The visible world is real phenomenally; my thought is real, my experience is real, phenomenally; love, friendship, are real to me phenomenally; each is real to me, but dependently so. Noumenal reality is being, essence, substance, i. e. uncaused existence. But being implies energy, activity; passive being is an anomaly; the term vacates the thing, and therefore it cannot exist. Phenomena demands, and is inconceivable without, noumena; that is, dependently exists; all manifestation whether physical or psychical is unthinkable alone and uncaused.

What Herbart affirms of being as "absolute position" is true simply as concept, it is not true of essence, nor is it possible for the concept to create essence, but the former results from and is dependent upon the latter. It cannot be materialization of subjective conditions. Causality is the distinguishing mark of being, and by being we mean cause, which is the power of acting. But phenomena, as existing, demands intelligent noumena or cause. There can be no impersonal, intelligent cause, and by person we mean a being who thinks and loves, hence phenomena in matter and mind, the physical as the psychical manifestations, point back to an intelligent personal cause, the Eternal God, whose intelligence and activity is the ground of the universe. More than that—the manifestation of morality necessitates thought, noumenal morality, and predicates that the great First Cause is not only intelligent, but good. Herbert Spencer caught something of that meaning in its greatness and fulness when he declared that for us



thinking men and women amidst all the mysteries of life, there must be for us an Eternal Energy from which all things proceed.

The mechanical theory has indeed given place to the energistic theory of the universe, and this has been no small, but a large and healthy contribution that science has made to the rational religious thought of the time. Only the personal truly is, and personality only can give concrete meaning to those ontological categories by which we seek to interpret being. Only personality is able to reconcile the Eleatic and the Heraclitic philosophies, for only the personal can combine change and identity, flow and permanence. The impersonal abides in perpetual process. It may hereafter appear that the impersonal is only a flowing form of activity, to which cause of its constancy we attribute thing-in-itself, which Kant contended, but which in reality is only a form of activity of something deeper than itself. If this be so, then the absolute person, not the absolute being simply, is the basal fact of existence—the Eternal Noumenon.

Materialism has psychic as well as cosmic significance, super organic as well as organic manifestations. "I dinna wha I came frae," as George MacDonald expresses it, reaches down to "I dinna wha the world came frae."

Mind and matter are apparently irreconcilable parts of existence. Are they essentially one, or are they substantially different? If one, which causes the other? Which is basal, which is noumenal? Which is the Eternal Cause? Is dualistic monism or monistic dualism possible? Is Haeckel's biological unity possibly true, or is Monotheism the completer form of explanation? If matter and mind are different essentially, or even to the extent advocated by Descartes, are there two Eternal Causes? Are matter and mind equally noumenal? Is it possible to think of two world grounds? Scientifically, is not Cartesian philosophy impossible? Do Spinoza and Darwin and Haeckel view the cause from different points of view? Can *natura naturans* be translated into development through selection along

natural laws by means of resident forces? Is *natura naturata* another name for the "survival of the fittest?" But what determines the fitness for survival? Can impersonal mind or impersonal matter do it? Can the determined come out of the undetermined or the indeterminate? Is it by resident force? How and whence come those particular forces, and what disposes them towards selection? Is it by "pre-established harmony," as Leibnitz urges? But who preestablished harmony at all, or the particular harmonies? Is it by molecular or atomic affinity? Whence the molecules and atoms? How did they happen to be disposed that way? Is it by means of cellular development, by protoplasmic base? But how did the protoplasm and the cell generate? Did they develop or change and become intelligently or unintelligently? If unintelligently, how? If intelligently, by whom were they generated and directed? Is it by impersonal mind, or by *natura naturans* becoming *natura naturata*? But impersonal mind is unthinkable, because it effects consciousness and therefore it vacates itself. The very term negatives the existence of the thing, and the shadow vanishes for want of an object to cast it. Pantheism and Materialism stand antipodally apart in the presence of any Theistic conception of a personal First Cause, and the only refuge is in Agnosticism, which declares not only that one cannot know personal cause, but also, that such cause is unknowable. But how can the Agnostic know that he cannot know? Cosmically any theory or philosophy in empirical terms is materialistic that attributes thought to motion, whether by affinity, or by resident force, or by natural selection. Psychically, whatever theory attributes thought to organism is materialistic.

Is vital force in nature but the lower end of will force in man? Is "natural law in the spiritual world" identical or only analogous? Is it possible for indestructibility of matter to mean immortality of soul? Does conservation of energy mean the same for physical as for psychic phenomena? Is thought but a mode of motion? Is purposed and

correlated phenomena but the unfolding of impersonal noumena? If not, who unfolds it?

Is it possible for materialism as mechanically or organically explained by Darwin, biologically explained by Huxley and Haeckel, and ethically and super-organically applied by Spencer, LeConte and Drummond, to be translated into psychic phenomena or in terms of Theistic thought?

Not until two things become clearly proved, or more clearly proved than now, and are transferred from the realm of theory and hypothesis into that of reasonable fact and certitude.

First, that evolution as an organic and super-organic process, is true. Second, that the indestructibility of matter and the conservation of energy in quantity and quality applies to physical and psychic forces alike. The chemical and biological laboratories have not demonstrated the former, nor has the psycho-physical laboratory certified the latter. Phenomenally, we know matter by extension, form and weight, and mind by thought, feeling and will. But sets of phenomena are reduceable to force and energy, but the phenomena differ absolutely in properties and are phenomenally far apart. True, they are but manifestations of substance, force, energy, and the outflow of the noumenal cause. Is that cause physical, chemical or spiritual energy?

Psycho-physics and Psychometry are seeking to demonstrate the change and becoming of motion into thought. Physiologically nerve motion is sensation. But nerve motion is not thought until it becomes conscious nerve motion, nor can it ever become so by any theory of the conservation of energy, the correlation of physical or chemical forces. The vibrations of the nerves of my eye and ear are quite one thing from the pleasurable thoughts and emotions of the beautiful and harmonious through them. The sight of injustice is quite one thing from the stern energy that seeks to right the wrong. Nerve motion may be sensation, physiologically, but nerve motion must end in thought before it can become sensation psychologically. Exquisite joy and sorrow, and elevated ennobling thoughts

are quite different from their concomitant nerve excitation.

Motion may be converted into heat, and heat in turn produce motion. Hydrogen and oxygen, in proper proportions will form water, and water can be converted back into its original elements, but where in the universe is the laboratory in which motion can produce thought, and thought again be resolved into motion? By what alchemy does unintelligence produce intelligence? Would not the product in quantity and quality infinitely outrun the cause? The effect would transcend the cause in inconceivable proportions.

But if nerve motion produces thought, it must do so consciously or unconsciously. If unconsciously, how? If consciously, by whom? What gives nerve irritation its illumination? Where nerve motion ends and thought begins, we may never know, but nerve motion alone is not thought, nor is the human soul made up of material fibre, cellular tissue, nor is it a chemical education. Thought is intelligence. It is the manifestation of personality. If thought be but a mode of motion, the conservation surpasses in quality the thing conserved in infinite degree. But motion to become thought, must become so intelligently or blindly. If blindly, how did it happen? If intelligently, the statement "by evolution" is manifestly insufficient.

Again, when motion is transformed into heat, has not the latter new properties separate and distinct from the properties of motion? When oxygen and hydrogen become water, is not the water a new something different from each, and with properties peculiar to itself? May not nerve and brain coming together form conscience, yea, a soul, with properties of its own, different from each, such as intelligence, personality, immortality?

Heat may be converted back into motion, water converted back into oxygen and hydrogen, but thought can never be resolved again into motion, nor the soul into nerve irritation. Neither heat nor motion transcend the physical laboratories in their manifestations nor do oxygen and

hydrogen and water, but the physical and chemical are projected into the psychical and there is no return and no possible reconversion. Physiological psychology in its ultra form is but hyphenated materialism.

We turn from this materialistic discussion on the side of scientific statements and claims to the application of the theory of some psychic phenomena, and to ethical relations.

With evolution and conservation of energy projecting organic evolution into the super-organic in relation of cause and effect, what becomes of conscious unity and personal identity? Physiologically and chemically, repletion and waste are taking place every hour in every cell tissue and nerve fibre of the body. Every particle of the material in us is constantly changing and becoming. Each nerve fibre and each cell tissue is under the same law of waste and repletion. If mind is the product of nerve and brain-matter, how is it possible for it to be the same for any considerable period of time? How does the soul or the intelligent and spiritual within us become the permanent bearer in unity of all psychic manifestations through an entire lifetime? What becomes of the testimony of consciousness to the unity of personality? Neither nerve nor brain matter remain the same, then how can their product remain a conscious unit? We are not materially the same for any period of time, how then can we be psychically the same, when that which produced the mental state or specific psychic conditions has passed away? How is it possible on this basis to give any credence to conscience, that personality is a unit and not a compound?

Again, what becomes of memory, which is the unaltered reproduction of the past, or that which makes the real past, psychically present? Does the depleting or depleted cellular tissue whisper to the repleting or repleted new one its own experience? Is the chemical change a conscious one or an unconscious one? If unconscious, how is memory possible? If conscious, how is it possible without a co-ordinating, regnant, unitary principle within us? With the

constant and ceaseless decay and renewal of cell tissue and nerve fibre in organism, where is there a unifying substance, or what certifies to me that I am the same person of a few years ago? Memory becomes inexact and an illusion. Personality, in the terms of materialism, is an impossibility, even though it be considered to be a resultant of nervous affection certified by habit.

That the organic, as well as the inorganic, are products of one and the same original force is true, if by force we mean personal, infinite, moral, intelligent cause. Only in this sense can the physical law of the conservation of energy, and the chemical law of the conservation of matter find philosophic conception in the conservation of substance. It is this that has been deeply felt in much of the finest literature and poetry.

Tennyson indexed it when he said,

“One God, one law, one element,

And one far off divine event toward which the whole creation moves.”

Again—How can we explain the nature or psychic manifestations in all of their phases of joy and sorrow, of pain and pleasure, of hope and aspiration, and all ennobling thoughts that take in whatever is true and beautiful and good. Whence comes conscience, and the idea and conviction of moral obligations and accountability? How did the eternal ‘oughtness’ in man originate? Is moral obligation but a minor note in the cell organism of animals and plants, and a major one in that of man? Unless conscience be noumenal, and belongs to the innate furniture of man, it is but a diabolical machine to torment us, and its everlasting sanctions are of no value.

Mr. Haeckel in his “Monism” or the “Confession of Faith of a Man of Science,” says, in a certain sense we can regard the conception of animated atoms as essentially partaking of the nature of pure Monism—a very ancient idea which more than two thousand years ago Empedocles enunciated in his doctrine of the hate and love of elements. Modern physics and chemistry have indeed, in the main accepted the atomic hypothesis first enunciated by Democri-

tus in so far as they regard all bodies as built up of atoms, and reduce all changes to movements among these minutest discrete particles. All these changes, however, in organic as well as in inorganic nature become truly intelligible to us only if we conceive these atoms not as dead masses, but as living, elementary particles endowed with the power of attraction and repulsion. Pleasure and pain, love and hate, as products of atoms, are only other expressions for this power of attraction and repulsion

By what process, or by whom, do the particles become "discrete" or the atoms "endowed"? Are discretion and endowment attributable to natural selection by means of resident forces, or are they possible and thinkable without personal force which guarantees directive energy and a unifying intelligent cause! Are soul phases in unity possible, if by soul is meant the sum of thinking, feeling, willing, when these are but the sum of those physiological functions whose elementary organs by the microscopic ganglion cells of our brain, or of comparative anatomy and ontogeny can prove that the soul has in the course of millions of years been gradually built up from the brains of lower and higher vertebrates? The soul then becomes but a function of the brain. It is well that Empedocles nor Lucretius nor Spinoza nor Bruno nor Lamarck nor Darwin nor Strauss nor even Goethe, Germany's greatest thinker, in his "Gott und Welt," have explained the universe, nor will the heart and intellect of men be satisfied with other teaching than that of the great Teacher of Men with whom all the phenomenal in mind and matter find ultimate expression and unity only in the Noumenal Father.

Imagination, which is the altered reproduction of psychic manifestations and affections, is made void, for the altered would be confused with unaltered reproduction without the conscious atoms. But is not the adjective perplexing and even absurd? Such might account for the organism but not for the life of the organism or its differentiated manifestations. There can be no subjective unity, and without such a unitary subject no reality is possible.

The soul, then, is something more than a function of the brain due to ganglion cell life, or a "conscious automaton" as a result of animated atoms. God does not first make the mind a lot of raw material with rigid laws, and then combine it as best He can, but matter and mind, and all their laws are but His purpose constantly unfolding and realizing itself. The conception of matter as something given and fixed, we repudiate entirely. It is a notion that rests upon the supposition that God's relation to the universe is much the same as ours.

We hold then, to a phenomenal materialism and an absolute spiritualism. Matter is simply a form of manifestation of which the reality is the Immanent God.

With Hermann Lotze, one of Germany's greatest modern philosophers, we hold an absolute spiritual realism as the noumenal cause of the Universe.

"Behind the dim unknown  
Standeth God within the shadow  
Keeping watch above His own."

If Science has aided—and it has greatly aided—philosophy, philosophy must in turn illumine and spiritualize science. "We have but faith, we cannot know, for knowledge is of things we see" is not wholly true. *A priori* truth may be more directly certified to us in consciousness than empirical truth. The contention of some of the sensational school of philosophers that we have nothing in intellect except that which comes through the senses, has been happily answered by Leibnitz. "True," says he, "except the intellect itself."

Bruno long ago grasped the idea of matter as given by science and modified and illumined by philosophy. He asserted the identity of matter and energy and regarded nature as the constant product of the Divine Presence and the universe as the unfolding of the supreme reason, and the effect of one spiritual, noumenal cause.

Natural science has done much in the aid of philosophy. Its conclusions have often been hasty and false, or but one-half true, but it has enforced more exact and sober meth-



ods of inquiry. Neither can be discussed intelligently without patient investigation, and without some knowledge of each other. Inquiry has been transferred to the historic field and driven more and more away from the simply speculative field of inquiry. Many errors have been committed; often there has been a lack of reverence through the errors of bigotry in scientific as well as in philosophic and theologic dogma, but time is correcting these mistakes and conclusions, and with largely increased knowledge of the material and psychic world, will come a harmony in a universe which includes and comprehends both, "where mind and soul according well, will make one music as before, but vaster."

Materialism is largely a western product. The eastern mind meditates; the western mind thinks. There is little time and inclination for brooding over truth, and the form is often taken for the substance. Modern philosophy differs from mediæval philosophy in a wider range of inquiry, and in a clearer and more diverse data. Its questions are metaphysical in the light of modern science. The nature of matter and mind and their union in one system, with the ethical, social and religious questions of the world. Materialism, with its essential empiricism, vacates all supernatural revelation as to First Cause. God becomes "force" or "animated atoms," and as to final cause an idealized subjectivity, a materialized longing of the race thrown upon the canvas of the world. Christ is but the anthropomorphic realization of such an idea, born out of the human aspiration and idealization. Strauss boldly affirms that he is but a myth, made necessary, however, by the race struggle and effort to realize the ideal man.

Historic research has, however, established the authorship of the New Testament before the close of the first century, making it highly improbable, if not impossible, for a myth to generate and grow and crystallize within the life time of those among whom the person lived, and the wonderful events transpired.

Renan, more critical and historic than Strauss, saw this,

and confidently affirms the historic Jesus, while denying His Deity, but Renan was more literary than philosophical, and left unexplained the adequate cause of Christianity, and could not, or did not, understand that behind Christianity as an effect must stand God.

Mr. Buckle in his "History of Civilization" cannot fill the gap by saying that civilization is a product of the intellect, despite religion and especially Christianity. Christianity has not followed intelligence and intellectual progress as a hindrance and barrier, but everywhere religious teaching and the church have preceded the school house, and intellectual development and intelligence and morality have been kept alive and diffused by religious sentiment.

Morality is not simply an evolutionary process growing out of experience, and therefore simply another name for expediency, nor is religion simply morality touched with emotion. Conscience is something other than nerve excitation or a mystical emotion or a chemical equation backed by ages of cell and nerve culture. The Ten Commandments are not simply a Jewish code born out of race experience as expressing relations that are of the greatest good to the greatest number. It is the noumenal "oughtness" of man's soul, and its ground is the nature of God, and the permanent constitution of and relations among men.

Mr. Benjamin Kidd in his *Social Evolution* well and truly maintains that religion is the ground of all growth and development in art, science, literature and philosophy. The eternal truths in the heart and mind of man are something other than empiricism affirms.

Materialism with its blind, unintelligent force; Pantheism with its impersonal spirit; Deism with its uninteresting and uninterested God of power; Agnosticism with its affirmation that God is unknowable; Biological Monism with its organic and dynamic oneness of mind and matter, can never bring permanent peace or satisfaction to man's deepest intellectual and spiritual needs. Theism alone can do this. The God within and yet above us; the immanent Father in whom we live and move and have our being; the God of

power and yet of love; of justice and yet of mercy; who is through all and in all and above all, and who in his personality certifies and evidences the personality and immortality of man.

The divine sanctions are eternal; they are inwrought in nature and are inexplicable as evolutionary processes of empirical science. Neither has Spencer nor LeConte nor Drummond on the side of science spoken the last word in explanation of the universe, nor has Brooks nor Ian MacLaren nor Abbott on the side of religion, nor George Eliot nor Mrs. Humphrey Ward on the side of social and psychic fiction, nor Hume on the side of ethics, nor Arnold nor Voltaire nor Emerson on the side of literature, nor Browning nor Tennyson on the side of poetry.

The unconscious intelligence of nature must become conscious intelligence of the Creator, and not simply the redistribution of matter and force. The double-faced substance of Spinoza in thought and extension is untenable because of its vagueness. The identity of the ideal and real, the thing-pole and the thought-pole of Schelling meeting in the Absolute is inexplicable, and the identifying of the ideal and real of Hegel's Egoism everywhere vacates personal unity. The laws of thought are the essence of reality, and the development of thought is creation. The categories of thought are the categories of Being, and Being must be conceived and unified in a personality; and the basal course of the universe becomes not one of blind force or atomic affinity but of will and purpose in the mode of its realization.

Then the Davidic poetry with its modern Kantian application in philosophy, comes back with renewed truth and power,—“the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork,” and with exquisite appreciation of the unity of force, he declares “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.”

Irreverent skepticism will never take permanent possession of the human mind, for only in the presence of the Eternal Father will his children find peace in philosophy and religion.

B. F. WILSON.

Converse College.

### III. CALVINISM AND THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

Is Calvinism inimical to the Fatherhood of God, when the latter is properly explained and understood? What we mean by this question is this; is the doctrine of particular election, as taught by Augustine, Calvin, the Westminster Standards, and held by the large body of evangelical Christians, called Calvinistic; is this doctrine fatal to that other doctrine, precious and sweet as it is, of God's fatherhood? Every one knows what is meant by father. The name suggests a strong and loving character, that can by no means be inconsistent, unkind or unloving.

It would be well for us to settle what we mean by God's fatherhood? There is a growing sentiment that God is universal father, in such a sense, as to preclude the possibility of his holding the relation of judge and ruler. Reason and Revelation both unite to refute such a view. If we turn to reason, what does it teach? It teaches that God is father of all men only by creation, not by generation.

This is the sonship of which Paul speaks, when quoting from a heathen poet: "For we also are his offspring." It is the same sonship of which the evangelist speaks, when giving the genealogy of Christ, he traces it back to Adam, "Which was the son of God."

We can readily see that the relation of creator differs materially from that of paternity. Reason tells us that God is father of the whole race, in somewhat the same sense as we speak of man being the father of an idea or an invention. It is the creation of his own brain. So God is father of this universe. And this view is in perfect harmony with Revelation. In no place has Scripture declared God to be the father of all men, except in the two cases cited above and these of necessity mean paternity by creation. Nay more, wherever in Scripture, God is spoken of as father and we are commanded so to address him, it is

always in connection with the redeemed people. The model prayer was given to the disciples, not to the world. A provision is made in the Gospel, by which man can become a son of God, viz: by regeneration of the Holy Spirit, by faith, by adoption, by gift. It is needless to show that it would be utterly contradictory for God to talk about adopting his own children; yet he is so represented, if this sentimental view of the Fatherhood is correct. Romans 8:14-15. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father." Two things are plain. First, is it not implied that we are not the sons of God until we are led of the Spirit? Second, that it is by adoption that we cry, "Our Father." If man was God's child by birth of flesh, how is it possible for him to be adopted? Again, if man has the inherent right of sonship, how could God be said to bestow it in the Gospel? "Behold what manner of love the father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." I. John 3:1. How could God give us what was already ours; or show any love in the giving?

The clear teaching of Scripture is that there is a vast difference in the relation that man holds to God under the law and under the Gospel. That is through Christ we have true sonship and God becomes our father. Then we are not surprised to read that God will never leave nor forsake his regenerate child; but will bear with his faults and sins and will, at last, bring him to himself. This he is enabled to do by the atonement of Christ. To the regenerate, God is bound by the double relation of creator and father. But to the unregenerate world, God holds no such relation. He loves the world; but it is a love that has its spring in his infinite perfections and creation. A thought that grows upon us when we are told that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

We would not for one moment minimize that love. This

Gospel reveals to us that God takes no pleasure in the death of him who dies and that he is long suffering to us-ward not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance. Far from minimizing, we rather exalt that unspeakable love. We could imagine a father willing to sacrifice himself for the good of his children, however reprobate. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." The principle of paternity did not prompt him, but a gracious love. God's relation to the world is that of creator, judge and ruler. This relation prompts to love the world. but it is a love, a perfect harmony with his innate sense of justice. His acts toward his creatures that are just and right must be most loving and kind, for the right is always best.

Then it is only in this much narrower sense that God is said to be father of the whole human family. It is in this sense we shall, in the following pages, use the term: "The fatherhood of God."

Does the doctrine that God, of His own gracious purpose, chose out of the great mass of sinful humanity a certain, fixed number and effectually called them to everlasting life, while with sovereign justice He passed by the remainder and for their sins ordained them to everlasting death; does this doctrine contradict the precious faith in God's loving fatherhood? If it does, then let it be relegated to the oblivion it deserves, as a relic of barbarism.

To those who so view this great doctrine it ought to be an eye-opener, that its chief exponents and teachers have been men noted for logical and discerning minds, and at the same time having the sweetest thoughts of God's love and gracious fatherhood. If there had been this antagonism, which some suppose, would it not have been apparent to their discerning minds?

But more, among those who have held this "horrible dogma" are thousands, who fought with every power of reason and prejudice, against accepting the "five points of Calvinism," which fight they were afterwards convinced was

born of a gross misunderstanding of the doctrine and of a natural prejudice.

It also should be a cause of care in condemning such a doctrine, namely, the fact that it is Calvinism that has given the Church its martyrs and theologians, the State its strong characters, religious freedom its bravest champions, and the world its greatest philanthropists.

Of course to this statement there are notable exceptions. But so singular and continuous has been the alliance between Calvinism and strength of character that it passes among the observant students of history as a fact indisputable. But for fear that these lines may meet the eye of some who have not studied history from this point of view, and are therefore not ready to concede the point, it may be well to give the opinions of some who are by no means favorable to the Calvinistic view.

Mr. Gladstone, in speaking of Calvinism, says: "It has given Presbyterians advantages which in civil order belong to local self-government and representative institutions, orderly habits of mind, respect for adversaries and some of the elements of judicial temper, the development of a genuine individuality, together with the discouragement of a mere arbitrary will and of eccentric tendency; the sense of a common life, the disposition energetically to defend it; the love of law combined with a love of freedom; last, but not least, the habit of using the faculty of speech with a direct and immediate view to persuasion."

Professor Ranke, the great German historian, says: "We may consider Calvin as the founder of the free states of North America."

Froude declares: "When all else has failed, when patriotism has covered its face and human courage has broken down; when intellect has yielded with a smile or a sigh, content to philosophise in the closet and abroad to worship with the vulgar; when emotion and sentiment and tender, imaginative piety have become the handmaids of superstition and have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there was any difference between lies and truth;

that slavish form of belief called Calvinism has borne ever an inflexible front to illusions and mendacity and has preferred to be ground to powder like flint, than to bend before violence ; or melt under enervation and temptation."

Such unwilling concessions could be multiplied, but these suffice. We shall have cause to refer to these quotations again, so only use them now to enforce this point, viz : that when such men as Gladstone, Prof. Ranke, Froude and a host of others, not doctrinally sympathetic, yet are one in the concession, that those who hold this doctrine are wise, freedom loving, strong, mentally and morally, the most faithful defenders of truth, and at the same time, have done more than all others in shaping the destiny of the freest and most progressive nation on the globe ; that when this is true, it should open the eyes of the most prejudiced to the fact, that Calvinism is more than a "horrible dogma" to be despised and abused. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Again, it should be borne in mind, the Calvinist admits no one to be a sincerer believer in the word of God, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, than himself ; that, for every point maintained, he believes there is Scripture proof, indisputable, when the Bible is taken as the revelation of God, in its entirety and explained in sweetest and most rational harmony.

We freely concede that all this might be true, viz : that wise men might see no contradiction and yet it might exist ; that the world may owe more to Calvinism than to any other single doctrine or belief and yet it might, as to its main points, be false ; that the great host of Calvinistic theologians, in spite of their piety and mental acumen, may be wrong in their interpretation of Scripture. Such a thing is possible, but by no means probable. Nay more, such a fact would be little short of a miracle. Calvinism is not the birth of a century. Paul states its points as clearly and succinctly, as Augustine, as Calvin as the Westminster Standards, as Spurgeon and Moody. Again one would naturally conclude, that to assert that Calvinism and the



fatherhood of God are inimical the objector would have to search Revelation with an unprejudiced mind, viewing it in its entirety, interpreting it in harmony, as the naturalist interprets nature ; then would turn to the great expositors of the Word, learn what they have believed ; and then, in sight of God, honestly to conclude and form one's own opinion. Those who arraign this doctrine, should know whereof they affirm. Instead of this what do we find ? We are not speaking now of the evangelical Arminians, who are practically Calvinistic. But we are speaking of the religious sentimentalist, the idle vaporings of a senseless press, ignorant of Divine things ; the tirades of prejudiced platform speakers, who show their ignorance in every word, both of Revelation and of the doctrine as taught. This ignorance and prejudice of even intelligent speakers are shown in such remarks as the following : "The only satisfaction love requires is love." "There never was a time when God was anything but love. Revelation says, 'God is love.' Man needed to be propitiated, his rebellious spirit crushed, so the great love of God was shown to break man's heart."

This sounds very well, and as a flight of oratory is no doubt beautiful, but is it true ? There is one truth, and that is a quotation from Scripture, viz : "God is love." All else is pernicious in statement and ruinous to a soul's eternal interest if accepted as true.

"The only satisfaction love requires is love." This means, if it means anything, that God being love, to please him and satisfy the demands of justice, the sinner has only to love in return. There is no need or place for repentance, nor propitiation, nor humble confession. The vicarious work of Christ is the fiction of a disordered brain.

"Other refuge, have I none,  
Hangs my helpless soul on Thee,"

is poetic license and meaningless. If man's love for God is the only satisfaction demanded, then that love is man's only refuge ; not Christ. This is self-born and inspires no humility. If man could get an idea of how God loved

him, outside of Christ, then that sacrifice was most useless. Do not nature and providence speak God's love? Yea, even better than a meaningless and cruel murder, and the crucifixion is both these, if not absolutely necessary.

What do such terms as sinner, guilt, law, righteousness, judgment, when applied to man in relation to God, mean? What do such terms, when used to describe the relation of the citizen to the state, mean? We all know that such terms, not only imply, but teach that the state holds the relation of ruler and judge as well as benefactor. That no amount of love can wipe out unatoned guilt. For our part we prefer to believe Scripture and conclude that we are all sinners and by sin have failed to reach the mark God's law justly requires. That God, though infinitely loving, holds the relation of judge and ruler. "The only sacrifice love requires is love;" means that God sits upon the bench only to acquit. What a travesty on human justice, much less divine! The judge sits upon the bench. The prisoner is at the bar. He is guilty. The judge loves that prisoner only less than a son. There is no sacrifice of time, money or blood, which he would not make to save that boy; yet the law is inexorable. All the protestations of reform will not remove guilt. Love does not and cannot satisfy broken law. One of two things the judge must do, resign his place to another or pass the sentence of guilty. Let us bear in mind that the judge may consider all palliating circumstances and fix the penalty accordingly; but he cannot clear the guilty.

Is God, our Judge and Father, less loving and just than man? Away with such a suggestion! Let us settle in our minds once and forever, that to be truly loving God must be just. Then the question propounded ages ago and answered then in Christ, is the living question to-day, "How can God be just and yet the justifier of the ungodly?" In other words, how can God be just and loving at the same time and to the same person? This question was answered on Calvary, when the God-man died the just for the unjust. There, "Mercy and truth are met

together, righteousness and peace have kissed." To make the sacrifice of Calvary merely a manifestation of love, is tragic nonsense and nothing short of blasphemy. It is true that all God requires of us after we are pardoned in the blood of Jesus, is a loving life and service ; but the justice of God requires something more than love ; it requires a faith that appropriates Christ, uniting us with him, thus enabling us to partake of the benefits of his sacrificial and propitiatory death. If love is the only sacrifice demanded and the sacrifice of Christ was merely a manifestation of love, then on its face it bears the marks of folly. If man did not need a propitiatory sacrifice, why did not God choose some other way of manifesting his love, less bloody and awful, than the cruel tragedy of the cross ? Why the blood ? God's Word alone has answered, "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." It is vain to minimize guilt, man is too conscious of the awful fact. There are many things in connection with Christ's death inscrutable, except that he bore our sins in his own body on the tree. Christ is not the hero, that friend and foe have painted him, unless he died with an awful sense of guilt ; not his own, it is true, but the world's. Why the agony above that of physical pain ? Why the despairing cry, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ?" If Christ was only manifesting divine love, all this is inscrutable. Yea more, Socrates died more heroically. There is a deeper meaning to Calvary than that. The Creator's heart bleeds with love for a reprobate race, his offspring by creation ; this love prompts that sacrifice ! But why Gethsemane, the bloody sweat, the broken heart, the death agony ? Here it is ! "He was bruised for our iniquities." "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Then God is something more than loving, he is just. To those who do not partake of Christ's righteousness by faith, "Our God is a consuming fire." If God is love and love alone, then it is not a fearful thing to fall into his hands. Our Scriptures

teach us that, unrepentant and unbelieving, it is fearful to meet God in judgment, but repentant and believing to fall into his hands, is to be forgiven and receive the welcome of returning prodigals.

We have now reached three conclusions. First, God may be Judge and Father, in the sense of Creator, at the same time. Second, man without exception is justly under condemnation for his sins. Third, the only way to receive the benefit of God's love and escape the Judge's sentence, is faith in Jesus as the atoning sacrifice for sin. Then man is not to be propitiated, but it is the ineffable law of God's holy nature that must be satisfied. Man is to be reconciled to God, but in order for God to make the overture of reconciliation, the demands of the law must be met, and man must appropriate the satisfaction.

Up to this point all evangelical Christians are agreed. It has remained for men like the one we have been quoting, to see that, if we once confess man's guilt and undesert, then of necessity God has the right to pass by the whole race if he sees fit. He also sees that, when sovereign grace conceived and effected redemption and offered it to all men, that this was love beyond the power of man to conceive. He also sees that, to confess man's guilt and undesert, when God makes a bona fide offer of salvation to all men and when all men, with one consent began to make excuse and declined to accept the invitation, then God's love superabounds, when he determines to save some and to do this must of necessity decide whom. The fact that all this was determined in eternity, does not alter the case, when we remember that all things are immediately present to the infinite mind.

In spite of the fact, that the Arminian acknowledges man's guilt and undesert, he unconsciously feels that God is not only under obligation to offer salvation to all, but to raise man out of his state of moral inability and raise him to that plane where, if not disposed to God, he would be in a state of equilibrium. We cannot pause to discuss the psychological question as to whether man can be in a state

of mental equilibrium. The point is this, if God is bound in the matter of salvation, then we can no longer sing:

“Oh, to grace, how great a debtor,  
Daily, I'm constrained to be ;”

for the Gospel is not a gracious offer of salvation. If we go thus far in denying Scripture, why not go a step farther and declare that man did not need a Saviour, only to be reconciled to God.

But men are guilty and undeserving and God has made salvation full and free, the burning question is : How shall it be applied ?

The justice of election is a foregone conclusion, if man is guilty; but is it in harmony with love ?

It is declared with forensic eloquence and with a deal of bombast, that the Calvinistic way is ungodlike and contradicts His loving fatherhood. The intelligent speaker from whom we have already quoted, in a sermon upon this subject, declared: “There was a time when men preached that God for his own pleasure had predestinated a certain number to eternal happiness. Every element that enters into the nature of a father is outraged by such a conception.”

The ignorance or wilful perversion of the doctrine, as taught by its intelligent advocates and the Westminster Standards, is apparent. No true Calvinist ever taught that God for His own pleasure had predestinated a certain number to everlasting destruction. The impression upon the mind of the speaker was evidently this, that the Calvinistic creed represents God is taking actual pleasure, yea, joy, in condemning a certain fixed number to eternal death. It is plain that such a statement contradicts every postulate of human reason and every page of Scripture. “As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?”—Ez. 33:11. In Ez. 18:20, the prophet declares : “The soul that sinneth it shall die.” In verse 23 he asks the striking question : “Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord; and not that

he should return from his ways and live." In verse 32: "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord; wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." Note first, that this statement occurs in the Old Testament and in the midst of threatened judgments; second, that it is in striking harmony with the New Testament truth as stated in II. Peter, 3:9, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promises as some men count slackness, but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

How is it possible that such a host of intelligent and godly men, close and reverent students of the Word, that such as these could teach that God takes pleasure in condemning to eternal destruction the fixed number of non-elect? The thing is preposterous on its face and is the base slander of ignorance or prejudice. Evidently the above quotation comes from a man that has a very confused notion of the Westminster Confession—so confused that he has applied language concerning God's decree of election to His decree of non-election. Hear the words of the Confession, chapter three, section five: "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory," etc. Here the distinct statement is made that God took pleasure in electing to everlasting glory. In chapter three, section seven: "The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures to pass by and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice."

"God was pleased," does not mean, "He took pleasure." By no possible construction can it be made to mean any such thing. The language is designedly different from that of section five, where it speaks of, "His good pleasure." "He was pleased," means, "He saw fit." It neither

expresses pleasure nor displeasure. So far as God's pleasure is included in the decree of non-election, it is only the pleasure one feels in acting justly, though it was a disagreeable task. The distinct statement is made that they are passed by for their sins. This precludes the possibility of its being for God's pleasure.

Why God did not save all men ; or why he decreed the coudemnation of any, when he has the power to work faith in all, as he does in those that believe, is a question concerning the unsearchable acts of God, which he has not seen fit to reveal. The Calvinist says: "There must be good and sufficient reason, satisfactory to the heart of our great Father ; therefore we are willing to leave it in his hands, till the revelations of that day." But the Arminian answers: "You Calvinists mistake the whole question. There is no mystery. God has decreed to save those that believe. He has also decreed to condemn those who do not believe. God knows from all eternity who will believe, not because he has elected man, but because he foreknows all things. God does the same work on and for all. He is no respecter of persons. He provides the same Christ, he works by the same Spirit, he raises all men to the same plane. When man rejects Christ, it is not because he cannot accept salvation, but because he will not. For this act God is not responsible, for he has done all possible, without overruling man's free agency. Although the Father grieves, he is powerless to prevent the calamity."

If this view contradicted no well established law of experience and Scripture, it would be an excellent scheme. Let us analyze it. There is an insidious error lying at the root; if not stated in so many words, it is implied and gives coloring and credibility to the whole scheme. The implication is this, that God, in order to justly condemn any man for his sins, must place the sinner in such a condition, that he will at least be in a state of equilibrium, if not actually disposed toward holiness ; that God is under obligation to raise man out of the corruption and sin into which he has fallen, then to offer him salvation. This

means that it would be unjust in God to condemn man, without giving him another opportunity, such as Adam had in Eden. This is done in the universal work of the Spirit, when all are disposed toward holiness.

This is the old objection, which has been so often made to the doctrine of original sin. We have referred to this point once before, but it is of such vast importance, we beg leave to add the following points.

First, if we concede that is the penalty of sin, then how account for the death of infants? Their death is wholly unjust if they are not in some sense guilty. What can this be but original guilt? We can unite in praise to sovereign grace, in that without their consent they are included in the covenant of works; so also they are included in the covenant of grace. Here is a glorious fact of election, in that all infants, dying in infancy, are chosen of God to salvation, to the praise of his glorious grace. Suppose the Arminian was right viz. that only those are saved who exercise faith and election consists in foreseeing faith; then on what ground could infants be saved? Only on one of two, either they are not guilty and need no Saviour; or guilty and saved through the electing love of God. Which will you take? God elects them when he fixes the time of death, and that was fixed in eternity. We readily consent, that no adult is saved without personal faith; but that if infants are to be saved at all, they must be, by the election of God; without foreseen merit. It is illogical to claim that this favor is shown them because they are infants. If so, then on what ground is the distinction made between infants? Some are taken in infancy and thus elected; while others are spared to adult age, and may or may not be saved. What right has God to make this distinction, except that none deserve anything and that it is all of grace. This is not a respecting of persons, but simply a sovereign act.

The words of our Saviour are inspiring: "Even so it is not the will of your heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish." Election hath obtained this, whereby



more than one-half the human family are saved. Is this unfatherly?

Second, this scheme of the Arminian cannot stand, because it contradicts Scripture. If God, before he can justly condemn man, was under obligation to thus prepare him to accept salvation; then salvation is not a free gift. Its name is a misnomer. Grace is unmerited mercy. The very name God gives his offer, proves that however much God's love would prompt to save, yet he would have been just to have condemned the race, without Christ having died. Remember, here is a plain case, the Gospel is either freely offered or necessarily offered. Which? The man who accepts Scripture, must conclude it was all of grace!

But again the Arminian answers: "While we believe God would have been just in condemning the race without Christ, yet we believe that he loved them too well not to give to all the same opportunities and the same gifts of his Spirit."

Here is all the concession we want, viz: that God is not under obligation to offer salvation at all. Those who claim that he is, in face of reason and Revelation—with such we have nothing further. It is a question of applying this salvation to undeserving creatures. This we pass for the present, while we show another inconsistency in the Arminian scheme.

The third fallacy lies in the Arminian and Pelagian view of the effect of sin. The Pelagian believes that man of his own power can rise from his degradation in sin, his hatred of God, to a newness of life and a love of holiness. The Arminian believes that man cannot do this of himself, but this willingness is given him in the general work of the Spirit. We can answer both in one. Scripture does not use similes and metaphors for nothing. Granting that, when God says that we are dead in trespasses and in sins, the word death is a metaphor; yet what does it mean?

The Pelagian says: "It means that we are only a little sick of sin." The Arminian declares: "It means we are desperately ill, sick unto death, yet with God's cooperation,

capable of restoration." The Calvinist affirms: "It means we are in such a condition that the helplessness of death is a fit and accurate description of the unregenerate soul."

The Calvinist is not dependent upon the metaphors and similes to describe man's slavery in sin. The loving Saviour says: "Whosoever committeth sin is the slave of sin." The great apostolic theologian declares: "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God is not subject to his law neither indeed can be." The carnal mind is the unrenewed nature. Man's own choice of evil has built this wall of enmity between him and his God. Has created a love of sin and hatred of God. Who will break this wall down so long as man himself is unwilling to do it? This unwillingness must last just as long as the man sins willingly. Here is the impregnable wall of man's inability, not that he has not the power to break the barrier; but because he will never exercise that power until so disposed. A new disposition must be created within him, before he will ever exercise the precious privilege of loving God. Here is the slavery of which Christ speaks, and the "cannot" of Paul. "And ye would not." God's Holy Spirit alone can change the disposition. This is a miraculous act and imparts Divine life.

Such Scripture refutes the Pelagian; but the Arminian says: "I concede that man is helpless in sin and for that reason I postulate the aid of the Holy Spirit." Let us ask, if a man be dead how can you aid him? Or if he is disposed to be evil, how may he be disposed to righteousness? Has the word of God revealed any other way than the new birth? The persuasive gifts of the Spirit may be used to convict the rational spirit of sin, but the all-important question is: will he act upon that conviction? We are commanded of God: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This means: "Ye must be born again." This is God's work and it rests with him whether it shall be done. The truth, eloquence, the Sacraments and

the persuasive Spirit only show man the path of duty, never do nor can move to love for God, so long as the disposition is to hate God. The question might be asked, "Cannot man change his own disposition?" We answer, yes he can; but will he? There is no physical necessity compelling him; but the metaphysical necessity that he will not. This means that he possesses the power, but will never exercise it until God by His Spirit gives him a new disposition. He has salvation within his grasp, but does not want it; else he would take it when offered.

If to be carnally minded is death and to be spiritually minded is life and peace, the new birth is making alive. Is not this new birth a state of salvation, either conscious or unconscious, that will inevitably lead to faith? The Arminian is in a dilemma; he must hold that God regenerates the whole human family, then offers salvation to all; some accept and are saved; while others, in spite of the fact that they have Divine life, reject it with scorn or indifference.

It should be remembered that this life, imparted in regeneration, is Divine, that it becomes part and parcel of one's own nature, that it cannot be separated; therefore it is not like one's money to be lost, or found at will. The only way to get rid of it, is to annihilate it. To do this you must annihilate the person. The victory is to the stronger. The spiritual nature must triumph finally. This disposition toward holiness, like the germ of life in the seed, only awaits the favorable opportunity to come forth to the light and wage the mortal combat between the old and new nature. Regeneration inevitably leads to faith, and faith leads us to commit to God the present and the eternal interests.

This rational view is in perfect harmony with Scripture. II. Tim. 1 : 12, "For I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." Here is the Apostle's confident assurance that all will be well, because he has committed his all to God. To his regenerate child God has said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." He

has promised. I. Cor. 10 : 13. "There hath no temptation taken you, but such as is common to man ; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." Here we find the distinct statement that while God allows his child by regeneration and faith to be tempted and it may be to sin, yet he will not leave him without a way of escape.

The Arminian represents God as forsaking his child, leaving him to himself. This the Word of God declares he never will do. He represents the regenerate man as doing the impossible, viz.: denying himself. If all the race is regenerated, then all the race is saved. But Scripture and experience teach us that all the race is not saved. The conclusion is inevitable that all the race is not regenerated. Here is the dilemma in which the Arminian places himself. He must teach that God deserts his regenerate child, if that child is lost; or he must agree with the Calvinist that God in offering salvation to all men, in order to make it a *bona fide* offer, is under no obligation to regenerate before he can condemn. The former position we have shown to be irrational and un-Biblical. The latter we believe can be shown most rational, Biblical and loving.

The third fallacy of the Arminian is in regard to the decrees, viz.: that God can foresee that which is not certain and therefore not decreed. He is represented as foreseeing faith in an individual whom he has not decreed should exercise faith. The question is, can God foresee anything that is not certain? What makes anything certain? We are apt to allow the thought of God's infinity to mislead us. He can do all things? Yes, but in doing all things he does not and he cannot deny or contradict his own nature. The Bible distinctly declares: "God cannot lie." Why? Simply because he will not betray that ineffable truth of his very being. God knows all things? Yes, but his knowledge is dependent upon his own infinitely perfect mental constitution.

His means of knowing are not independent of his own

being. To any mind the uncertain is the unknowable. When a thing passes from the realm of the unknown to the known then of necessity it is certain. A contingent future act cannot be known until it is certain. All things are present to the mind of God at once. He has nothing to learn. How is this, except they are there by God's decree? Then it is clear to any rational mind that the only way God knows all things, is that they are rendered certain by His decree. This is true of those things produced by operation of second causes, as well as those produced directly. Things may be contingent to man, but they cannot be to God. His foreknowledge presupposes his foreordination.

Let us apply this argument to the case in hand. Here is a race of undeserving sinners. So blind to what they need, that they cannot see any light or beauty in the cross; so perverse, that they will not listen to the dictates of their own reason; so in love with sin, that they will not love righteousness. Salvation is offered. They with one consent reject. How does God know they will reject? Plainly, because he decreed the temptation and the fall. This gave to man his bier toward sin. How can God foreknow any will believe? Plainly, by regenerating, thus freely, but certainly leading them to repentance and faith. How can God foreknow that one will not repent and believe? Plainly, by not regenerating him. Repentance and faith are the fruits of the Spirit. Then it is God's work. Gal. 5:22-23; "Now the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

There is no one so foolish as to claim that any of God's acts are uncertain and therefore the result of second thought. There are no second thoughts with God. Then of necessity the foreseen faith of an individual is the result of God's predetermined act to work faith in him. Regeneration does not leave the affections and will in a state of equilibrium, equally biased to good and evil. This condition is anomalous. There may appear a vacillation in deciding what to choose, but this indecision only lasts so

long as the weaker motive can block the way of the stronger. Back of this vacillation is a disposition, which will inevitably determine the act. If that disposition is the old carnal nature, it will never accept Christ as prophet, priest and king. If that disposition is the regenerate nature, then inevitably, yet freely, it will impel to go to Christ.

The Arminian cries out with horror: "Why, then, man is no longer free." If regenerate, he inevitably does a certain thing; if unregenerate, the action is fixed; then where is freedom? We need to make it clear in our minds that all actions left to free choice are the actions of a free agent, so long as they are not physically controlled. That is not a free choice, when disease takes an action from under the control of the better judgment; or when an external physical force compels an unwilling action. The man is free so long as he does what he wants to do. This is the only freedom man or even God possesses. The nature determines the act. God is free to act out His own nature. should be left to work out their destiny, unaided by the regenerating Spirit." The Arminian asks: "What possible conditions could so narrow the application of redemption?" Christ gives us an intimation of the difficulty. In Matt. 18:7, he says: "Woe to the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come, but woe to him by whom they come." There is something more here than the statement, that because sin is in the heart, it will out in sin. "It must needs be that offences come." Why? Surely, they come for the perfecting of redemption and the establishing of the truth. Sin having come into the world, redemption treats the case under those conditions. The unbelief of men, their sin and folly, has and is destined to play no unimportant part, in the furtherance and establishment of redemption.

We can find numberless proofs of this truth. Let us take only two. The case of Pharaoh. "And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all

His will is but the expression of that nature. Man is free to act out his own nature. He can do as he pleases. Can there be any higher freedom than this? The unregenerate or if you prefer, the finally impenitent, are those whom God leaves to themselves; but this inevitably fixes their destiny. On the other hand, when God regenerates, He does not overrule a man's free agency, nor does He compel him to act against his will; but He miraculously gives him a new nature, then by gracious, and loving assistance helps the child to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that it is God that worketh in him, both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

The above explanation is the only key to the interpretation of Scripture. The following quotations will show:

First, we hear God promising his Son: "He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." Is. 53:11. We hear Christ, with absolute confidence in that promise declare: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." Jno. 6:37. Again in his intercessory prayer: "I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me." Jno 17:9. Again, why do not all men believe on Christ? Says Christ: "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me. My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Jno. 10:26, 27, 29. Again, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me, draw him." Jno. 6:44. We are particular to take these quotations from John, the apostle of love and the Fatherhood. Let us look a little more closely at these statements of Christ. What do they teach?

First, the distinct statement is made that God, the Father, in making his covenant with the Son, promised, if he would undertake the work of redemption, that he, the Father, would insure the Son a sufficient number of souls to satisfy him for all the travail and pain.

Second, Christ affirms his confidence in this promise, "all that the Father giveth me shall come to me."

Third, Christ declares none others can come. The Calvinist alone has given a rational explanation of this inability to come to Christ without the Father's sovereign drawing. Let the Father cease to draw, man ceases to desire.

Fourth, Christ declares that he does not pray for the world. His intercession extendeth only to those given to him.

We ask in all earnestness, how could God make such a promise to Christ, or Christ expect its fulfillment, unless God had decreed its fulfillment and effected that decree in providence? Clearly no such promise could have been made if to God man's acts were contingent and uncertain. According to Christ himself, the number who are to come is fixed by gift. None come who are not given; all come who are. All who do come are drawn of the Father. The efficient cause of man's not coming to Christ is found in man's own nature, not in God's decree. If man is left to himself, to do as he pleases, he dies of his own fell purpose. "He loves darkness rather than light."

It must be that, in some way, God can, by changing the disposition, thus turn men to Christ, and do so without destroying his free agency. Yea rather, he lifts man into a higher state of freedom. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

"The king's heart is in the hands of the Lord, as the rivers of water, he turneth it whithersoever he will." Prov. 21:1. The Psalmist declares, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power." Psalm 110:3. If God can turn the king's heart whithersoever he chooses; if he can make his people willing in the day of his power; then it follows of necessity, that God, either arbitrarily withholds his regenerating Spirit from a vast number; or he withholds his Spirit for good and sufficient reasons. The Calvinist spurns with contempt the aspersion that God ever does an arbitrary or unreasonable act. The Calvinist could rest the case here if he wished. Certainly that act cannot be arbitrary that passes by an undeserving sinner. That act is



certainly most loving that decrees to save, in spite of unwillingness and undesert. But we are willing to go a step further. The fact that God does not save a great number presses home alike to the Arminian and the Calvinist. Why does He not save all men? The Arminian answers, "God cannot save a man against his will." This is true. Having made man a free agent, God will never destroy or contradict it. But no man can deny to God the power to re-create, to impart the divine nature and thus change the disposition. This is not coercing the will, although it reverses the whole purpose. This is precisely the work that is done in the birth of the Spirit. The carnal nature being enmity against God and not subject to his law; therefore, if man is to be saved at all, he must be regenerated.

But what is regeneration, except the Divine operation, by which the disposition is changed from enmity to friendship, from unwillingness to willingness? There is no coercion here, but a most blessed unity of will. That this is the right view of regeneration will appear in the following words from Paul: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation [not creature] old things are passed away; behold, all things have become new." II. Cor. 5:17. The Psalmist evidently implies that God has the power to make willing: "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." But we are not dependent upon inference. While man is commanded to work out his salvation with fear and trembling, yet he is reminded: "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure. "Here the distinct statement is made, that God worketh in man, to will." If he does so in one case, why not in all? God can control man's will. In regeneration, he controls man for good, thus makes his acceptance of salvation certain, yet free. Why does not God regenerate all? The Arminian is speechless. He represents God, the Father, as having salvation sufficient for the whole race, with nothing standing in the way of giving it to all, except the unwillingness of man to receive it. God has sovereignly overcome that unwillingness in millions of

cases, why not in ail? If the Arminian is right, then God is unfatherly. Let us question the Calvinist. Why does not God make every man willing in the day of his power? Why does he allow the multitudes to go on in their carelessness, when he possesses the power to regenerate? The Calvinist would answer: "The exact reason I do not know, but of one thing I am assured, there is some necessity. It was not because salvation is not sufficient for all; it is not that the heart of the Father did not go out in love to all the race, and not that he did not desire the salvation of all; but it must be on account of existing conditions, which rendered it necessary that a certain number the earth." Ex. 9:16. Pharaoh was used to establish the truth through his high handed rejection of God, his foolish pride and unbelief. God did all to make him willing, except one thing, he did not regenerate him. Could he not regenerate Pharaoh? Of course he had the power; but the truth must be established. Man's sinful heart demands proof. This can only be given through Pharaoh's foolish fighting against God. Here we find the best testimony to God's power and patience.

The second case, Peter in preaching on the day of Pentecost and speaking of Christ, says: "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death." Acts 2:23-24. Christ must be raised from the dead. To this end he must die. But his death to accomplish its purpose must be accomplished unjustly. One of the essential factors in the establishment of a redemption for man was the use of the sins of men. The flood, the Egyptian bondage, a Pharaoh, an idolatrous people, a traditional church, wedded to ceremony were these essential factors. Then, when Christ came, it was necessary to have the rejecting Jew, the betraying Judas, the vacillating Pilate, the mocking throng. "It must needs be that offences come." Let us note, that God in order to effect this decree of the crucifixion, did not have to put it into

Judas' heart to betray ; into Pilate to deliver ; nor into the people to demand the crucifixion.

The temptation could but triumph over people so disposed to sin. God left them to themselves. He causes the wrath of man to praise him and the remainder of wrath he will restrain. God's providence over this world has not ceased. He is establishing truth today just as always. If there was a necessity for a Pharaoh and a Judas, why not today? If there were necessity for one Judas, why not many? The effecting of redemption demands that some should not be saved. It rests with man to say how many. Not one more will be lost, than is necessary to convince man of his need of redemption. The all absorbing question is, how can redemption be made efficient to the greatest number? Who can doubt that God saves every one possible? Is it a contradiction of his fatherly character, to say, that in order to save any, he had to choose them. They would not choose him. All, to a man, began to make excuse. Some must be passed by. Not one deserves to be saved. Is it unjust or unfatherly for God to decide whom he will effectually call? There is a battle at sea. The enemy's ship is sinking; yea it is already down. A thousand men are struggling in the water. They deserve their fate, for they have gone down fighting against their own righteous ruler. In spite of the undesert, the king orders his ships to the rescue. The lost, some on pieces of timber, some trusting in their own expert swimming, all with inveterate hate of the king, had rather perish than be rescued by him. Has the king not only the right; but is it not love, that he should point out to his servants, those under whom the saving arm is to be put and thus lift them into the life-boat? This is not respecting persons. The saved have everything for which to be grateful. The unsaved have nothing of which to complain. It is their own fault that they are struggling in the water.

The illustration is not perfect, but it points the lesson. In effecting redemption, God is dealing with a reprobate race, every one of whom is in open rebellion. To add to

the awfulness of their sin, this rebellion is conscious and willing. Yet God loves the beings he has created and so loves as to give his only begotten Son to die for their redemption. This sacrifice is sufficient to save all; but in its effecting, as we have shown, offences must needs come. Who shall be the vessels of wrath? God, the Father, shows his love by saving as great a number as possible. He snatches them as brands from the burning. The rest necessarily because of their sins, not for God's pleasure, are vessels of wrath, left to their own innate folly. The fact that the number is fixed is of necessity. To save at all, divine love gave to the Son an innumerable company. The choice of that number is necessarily in the hands of God. It cannot be left to the contingent act of man. In God's government there is nothing contingent. Without that choice a host, which no man can number, out of every kindred and tribe and nation, are saved.

Place the responsibility where it belongs. Man sinned freely! He continues sinning willingly! God's love is manifested in the conception and effecting of redemption. It is man's unbelief that demands proof. To give this proof many had to be passed by that they might by their rejection of the Gospel establish and promote it.

This, of course, would be all wrong and unloving if man wanted redemption. This is not true. He makes every one a *bona fide* offer; he urges every one to come to the feast, but they all with one consent make excuse. They clearly have no right to complain. And God's love is shown in using them to effect redemption for those whom in sovereign love he has chosen.

Here is justice, wisdom and love unsurpassed. Nothing more humbling to human pride! Nothing more exalting to God's grace and none more perfect as a manifestation of a Father's love.

“Why was I made to hear his voice  
And enter while there is room,  
While thousands make a wretched choice,  
And rather starve than come?”

The love of God shines brighter on the dark background

of man's sin and undesert. To lose sight of these two great truths will sooner or later obscure the love of God. There can be no grace in loving the deserving. Postulate man's inherent sonship and you establish man's right to the treatment of a reprobate child. Thus with one fell blow you cast God from the judgment seat and destroy his gracious love. But the Calvinist magnifies the love of God by opening up that great truth of Scriptures, viz.: "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." He did this when we were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world."

This is love and the true fatherhood. And this is Calvinism!

#### IV. THE PHILOSOPHY AND FALLACY OF PERFECTIONISM.

The idea of human perfection and the endeavor to obtain it are not peculiar to the Hebrew or the Christian religion. Man from the beginning of his creation and during all the stages of his development has felt burning within the shrine of his spirit this lamp of the Infinite, where inner glory is both a humiliation and a promise. All men who possess a normal humanity feel the torturing sense of an ideal unattained, of a goal forever receding the more passionately it is approached. It is this feeling which is both the dynamic and the prophecy of all progress. Art is born of this supreme emotion; poetry finds in it its daily food; science is inspired by it to its lofty labors. Every quickening movement in our impetuous modern life starts anew from this point, as it strains toward the eternal to-morrow, which yet is never reached. We live our whole life between these two tremendous facts—the Real and the Ideal; the Actual and the Absolute. And it is the Ideal and the Absolute which saves our life from the irreparable disaster of monotony and stagnation. We are saved by hope.

This vision of the Ideal, this glorified imagination, which assuming different shapes in different natures, is yet to every race and nation its measure of divine opportunity and standard of achievement reveals its deepest passion and its largest force in the realm of religion. Religion has many definitions, but they all include as their common fundamental fact the effort to bring God and man into harmony and fellowship. The heathen, like the Hebrew and the Christian, strove to imitate his gods. Whatever he conceived them to be he tried to become himself. If his gods were cruel, lustful, tyrannous, his own character reflected these vices, his own altars were stained with these crimes. The dreamy, passionless deity of the Brahmins found his true counterpart in the listless, vacuous trances, of the Hindoo Togi. The heroes of Homer are the true

children of the fighting, brawling, boastful, intriguing gods of Olympus, Ares, Zeus and Poseidon. Those monstrous degradations of humanity which we find among the worshippers of the Syrian Astarte and Baal were copied from the imagined orgies of these celestial dynasts. Everywhere in the lowest as in the highest religions of man, earth is but the brighter or gloomier shadow of heaven. And so in obedience to this universal analogue, Christianity holds up as its ideal of the Perfect in man that archetypal Perfect which it calls God. The perfect life as conceived by both Old and New Testament saints is likeness to God. The first man was made in the image of God, and the whole effort of fallen man is to restore that marred image in all its original brightness, and to add to it a new lustre borrowed from the beauty of a more glorious Adam. Be ye holy, for I am holy, is therefore the final commandment, as it is the highest human outlook of both Scriptures.

But where is man to find this Image of Absolute Perfection which he is commanded both to worship and to imitate? He knows nothing and he can know nothing about an abstract and superessential Deity—that unknowable being of agnostic philosophy who dwells within the dark abysses of his eternally retreating essence, to all human thought and love forever inaccessible. This all-perfect must be translated into the terms of our own consciousness. He must enclose himself within a finite horizon. He must descend into humanity and invest himself with its cognizable attributes and its traversable dimensions. He must make himself visible in time and space, and in our form of flesh and blood. He must draw so near to us that we can not only touch the hem of his garment, but lie in holy affection upon his bosom, and feel that while he mysteriously transcends, he still belongs to our human family. And finally this Being who sums up in humanity all that we can conceive of the Absolute and the Perfect, must be able, having thus invested his Divine essence with our humanity, to stand up before us and declare in authentic accents, 'he that hath seen me hath seen the Father also.'

The Perfect Life is therefore revealed to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. We reach up toward both the human and the Divine ideal mingled mysteriously and eternally in him, as we become more and more like him.

But now we approach another step and crisis in our argument. How do we come into the personal possession of this image of that Christ, who in turn is himself the reflected image of the Father? This perception and possession of the Christ who is our Example and Life can only come to us by means of a third set of intermediaries. Our knowledge of Christ is first of all historical and philological. It is given to us in a Book, in the New Testament. Our knowledge of him is not and can not be gained by the mere immediate process of physical vision and sensible evidence. The Apostles who companied with him on earth were admitted to a mode of acquaintance with him which is closed to us. Whether their advantage in this respect was less or greater than ours is a question alien and useless to raise in this discussion. It is enough for us to remember that our only means of gaining any intelligent and adequate knowledge of the Christ of the Gospels and the New Testament is through the medium of these documents. No one, therefore, can enter, except by a special miracle, into the perfect life there portrayed without an intelligent knowledge of the materials which are employed to describe it. It is first of all an intellectual process; an intellectual process which makes proper use of the philological and historical data at its command. This shape of Divine Beauty which has become incarnate in our Lord does not, so far as we know, project itself by immediate radiation upon the imagination, but is to be distinctly visualized and comprehended only by the normal processes of the logical and reasoning intelligence, depending upon the written narrative of Scripture. That such purely intuitional or spectral or supra-intellectual processes fail to reach the point of Scriptural identity, may be seen by glancing for a moment at the history of mysticism. The types of Christian piety which we find here, vary strictly in



normality and abnormality according to the Scripturalness of the copy set up. The dreams of monkish ignorance ; the delirations and ecstasies of conventual and ascetic life, in these ages in which the Bible was an unread book, are valid witnesses of the necessity of a spiritual intelligence educated at the sure fountains of inspired fact. The more Scriptural the understanding the more Scriptural always is the type of sainthood. Christ therefore comes into our imagination and heart clothed in the sober forms of human language ; a precise and careful acquaintance with which is the first lesson of all religious discipline. Christ is not only the Divine Word of God, but it is only through the medium of human words that we can come to know him. All the resources of our best natural and instructed intelligence are demanded in this investigation. All the faculties and forces of scholarship, the lexicographer, the philologist, the grammarian, the critic of text and manuscript, the exegete and commentator, the translator and editor, the expounder, preacher, and last of all the devout student of the word into whose avid mind all this ordered treasure is to be poured—all these agents and accessories are needed before the most elementary knowledge of this Divine Type of Humanity can be imparted to us.

But this perception of our Life's Ideal as set forth in Scripture is not altogether a matter of verbal and intellectual apprehension. Not even the most literate and profound acquaintance with the documents, the verbal instruments which set forth this life in all its glorious fulness can make this Image of Christ a living photograph, an actual person fixed within the centre of our vision and love unless another power has first clothed these dry bones with life. It is the Spirit working through this body of inspired literature and upon our mental and moral consciousness, and this consciousness clarified and vitalized by faith, love and obedience, which at last and not until then is able to bring before the eyes of our understanding and within the orb of our spiritual reason the full resplendent Image of that Son of man who in making us like himself is also to make us sons

of God and sons of glory. But even then with all these aids of nature, discipline and grace, what mortal mind has ever been able to comprehend all that is included in the divine dimensions of the man Christ Jesus? Even the inspired reporters of his life, and history have given us only an approximate conception of the Saviour as he really was. It is only the shadows of the Reality and not the Reality itself which they give us. A picture true and large enough indeed to serve our highest uses, yet veiling its uttermost glories behind the obtuseness of our coarser conceptions. And if the evangelists themselves were only able to reproduce for us this remoter likeness of Christ's absolute humanity how shall we who gaze upon the picture, as it were afar off, hope to rival their lucidity of vision? Indeed what man is there of us who would soberly claim to have adequately comprehended either in his dogma or life the one perfect exemplar? Who of us, I ask, even with the whole of the New Testament before him, and with all his knowledge of its contents and meanings, and with all the light of the Divine Spirit shining upon the printed page and within his own soul, and standing at the summits of his loftiest mood and most comprehending emotion, who, though gifted with such sublimated power, would dare to assert that he had reached the end of the scale of divine apprehension within, in thought or in character? No one but a fanatic or a blinded egotist would claim such a power. For just as the poet feels that there is a world of beauty far more vast and wonderful than any into which he has yet entered; just as the artist feels the despair of being able to clothe in the visible colors of his canvass those visions of immortal loveliness which his imagination can make but which his art cannot execute; just as the musician hears but hears too faintly to re-echo into audible sound that unearthly melody which floats toward us from the lips and harps of angels, so our clearest spiritual intelligence and our most rapturous religious experience are, we feel, only dim anticipations and reverberations of that life of faith, love and holiness which Christ has yet to reveal to us and within us. In

other words, our highest Christian perfection is only and can only, so long as we are in the flesh, be an individual and therefore a partial perfection. Each of us beholds only a partial Christ. Even with the divine picture looking on us daily from its evangelical frame, our minds are so narrow and our eyes are so dim that we do not see in its wholeness but only some single feature of it. We see Matthew's Christ, or Mark's Christ, or Luke's or John's or Paul's, or more likely still, some misrepresenting miniature as unlike the real Christ as Raphael's Madonna is unlike a newspaper photograph. It is given to few minds and perhaps absolutely to none to generalize the different Gospel portraits into a single composite likeness of which one could say pointing to it, *ecce Homo*. And here is the fatal fault which belongs to all those volumes of Perfectionism and pretensions to its attainment which are so common in our day. They all alike fail to distinguish between that absolute perfect which shines forth in the Incarnate Person of the Son of God, and their own private and particular imagination of it. Their mistake is in taking some one quality of this perfection and making that stand for the whole quantity. Thus as is inevitable there are as many different types of scholars of Perfectionism as there are types and tendencies of human nature. One set of teachers make perfection to consist in what they call "perfect love," another takes as its catechism "holiness;" others style it the "second blessing," the "higher life" or "entire consecration." Another class carry the argument into the elusive realms of logomachy and make a nebulous distinction between being "faultless" and being "blameless," rejecting the former phrase as being too intense but choosing the latter as the precise and fitting epithet. But they all overlook the main fact in any true scheme of Christian perfection, that it must include not a part of our Christian culture and experience but the whole of it. It is not enough that I love God and my brother with my whole heart, this love must also include the element of justice or it is not a "perfect love." I cannot reach the "higher life" until my whole character is elevated to a

point where it overlooks and includes all the common duties and relationships of life, domestic, social, civil, political, ecumenical, in the spirit of our ideal and rightly proportionate justice; a justice which renders to every man his just due. The perfectionist fails to discriminate here between love as a casual emotion and love as a morally causative principle; between love as a subjective and sentimental state of feeling and love as an act of distributive righteousness. Love in the normal Christian scheme is a law operating as much in the region of ordinary morals and conduct as in the ardors and ecstasies of prayer and communion. But it will not do to consummate the entire possibilities of Christian attainment within a single attribute even though that attribute were the crowning one of love. Every true theory of human perfection must demand the harmonious cultivation of the whole content of human nature. It must not despise the nurture of the every day virtues of honesty, equity, industry, veracity, charity, moderation in word and judgment, rationality, openness of mind, sweetness of temper and generosity in the treatment of disagreeing verdicts, and whatever other quality has value and utility in the secular markets of the world. It includes, among other things, the right use of our intellectual faculties. For no man who is mentally lazy or careless or prejudiced in his intellectual judgments can claim to have entered the vestibule of the perfect life. The *νοῦς* no less than the *πνεῦμα* is the Kingdom of God's indwelling Spirit. The truth cannot make us free to become the sons and daughters of God until it has set our intellect free from the stunting atrophy of wilful ignorance, or the warping misjudgments of a self-committed theological bias. No one will have his claim to a superior piety allowed in the large court of human reason who blindly perverts Scripture to the service of a theory, and having nailed his flag to the mast-head of a single or a half a dozen proof-texts makes obstinate war against all the rest of the Bible. The most of our perfectionist friends seem to have overlooked that striking passage in the Fourteenth of First Corinthians,

where the apostle exhorts his readers in "understanding to be perfect," *τέλειοι*.

This "counsel of perfection" I insist includes the whole diameter and circumference of the normal life. It includes the care of the body, the control of all the appetites, hunger for food as well as craving for pleasure; it includes the will as the fountain of our energies and the application of these energies to the noblest ends of living; it includes the temper and the tongue, the silence of solitude and the conversation of the parlor; the amenities of friendship; the leisure and the labor of life; our civic interests, our affections, affinities, denials and allowances down to the remotest item of time and act. Nor do these perfectionists pretend to take any such broad view of Christian perfection as is here outlined. They would say that such a plan was only a slavish legalism, a going back to the beggarly elements of the law. The advantage of sanctification to them consists in being spared all this striving and doing. With them perfect holiness is the work of a moment. Like justification and regeneration it is instantaneous. You do not become holy; you are made holy. It is an event in which, like the flash of the electric spark across the continent, the element of time may be metaphysically and mathematically present, but we are not necessarily conscious of its existence. Now there is a partial truth here along with a very plausible and dangerous error. The truth lies in the assertion that the grace which sanctifies, like the grace which regenerates enters the heart and begins to operate the moment faith is exercised. And this grace being wholly a divine gift the effect of its operation within the soul is wholly a divine result. But the mistake of sanctificationists is in making the initial cause and the final effect of sanctification simultaneous and identical. They make no allowance or provision for this initial grace to work over its normal area of time and space to its final effect in a completed character. They confuse the gift of the Spirit with its co-operative result in the progressive development of human nature. They put spiritual

magic in the place of spiritual logic and destroy the divine normality of Christian culture and experience. Moreover, as we have already said, the common tendency of all these schemes of the "higher life" is to shift the centre of gravity from character to feeling. Their creed is mainly subjective and its tests are too often confined to a single witness, the witness and the judge being the same parties. They thus become antinomian in their temper and are a law unto themselves.

But this is not the only flaw in these errorists. Being mainly subjective and emotional in their character their logic lands them mainly always in some form of Pharisaism. The carping, censorious temper is almost sure to accompany these boasts of advanced spirituality. If you are not in their class you are, no matter how good and pure your life may be, objects of pity and special prayers. And let us remember that being in their class means that you must be personally conscious of this holiness and that you must openly profess it. You may, in fact, be far advanced beyond the spiritual attainment of any of these clamorous Pharisees, your visible holiness counts for nothing unless you put a trumpet to your lips and let all the world know it. Modesty and reticence are not required virtues in these favored sons of light. The sounding brass and the tinkling cymbal are supposed to give a certain orchestral value to this peculiar style of holiness.

Perhaps one of the most remarkable traits of these professional sanctificationists is the limitation of their sympathies. Many of them, I will not say all, are the most intense egotists and have not a thought beyond the study and exposure of their own emotions and attainments. Many of them are blind self-idolators and have lost all true vision of a God who exists outside of their own narrow and pedantically poetistic lives. And even in the case of those whose sympathies are wider and more human and wholesome the same centripetal tendency is more or less manifest. Thus whenever a preacher or evangelist becomes infected with these spurious ideas of holiness, you will invariably note

an immediate shortening of his range of Scriptural vision to a favorite collection of texts and subjects, all of which are dexterously drummed into the exclusive service of one inevitable theme. In other words, the broad evangelistic effort to save souls is narrowed down into a cultus of sanctification for the benefit of an elect ministry who are usually more intent on getting to heaven themselves than in leading others there. I could mention not a few eminent names of religious teachers who have become the victims of this tendency.

I need not point out at any length one of the most fundamental fallacies of these irrational theories: viz. that they all contradict the universal law of growth and progress. They are opposed to the whole method of nature and to all the facts of human experience, except in those cases of special pleading which we are now considering. The perfectionist contradicts Christ's parabolic law of development, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear," and would cause the plant to cover all the stages of its existence simultaneously and to spring into full grown maturity in an instant as a conjurer does his magic flower. With him there are only two stages of the spiritual life, that of the child on conversion and that of the adult on sanctification. According to this theory you cross the wide gulf between infancy and manhood by a single leap; the intermediate station of youth, adolescence, early, middle and ripe manhood being altogether absent. And when once this stature of spiritual adulthood is reached the whole process is finished. We have not only escaped from Egypt and left behind the wanderings of the wilderness and crossed over Jordan; but once having crossed and arrived on the farther shore the whole pilgrimage and its toils and tasks are forever ended. There remains no necessity for the perfectionist, as in the case of our spiritual forefathers, of entering upon a long campaign to possess the land, but he finds it all comfortably conquered before-hand; Jericho fallen, Ai burnt, the stronghold of the Jebusites with opened gates and surrendered garrison, the Cananites,

Amorites, Hittites, Perizites, Hivites and Philistines all enchanted to stone or turned into pillars of salt like Lot's wife, with nothing to do but to step in and begin a secure and unmolested tenancy. It is indeed a paradoxical picture but it is not true to life and the only place where you can find it is in the glowing rhetoric of a hallucinated fancy or in the superficial experience of one who knows nothing of the deeper life of the same, because in the interest of some artificial theory of religion he has closed his eyes to its broad and infinite perspective.

But not only do these dreamy doctrinaires set themselves against the divine law of development, as true in the spiritual as in the natural world, but they seek to contradict it in one of its clearest manifestations viz.; that the higher the form of life the more delayed and remote its perfection. They would reverse the order of nature and cause the oak to grow in a single night, while the mushroom might require a century. It may need thirty years of close application and rigid discipline for me to educate my mind into the stature of an ordinary scholar, but I may comprehend the whole mind of the spirit in a moment. It may demand half a life-time for the painter to train his eye and hand into a wise and dexterous compliance with the laws of his art, but to beat out into glorious symmetry the golden statue of a perfect life needs but the moulding touch of a single act of faith or a word of prayer. Such a view of life is preposterous for it does violence to the common laws of reason and to the plain facts of an every day knowledge. The only possible way in which the perfectionist can make good his theory, as a theory, not to speak of it as an attainment, is by perverting and mutilating the very evidence on which he depends for its support. And it is just here that both his ignorance and his ingenuity reveal their wonderful extent. The perfectionist takes his stand upon the Scripture with an assurance of infallibility, which is only matched by his skill in patch-work and his cleverness in evasion.

The perfectionist, like all purveyors of theological eccen-



tricitics, is in his own esteem a notable linguist and a redoubtable exegete. Dialectics are the health of his life and the exploring capacities of his reason are only just short of an original inspiration. But unfortunately for him, or perhaps we should say for themselves, his critics do not share this divine estimate of his own wisdom. Indeed, there is nothing which the real student and critic of the New Testament fears less than the perfectionist exegete. But does not the Scripture plainly teach a doctrine of sinlessness and a doctrine of perfection? Does not Jesus command us to be perfect, even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect? Does not the First Epistle of John teach a doctrine of sinlessness? Does not this apostle expressly say that he that is "born of God cannot commit sin?" And are there not a multitude of passages in the New Testament which teach either directly or by clear implication this high doctrine of holiness? We agree, of course, with the perfectionist advocates that such passages do exist and that they do teach a doctrine of holiness to which is coupled the exhortation that we should earnestly seek after it, and the promise that we may obtain it. But our contention is that their interpretation of this Scriptural language is both unphilological and unphilosophical. We contend that they read both too little out of and too much into the words of the text. For example, to deal with all these texts under the two general classes referred to, those which treat of sin and those which treat of holiness, we say; that these extremists show a very crude conception of the science of language and its necessary gradations of meaning. Now the most common words which we employ have each of them a wide range of application under varying circumstances. Thus when I say that my friend is a good man, and that God is good I surely do not mean to put them both into the same class or degree of goodness. We often speak of a man as being good when we only mean it to be inferred that he is kind-hearted or moral or faithful to his trust. In the one case as applied to an ordinary man it is merely an ethical goodness, applied to when God it is a spiritual goodness.

The words sanctified, holy, perfect are used in Scripture in the same way. When Paul says to the Corinthians. "But ye were washed, ye were sanctified" we can hardly think of him as asserting that these backsliding Christians had reached a state of perfect holiness only to fall back quickly into the most disgraceful sins. All that we can take him to mean is that they had made a start in the Christian life, they had taken the first steps of a holy life, but had not gone far enough to become fixed and secure in a state of advanced and confirmed holiness. Likewise when he says "But we speak wisdom among them that are perfect," he does not declare that these same Corinthians whom later on he roundly rebukes for their sad declensions and scandals, belong to a special class of anointed and illuminated initiates, but only that they, as having received the Spirit along with all true believers, are able to understand the language of spiritual things—may be only its most rudimentary beginnings. But they belong nevertheless to the class which he calls "the perfect;" which though constituting a single order stretches upward into ascending grades and degrees of perfection. In other words "perfection" or *τελειότητος* is not so much an end reached as an end aspired for. Perfection is an attitude rather than an attainment. This the Apostle clearly teaches in that other famous passage which the perfectionist finds so hard to reconcile with his creed. "I count not myself to have attained neither to be already perfect." Here there is no contradiction to the progressive sanctificationist because he recognizes that in the Apostle's use of the word he includes not only the conative present but a future and a future perfect. We understand Paul to be speaking here of the future perfect and its post-mortem fulfillment. Indeed this is the only explanation of the passage, and of that which follows it where he exhorts "as many as be perfect, *τέλειοι*, to be thus minded; this is the only explanation of these passages by which we can preserve his inspired consistency.

And so of those verses which seem to teach a state of sinlessness, the holiness advocate displays the opacity of his

exegesis by his failure to discover the vital difference between the metaphysical nature of sin and its experimental nature, or between sin as a constitutional and organic disease, and sin in its pathological manifestations. No man can really know by an act of consciousness that he is sinless. His consciousness may easily deceive him and indeed there is nothing which, as we know by observation, lends itself more easily to the delusion of sinlessness than an imaginative, emotional temperament under the influence of this peculiar and pernicious doctrine of perfectionism. That which we believe John to teach in his first epistle is not a state of absolute essential sinlessness but an entire absence of sinful motives and deliberate transgression. We believe it to be impossible, just as the teachers of sinless perfection do, that a regenerate Christian should commit wilful sin. The Christian sins only through ignorance, or impulse, or when drawn into it by some form of Satanic sophistry which calls evil good and good evil. Moreover the perfectionist makes the definition of sinlessness too narrow and negative. Sin is "any want of conformity unto" as well as "any transgression of" the law of God. Hence I may possess a good conscience in regard to my positive volitions and acts, and be deeply conscious of a world of holy obligations into which I have not yet entered or even fully imagined. It is not necessary, however, to continue this form of the argtment, for we are all more or less familiar with both sides of it. My main insistence in this paper is that the greatest weakness of the perfectionist theory lies in the three main allegations I have laid against it, viz: It does not place its standard high enough, it does not make it broad enough, and it does not allow space for the element of inspiration and ideality, in other words for the law of progress. Its standard is not the real Christ, but a rational, partial Christ, conceived under the restrictive conditions of its own fictionizing fancy and narrow temperament. And as its standard is not high enough, so it is not broad enough. It does not take in all of life, but only a part of it, and lives at the slipperly apex of some single virtue or emotion which

it converts into a mantle of charity ample enough to hide from its own eyes at least all its other infirmities. And finally as there is no room in the perfectionist theory for the future perfect, as it is an eternal present tense, so it logically results in the production of a pedantic and petrified type of piety. It is a case of arrested development; at whatever point of actual religious experience the leaven of perfectionism enters the spiritual life at that precise point experience must ever remain revolving on its own axis and within an eternally unexpanding circle. There is no growth in grace logically possible to a perfectionist; he has already arrived and attained and all he needs to complete the programme and to attain his apotheosis, is his ascension robe and chariot of fire.

In conclusion I remark two things. First we must be careful that in our opposition to these false theories of sanctification we do not overlook the truth they contain. It is the duty of every converted child of God to strive after true holiness. And he should not permit his prejudice against these fanciful and fanatical schemes of an impossible spirituality to blind his eyes to the real beauty of holiness, or quench his ardor to possess and be possessed by it. In an age as sensuous and material as our own we need to guard our own souls against the subtle pessimism of a wordly piety and to preach to our congregations that Gospel which declares that the promise and purpose of God for every believer is that "his whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

My other remark is that all true Scripture holiness is indelibly marked by the following characteristics :

It is first of all deeply and quietly modest. While it rejoices in the Divine assurance of its hope in Christ and gives God praise and glory for all that it has received from him, it is, nevertheless, careful not to boast of its attainments. It lets its light shine, it does not flash that light ostentatiously into everybody's eyes. It tries to lead a holy life in all meekness and humility; it does not put a trumpet

to its lips and demand tribute from every passer by. True holiness is content that God should see and applaud its beauty, and that man should over-look and disesteem it if that should be for his glory. It is not talkative, but reticent, not assertive, but humble, whose praise is not of men but of God.

Again, true holiness is always sympathetic and serviceable. The nearer it gets to God the closer it comes to man. Its Gospel is not for the righteous, but for sinners. It is not afraid of rough work and coarse society. It is willing to be entertained in the house of the rich Pharisee, but it prefers to feast at the table of Levi with publicans and sinners. Its white robe is not too fine for the dust of the street; its cleansed fingers not too fastidious to touch the sores of the leper. The world is not too bad for it to live in, nor any form of goodness, however unlike its own type, unworthy of its recognition and blessing. The higher life is a wholesome, human, reasonable, Catholic life, approachable by all men, sympathetic toward all men, helpful to all men.

Finally this higher life of Scriptural holiness is a life of daily aspiration toward ever better things. It counts not itself to have attained, either to be already perfect. It forgets the things which are behind and reaches forward unto the things which are before. It lives by hope, it is nourished by expectation. It sees the dawn of a divine to-morrow kindling behind each horizon of to-day. At the end of each stadium of the mortal journey it girds up its loins for a new start toward that shining goal where is fixed the prize for the mark of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. And that goal it knows it shall some day reach, and that prize obtain when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, and the death of life's defeat is swallowed up in the glory of its eternal consumation.

Louisville, Ky.

J. KINSEY SMITH.

## V. A NEW EXPOSITION OF THE WILL.

The problems of the human will are perhaps the most interesting and difficult of any which have ever been considered. It may be said that in a large measure they have remained unanswered. Among them is that of the relation of the will to the universal reign of the law of causation. How shall this be set forth and explained? We think that it may be by a new exposition of the will, which we here present.

That volition is not contrary to, but acts strictly according to the universal reign of causation may be made evident as follows:

Man is a real independent agent. The human soul is endowed with real energy. Just as the material substance has its inherent forces, so also has the spiritual substance, or spirit, its inherent forces, or powers. The various powers of the spirit, such as thought, emotion, desire, will, act and react upon one another, and thus guide, control and determine their activities, so that at one time they may all be in activity, and then again greater activity may be given to some rather than to others, and at times some may be held in a state of rest through equilibrium; in all this corresponding to the mutual activities of the varied forces of the material world, where at times violent activities and reactions occur, and at others, equilibrium prevails through the counterbalancing of equal forces.

Moreover, the man's environment is the occasion, the prompting, the external cause of the spiritual activities within. The spirit's energizing is its own self-determination, but responds to and corresponds with that which is without. The man's thinking, feeling, desiring and willing are his own exercise of his own inherent energies, but his thoughts, etc., are what they are because of that upon and under which they act, the sights, sounds, etc., and influences of the world in which he lives.

The forces of the material world are always in full energy;

the rest which extensively prevails being due only to the equilibrium of the energizing of opposing forces. So the powers of the spirit are always in full energy; the greater or less manifestation of activity being due to the degree in which the various powers are held in check by one another, or allowed full play.

The human spirit must, therefore, be conceived of as being ever energising; should this energising, cease the spirit would cease to be, and, as is the case with all material forces, should one power of the spirit fail to energise, it would no longer be a power; it would be lost to the spirit. This unceasing energising of the powers of the soul being under the control and direction of the various faculties wherewith the soul is endowed, gives rise to all our inward, or spiritual experiences, or doings. The man thinks, and as he thinks, he wills to think with greater or less concentration upon certain objects of thought, in as much as the powers of thought are under the control and direction of the will; and as he "wills" he does so according to his thoughts, in as much as his will is under the control and direction of the powers of thought. And as the man thus thinks and wills his emotions are aroused, or depressed by his thoughts and volitions, as the emotional powers are under the control and direction of those of thought and volition; and he thinks and wills according to the character of his emotions, because the powers of thought and will are under the control and direction of those of emotion. And as he thus thinks, and wills and feels, his desires or aspirations are aroused, or expressed according to the character of his thoughts, volitions, feelings, because these control and direct them; and on the other hand the thoughts, volitions and feelings are determined by the desires or aspirations, in as much as these latter exercise their control and direction over them.

Thus it appears, that the "will" is but one of the powers of the individual man, and being a real force, or power, it is always as such in full energy, as is true of all powers spiritual and material, and being ever in full energy, that is

ever fully energising, or exerting its force, and being under the control and direction of the other powers of the soul, it is quiescent or active and acts in this direction or another according as it is repressed, or allowed to act, and is directed by these powers.

In other words the man, not an entity apart from the faculties of the soul, but an agent, or the Ego, to be thought of as consisting of these combined faculties, having this will energy, or power, uses it by willing or not willing, or forming resolutions of one kind or another, according to his own thoughts, feelings, desires, etc. The man utilizes his will energy as the engineer utilizes the steam power which is at his disposal.

As thus far presented it is evident that "volition" presents no contradiction to the universal reign of causation. It no more contradicts it than does the engineer's use of steam power. Equally in both cases there is the presence and the utilizing of a force. The engineer has the steam energy, which he uses as he pleases—the man has the "will-energy" which he makes use of as he pleases. In neither of these cases is there anything like a new creation, an unaccounted for action, a coming of something out of nothing, spontaneous activity, as volitions are often said to be with the insuperable difficulty involved; for in both cases there is the presence of a pent up energising force, ready for use; the steam, whose energy is held within the steam-chest, and the will-power, whose energy within the soul is held by the powers of the soul, ready to be used by the individual man.

Thus far there is no difficulty whatever, and if we be content to accept facts as they are at present, there is nothing more needed to be said, or desired. We may rest satisfied with understanding how our volitions are under the law of causation. Every effect must have its adequate cause, our volitions have their adequate cause. They are produced by the ever energising will energy or force, which is one of the powers of the soul, just as the working of the engine is produced by the energising steam power, and



they come and go and are of this or that character as controlled and directed by the man, just as the working of the engine is according to the control and direction of the engineer.

But two difficulties arise if we look beyond present facts, in the light of what is supposed to be true of the material world ; the one is the final cessation of all activity of the soul through the equilibrium of all its powers, and the other the exhaustion at last of the will force, through work done by it outside of the soul in the material world. In regard to the first of these difficulties, it is to be remembered that the hypothesis is that, viewed with the widest range of vision, the material universe is, as it were, a great mechanism in full activity, but which is steadily running down, and which will finally cease to move. According to the law of correlation and transmutation of forces, no force is ever lost ; they are ever acting and reacting upon one another, but with a constant trend towards a universal equilibrium of opposing forces and a state of perfect rest.

The primitive, indefinitely attenuated and diffused nebulous matter by a process of condensation brought the varied material forces into activity ; motion, heat, light were produced ; suns and planets and systems of worlds were formed with their revolutions through wide, sweeping circuits ; successive changes have taken and are taking place within suns and satellites, through cooling and contraction ; stage after stage passes away ; the varied forms of life appear ; step by step the worlds grow cold and dark and dead, and at last all forces come to a state of abiding counterbalance, and universal darkness, cold, solidity and rest prevail ; unless through crash of worlds with worlds, or in some other way, the solidified matter becomes the attenuated and diffused nebulous material once more.

As far as known, it is thus with the material world, and it may be supposed that a corresponding process is within the spiritual world, that is, within the human soul. It begins with its endowment of powers, as does the material universe, but, with these in abeyance, or inactivity, as is

the case in the realm of matter. These powers gradually act and react upon one another and under the law of conservation and transmutation of spiritual forces no power is ever lost ; but according to the same law there must be as in the natural world, a steady advance towards and a final reaching of a state of abiding rest through the counterbalancing of all the powers of the soul.

Theoretically we must make this supposition, for otherwise there would be within the soul, perpetual motion, self-perpetuated or self-produced activity, spontaneous, or uncaused, unaccounted for activities.

This difficulty may be met thus: There is an all-important factor in the spiritual value which makes its case different from that of the material. In this latter there is no influence, no impulse, no addition of any kind introduced from without. This is an essential point in the hypothesis regarding the material universe, and this is the reason why there is a steady progress towards final rest. It is otherwise, however, with the soul of man; it is in continual communication with that which is out of and beyond itself, and is ever deriving impulse and influence therefrom.

Than this there is nothing more evidently true: The man is born into the world fully endowed with all his spiritual faculties, or powers. These, however, are in abeyance and would remain so were they not influenced by that which is without. The faculties of the soul need to be drawn out, stimulated, furnished with material upon which to act; acquisition, education are necessary. All these are furnished through vital union with the bodily organization. There is no need here to attempt fullness of detail, it suffices simply to refer, for example, to the inflow of knowledge through sight and hearing and touch ; the stimulus afforded by the various bodily sensations, and yet more the unspeakably great influence of man upon his fellow-man by language spoken and written. There is, moreover, the fellowship and intercommunion of soul with soul, a real power which we exert upon one another, elevating or debasing, as the case may be, and assimilating the character of those who dwell

together. What influence we at present receive from other created intelligences, it may be hard to determine scientifically, but there are such beings and Revelation makes it plain that they have such communion with, or power over us that we are largely guided and controlled by them. Still further, while the scientist may exclude all interposition of the Deity from the material universe, this cannot be done in regard to the human soul. God does dwell within man, there is a real fellowship between God and us; directly and instrumentally he teaches, directs, controls us; from him we receive impulse, inspiration. All these things are true of men, while yet within their bodily organization, and will be true, probably with great enlargement, after the resurrection. During the disembodied period mighty influences, however modified, will doubtless still be brought to bear upon the soul. Because of all this quickening from without the tendency towards final loss of the activity of the soul is removed; its energies are forevermore continually stimulated anew. In view of the boundless universe and of the countless ages of existence, the enlargement and exaltation of being and activity for the soul are beyond our powers of anticipation and conception.

To appreciate the force of this reply to the difficulty in question, it should be borne in mind, that all that is needed for the perpetual activity of the soul, is to prevent its energies, which can never cease to be, and to energise, from coming to rest by the counterbalancing of one another, according to the hypothesis which is accepted as true in the material world.

This is such a complete removal of the difficulty, that it may be regarded as perfectly satisfactory. Then it may be remarked that the progress of the soul to a state of inactivity, if deprived of influences from without is far more than a mere hypothesis; it is a dread and well known reality. A man with a certain amount of knowledge and experience, may continue to be mentally active for a time, if cut off from all that is without, but not perpetually. Shut up in solitary confinement in a dark cell, without a

book, or any article which he may handle and use he passes with rapid strides to lunacy and idiocy. This result is inevitable, unless there be communion with God; with no food for thought he ceases to think, desires, hopes, aspirations die, all motives disappear, volitions are no longer made, there being no occasion, no motive, no thought to call them forth; all has settled down to a dead level and calm, the ceaselessly emerging powers are still there, but they counterbalance and hold one another at rest. The oft repeated story is a case in point, a solitary prisoner kept himself mentally alive by three or four pins, with which he occupied himself, throwing them about his dark cell and searching for them, and placing them in every possible posture. So slight an influence from without as this served the purpose.

The second difficulty to be met is the exhaustion at last of the will force through work done by it outside of the soul in the material world.

The well known fact is that all work is done at the expenditure of force, which must be continually re-supplied. The furnace generates new steam for the engine, the electric storage-battery must be re-charged, the watch must be re-wound, the radiation of heat and light by the sun will result finally in cold and darkness, the material universe is running down and will come to stagnation and death. According to this the will force must exhaust itself by the work which it does in the material world.

To understand this it must be noted, that the attribute, faculty or power of will itself abides forever incapable of exhaustion, or impairment, and is moreover ever exerting its full energy, this being the case with all powers, or forces. Of this gravity is a readily perceived example. It ever remains unimpaired and by its never-ceasing energizing attracts all bodies to itself and gives them their unvarying weight. This being true of all powers, or forces, they are either at rest through the equilibrium of opposing forces, or they are imparting energy to objects because the forces opposing them are weaker than they. This has been called

active force, living power, dynamic energy, or here we might for convenience and conciseness, call it energy, reserving the terms force, or power, for that which produces or imparts this energy. The sum total of such energy always remains the same, but any given energy so far as it does work, or which is the same thing, overcomes resisting energies or forces, is expended and exhausted, not however by being destroyed, but by transmutation into the resistances which they overcome, or into other energies.

All work, therefore, is at the expense of "energy," and the work done is exactly equivalent to the amount of energy expended. Moreover not only is the "energy" spent, but also the forces which produce and impart it. The meaning is that a force loses its activity and comes to and remains at rest in producing and imparting energy. The reason of this is that the imparting of energy is limited by the distance or time through which the force operates, the limit is reached when some opposing force brings the force to equilibrium. Gravity, for example, imparts energy to a falling body till it reaches the ground, when the resistance of the ground brings the force of gravity to rest. In combustion, the separated atoms of carbon and oxygen unite and produce a definite amount of heat energy, but no more, because the uniting forces of these atoms are in equilibrium in the produced carbonic acid. A plain illustration of how both the forces imparting energy and the "energy" are expended in work performed is found in the ignition of gunpowder. When ignited, a definite amount of explosive energy is produced, but no more because the forces producing it have come to the rest of equilibrium in the products of combustion, their production of energy is expended. The produced explosive energy is imparted to the rifle-ball, which if directed vertically ascends a definite distance, that is, till the work of lifting it up in opposition to the force of gravity is equivalent to the explosive energy of the powder imparted to it. For an instant the ball is at rest, the energy has gone from it, it has been transmitted into the work done, the lifting of the ball, or that overcoming of the force of

gravity. The ball is at rest when the energy imparted to it is equalized by the force of gravity. The ball immediately descends again, gravity reimpacting to it the amount of energy it had lost, but no more; for as it strikes the ground at its original starting place, the force of gravity is brought to rest by the resisting force of the ground. In all this we see the persistence of force and energy and how both of these become expended in the doing of work and need renewal for further work.

Another beautiful and interesting illustration is found in the pendulum. When it hangs vertically the energising force of gravity is exerted upon it, but this force imparts no energy to it, because the force which supports the pendulum and gravity are at the rest of equilibrium. They remain thus till some third force overcomes that of gravity and pulls the pendulum to one side, thus lifting it up a certain distance. This third force has expended itself in the work done in lifting and holding up the pendulum, or in overcoming the force of gravity. Upon being released from the third force, the pendulum descends to the lowest point of its swing with the energy imparted to it by gravity operating through that distance. Gravity can pull the pendulum down no lower and can impart no more energy because its force is brought to rest by the opposing force which supports the pendulum. The imparted energy remains in the pendulum and carries it up in its swing in opposition to gravity, till the energy is expended in the work of lifting the pendulum, or overcoming the force of gravity. When the energy and gravity are equalized the pendulum is at rest, but it immediately descends again, gravity reimpacting to it the amount of energy it had expended, but ceasing to give further energy, because when the pendulum reaches its lowest point gravity is at the rest of equilibrium. The reimpacted energy carries the pendulum up, and the process goes on. All this is upon the supposition that there is no loss of energy by resistance of the air, nor from friction.

In this illustration we thus have a beautiful and plain

exhibition of work done by the expenditure of both force and imparted energy. The power which pulls the pendulum aside and lifts it up, gravity and the momentum of the pendulum, these three are all spent, but not destroyed. The activity of gravity comes and goes with the work done in the swinging of the pendulum, but its inherent power remains ever the same ; the imparted energy also comes and goes, but this is by its transmutation into its equivalent of work, or of opposing force that of gravity and its recovery again therefrom.

All this acting and reacting of forces and energies and doing of work is possible because these forces and energies are so related to one another that they admit of transmutation into one another. It may be that they are only different modes of material motion ; and because they are in unstable equilibrium, that is, there is not as yet a state of universal rest through the equilibrium of all forces.

As thus presented the points to be noted are : the original ever-energising forces are imperishable and admit of no impairment, their activity by which they impart energy is limited by the distance or time through which these forces operate, or the relation of things to one another ; the imparted energies are transmitted into forces and other energies, and all work is done at the expenditure of these energies and of the activity of the forces which produce them, these forces resupply the expended energies at the expense of their activity.

It is evident, therefore, that when it is said, that the will is exhausted by the work which it does in the material world, the meaning must be that it imparts physical energy which is expended by the work performed and that as this is imparted at the expense of the activity of the will which imparts it, this activity of the will and the physical energy due to it must at length be exhausted.

The activity of the will force in producing physical energy is possible only as it is resisted by forces weaker than itself, and as it is not omnipotent, but weak, it must soon be brought to abiding rest through general equili-

trium with other forces. In other words the will in doing physical work has an actual and a potential, that is a possible, activity, both of which are of necessity limited. This is true of all forces in doing work. Their possible activity depends upon the relations of all objects and forces to one another. The potential activity of gravity in the case of a clock with weights is the degree to which the clock has been wound; when it has run down the activity ceases. The potential activity in a clock moved by a spring is the number of times the spring has been coiled up; when it has unwound itself the activity is at an end. In gunpowder explosion, the possible activity depends upon the amount of powder, the kind, quality and proportions of its ingredients and of the forces involved; when the activity due to these relations has taken place, the activity ceases. The possible activity of a steam engine is that which is due to the amount of fuel which is burning, the steam pressure and the relation of these to all the parts of the engine; when this activity has been expended the engine ceases to move. The possible activity of our earth, its ocean currents, winds, flowing waters, moving objects, its electricity, its burning heat, the growth and activities of plant and animal life, is due to the present relations of all things and forces; when this activity is expended, all would be at rest, were it not for new energy derived from the sun. This is the invariable law, from it there is no exception—all forces in doing work, have a potential, or possible activity dependent upon and limited by the relations of the objects and forces to one another.

If therefore the will be a force doing work in the material world, it has only a limited possible activity; an activity dependent upon and limited by the relation of the will and material objects and forces. When this has been expended this activity of the will is exhausted.

With the distinct understanding, as thus presented, of what is meant by the exhaustion of the will through work done by it in the material world, it may be said in regard to the difficulty arising therefrom as follows; In the first



place, all that has been mentioned in regard to forces, energies and work depends upon the correlation of forces and their transmutation into one another; this is the central, or essential thought of the law we have presented. Force is never destroyed and lost, it is used and exhausted by being transmuted into other forces. The steam power is changed into the work of the engine, that into the motion of the dynamo, that into light and heat and all kinds of working of electric machinery and these into others on and on indefinitely in wide diffusion till the rest of equilibrium be reached. The will force, therefore, in performing outside work cannot be destroyed, it must be transmuted into the work accomplished; if the law, of which we are speaking, holds good in regard to it in its relation to that which is material. This, however, appears to be impossible. The material forces are correlated and may be transmuted into one another, but we have no proof that there is any such correlation between these and spiritual forces. From all that we know of the nature of these two sets of energies, it is impossible that the one can be transmuted into the other. Spirit is that which matter is not, as is expressed by the terms immaterial and material. The energies, therefore, inhering in the one cannot become the energies of the other. Hence will-power cannot be transmuted into mechanical force. It cannot in this way exhaust itself through the work which it does in the world.

In the next place the outside work which the man does is indirectly and not directly by will-power. It is by muscular energy that he operates, and it is this which is transmuted into mechanical motion and which becomes exhausted and is in need of recuperation, which it receives from bodily nourishment. The will no more performs the work than the engineer does the work of the engine. In the one case the work is done by muscular force, in the other by steam power. As thus considered it still further appears that there is no exhaustion of the will energy by the work performed; it is the muscular power which is expended; just as there is no exhaustion of the engineer

by the work done by the engine, nor of the little child who presses the electric button and by a mighty earthquake rends the solid rock in the bed of the East River.

In the third place, the act of the will in the case in hand, is one of direction, control, mandate. The will determines, but does not do the work. The engineer directs and controls the work which the engine performs; the little child directs and controls the explosion of the mines in the rock. With a number of buttons at her disposal, she may cause a greater or less explosion, or in one place or another, as well as determine the moment at pleasure. With another person to operate the key-board she may do all this by a gesture, a look, a word. The captain of an ocean steamer by sign, look or word controls the complicated machinery of the vessel, determines her movements and her course, and brings a floating palace with its hundreds of living persons through raging seas, at the speed of ten or twenty miles per hour, safe to port. In all these cases there is no expenditure of force on the part of the director for the performance of work; there is only direction, control, mandate. The same thing is true in regard to the will.

Such being the character of the act of the will, we have in it the revelation of the nature of the relation between the spiritual and the material forces; it is one of mandate and obedience. There is the impassable gulf of separation between the two; the one cannot be transmuted into the other, but such is their relation to one another, that the spiritual is the superior and has power over the material; the spiritual commands, the material obeys. This is indubitably so in regard to the Supreme Spirit. He holds all forces in his control. He speaks and they obey. He wills and it is done. In creating the finite human spirit he has endowed it with the same kind of power in a very slight degree. At present it is almost, if not altogether confined to power over the nervous force inherent within the network of the nervous organization. But there, it is a reality of which we all are fully conscious, and which we constantly use. We will, and as we will, the nerve force

responds and in turn directs the muscular energy which performs the desired work. The reason why our will-power is at present confined to the nerve force, is because it is weak, and suffices only to exert control over the matter and force which have been, as it were, prepared and refined, made delicate and sensitive for this very purpose.

It may not be objected to all this that it is mysterious, inexplicable, inconceivable, for it is not more so than are other mysteries with which we are surrounded. The sun, millions of miles distant, holds the earth in its orbit. Who understands this? Who can form any conception of such a power? We can only say that it is and that it does exert its energy. With no more difficulty we can know and say that the will has power over the material force within the nervous system, so that its mandates are obeyed. This is a fact with which we are familiar, and well attested instances show that such is the real power of the will over material force, that at times it may pass beyond the nerve force in exercising its control. In moments of extreme excitement and exaltation of spirit men have been known to put forth extraordinary strength and accomplish that which at other times is far beyond the possibility of their muscular power. It was done by the control of will over matter. Such being the relation of the will to that which is without, it is certainly legitimate to conceive, that when it exercises its control and indirectly performs external work, it does not expend its energy beyond the limits of the soul in which it inheres. It acts and commands and it is the part of the material force to obey. There is no exhaustion and no need of re-supply. This may be made more apparent if the word "authority" be used. The will has authority over the material and the material objects. With prompt obedience to its authority the will expends no energy beyond the limits of the soul: it, as it were, simply speaks and it is done.

In the fourth place if it still be insisted, though it would seem, unreasonably, that there must be some outside expenditure and exhaustion of will force in the work which it does in the world, even if it be indirectly, and even if it be only

the exercise of authority, it may be replied, that the soul is constantly receiving influences from without. This has already been mentioned in speaking of the first difficulty. From both the spiritual and material worlds knowledge, promptings, influences, inspiration are evermore being poured into and brought to bear upon the soul. This maintains it in ceaseless activity, develops and expands its powers; the infant becomes the intelligent child, the educated, trained youth, the matured man of intellectual force, of commanding power, and in the life of the world beyond, a being more and more godlike. The will power of such a being will doubtless be vastly greater than that which we now have. It will be what we, at present, would regard as miraculous. Such an one, it may be, will hold material objects and forces at disposal, as he commands they will come and go, and do this and that. Rightly considered our will-power as exerted in the world is, in a small way, miraculous. Man has often denied the possibility of miracles on the part of the Deity; no interposition from him can be allowed, yet he is all the time doing miracles himself. Man is a new force introduced into the world, a great disturbing factor in the realm of Nature. He has been spoken of as one of the most potent geologic agents. By his voluntary activity and labor he interferes with and changes the course of Nature; great results flow from his activity which would not otherwise have taken place. His every act is a miracle in this sense that it is the play of material forces and the movement of material forces and the movement of material objects according as he wills. He wills and his body moves from place to place, or remains at rest; he wills and stones fly through the air, or showers of shot and shells; he wills and the strata of the earth yield up their buried treasures of coal and iron and precious metals; he wills and an iron network of rails spreads itself over the continents and ponderous masses of material speed over them by day and night with irresistible force and velocity; he wills and hidden electricity comes from its seclusion and reveals itself with brilliant display, turning night into day; he wills and rivers

change their courses, the currents of the ocean are modified and through appointed channels seas, separated by Nature, flow into one another. All this, and vastly more, is due to the thought and will of man, even as he now is; vastly greater doubtless will his will-power be hereafter.

What we have stated is not a supposition; this marvellous development of man's spiritual powers from the weakness of infancy under the stimulus of influences from without is a known fact; nothing can be more assured. Instead of exhausting itself through work done in the world, the energy of the human soul, due to influences from without, exerts greater power. Any loss of energy, were such loss possible, may be and is as a fact even more than regained.

Here, however, the criticism may be made that this great progress in the energy of the soul under influences from without, may not be any real gain, or increment, but only the drawing forth and development of latent, potential energy, which the soul originally has. If this be the case, no matter how highly exalted the soul's power may become, a climax must be reached and a decline take place, if there be expenditure of force through work done in the world, and final exhaustion must ensue. In reply it may be said, that the known fact is that the soul's energy is enlarged, as life advances, and inasmuch as this is largely due to influences from without, it is fair to assume that if there can be, which we do not admit, any expenditure and loss of will-force upon the external world, its recovery therefrom is possible also. This possibility is, moreover, required by the law of the transmutation of forces; a force which imparts energy, may recover that energy; it is required also by the law of resistance and reaction of forces. When a force imparts energy there is always resistance and reaction. If I hold up a pound weight, I impart that amount of energy to it and the weight imparts that amount to me; but there is no motion because the two energies are equalized. To lift the weight higher I must impart greater energy. Hence, if the will can impart energy it can and must recover energy; the very act of imparting includes recovery.

In the fifth place a still further reply may be given. The nature and the powers of spirit are different from and contrary to those of matter. When one particle of matter gives to another particle it is a loss to itself. When it takes from another particle its gain is at the depreciation of the other. This is not true of the spirit. It both gives and receives without any loss to itself, or to that from which it takes. This is evidently so in regard to its communion with other spiritual beings. The unspeakable gain which we receive from others, benefits them as much as it does us, they suffer no impairment or loss; and the influences which we exert upon them is with no deprivation to ourselves. So also all the knowledge, impressions, excitements, promptings, stimulus which we receive from the material world leave it altogether unimpaired and unimpo- verished; and on the other hand all the spiritual power which we exert over the material is without loss of energy on our part, or gain to it. We take from the material world without depriving it of that which we take and we exert our energy, influence, direction, control, authority over it without loss to us or gain to it. This is the palpable fact. If we expended energy upon the material it would necessarily gain that much of force, but throughout the many thousands of years of the period of man in the history of the earth, the unnumbered millions of men have been directing and controlling nature in the way which we have recounted above, and yet not the minutest particle of matter, nor an infinitesimal degree of force has ever been added to the material world; this is the positive affirmation of science. The fact that the world has gained nothing is proof that the will energy has lost nothing. It is simply thus—man has willed and his will has been obeyed.

Thus with the removal of these two difficulties the way is clear for accepting the view of the human will as an ever-energising force which we have presented. In its structure and activities the soul is regarded as corresponding with the structure and activities of the material world. The forces within both are ceaselessly energising and ever as a

unit acting and reacting upon one another ; the action of any one force being invariably due to its action upon all the others and theirs upon one another and upon it, independence being utterly unknown and impossible, as is also rest except that due to the equilibrium of ever-energising forces.

The will being one of such forces of the soul, it is evident that its independence of the other powers is unknown and impossible ; it acts and reacts only together with them, its every act is that of the unit of these combined forces and its rest only that of the equilibrium which may at times take place in their interaction. A causeless act of the will, one independent of the thoughts, emotions, etc., the whole make-up of the soul is as impossible as is a causeless act of a force, one irrespective of the other forces, in the material world. As the phenomena of the world result from its combined material forces and activities, so the phenomena of the soul result from its combined spiritual forces and activities.

The will may be illustrated by the wound up spring of a watch. It is an energizing force, held from unwinding itself in a moment by the other forces of the watch ; it is at rest when the watch is not going, by equilibrium with the other forces ; when active it acts only with and as controlled by these forces throughout the entire mechanism ; and the combined result is the movement of the hands over the face, which movements represent the formed volitions. As the spring cannot move the hands at random, irrespective of the forces and activities of the watch, so the will cannot form volitions at random, irrespective of the forces and activities of the soul. And both the watch and the soul need and receive external influence by which their activity is maintained.

The exposition which we have presented will be seen more evidently true when contrasted with that which is given by others.

In answer to the assertion that the power of the will and the universal law of causation are contradictory, it has been

said that they may be contraries, but they need not be contradictories. This seems to be the confusion of knowledge by words. It would be difficult to form any idea of the difference between contraries and contradictories. They are indeed precisely one and the same. A thing which is contrary to another is its contradictory. It is because it is contrary that it contradicts it. That which contradicts another thing shows itself to be its contrary. There are five ways in which the expression may be taken. In the first place it may be regarded as making a false statement, as just pointed out; things cannot be contrary without being contradictory; and, moreover, the power of the will and the universal law of causation are not contraries, the former strictly obeys the latter. In the second place, it may be regarded as meaning that things may seem to be contradictories without being such in reality; fuller knowledge of them on our part would show that they are not. But if this be the meaning it should be plainly stated and not hidden by the words employed. In the third place, the meaning may be that the things are very different from one another, but, through extreme, the difference falls short of contradiction. If so, the expression is as objectionable as in the other cases. In the proportion as things differ they are contradictories. If the difference be trivial, the contradiction is slight; if it be great, the contradiction will be complete. Two colors may be hardly distinguishable from one another, but one differs from the other in having a slight shade or tone of coloring which the other has not; to this extent they are contradictories. Light differs from darkness in having a brightness which darkness has not at all, and hence these are thorough-going contradictions. Extreme difference falling short of contradiction between things cannot, therefore, be expressed by saying that they are contraries, but not contradictories; the greater the difference the more contradictory they are, and, however slight the difference they still contradict one another to that degree.

It may not be objected that, if this be so, in having different qualities, objects will have those which are contradic-



tory; for the difference and contradiction are simply between the qualities as qualities and have no reference to the object to which they belong. One quality differs from and contradicts the other qualities, but only so far as it is itself concerned. The one quality is not and cannot be another quality; it excludes from itself all but its own character, but such contradiction does not refer to these qualities as attributes. We may attribute to a body any number of these different qualities which contradict and exclude each one the others from itself, provided we do not attribute and deny the same quality to the object; that is, provided these contradictory qualities which exclude each one the others from itself, do not have such additional contradiction of one another as to prevent them from being attributes of the same body, this additional contradiction being that they are different, that is, contradictory kinds of the same quality. An object may have different qualities, but not different kinds of the same quality. The common expression different but not contradictory may be used for convenience, if properly understood as meaning contradictory in one respect but not in another; thus qualities may be contradictory as regards one another, but not as attributes of an object, or not as being different kinds of the same quality.

Thus a marble may be round, white, hard, cold. These are different because they contradict one another, each excludes the others from itself, but they do not contradict one another as attributes of the marble. But this marble cannot also be square, red, soft and hot, because these qualities not only contradict the others as qualities, but also as attributes of the marble because they are different, that is contradictory, kinds of the same qualities, namely, shape, color, density and temperature; a body cannot have more than one kind of each of these at the same time.

All the above is of value, as it proves that freedom and causation cannot be affirmed of the will, for they are different kinds of the same thing, namely "mode of acting," they exclude one another as attributes; if the very nature of voluntary action be one of these, it cannot be the other.

This necessitates the rejection of a fourth way in which the expression may be taken, as meaning contrary to one another, but not as attributes of the will; they are contradictory in both respects.

In the fifth place, and this seems to be its real character, the statement may be regarded as an attempt to express an indefinite, unattained, unknown thought; something which the mind is grasping after, but fails to reach.

It would seem that these are the only ways in which the statement may be taken, and if taken in any of these it must be rejected, and in its objectionable character it stands in bold contrast with the plain, simple and true statement that the power of the will is a real force, which like all other forces obeys the law of causation.

Again it is said that the power of the will, and the universal reign of causation are ultimate facts, and must be accepted as true, even though we cannot trace the connection between them. The principle here involved is perfectly correct, but it is not the case that it must be here applied. It is right for those to resort to it, who do not perceive the connection between the power of the will and the law of causation. However inexplicable it may be to them, they are assured of their own free agency and causation. They cannot deny what are to them ultimate facts. But there is no need to resort to this principle in the present instance; for it is possible to explain, as has been done, how the will acts in accord with the law of causation. Thus, the will is a ceaselessly energising force within the soul, held, controlled and directed by the other powers, ready for any action and utilized by the man according to his own thoughts, emotions etc., and environment; just as steam is an ever-energising force held within the boiler, capable of and ready for any work, and controlled and directed by the engineer and utilized by him according to his thoughts etc. The law of causation operates exactly in the same way in both cases. There we must carefully discriminate. The will is free in so far as it is an energising power capable of and ready for any volition; beyond this it is under the law

of causation; and the man is a free agent because he has this voluntary power, and uses it according to his own thoughts etc., and because in his thoughts, emotions etc., in all that constitutes his character, himself, he is what he is because of original endowment, education, training, environment, and the way in which he has himself made use of all these throughout successive years. There is such a thing as the building and establishment of character, and that which has taken years of labor, effort and experience to form, cannot be ignored, nor destroyed, nor radically changed in a moment.

Here everything is plain and self-evidently true. Here there is a sufficient and efficient cause for everything; a cause for what the man is, at any given moment, in himself, his character, his thoughts, emotions, etc.; these are the cause of the direction and control given under which the volitions come and go, and have their peculiar character; and the cause of the uprising and passing away of the volitions beneath this control and direction is the will, a ceaselessly energising force within and at the disposal of the soul, as the ever-pressing steam power is at the disposal of the engineer; and in the midst of all this causation, operating exactly in the same way in which it does in the material world, the man is free in such a sense and degree that he is responsible; because he has this ever energising will-power within him and at his disposal, because he utilizes it himself and not another, according to what he is, and because he is what he is by reason of the use which he has made of his original endowments and ever varying environment, spiritual and material, and has, moreover, the perception of right and wrong. All this, which is so evidently true, is in direct opposition to statements which have been repeatedly made, thus, "To act freely is the very nature of the will." "The human will, because the activity of a person or spirits cannot but be free." "Its freedom is its essence." "In the material and spiritual realms causation operates differently because of the radical difference between them. In the one case it is

physical and, therefore, must be necessary ; in the other it is rational and, therefore, must be free."

In all this there is failure to make proper discrimination between the will as a power of the soul and the soul, or person, of which it is a faculty. It is the soul that is free, but the will itself is not free ; it is held, controlled and directed by the soul, or person who utilizes it, and it acts according to the law of causation. It cannot break away from, nor be independent of, nor indifferent to the control and direction of the other powers of the soul, neither can they break away from it. These ever-energising forces are ever acting and reacting upon one another, and what a man at any given moment thinks and feels and says and does is the resultant of the action and reaction of these forces ; a resultant which is as necessary as is the resultant of the acting and reacting of the forces of the material world ; a change may take place at any instant in the man's conduct, but only as there is a change in the acting and reacting of the forces of the soul. There can no more be an independent force in the soul, than there can be an independent force in the material world. Were this possible there would be a kingdom within a kingdom, with the destruction of harmony and order, and the introduction of antagonism and discord ; the soul, with its varied and complicated attributes and activities, would not be a closely compacted unit, the man would not have complete and assured mastery over himself. All assured accomplishment of purpose and safety against wreck and ruin for the engineer depend upon the certain response of the steam power to his control, and for the man upon the certain response of the will-power to the control, which he has over it, through all the powers of the soul.

For the will to break away from such control would be like the breaking away of the main-spring of a watch, or of the heavy weight of a clock, an unintended, useless, senseless, disastrous crash. Taking all this into consideration and making the proper discrimination between the will, as a power of the soul and the soul to which it

belongs, it is evident that it is a misstatement to say : "To act freely is the very nature of the will." "Freedom is its essence." "The human will cannot but be free." It is free only in this sense that it is a force which acts of itself in virtue of its own energy and can form any kind of volition, in the same sense in which steam is free, as it is a force which acts of itself in virtue of its own energy and can do any kind of work within the sphere of its activity, but otherwise neither the will force, nor the steam are free, because inseparably connected with other powers and under their positive control and direction. They both act under the law of causation and with the same necessity. Hence also, it is a misstatement to say, "That in the two cases the operation of causation is different because of the radical difference between them. In the one case it is physical and, therefore, must be necessary; in the other rational and therefore must be free."

We have here not only a misstatement, but also an unfortunate use of language. Strictly speaking causation cannot operate freely, it must operate necessarily. Causation is not that which may or may not produce its effect; it is that which does and must produce its effect. If its effect does not follow it is not causation. Causation, therefore, is not brought to bear upon the will, if it does not necessarily determine its action, and the will is free to act, or not. In such case the will is its own master; it decides for and determines itself. When it is said that in the case of the will causation operates freely, the only possible meaning is that the will is free to act, or not in response, but this is to be free from causation, free from that which necessarily produces its effect. If the will being free does not act or acts in a different way, it has not been caused, and if it does yield to that which has been brought before it, it has not been caused to do so by it, but being free it has of itself yielded instead of refusing, as it might have done. It acts in that way because it does; that is, of itself it wills in that particular way. There is no causation, no force outside of the will producing its effect; that which is

before it is only an opportunity, suggestion, proposition, a mode of acting, a guide, rule or dictation presented to the free will upon which it acts or not as it may ; these have no power to cause the will to act in their way, if the will be free to act or not in response. For free will they are not causes, they do not act freely, they do not act at all upon such will. They are that which a free will uses. I put my hand in the fire and burn myself. The fire does not burn me, it cannot even take me unawares and burn me, if it can act upon me only as I will, as I permit. I place my hand on an embossed surface and make an impress upon myself ; the surface is inert ; the impress and its character are mine own. I made it by using that surface, as a printer makes a print from a plate which he takes from a large collection ; the print and its character are his own doing, he made it by using the plate which he took. So a free will is not caused by external things, it uses them as it wills.

It cannot be claimed that there is causation acting freely because the will is self-caused ; such are the forces, activities, nature, laws and character of the will, that it is caused by them to act in the way in which it does in regard to external things, for this would be necessity, the will would not be acting freely. A magnet acting as caused from within by its own forces, nature, law, character, is under necessity ; it must draw to itself the piece of iron presented to it. A man, if caused by his own depraved character, habits and tastes to do evil, is acting under necessity. If a man is caused by his good character to act uprightly, he also is acting under necessity. So far as there is causation there must be necessity. As the leopard cannot change his spots, so they cannot do good that are accustomed to do evil. If the will be caused from within it acts by necessity.

When under temptation to evil men do that which is wrong it is generally said that they act freely. This, however, is not the case. They act voluntarily but not freely ; they have been overpowered, overcome, overmastered, they have lost self-mastery. The temptation has compelled, constrained, caused them to do wrong. They are, how-

ever, responsible because it was themselves that did the wrong, knowing it to be wrong; they willed to do it, it was their own act; acting under compulsion and because it was their own fault, they ought to have had strength of character, of principle and of self-mastery to resist. Inexcusably vanquished by an inferior force, as is often the case in warfare, or not having the strength which they ought to have had, they were at once both helpless and responsible. This illustration serves to show that causation does not and cannot operate freely, but necessarily. Another illustration showing the same thing is obedience to authority. Such obedience is voluntary, but not free; for authority is no authority unless it enforces and secures obedience. The obedience of children to parental authority is voluntary but not free. It is often said, those children are under perfect control, they are uniformly and promptly obedient—these children are beyond control, they are always disobedient. The reason is because in the one case the parental authority is real and has controlling power, in the other it is only nominal: in the one case by education, training, discipline, authority has been enforced and established; the children are not their own masters, they cannot do as they please, but must live and act according to parental rule and command. In the other case there has been no exercise of parental authority, the children have been permitted to run wild. Parental authority is still further enforced by the civil power. The runaway child may be arrested and returned home; the incorrigible may be imprisoned in the house of refuge, or some other reformatory. By law the child is not free till of full age. Just in proportion as authority is real, is obedience enforced. Under army and navy discipline obedience to the commanding officer is voluntary, but at the same time compulsory. In our own land we are a free people not because we are free to obey the civil government, but only because we make our own laws and select our own rulers. When the law is enacted and the rulers are in office, our obedience is necessary, as necessary as is the work done by a slave beneath the lash of the master

who owns him. In the family, the army, navy and state, authority is the rightful exercise of power compelling obedience, power which produces its effect; it is a cause operating necessarily. If the effect does not follow, there is no cause, no compelling power, no obedience, no authority. The Roman centurion well expressed the truth who said to Christ, "For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers; and I say unto one, go and he goeth; and to another, come and he cometh, and to my servant, do this and he doeth it. Speak the word only and my servant shall be healed."

Thus it is evidently impossible for causation to operate freely; so far as there is causation, the effect must follow. To say that in the spiritual realm it is rational and therefore must be free involves error of thought and the wrong use of language. To these the whole difficulty is due. The attempt is made to unite causation and free action. This is impossible; the former is necessary, the latter is without necessity. Moreover, the will is not free, it acts under the law of causation. Two children are punished, the wrong-doer and the one who caused him to do wrong. The act of the first was not itself both caused and free. There was causation all through. The voluntary act of the wrong doer was caused by his thoughts, feelings, wishes etc., these were caused by the skillful work of the second child. When he had fashioned them aright for the purpose, they framed the volition and the wrong was done. This explains how the voluntary acts of a man may be caused without destroying his free agency. It is by operating upon and shaping his thoughts, feelings wishes, hopes, fears, etc., leaving them free to cause his volitions as they will and must do; the man is free from violence to his nature. There is need of careful discrimination, knowledge and definition.

"Will" is simply power to act, or execute, it can no more be said to be self-caused, than can the material forces. These and the will are energising powers to be utilized. The will is "power to act" used by the thinking, feeling, wishing soul to impress, execute itself upon the activities of



its various acting and reacting faculties, thus bringing them under its direction and control, and to execute its thoughts, feelings, wishes, decisions, etc. The will has no choice and decision of its own. Choice is emotional, it is the feeling of preference, of "pleasure in," and "wish for." Decision is the conclusion reached by thinking, comparing, considering, it is made by the cognitive powers. The two act and react upon one another, the soul by will-power executes them, or not, according to the strength and character of the feeling and thought; these as executed are in a secondary sense the will of the soul.

This executive power of the soul is the same that nature has over its activities. But this power of nature is not called will, because it is the control of material forces producing material phenomena; while that of the soul is the control of spiritual forces, producing spiritual phenomena; such as thoughts, reasoning, purposes, plans, desires, language, speech, bodily movements expressive of intelligence and emotion and directed to intelligent acts; the name of will is reserved for, and given to this control. Though different in rank and name the executive power itself is the same in both cases. Thus heat executes itself or acts upon an object and makes it hot like itself; it acts upon the force of cohesion and drives apart the particles which it would hold together and causes expansion. Steam executes itself or acts upon an object and imparts its own motion to it. Gravity which is the power of drawing, executes itself upon an object and draws it to itself; the crystalizing power of water executes itself upon the molecules of water and makes them crystalize in its shape. The same power of alum executes itself on the alum molecules and makes them crystalize in its form. The same power of the diamond executes itself on it and makes it take the form of its crystal. The organic forces of plants execute themselves on the material at hand, and form in each plant its own foliage, flowers and fruit. The sun executes itself on far-distant worlds, making them bright like itself with the light of day and the brightness of the morning and evening stars. Thus on

throughout the entire realm of nature without end. In all these there is executive power, power to act, to control.

It is precisely the same with spiritual forces—thus, thoughts execute themselves, or act upon emotions, making them like themselves. Wishes execute themselves upon the thoughts, so that we carry on our thoughts as we wish. Imagination executes itself upon the hopes and fears making them of like character. Thinking and reasoning execute themselves upon our beliefs, or trusts making them what we think and reason. Perceptions of external objects execute themselves upon the whole process of our thoughts and reasoning, making them of corresponding character. Perceptions of sounds, such as of speech and music execute themselves upon all our thoughts and emotions. Thoughts, emotions, wishes, decisions reached by reasoning, execute themselves upon the nerves and make our bodily movements expressive of them. The whole soul, as it is as a unit at any given moment executes itself upon its various faculties and makes their activities like itself. A soul of great intellect, noble and good executes itself upon its activities making them of corresponding character; a soul weak, foolish, depraved executes itself upon its activities, making them like itself. In all these there is the simple power to act, to execute, to control, in no wise different from the executive power of nature, though called will to distinguish the spiritual from the physical; the latter is the executive power of nature, the will is the executive power of the soul.

Being simply "power to act," the will evidently has no choice or decision of its own; by it the soul, as it is at the instant, executes itself, as an engraved stamp executes itself on that upon which it is pressed.

The expression "self-execution" is preferable to "self-determination." The latter needs careful definition and explanation to guard it from error. Without these it implies that man has a power which he does not possess—that by his will he acts independently of his environment and character, and by mere volition can immediately fashion in any way both himself and his conduct.

“Self-execution” expresses all and more than all the truth expressed by “self-determination” and without the ambiguity and error of the latter term. The precise truth is, that the whole soul, including all the impressions made upon it from without, impresses itself upon itself and its environment. There we have the will in its true nature, as mere executive power, and the soul exerting its influence upon persons and things according to its own character, and fashioning itself according to its own nature and character and the new elements and influences received from without, such as knowledge, impulse, suggestion, fears, inspirations, etc. All this is exactly and pointedly expressed by “self-execution,” but not by “self-determination.”

Causation is that which necessarily produces its effect. Though language, because of its brevity and imperfection, often seems to imply it, an effect cannot have two causes. Every force is a cause; there may be two or more forces, that is, causes, forming a cause; each of the component forces, or causes, produces its full effect, but the resultant is as they act upon one another; there may be a series of causes, each effect being the cause of the next throughout the series; there may be a number of causes operating on the same, or on different things and at different times; and each of several causes may have the same effect. All these distinctions are expressed by the same language, which quickly and without notice passes from one to another.

Influence is a cause producing its effect; the slightest influence is causation. The term properly denotes one of two or more forces acting together, the resultant of which is the effect. Each force produces its own effect, but cannot of itself produce that of its action with the others.

The use of the word is the source of error, as it seems to intimate that there may be influence without causation. This is impossible; forces which produce no effect upon us have no influence.

“Free” is “free from,” free from compulsion, from necessity, and hence free from causation. Men and things are free only so far as they are free from causation. As to

freedom the question is from what causes and to what degree are men and things free. There is no perfect freedom. Men and things are free only because free to a greater or less degree from some causes, though not free from all.

An agent is that which acts by inherent force or forces which produce their effects, as gravity, heat, etc., and the forces of thought, emotion, etc. Things and men are agents, and as such are free, so far as free from external causation, which is never altogether the case.

Definition of "Free-agency": A free-agent is that which acts by its own inherent forces, according to its nature and laws, free from all violation of its nature, and in varying degree, though never entirely, free from external causation. This is precisely and definitely that of which men are conscious. They know that they act by their own inherent powers; that their actions are rational and emotional (caused from within) and in large measure, according to their environment (caused from without), the only freedom of which they are conscious, being freedom from violation of their nature and in some measure from external causation.

The consciousness of acting by their own inherent powers is often misinterpreted by men as implying a freedom, which they by no means possess. A wound up watch acts by its own power, but not independently of its structure and condition as a watch and of external influences; so men act by their own power, but not independently of the constitution of their nature and character, and they and their environment must necessarily ever act and react upon one another.

Hence also, there are various degrees of freedom and responsibility. The freedom of individuals varies according to circumstances and some men are more free than others. Those of a masterful spirit rule their fellows and subdue in good degree the external forces brought to bear upon them, while men of a weak and yielding disposition are ruled by others and swayed by their environment. At

times external circumstances are of such a character that they overpower and master the individual and again are such that they exert only a slight influence. By education and self-discipline men may become more masterful and hence more free from the control of other persons and of circumstances.

With this varying freedom responsibility varies, God alone, the omniscient judge of all, being able to determine its degree, making all due allowances. Those of superior endowment and education and those who have had all things in their favor will be held to a more strict account than the weak and ignorant and those who have had all things against them.

Freedom, causation, necessity prevail alike in the mineral, mechanic, organic, animal and human realms.

A stone, or any material object, is a free agent, it acts by its own power and according to what it is in itself, its nature, character and laws. It is free so far as it is free from external causation. It does not act only as acted upon, but it acts by its own power and in its own way, except as it is overpowered by external forces, and only so far as they are strong enough to overcome its resistance. Of itself the earth, rotating on its axis, would move on forever in a straight line with undiminished force and velocity. It moves in its orbit around the sun because the force of the sun deflects it to that degree, but cannot overcome its resistance further and draw it down to its own surface, nor interfere with its rotation, momentum and velocity. Should the sun relax its energy, the earth would of itself go on in its own way in a straight line. It is a free agent. A stone thrown by you into the air, moves because you have exerted your strength upon it and have overcome its resistance; a large stone you could not overcome and throw. The stone in motion would move by its own energy in a straight line forever, but it is overcome by the force of gravity, which draws it to the ground against its resistance, but only in a curved line and gradually, not having force enough to do otherwise; finally the stone strikes the

ground and is completely overpowered. Thus it is with man. He is as free as a stone, but not more truly so. He like it acts on himself, by his own power according to his own notion, character and laws, in his own way except as he is overpowered by forces ever acting upon him, and only so far as they are strong enough to overcome his resistance. Man, the earth and the stone are alike free agents.

A watch is free—it moves of itself for hours, in good degree free from external causes, and according to what it is within itself; if good and in proper condition it will keep time, if poor and in poor condition will itself gain or lose time. It moves and governs itself, till exhausted; man can do no more.

All plants in like manner are free agents. They determine themselves by themselves. By their vital forces and activities, according to their own nature, character and laws and in their own way they perform all their own mysterious organic functions, select from air, earth, water and sunshine appropriate materials and construct their own roots, stems, foliage, buds, blossoms, fruit and seed, reproducing themselves after their kind. They are free except so far as overcome by influences from without and caused to grow otherwise than they would, stunted, ill-formed, richly and with or without flowers and fruit. Man and plants are alike free. All animals are free also. The same definition of free agency applies equally to the earth, stone, watch, plant, animal and man.

In the five realms freedom is the same, the only difference being one of rank, of greater or less superiority according to the character of the things and forces. A stone has no spiritual powers, and cannot act with powers which it does not possess, but it does act freely with those which it has, resisting all opposing powers. It is its nature to determine itself by itself; it is free, so far as free from external causation due to forces acting upon it. Its freedom is inferior in rank to that of man, only because man's freedom is that of superior powers; those of conscious-

ness, intelligence, emotion, desire, volition. So also, causation and necessity prevail alike in the five kingdoms. The activities of material objects are caused from within ; they are caused also to a greater or less degree by forces from without, according as such are strong enough to overcome their resistance and are brought to bear upon them. The causation, whether from within or without, is necessary. The plant's activities are caused by its own vital powers, etc., from within, and also by external forces so far as these are brought to bear upon them with sufficient power to interfere with and determine their actions. Here also is necessity. The same is true of animals. So likewise with man ; all his activities are caused by his own powers, etc., from within and also by external things so far as they are or have been brought to bear upon him and have power to determine his thoughts, emotions, desires, hopes, fears, etc., and through them as secondary causes, his volitions. There are causation and necessity both from within and from without, as truly as is the case with the animal, plant, mechanism and mineral.

To such a degree is man caused from without, that it is difficult to decide whether the causes from within or those from without have the greater effect. A citizen of our own land, a Filipino, a Russian peasant, the Tsar on the throne of his fathers, have been made in character, thoughts, emotions, hopes, fears, aspirations, beliefs, efforts, habits, conduct, speech, what they are, by birth and life-long environment. Addison says, "What sculpture is to marble, education is to the soul" Unprogressive conditions of human society reproduce the men of the past with unflinching regularity. In localities where occupations are handed down from father to son the individuals are the exact reproduction of those former generations. Savage and barbarous people when discovered are perfect representatives of their forefathers from remotest times. An Arabian Sheik of today is an Abraham still living. The Chinese in their own land differ in no respect from men of centuries ago. Until recently the Japanese were no other than their ancestors,

and would have remained such were it not that by Western civilization they are being made like ourselves. The native tribes of Africa have been unchanged for ages, but are now rapidly advancing by reason of the opening of the Dark Continent. Even the weather determines how we think, feel, act and speak; by utmost effort we cannot entirely throw off its mastery over us.

The truth plainly and briefly stated is, all activities of all material things, plants, animals and men are caused and as caused are necessary, but some of these activities are free also; not that they can be both caused and uncaused, but that they may be free from some causes, though never free from all, that is to a greater or less degree free from some external causes, either as some external forces do not bear upon them, or they by resistance destroy in some measure the efficiency of such forces. Like that of the stone, watch, plant and animal, man's activity is caused by that which is within, and always in some large measure by that which is external, but they all and he are free agents because they act by their own powers according to their nature, character, etc., and are in large measure, though never altogether, free from external causes. Though he is free in common with all things else, man's freedom is the far greater and superior because it is not the freedom of the animal, plant, mechanism or mineral, but the freedom of a god-like being; a freedom so superior that ordinarily all other freedom is obscured and disregarded, as though man alone were a free-agent. The idea of causation is perfectly definite; it is a cause necessarily producing its effect and we can conceive of no difference in it whether it acts in the material or spiritual world.

By holding up, as we have done, our exposition of the human will in contrast with that given by others, its truth has come the more prominently forward. It may well be established that the will acts strictly according to the law of causation which acts always and everywhere in the same way. But further confirmation is at hand.

A striking illustration of the causation of the will is af-



forded by vacillation. Under it all the varying actions are volitions—they rapidly come and go as they do, because the man is in a tumult of conflicting feelings, hopes, fears, thoughts, reasons, and conclusions. These sway the will as the fitful winds sway the weather vane; both the will and the vane are formed to move in any direction, but they move as determined by the influence to which they are subjected. They are for this very purpose; the vane to show the direction of the wind, without which it would be useless; and the will to execute, to give expression and effect to the thoughts, principles, purposes, emotions, wishes of the man, without which it would be of no value; it would be annoyance beyond endurance if the will did not respond exactly and necessarily to the wishes and mandates of the soul, like a mule with his power of contrary choice.

Again, it is only as the will acts under causation, that our conduct is rational and ourselves responsible. This is self-evidently the case. If our volitions are formed uncaused by our thoughts, they are irrational; and if formed uncaused by our thoughts, principles, views, feelings, etc., they have no more character. Such volitions do, in certain abnormal or deranged conditions, occur, and by common consent, the man is considered not responsible for them. Volitions are often formed in moments of thoughtlessness, inadvertence, abstraction, absent-mindedness, intense excitement, sleep, dreams, somnambulism, drunkenness, hypnotism, lunacy, idiocy. The volitions in all these cases have two characteristics in common; they are not properly determined by the man's thoughts etc., and for them the man is not responsible. There is in these cases some interference with, some deficiency, or derangement of the proper and normal control and determination of the will by the other powers of the soul, and it is because the will acts without proper caution, that the volitions formed are irresponsible; they are irrational and without moral character. It must also, however, be borne in mind, that the man himself may be held responsible for being in

such conditions; as for example, he has no right to be drunk, and drunkenness affords no due excuse for wrong doing. The man should ever hold himself in perfect control and never seek in the loss of self-mastery an excuse for evil deeds; and there can be self-mastery, rational, moral, responsible only in so far as the will is controlled by the other powers of the soul, not freely, but necessarily. Only thus can self-mastery be assured. It must rule with no uncertain power.

Again, the causation of the will is the teaching of Scripture. It speaks of the dominion under which the will is. The sinner is the servant of his own vile nature and habits. Christ makes men free by change of masters. He sets men free from the dominion of sin by making them the servants of righteousness. This is to be free indeed, not because men freely submit to the new dominion, which would be no freedom, or no dominion; not that they are free to do right, or wrong, but because they are free from the power over them of sin and evil, and because men have and act out their true nature, as originally designed and made, when under the dominion of righteousness. According to Scripture, all wrong and wrong doing are foreign, abnormal, unnatural to man; they are a disease, deformity, malformation, monstrosity, harmful, destructive and to be free from these is to be free indeed.

The peculiarity of the exposition of the will, which we have given is, that it is the application of the scientific view of the material universe, and is formed from the law of the conservation, or persistence and correlation and transmutation of forces. The individual human soul is conceived of, as an ever-energising cosmos; its activities being due to the harmonious acting and reacting upon one another of its varied powers. These are all ceaselessly energising, are inseparably bound together and invariably act as a unit; every volition is the act of the entire soul, the resultant of its combined forces and activities; without any break, hiatus, gulf, or separation, there is an even flow in the soul's activity; every step, or stage springs from the immediately preced-

ing one and determines the next, precisely as is the case with the material cosmos; it is self which determines self; the whole make-up of the soul, its character, thoughts, emotions, views, principles, hopes, fears, habits, volitions, acts, the entire self of one moment determines self of the next moment; the only exception, interruption, or uprising of the altogether new and isolated possible, being such as may, and do arise from influences brought to bear upon the soul from its outward environment, the soul in itself and activities being the resultant of the internal and external forces. And as the material universe can never cease to be, unless destroyed *ab extra*, so the soul, the spiritual cosmos, can never of itself lose its being. It must forever continue to be with the full energising of all its faculties; but unlike the material world, which ever tends to equilibrium of its ever-energising forces and to stagnation, it evermore remains in full activity because of the influences ever brought to bear upon it from the material and spiritual realms within which it lies, and especially from the Great Being for fellowship with whom it was made, whose likeness it bears and with whom it holds communion forever.

Therein is its superior exaltation, its god-like character, that it has been endowed with will-power; and herein its great responsibility, that over that will-power it, the indivisible soul, the unit of combined, ever-interacting powers, has been entrusted with complete control.

WILLIAM H. HODGE.

Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.

## VI. THE CONDESCENSION OF SOME APOSTLES OF MODERN CULTURE.

We are not likely soon to forget that we are living in the era of modern scientific progress. Upon thousands of commencement platforms this fact is proclaimed annually by thousands of brave young trumpeters to circles of admiring relatives and friends ; and the still better evidence of its truth is seen on land and sea, and in the very air itself, in improved methods of communication and travel, and in the betterment of all the arts of comfortable and luxurious living. From every standpoint we may well rejoice in this brilliant triumph of modern science, contributing so prodigally to the arts and culture of modern life. But at the same time we may condemn certain apostles of the scientific spirit, who commit the fallacy of mistaking their kind of science for omniscience, and who tell us that beyond the boundaries of the natural or physical sciences there is no certain human knowledge. And we may yoke with these representatives of the scientific culture, certain apostles of the more liberal culture, as some economists, sociologists literary critics and others, who, while resenting the claim that there is no assured truth in their respective fields, are at one with these certain scientists in telling us that in the great sphere of religious truth or theological doctrine there is no rock foundation of certainty upon which the feet of the adventurous explorer may be planted. With a lordly condescension as if from some superior height, they seem to call down to us from these complacent summits upon which they fancy they are seated, that we may spare ourselves the effort of trying to reach certain knowledge and assured truth in that great department of theological science where so many of the world's elect and lofty spirits have labored for a life time in the conviction of possessing the infallible truth of God.

Let me first present to you some evidence in confirmation of this article. Let me quote an extract from the

Coryphæus of the modern scientific culture. (Herbert Spencer, *First Principles of Philosophy*, Section 33) He is speaking of the proper attitude of the man of science. He says "It is hard for him to bear the manifestation of that pride of ignorance which so far exceeds the pride of science. Naturally enough such a one will be indignant when charged with irreligion because he declines to accept the carpenter theory of creation as the most worthy one. He may think it needless, as it is difficult, to conceal his repugnance to a creed, which tacitly ascribes to the Unknowable a love of adulation such as would be despised in a human being. Convinced as he is, that all punishment as we see it wrought out in the order of nature, is but a disguised beneficence, there will perhaps escape from him, an angry condemnation of the belief that punishment is a divine vengeance, and that divine vengeance is eternal. He may be tempted to show his contempt, when he is told that actions instigated by an unselfish sympathy or by a pure love of rectitude are intrinsically sinful; and that conduct is truly good, only when it is due to a faith, whose openly, professed motive is other-worldiness. But he must restrain such feelings. Though he may be unable to do this, during the excitement of controversy, or when otherwise brought face to face with current superstition, he must yet qualify his antagonism in calmer moments, so that his mature judgment and resulting conduct may be without bias."

Now I wish to be moderate, but there are three things in reference to the extract I wish to mention; first, its unwarranted dogmatism. If Mr. Spencer knows all that he here assumes to know, he is entitled to the attribute of omniscience. How else could he know that all punishment is beneficent and no punishment is eternal. Second, the wondrous facility of misrepresentation, which marks this extract, is characteristic of this writer whenever he trenches on religious themes. For example, what theologians hold the doctrine that actions instigated by a pure love of rectitude are intrinsically sinful. But, third, the immeasurable and ineffable condescension with which this

apostle of culture climbs to the lofty throne on which he complacently seats himself while he relegates to abysmal depths far beneath his imperial place, the poor votaries of the current superstition, towards which he exhorts himself not to feel too much indignation, repugnance, angry condemnation and contempt. We are obliged to him for this delicate consideration. I charge myself to keep calm and not to seem violent.

But we will employ ourselves with sampling some more of these apostles, and let Mr. Matthew Arnold tell us in his "St. Paul and Protestantism" that "The predestinarian and solifidian dogmas for the very sake of which our Puritan churches came into existence begin to feel the irresistible breath of the zeit-geist. Some of them melt quicker, others slower, but all of them are doomed." Bear with me while I call you to note three things about this accomplished gentleman's prophecy. First, this prophet's unwavering confidence in his own prophecies, he must believe them for he himself has uttered them; a confidence misplaced by the stern comment of event for these very dogmas which he informs us are certainly doomed are more widely taught and believed this very day than ever before in our world's history. Second, the canon of truth which he proposes as the test of these dogmas, namely, the breath of the zeit-geist. Translated into plain, every-day English, what that means is, that at any particular time the truth of doctrines is to be tested by the count of noses, which is just as accurate as to say that the value of articles of merchandise is to be determined by the number of pounds marked on the scale. A tub of lard is worth near three hundred pounds of diamonds. But third and most notably, the unapproachable condescension is well nigh surpassed by the bland and insinuating tones in which this gifted literarian reveals his contempt by the use of barbarous words. "Predestinarian and solifidian" is good. I do not at this stage discuss this condescension; I simply wish you now to observe the air of contemptuous patronage with which our author pities those victimized by a belief in these "predestinarian and solifidian dogmas."

But we will sample another one of these fools and get the task through. Mr. Leslie Steven is kind enough to let us into his secret as follows: "Men of sense I fancy often wish to avoid scandal rather than to conceal their sentiment from their peers. They trust to a free masonry, which exists among themselves and which presents an impenetrable barrier to the sagacity of fools. One may guess that the esoteric creed drops some articles of the orthodox faith, but the man of sense, while he has a contempt for any one who (as M. Renan says of St. Paul) believes heartily or takes all creeds seriously, has a hearty dislike for the man who too openly discards the established tenets. Why drop a veil so easily worn. Religion is after all useful and we are even bound—for the sensible man can take a high moral tone when he pleases—to invent the God who does not exist." Now I charge myself to be calm and refrain from violence and not to express unduly indignation, repugnance, angry condemnation and contempt, but there are four things I must note. First the unconscious dishonesty of this self-revelation. Men of sense, like himself of course, conceal their sentiments in order to avoid scandal. They invent the God, whom they know not to exist, because he is useful. If this is the natural fruit of agnosticism then we know its real intrinsic nature. Second, the unspeakable condescension with which this Mr. Steven arrogates to himself the tickling impertinence for that greatest of all heroes, St. Paul, is too overwhelming for comment. Think of it, Leslie Steven standing there, Apostle Paul standing here, confronting each other, and Mr. Steven smiling a contemptuous smile in the face of Paul. Get that picture into your head if you can. I confess it staggers me to believe in its possibility.

We will hear from just one more of these apostles. This time Prof. Thornstein Veblen of the University of Chicago in his recent work "The Theory of the Leisure Class." (pp 322-4) "As a general rule the classes that are low in economic efficiency or in intelligence or both are peculiarly devout—as for instance the negro population of the

South, most of the lower class foreign population, much of the rural population, especially in those sections which are backward in education in the stage of development of their industry or in respect of their industrial contact with the rest of the community. \* \* \* That is to say the peculiar devoutness of women is a particular expression of that conservatism which the women of civilized communities owe in great measure to their economic position. The logic and the logical processes of her every day domestic life are carried over into the realm of the supernatural and the woman finds herself at home and content in a range of ideas, which to the man are in a great measure alien and imbecile."

I wish to signalize the amazing condescension with which this distinguished professor, wrapped in the complacency and serenity of academic contemplation, classifies the devout into these four great divisions, the negro population of the South, the lower class foreign population, the rural population and the women. I think that is exceedingly cool. Some of us come from the country; all of us had mothers, most of us have wives and all of us ought to have. If there is any sublime excess of loftiness beyond this to be reached by the soaring and the venturesome spirit, ambitious to display a still more amazing condescension, I do not believe that you can find it even in the imperial Capital of the Northwest from which the book issued, able as that great city is to meet almost all the demands upon her resources and ingenuity. In Prof. Veblen's condescension Chicago has already distanced all competitors and surpassed the world, and we would have to emigrate to another world to find it excelled. We have found then these four representative apostles of modern culture, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Steven and Mr. Veblen all absolutely at one in the condescension with which they look upon the benighted votaries of theological science. They differ only in degree and amount of this strange and unwarranted emotion, which they wear. One may have a bigger gun than the other, but in every one of them the gun is loaded to the muzzle.



I. Let us examine this condescension as to its nature and work. First, it is out of place in those who have no title to be regarded as specialists in the field of theological science. I intend to bring no railing accusation against these gentlemen. "Michael, the Archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed with him about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." I intend to follow the example of the Archangel in this respect, but it is a simple statement of fact to say, that none of these gentlemen even claim to be experts in any of the great departments of theological science. Let us see what claims they have to weight as theological authorities. Mr. Spencer evidently regards himself as a specialist in a great many of the most important departments of human knowledge. He has published ponderous volumes which he regards as authoritative, on the First Principles of Philosophy, on the Principles of Biology, on the Principles of Psychology, on the Principles of Sociology, on the Principles of Morality with several volumes of essays and a treatise on Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical. Now I am willing to admit the remarkable gifts of this worker and writer, but I raise the question whether with the wonderful modern additions to the sum of human knowledge any modern scholar can claim to be a specialist in so many and various fields, and I ask whether the extensiveness of his claims is not in some measure an impeachment of those claims; and I raise the further point that he does not even pretend to be a specialist in the field of theological science, and were he to do so, his works would furnish easy disproof of his claims, and yet he declares himself with the air of infallible assurance upon theological subjects upon which no man is entitled to an opinion except as the result of years of investigation and study.

Mr. Arnold was a poet with a happy turn for a certain kind of cool and easy-flowing verse. He was a literary critic of excellent judgment, he was a consummate verbalist with a taste in coining neat phrases seldom excelled.

But Mr. Arnold as a theologian, is like the fabled animal who attempted to play the lion's part. How could he roar like a lion and how could Mr. Arnold talk like a theologian? "St. Paul and Protestantism" would be exquisite humor, were not the subject too serious for the play of badinage and the sport of fun; but I believe no one but the author himself ever took this volume seriously. And surely it is not reasonable, that because a poet of some pretensions, and a literary critic of exquisite taste, he should settle in *ex cathedra* fashion the deepest problems of theological science.

As for Mr. Stephen, he is the facile composer of attractive magazine articles and the glib manufacturer of startling newspaper leaders. But surely the easy and jaunty omniscience of the magazinist and the unfailing cock-sureness of the imperturbable editor are not the court before which the claims of the spiritual life and destiny can be safely adjudicated. Do audacity, self-assertion, a willingness to decide all questions off-hand, "in the heavens above, in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth," fit one for the role of a calm and judicious investigator, whose opinions are of intrinsic weight and worth?

Professor Veblen is doubtless the accomplished economist and sociologist who, by years of patient study and investigation, has been prepared to formulate judgments entitled to consideration; but there is no evidence that a similar discipline has qualified him to give us theological opinions of similar weight and worth. And yet, along with his economic and sociological conclusions, he gives us theological judgments with the same air of authoritativeness and conviction. Let us reverse the case. Let me make the violent supposition that Jonathan Edwards, who was something of a metaphysician and theologian, should intrude into the sphere of chemistry with the announcement that Dalton's law of chemical combinations was a farrago of nonsense; let me suppose that Dr. Charles Hodge, who has some title to be regarded as a theological expert, should venture into the department of physics with the declara-

tion that the hypothesis of ether as the condition for the diffusion of radiant energy was a vain conceit of shallow sophists ; suppose Bishop Lightfoot, a ripe scholar in the field of Biblical interpretation, should summon a court of judges and of legal voters, and should tell them that the whole structure of the common law, as built up by the best efforts of political expounders of that law for centuries, was a fasciculus of baseless fictions ; suppose Bishop Westcott, a textual critic of the highest repute and skill, should insist in trampling the new science of sociology under his feet on the ground that it was an unworthy and indecent bastard ; why, the hot indignation of the chemists and the physicists and the jurists and the sociologists would warn Edwards and Hodge and Lightfoot and Westcott that they were profane intruders into a field of which they knew nothing. Now I ask by parity of reasoning, may not Spencer and Arnold and Stephen and Veblen have warning to vacate the theological premises upon which they are intruders and "squatters?"

If the theologians must be careful what they tread under their feet, why not insist on equal care from those learned and gifted gentlemen, who are physicists, economists, sociologists, literarians or what not, but who have no claim as experts in the field of theology.

II. I remark, second, this condescension is out of place when exercised toward those who may justly be regarded as specialists in the theological sciences. I cannot crowd into small space even the most cursory selection of names at which it would be hard for a man of sense to smile a contemptuous smile. From Moses to Paul, the whole Hebrew history and literature is crowded with men of the loftiest genius, who gave all their powers of intellect and heart to religious life and service; and who surely were not the kind of men to build their faith and their hopes upon a foundation which was not laid deep in reason and judgment. And Christian history is bright with other illustrious names, which the world will never allow to die; men of the very first order of intellect and the highest type of character

who gave themselves without reserve to theological study, with an unflinching conviction of the possession of the certain truths of God. Was Augustine an intellectual weakling, likely to be deceived by old wives' fables of childish invention? If you think so, study his *De Civitate Dei*, in which are stored up the results of the ripe reflection of a mind second perhaps to none in the whole history of human thought. Was John Calvin a mental infant, quieted by the cheap nostrums of religious quacks? If you think so, study his "Institutes," and if you can master his mighty system you will certainly have your senses exercised by reason of use, and will be able to distinguish between a "fool" and a genius of the very first order. Was Bishop Butler an ignorant blunderer, embracing mad superstitions out of sheer blindness of intellect? If you think so, study his immortal "Analogy," and if you can appreciate the unanswerable demonstration which silences all reply you will find the invincible logic as finely illustrated as your rational curiosity could well desire. Was Dr. Thos. Chalmers an incompetent driveller, helpless in the art of just thinking before the high problems of thought and destiny? If you think so, study his "Ecclesiastical Economics," and caught by the tide and sweep of his argument you may discover that the "great Scot" has a just place among the very first of the sons of men.

I have recalled these mighty names, that you may imagine Augustine and Calvin and Butler and Chalmers seated there, and Spencer and Arnold and Stephen and Veblen seated here, smiling contemptuous, condescending smiles into the faces of these heroes of faith and character, because, forsooth they are guilty of the sin of believing heartily in certain great spiritual verities, as the result of profound investigation and experience; and I want your verdict as to whether these lordly smiles are not thus somewhat overpassing the tolerance of allowable procedure?

III. I close by remarking third and last, this condescension is misplaced, because the methods of theological science are the same with the methods employed by all the

other sciences or departments of human knowledge. No particular science can claim a monopoly of the scientific method, which is employed by all the sciences as the instrument through which knowledge is ascertained and verified. The scientific method is not peculiar to chemistry or physics, or to economics or history, but wherever logical and rational processes are used in establishing facts and in drawing the necessary influences from those facts, then the scientific method is employed and stands voucher for the results. And in the various theological sciences, the scientific processes have their first illustrations. Where have the laws of evidence, graduating the amount of credence to be attached to testimony, received more careful statement than from the vast array of noble apologists, who have built up the proofs of the supernatural origin of Christ's religion? Where have the laws of rational interpretation had more crystalline statement than in the noble literature of Biblee exegesis and theology? Where have the principles of the inductive logic had more luminous examples, than in the sphere of systematic theology itself, where some master mind has gathered a wide range of facts, from every part of Scripture, and has focused them in some great doctrinal generalization of the Atonement, the Trinity, the Divinity of Jesus Christ. There is nothing which chemistry or physics can claim as making them scientific, which Apologetics, Biblical Theology, or Biblical History can not claim in exactly the same sense as making them scientific. The physical scientists employ the laboratory method, as if it were peculiar to them. Why, it is the latest and best educational doctrine that no subject is to be taught except through the laboratory method. The essence of the laboratory method is that the student handles for himself the material of the science, as in chemistry, the student takes water separates it into hydrogen and oxygen and puts them together to make water. But how can a scholar study Latin, Greek or Hebrew without handling the very makeup of this branch of linguistic science. In no reputable University of the day is history

or literature taught except by the laboratory method. The student trained to accept the statement of a text book has to examine the sources for himself, and to draw his own conclusions therefrom. And theology for generations has been taught in this way, the student being led to handle for himself the Word of God and by the activity of his mind and heart made to get out of it the doctrines that it teaches ; and there is no Theological Seminary in our land that is not a laboratory as truly as any chemical or physical workshop in the world. The physical scientists made much of the tests by which physical doctrine can be verified. But the verifiability of Christ's religion is equally in evidence. No physical test can be deemed more scientific than the tests to which our Lord consents to submit his claims. He demands that his claims be put to the test, and multitudes of men have tried him and his claims and found them to stand every test. And this vast host of witnesses who have tried the Son of God, and found him to stand every strain which life's experience may bring can not be "whistled down the wind," by the sneers of those who have never put him to these same tests. These gentlemen, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Veblen, by their own confession stand outside of the circle of Christ's religion; they have never tried him, what therefore is their negative testimony worth? Let me illustrate: In the county in which I live there is a bridge of solid rock, which spans a great chasm at a height of hundreds of feet. No human hand ever built it; and underneath its arch of stone, there are cunning lines which no human hand ever drew. I have seen these things: a man says he never has, he does not believe they are there. I bring him the evidence of Thomas Jefferson in his notes on Virginia, who testifies to these things of his personal knowledge. I bring him the evidence of George Washington, whose published letters tell us that he saw these very sights one hundred and fifty years ago. The man still says he has never been there ; he does not propose to go, but that he does not believe that these

things could be seen. I bring him the evidence of the distinguished President of Washington and Lee University ; of the accomplished Superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute. I bring him the evidence of scores and scores of lawyers and bankers, and merchants and farmers, whose word would carry conviction in any court of justice. He still shakes his stubborn head. Now, would I not be a fool if I were disturbed about the mental attitude of this miracle of obstinate obtuseness ? Would it not be the part of wisdom for me to say : I have the evidence of my own senses, the confirming testimony of scores and hundreds and thousands of observers, and your unbelief, is to me matter of as much indifference as the buzzing of a remote and an unheard insect. Sometimes the complacent and lordly condescension of gentlemen of the stripe of Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Veblen and others of that ilk, ripples the serenity of our self-possession and the composure of our buttressed faith ; but in Tennyson's simple phrase we may "be dowered with the scorn of scorn," and we may smile back upon them, while we say, "Gentlemen, we are sorry for you. May the Lord have mercy on you."

There is one impregnable argument which the sneers and scorn of gain-sayers can never disturb, and that is the conscious experience of the saving power of this "Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God." Surrender your life fully to the sway of the forces with which the Spirit of Christ clothes this Gospel, and doubt will be as powerless in disabling you, as storms of sinful passion will ever be to beat into foam that "sea of glass mingled with fire," which mirrors the majesty and stability of the everlasting throne.

Lexington, Va.

THORNTON C. WHALINC.

## EDITORIAL.

### THE GREAT RELIGIOUS ASSEMBLIES.

#### THE ECUMENICAL CONFERENCE.

It was a never-to-be-forgotten sight, a source of inspiration for years to come, the gathering of the delegates and the missionaries and believers in the Kingdom of Christ, in Carnegie Hall. The Conference met at half-past 2 o'clock Saturday, April 21st. Every seat in the auditorium was filled. Three immense galleries were packed to overflowing. On the platform were several hundred foreign missionaries. One hundred and four missionary societies were represented. Dr. Judson Smith, of Boston, called the meeting to order, and asked that the Conference sing "Coronation." A volume of joyous praise rose and swelled, filling every part of the building. After the prayer by Dr. Mabie, of Boston, a little man stepped forward and was instantly recognized by a majority of the delegates. His hair and beard are almost white now. He has occupied the highest political position in the world. He still occupies the highest ecclesiastical position. He is a Presbyterian elder. Ex-President Harrison seemed to have grasped the full significance of the occasion. He said, "I count it a great honor, a call to preside over the deliberations of this great body. It is to associate one's self with the most influential and enduring work that is being done in this day of great enterprise." His whole address was pitched upon this plane. He spoke of the "unsurpassed steadfastness and heroism" of the missionaries. He declared that the greatest need of the foreign field is a "revived, reconsecrated and unified home church," that all the inventions of this strenuous generation are "worthy only as they contribute to the regeneration of mankind." He made a plea that the great nations who had combined to suppress the slave trade should combine now to suppress the liquor trade in heathen lands. Perhaps the finest passage in his brief address was



the following: "The natural man loves to be ministered unto. He buys slaves that they may fan him to sleep, bring him the jeweled cup, dance before him, and die in the arena for his sport. Into such a world there came a king not to be ministered unto but to minister. The rough winds fanned his sleep. He drank of the mountain brook. He would not use his power to stay his own hunger but had compassion on the multitude. He entered the bloody arena alone and dying broke all chains and brought life and immortality to light." Dr. Judson Smith made an address of welcome to the delegates. He was followed by the Rev. R. Wardlaw Thompson, who spoke for the British delegation. Dr. Schreiber, who represented the German delegation, and Dr. Joseph Chamberlain, who is both an M. D. and D. D., representing the gospel of bodily and spiritual healing, who spoke for the missionaries. The Secretary's report was read by Mr. Robert D. Spear, and it disclosed the fact that there were 1,666 delegates and 750 missionaries present. On Saturday night Carnegie Hall was packed again, the standing spaces becoming so choked that it became necessary to close the entrances. On the platform were Bishop Thoburn, Controller Coler, President Seth Low, Dr. C. C. Hall, President of Union Seminary; Admiral Philip, Dr. W. R. Huntington, Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, Dr. Howard Duffield, Dr. Arthur J. Brown, Bishop Henry C. Potter, President McKinley, ex-President Harrison, Governor Roosevelt, William E. Dodge, Cornelius N. Bliss and others whose names are well known. Mr. Maurice K. Jesup made the opening address after Bishop Potter had offered the prayer. President McKinley was greeted with applause as he arose to speak. Mr. McKinley was followed by Governor Roosevelt.

On Monday morning the session began promptly at 10 o'clock. Dr. A. H. Strong made the kind of address that one would expect from his name and fame. He declared that the authority for foreign missions and the purpose of foreign missions were Christ. The address was excellent though anti-climatic. The Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, founder

of the China Inland Mission, received an ovation. The story of the success of this great enterprise is one of the marvels of Christian missions. In November, 1886, they prayed that a hundred missionaries might be sent out by the English board and they asked God for 10,000 pounds: Eleven thousand pounds came in eleven contributions and more than six hundred missionaries offered to go to the foreign fields.

Next Mr. Robert E. Spear made a stirring talk upon the supreme aim of missions. It is not to reorganize society nor to feed the hungry nor to heal the sick nor even to establish schools as ends in themselves. It is to make Jesus Christ known to the world with a view to the salvation of man.

There was an overflow meeting at the Central Presbyterian Church. Dr. James I. Vance, of Nashville, made an address upon the same general subject of the purpose and authority of missions.

But we would weary the reader with attempting to give even an abstract of the speeches and reports of one day. Nine meetings were held in the afternoon on Monday, each one in the interests of a different country. The Rev. J. W. Davis was one of the speakers at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church on the subject of China. Dr. A. T. Pierson spoke at Carnegie Hall in the afternoon and at night Dr. Eugene Stock, of the Church Missionary Society, gave a review of the century. It was an admirable paper, full of information as well as of encouragement for the future. The Rev. J. S. Dennis, D. D., gave the missionary statistics for the century. Dr. A. T. Pierson spoke again on God's Guiding Providencce. It was striking like everything Dr. Pierson says and writes but it also gave the impression that truth was sacrificed to incisiveness. Dr. J. G. Paton, the venerable missionary of the New Hebrides, spoke also of his work among the cannibals. With his snowy hair he was one of the striking figures of the Conference.

On Monday night there was a clannish gathering of the Presbyterians, a reception being tendered them at the Hotel

Savoy. Ex-President Harrison and Mrs. Harrison were among the honored guests. Dr. Babcock made the prayer of invocation, Dr. C. L. Thompson, Secretary of Home Missions of the Northern Presbyterian Church, made an address of welcome, and Dr. George Robson, of Edinburgh, Scotland, responded on behalf of the visitors. Dr. Robson spoke of the progress toward union of the three Presbyterian bodies in Scotland. The edict of the Synod of Virginia on the woman question must not have been widely read by the members of the conference, for Miss Lilavati Singh, a Hindoo woman in native costume, told of life in India to the great interest of the audience. In view of the edict, we are afraid to say to their edification. Ex-President Harrison made another delightful speech, closing the exercises, and the benediction was pronounced by Dr. Duffield.

The conference apparently has very little patience with the views of the Radical Criticism or any of the modern theories of the Bible. On Tuesday Bishop Thoburn tried to make the archaic distinction between the Bible and Christ. Said Bishop Thoburn, "perhaps too much time has been given to the Bible. The true foundation is Christ. The Revealer is of much greater importance than the revealed." He got his rebuke in short order. Dr. Pierson is not adverse to making a palpable hit himself and in the discussion that followed Bishop Thoburn's paper took occasion to say that it was impossible to impair the integrity of the written word without impairing the integrity of the living Word. The rebuke came not from Dr. Pierson but from the deafening and long continued applause which his terse sentence evoked.

On Tuesday afternoon Woman's Work was the subject of the "sectional meetings" as they are called. We confined our attendance to Carnegie Hall and did not hear, of course, many of the great papers and addresses given elsewhere. The Lord has not made many women whose voices can be heard in Carnegie Hall. The straining effort to be heard is not pleasing and it would have been a decided relief if the addresses had been put to music and sung.

Dr. Chester's address of to-day on "Native Agencies in Evangelistic Work," was delivered in his terse epigrammatic style, and evoked much favorable comment.

The Southern delegation was not without its influence.

Dr. William Ashmore, of China, has a face and a massive head that would attract attention in any assemblage. His address on the future of China showed that he was a far-seeing statesman as well as a successful missionary. He repudiated the idea of the dismemberment of China and said that she was to become one of the mightiest factors in the world's political and industrial future.

Dr. Fox, Secretary of the American Bible Society, told of the poisoning of the two agents of the society in Manila, by the priests, and introduced the survivor, Signor Castelles. He has gone to work again under the protection of the American flag. During all the years of Spanish Catholic occupancy of the Philippines not one word of the Bible was ever translated into the native tongues. Since American occupancy much has been done in the way of giving the Bible to the people. In Porto Rico Bibles are admitted free of duty, and in Cuba forty thousand copies have been distributed.

Speaking of Dr. Fox, we heard Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, and we were exceedingly pleased with his address. He has the gift of expression. It would be a good thing if more of our Southern ministers cultivated the art of saying things well. Not only the elocutionary art but the way of putting things, either in writing or speaking, that pleases and instructs, and also lingers in the memory. I do not mean by this that in virility of thought, in originality and in logical argument, the average Southern minister is not superior to his Northern brother, but he has not learned to say what he has to say as well. Dr. Hall's address was on the Seminary and Missions. He declared it to be the aim of the Divinity School, not to train the few for special service, but to kindle the missionary spirit in every man. The non-missionary pastor does a double wrong. He breaks faith with the men at the front and he occupies a place that might be filled by a fully equipped man.

Dr. W. T. A. Barber, Headmaster of Leys School, England, and formerly a missionary to China, made one of the best addresses of the whole Conference, in our judgment. These Englishmen do things thoroughly. His subject was the "Place of Education in Christian Missions." He contended on the one hand that the "Christian school must stand so high as a giver of knowledge that no secular institution can afford to point the finger of scorn at its equipment or its alumni." On the other hand he said, "The whole atmosphere of the school must be distinctively and unmistakably Christian and spiritual." In our judgment that puts the whole question of Christian education in a nutshell.

Hon. W. T. Harris spoke on the same subject. He is United States Commissioner of Education. The number of men of international prominence connected with this conference and in full sympathy with it is an object lesson of no small import. On one day telegrams of congratulation were received from Lord Aberdeen and from Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India. How far we have come from the days of Carey the Cobbler and his vision of a world's evangelization. Dr. Harris gave many interesting facts in connection with educational work in Alaska and the valued aid it received from the work the missionaries had done. To those who know the inside history of the labors and the trials of that pioneer of Christianity and Presbyterianism in Alaska, Sheldon Jackson, this was a gratifying statement from a government official. Commissioner Harris is getting to be an old man, as his white head indicated, but we trust that he may give many years of service to his country yet.

Dr. John Henry Barrows is an effective extemporaneous speaker. He is the President of Oberlin College. He has traveled in India and gave his testimony to the great work done by the Christian colleges in India. He said that in establishing these colleges, Christianity was building fortresses of stone, not of canvass; it builds for permanence not for a day.

Dr. Chamberlain, of Brazil, took part several times in the discussions. He was unsparing in his exposure of Roman Catholicism as it is in South America and declared that Rome feared the school more than it did the pulpit. Some of the correspondents of the Manhattan newspapers had a good deal to say of the exclusion of Catholic delegates from the convention. Of course the Catholic Church could not afford to recognize such a body as the Ecumenical Conference was. But the Catholic delegates would have heard some plain talk if they had been there.

President James B. Angell, of the University of Michigan, was a conspicuous personage, not only from his strong personality but from the fact that he had been Minister to Turkey, and the Turkish question about the payment due to American citizens for the destruction of missionary property is a burning one at present and may lead to the burning of a little powder before we are through with it. Dr. Angell took the indisputable ground that it was the duty of the government to protect missionaries, as it protected any other citizens and that if the missionaries were ill-treated and their lives threatened and their property destroyed, then any other citizen engaged in mercantile pursuits, for instance, might suffer the same fate. He did not believe that the government had the right to interfere by force, but only by request, when native converts were persecuted.

Dr. Guinness, of London, paid a compliment to our American missionaries for having exposed to the world the horrors of the india-rubber trade on the Congo and the butchery of natives in the collection of revenue. Readers of our church papers will recall the statements published by some of our missionaries. Dr. Guinness declared that since then the barbarites had been stopped.

Dr. Chester had partly the arrangement of the programme for Friday and it was one of the most successful days of the Conference. It was Layman's day. Here are some of the humble laymen who were present: devotional exercises were lead by ex-Governor Northern, of Georgia.

President Seth Low, of the University of New York, called the meeting to order and President Angell presided. John D. Rockefeller and Russell Sage, each able to support several missionaries, Col. J. J. McCook, and others too numerous to mention, were in evidence.

Miss Helen Gould was on the platform but there was no more regular or interested attendant of the entire Conference than this popular and gracious woman whom the Presbyterian Church is proud to number among its devoted adherents. Miss Gould usually occupied a box above and to the right of the platform and we were told was in her place at almost every service.

Mr. Sankey led the singing at the Laymen's meeting, and if his voice has lost some of its old-time power, he is loved and honored for his own sake and for that of his great co-worker, the greatest lay worker of the century, whom we need not name. Ex-mayor Schieren, of Brooklyn, made an address and introduced his friend Dr. Scholl, who told of the Muhlenberg Mission. Ex-Judge Barclay, of Belfast, testified to the value of missionary work in India. He was once a magistrate there. John H. Converse, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, was another horny-handed son of toil who had his humble ideas about missionary work as promotive of commerce—very excellent ideas they were, too. Dr. Chester presided at the Central Presbyterian Church in the afternoon where the most of the overflow meetings were held. Many bright speakers discussed the self-support of missions.

On Tuesday, the last day of the Conference, George F. Pentecost, who is a son of thunder, made a ringing address on the pastor's duty. "Let him execute his commission or surrender it," he shouted, and the audience applauded him to the echo. Greetings were read from the Church Missionary Society. Then after the announcements the vast audience stood and sang as they had sung at the opening service, All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name. A negro, near by, sang with a rapt expression on his black face that we shall not soon forget. Two young Japanese

were whispering excitedly to one another in the seat in front. The great volume of sound rolled to the roof again, "And Crown Him Lord of All." Then a hush fell upon the Assembly. Dr. Paton, looking like some picture of John the Aged by one of the old masters, stretched out his hands in appeal and lifted his voice, growing feeble now, in prayer. It was a fitting close, of a wonderful gathering of God's people.

Ex-President Harrison presided and spoke at the farewell meeting that evening. He was heard again with pleasure and Dr. Behrends introduced the discussion on the lines of church unity. By that time our steamer was far down the Jersey coast and we preferred to have as the last memories of the Ecumenical Conferences the echoes of that noble hymn, that sound of a great multitude, and then the fervent prayer, by the most heroic figure among living missionaries, whose snowy locks tell us that it will not be very long before he joins the innumerable company of the martyrs and the missionaries and the redeemed.

#### THE SOUTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church met at the Central Church of Atlanta at 11 a. m. May 17. The retiring Moderator, J. F. Cannon, D. D., preached the opening sermon. His sermon was just what all who know him expected it to be, a simple, transparent, forceful treatment of a great gospel theme. It was based on Jno. 21:17. His use of that text was to emphasize personal devotion to Christ as the insistent demand of Christ—the one essential mark of discipleship, the necessary condition of communion with Christ and the only efficient aspiration for service.

When the sermon was concluded and our clerk called the roll, it was found that 163 commissioners were ready and eager to vote for Moderator. A motion was made to vote by ballot, without nominations. This was vigorously opposed by some of the brethren, who wished to put the Assembly in possession of certain good points about those



who were supposed to be available Moderator material. A substitute was offered that the Assembly hear nominations. This substitute carried and then the tide of nominating oratory began to flow. Elder Bridewell nominated Judge J. W. Martin, of Arkansas. He commended him for the ability which he possessed to make a good Moderator, and clinched his arguments in his behalf by suggesting that it was time to recognize the Ruling Elder again. The Ruling Elder has been eligible to the office for 14 years, and during all this while the honor has only once been conferred upon him.

Rev. R. C. Reed, D. D., was then put in nomination and the speeches of his friends as well as the size of the vote for him showed the high regard in which he is held.

Dr. Chas. Ghiselin put in nomination Rev. G. W. Finley, of Virginia, making an effective speech in his behalf. Many members availed themselves of the privilege of seconding this nomination, showing the very great love and admiration in which Dr. Finley is held by those who know him best. The first ballot resulted, Judge Martin 73, Dr. Finley 32, and Dr. Reed 57. A second ballot resulted, Judge Martin 89, Dr. Reed 70.

Two temporary clerks were found in the persons of Rev. C. E. Cunningham, D. D., of Mississippi, and Rev. E. C. Murray, D. D., of North Carolina.

A reception was tendered the Assembly Thursday night. The beauty and chivalry of this great capital gathered in the auditorium of the Central church to take the Assembly into its arms, figuratively speaking, and to make all its members and some of their wives feel at home. An address of welcome was delivered by Rev. D. G. Armstrong in behalf of all the Presbyterians of the city. He expressed the pleasure they had in bidding us welcome by telling us of his opinion of Presbyterians generally. He says that Presbyterians are quite respectable people, rather more respectable than most folks. They are not much on numbers but tremendous on avoirdupois. He was followed by Dr. Landrum, of the Baptist church, who spoke words of

welcome in behalf of all Christians of the city who are not Presbyterians. He said that all the outsiders looked on Presbyterians as being rather fine people, and went on to tell us many things about ourselves that we were glad to hear. The Moderator responded in a very happy manner. After the speeches, we were invited below and treated to lemonade with strawberries floating on top. Much pleasant palaver followed, and then we retired to prepare for something more arduous on the morrow.

Greetings were sent to and received from the Northern Assembly, the Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly and the Dutch Reformed Church.

The treasurer's report was an admirable one, made with great care, and his recommendations that the money for the new hymn-book be provided from the sale of the book itself is sound sense. The Assembly is fortunate in its treasurer and stated clerk.

The Hymn-Book Committee made an elaborate report, through the chairman, Dr. Julius W. Walden. The committee worked under the following canons, which seem to us excellent :

1. To retain every old hymn of decided merit.
2. To retain a large number of the best versions of the Psalms.
3. To introduce the best of the modern hymns, giving preference to those that are direct aspirations of praise.
4. To retain the versions found in "Psalms and Hymns."
5. To exclude hymns that are purely didactic, personal, exaggerated and highly wrought in sentiment, sensuous, and all those that have made little or no impression on the mind and heart of the church.
6. To apportion the number of hymns under each subject in such a way that the book may be well balanced.
7. To find for each hymn the tune that best brings out its meaning by having the musical accent fall on the important words, as well as considering general character.
8. To retain every old association of hymn and tune that can be found to exist generally through the church.
9. To use alternate tunes, where the old associated tunes may not be generally acceptable.
10. To use very familiar tunes for hymns for special occasions, as dedications, ordinations, etc.
11. To group hymns under each subject so that several tunes of same

meter will come close together, and to see that at least one tune of each group is a very familiar one.

12. To retain every old tune that is in any way meritorious.
13. To transpose old tunes that are too high for average voices.
14. To provide every hymn with a tune of exactly the same length, so as to avoid meaningless repetitions of words.
15. To index very fully both by scripture text and subject, and in the latter case to make abundant use of cross references, so that all the hymns in any way bearing on any desired subject may be quickly and easily found.

The report closes as follows :

If allowed to express a wish, we would be glad to have the Assembly, in the event our book is substantially approved, to order its publication by the Executive Committee of Publication (as was done by the Assembly of 1866 with the old "Psalms and Hymns") in such a way as shall be judged by said committee most advantageous to the church, and under the editorial supervision of your ad interim committee, the book being subject to such changes as may be necessitated by copyrights or deemed expedient in the light of criticisms.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. W. WALDEN, Chairman.  
 S. L. MORRIS,  
 A. W. MILSTER,  
 R. C. REED,  
 W. L. LOWRANCE,  
 THERON H. RICE,  
 JOHN C. WHITNER, Secretary.

Individual overtures were a subject of discussion. The Moderator decided that individuals had the right to overture the Assembly while the mind of the Assembly was evidently in favor of the discriminating exercise of the undoubted right. The plan was to "discourage rather than to deny," as the Moderator expressed it.

Monday night was given to the cause of colored evangelization. Rev. D. Clay Lilly, secretary, was heard with interest and pleasure, as always. Dr. Rice read a memorial of Rev. O. B. Wilson.

The pastoral letter which was ordered by the last Assembly, and prepared by Rev. R. P. Kerr, D. D., Rev. R. F. Campbell, D. D., and Elder J. B. Ramsay, was read. It takes incontrovertible ground in denying the sin *per se* of the three worldly amusements, the dance, the theatre and the card table, but takes the sensible ground that these

things are evil in their tendency and are to be avoided by Christians for their own sake and the sake of their church.

Tuesday afternoon was given to laying the corner-stone of the North Avenue Church. After the laying of the corner-stone by the Moderator, there was a delightful social occasion, in which dignified commissioners and pretty girls and edible viands and a beautiful lawn figured to the great enjoyment of the commissioners.

The popular meeting in the interest of home missions was held Tuesday night and Dr. Clarke, of Augusta, Ky., Dr. Dodge, of Florida, Elder H. L. Moseley, of Fort Worth, Rev. John F. Loyd, of Indian Territory, and Rev. M. McN. McKay, of Arkansas, advertised the resources and heathenism, the brilliant prospects and the distressing needs of their respective states.

After the home mission report was taken up the next day Rev. Robt. Hill, of Dallas, Tex., made a stirring speech, telling especially of the encouraging work of one of their evangelists. He was almost forbidden to preach in a Texas town by the other churches and the local paper who told him he had better move on, but he insisted that he had been instructed to hold a meeting there, and he held it and organized a church of forty members, several of them having been Presbyterians in disguise in connection with the other churches, raised two-thirds of the salary for a pastor and built a nice church. We hope this evangelist will keep on having meetings. Rev. C. T. Caldwell, of Paris Presbytery, told how, in four years, their ministers had increased from 7 to 17, an evangelist had been appointed, 25 vacant churches had been supplied, and there had been contributions of 300 per cent. to foreign missions. However, it is always easy to make a large showing on the percentage plan if the original amount happens to be very small. Rev. R. N. Smith, the home missionary speaking from every line of his rugged features, stumped down the aisle on his wooden leg and made an effective talk. He gets the munificent salary of \$200 a year. The General Assembly might afford to employ several men at this rate.

The home mission collection taken up last night amounted to \$337, which almost consoled the venerable Secretary for the fact that he was cut off from making his last speech, no, we mean his latest speech, by a too sudden putting of the question. Then the Association prepared to hear the overflow of eloquence with regard to the place of next meeting. Telegrams were read from Little Rock, Ark., from the pastor of Broadway Church, Fort Worth, Tex., from the mayor of the same enterprising city, and a letter from Owensboro, Ky. Nominations being in order, Elder C. A. Bridewell, asked us to go West and stop at Little Rock.

In the afternoon some twenty minutes were wasted in true Presbyterian fashion in the effort to expedite business. A motion was made to limit speeches to five minutes. This was amended to give longer time on important questions. The motion to table the matter was lost. Then the substitute was discussed and lost. Then the original motion was lost and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States found itself in the position of the King of France with twenty thousand men.

In the debate over the place of next meeting Mr. J. W. Mosely, of Texas, addressed the "Convention." He apologized but was unable to forget that he was at a political gathering. Mr. Mosely made a strong speech for the claims of Texas. He said that all the officials from his county were Democrats except one, who simply went and told his neighbors and friends that he had not made his arrangements to do without that office. Texas and Fort Worth had not made their arrangements to do without the Assembly.

Dr. Hawes urged the claims of Owensboro, Ky. But in spite of the speaker's suave manner and pleasant voice the Commissioners were evidently afraid to go to Kentucky. Moderator Martin made a very effective speech for Little Rock, Ark. He propounded a conundrum, asking what the difference was between Massachusetts and Kentucky. The former State is noted for its boots and shoes and the latter for its shoots and booze. The Assembly decided to go to Little Rock by a good majority.

And after this the war! Dr. Finley made the report on Foreign Missions as Chairman of the Standing Committee. The report was unanimous.

Rev. R. S. Brown moved as a substitute for the resolution entrusting all matters such as fixing salaries to the Executive Committee, that the Assembly fix the salary of the Secretary of Foreign Missions at \$2,500 as a maximum. Mr. Brown wanted the Charlotte Assembly to fix it at \$2,000.

Dr. Finley made a clear statement of the reasons that had actuated the standing committee in making the report and incidentally made a smashing hit of the method by which the matter had been brought before the Church. He said that the most significant thing was the silence of the overwhelming majority of the Presbyteries on the subject. Mr. Brown followed in a speech, in which he supported his motion to fix the salary at \$2,500. He attacked the Standing Committee for not inviting Dr. Angus McDonald, the Chairman, before it, instead of sending for Dr. Bachman. Dr. Finley brought him up with a sharp turn by saying that the minutes of the Executive Committee showed that at a meeting, at which he presumed that the Chairman was present, Dr. Bachman was appointed to represent the committee at the Assembly. The vote was taken, with only one speech on record, and that in favor of the substitute, which was lost by a vote of 80 to 60.

The Assembly gave the night session to the popular meeting in the interests of Foreign Missions. Rev. W. C. Buchanan made a brief but exceedingly interesting address on the work in Japan. Dr. Davis followed with an address that presented new and most encouraging facts about the influence of the Bible, which it has already attained in China. Last year, for instance, there were as many as 1,800 copies or separate portions of the word of God circulated in the empire. The great reform movement was begun by the emperor after reading the Scriptures, and though the movement has been stayed for a time, it has

only been delayed. When the empress dowager deposed the emperor, over 1,200 men in Shanghai signed a petition at the risk of their lives, asking that she desist from her projected course ; such has been the influence of the Bible in elevating Chinese character and manhood. Dr. Davis' peroration on the Bible itself was eloquent in the extreme.

After the morning call of Thursday the Assembly took up the unfinished business before the body, which was the exciting topic of the reduction of the Secretary's salary. The question before the house was whether the Assembly should "instruct" the committee to exercise all possible economy, or whether it should say that it "trusted" to it to do so. But the "instructing" brethren changed their ground and Major Hardy offered a substitute referring the whole matter to the Executive Committee, and asking them to re-open the question of the salary and consider it carefully in the light of what has been said about it. Then Rev. Lee Richardson offered a substitute calling for a standing rule of the Assembly to the effect that all salaries should be fixed by the Assembly upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Mr. Richardson offered his resolution in the interest of the present decision of the Foreign Mission Committee with reference to Dr. Chester's salary but it was not generally understood in that way. The fatal objection to it is that it relieves the committee of responsibility that ought to belong to it, and gives the easy temptation to a committee to recommend what it would not pass.

Dr. Rice took the floor in behalf of the report of the Standing Committee and pressed for a vote of confidence in the Executive Committee. He gave the facts with regard to the management of the work which have never been controverted. He gave also some facts of a delicate nature with regard to the need. One of the remarkable things about the debate was that there was never a word said in criticism of Dr. Chester's administration, and only one attempt to depreciate the value of his services to the church.

Dr. Rice yielded the floor to Dr. Davis. We may perhaps be prejudiced but it was difficult to see how the Assembly would be willing to administer even an implied rebuke to Dr. Chester in the face of Dr. Davis's testimony to the entire satisfaction with which the missionary workers, 160 of them, regarded his administration. He spoke of the human nature that exists even in missionaries, and of the various problems of the foreign field, the whole burden of which came upon the Secretary's mind and heart. He gave an instance of his efficiency in his correspondence with the King of the Belgians, with regard to the massacre of the natives by the agents of the Congo Free State, according to the testimony of our own missionaries, and that the abominable outrages had been stopped. He spoke of the delicate work of determining the fitness of applicants for the foreign field. He gave a clear insight into the question from the foreign mission standpoint.

Rev. R. C. Anderson spoke to the point of getting the Assembly to fix the salaries at every meeting of the Assembly. We suggest that this would give the opportunity for personal enemies to attack the secretaries on this point, when they would be afraid to attack them for inefficient conduct of the work.

Rev. George Patterson made a most effective address in behalf of the Executive Committee of which he was the only member elected to the Assembly. He told one incident which we shall re-tell. When the missionaries contributed a part of their salaries to avert the necessity of retrenchment, and made a foundation for an appeal to the church, Dr. Chester, without the knowledge of the church made a corresponding reduction in his own salary for the same purpose. The afternoon session found the Assembly rather impatient to prolong the discussion any longer. The question was finally called, giving Dr. Finley as the chairman of the committee the right to the closing speech. Dr. Finley took a high stand for right and truth and justice. He brought out the fact that a careful and conscientious committee had studied the questions at issue for days and



had come to a unanimous conclusion and that no new facts had been brought out in the debate. He said that while a fund had been set aside for the traveling expenses of the Secretary, his zeal was so great that he spent beyond the sum, out of his own pocket, as much as the addition to his salary which had been made. It ought to be known that Dr. Chester speaks to some church of our Assembly three Sundays out of four.

Dr. Finley stated that his committee had been confronted with the fact that this was the most prosperous year in all the history of the work and he asked with telling effect, Why interfere with the management of a work which has been so signally blessed of God under the same management in the past? Dr. Finley's reference to the action of the Charlotte Assembly was a keen thrust. He said that evidently one of the other side had changed his opinion of the Secretary's worth since the Charlotte Assembly because he was the author of a motion to fix the salary at \$2,000, and now urged that it should be \$2,500.

The question was then put on Mr. Richardson's motion and was lost by the close vote of 76 to 74. Then Major Hardy got the floor. He made a very adroit speech appealing to the minority to yield the small point that they made. The majority was, he declared, a large one, and entitled to consideration. His substitute only contemplated the reference of the matter to the Executive Committee and he thought that every one would be perfectly satisfied if this substitute were adopted. He made an eloquent appeal for harmony and the way to secure it was for all to vote for this resolution. No one replied to this and his resolution was adopted by a vote of 90 to 60.

We do not suppose that anybody in the Assembly was left in doubt as to the real purport of Major Hardy's motion when the question came up of the appointment of the next Executive Committee. Judge Ewing took the floor and moved that instead of the committee of last year, some names should be substituted. He mentioned those whom

he wanted left off, and they were Dr. Hemphill, Dr. Cecil and Dr. Bachman. They are pretty well-known men. There is hardly an abler trio in the Southern Church. He moved that the names of Rev. A. L. Philipps, D. D., Rev. J. S. Foster, Rev. W. S. Jacobs and R. E. Douglas be substituted. Judge Ewing said that the reason for the substitution of the names was to save expense of the conveyance of the brethren mentioned to Nashville. He mentioned the fact that Major Hardy had been left off the committee because he lived too far from Nashville, in Birmingham. He mentioned also that Mr. Foster and Mr. Street had been left off the committee for other reasons. One of Dr. Philipps's members stated that it would be fatal to change the committee in the way indicated. We are sure that Dr. Philipps was not a party to this measure. Rev. R. C. Anderson spoke for Mr. Jacobs and said that he would positively decline to serve. Mr. Foster has since published his ignorance of the proposed measure. Then the Assembly voted on the question and almost unanimously defeated Judge Ewing's motion.

After the adoption of the report as a whole, as amended, the Assembly listened to a fine presentation of the Bible cause by Dr. John Fox, of the Bible Society, which we wish we could give to the reader.

Then Dr. Chester came in and was given the privilege of the floor. It was a critical moment in his career, which the Church has watched with so much pride and affection since he came to belong to us all. He trode difficult ground with a firm step. If he had given way to an expression of resentment he would have rallied around him all his friends and made them perhaps more devoted, but he would also have deepened the feeling of hostility on the part of the few. He showed himself the man by the spirit and tone of his address.

We hope that the Church will rally to the cause and see that no hurt comes to it from this clamor. We appeal to those in the Church who opposed the action of the Execu-

tive Committee under the impression that was first made upon some of the Presbyteries by the circular that was the origin of the trouble, to reconsider their opinions in the light of the facts. Many of the best people have been misled by the persistency of the attacks to imagine that there was something wrong. There is nothing. As we understand it, the salary of \$3 000 has been paid in the past and there was no objection. All the facts that have been published as to the economy of administration stand unchallenged. It costs less than six cents on the dollar to pay all the office force and all the office expenses. If the people raise what they ought to, it will cost a smaller amount still. Dr. Chester has set the example of surrendering \$500, which would have surely been awarded him again, for the sake of the cause. He deserves all the confidence and support that can be extended him.

The next important matter was the Hymn-book. The special committee to which the report of the Hymn-book Committee was referred made a unanimous report.

They recommended that the book be substantially approved by the Assembly and turned over to the Executive Committee of Publication for publication with such changes as the law of copyright should require. That the publication be delayed until after the fall meeting of the Presbyteries and that criticisms be invited from the Presbyteries and individuals during the period of delay. Dr. Blackburn moved that the lists be sent down to the Presbyteries and that the committee report on the action of the Presbyteries to the next Assembly.

Dr. Walden was given the privilege of the floor and gave in great detail the principles that had guided the committee, the work that had been done and the results accomplished. Without embarrassing the Committee of Publication by a detailed statement, he said that 75 cents a copy, for the hymns and tunes, would cover all the cost of publication. whether the Publication Committee chose to buy the copyrights of the new hymns, amounting to a sum between \$1,800 and \$2,500, or whether the Century Company

published the book and laid it down at Richmond with the imprimatur of the Publication Committee upon it, to be sold by them at a reasonable profit for 75 cents a copy.

Dr. Cannon contended that the book should be taken out of the hands of its parents who were evidently too partial to it. He made a strong speech. But when a good and earnest brother, whom we always heard with pleasure, Elder Leland, suggested that one hymn be left out because it was written by a Unitarian, "Nearer, My God, to Thee," the Assembly began to see what might be expected from the postponement plan.

Dr. Ghiselin made a strong speech of a few words on the importance of the songs of a people and argued that as they had a greater influence than its laws, we should be as careful about adopting a hymn-book as a book of Church Order.

There was undoubtedly much weight in this view of the matter, except for the fact that already and for two years streams of suggestions and hundreds of lists of hymns have been flowing in upon the committee. Aside from this, the excellence of the book is so marked that we are sure it will at once commend itself to the Church.

So Dr. Cannon's motion was voted down. Then Dr. Blackburn's original motion was voted down, and as he had come to an agreement with the Hymn-book Committee he offered a compromise resolution postponing the publication of the book to the 1st of January. The committee had in the meantime fixed upon the 1st of December as the date and the controversy had narrowed down to the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. Dr. Blackburn's motion was then adopted by a small majority and then by the motion of the members of the committee, unanimously.

This is the report that was unanimously adopted :

*Resolved*, 1. That the list of hymns and tunes prepared by the Committee on the Hymn-Book be substantially approved.

That this list be referred to the Presbyteries with the

view of having the whole matter sent to the Sessions for criticism and advice.

That the Presbyteries be directed to appoint committees to receive the suggestions of the Sessions, tabulate them, and forward the same to the *ad interim* Committee on the Hymn-Book not later than January 1st, 1901.

2. That the Executive Committee of Publication be directed to publish the book in such a way as shall be in the judgment of the committee most advantageous to the Church, and under the editorial supervision of our present *ad interim* Committee, the same being subject to such changes as may be necessitated by copyright or deemed expedient in the light of criticisms and suggestions and that the publication be delayed until January 1st, 1901.

Thus the question of having a hymn-book and of having substantially the one which is now before the Church is settled and, we think, settled wisely and well.

The report of the Sunday-school Committee was earnestly debated on the question of appointing a "rally day." The word "rally" was left out and the day, rather indefinitely described, was recommended. It is the intention that the children who do not go to Sunday-school be brought in on that day and that money for Sunday-school purposes be contributed. Then the debate grew warm over the appointment of a Sunday-school Secretary who should have the additional responsibility of looking after the Young People's Societies also. It was finally decided to send the question down to the Presbyteries for instruction. There is a magnificent work done by our Northern brethren who have adopted this plan and we hope that it can be carried out. But the Secretary will have enough to do without meddling with or originating Young People's Societies.

Rev. E. C. Murray, D. D., made a clear, strong speech for the need of some system of Bible study in the Sunday-schools different from the International Lesson. The matter was brought up by overture in the direction of a graded system by the conservative Presbytery of Winchester. The

overture was adopted and a committee appointed to report on the matter to the next Assembly.

The Committee on Colored Evangelization made an encouraging report. There has been an increase of \$1,000 in the contributions and there is some activity on the part of churches to establish Sunday-schools among the colored people. Stillman Institute is in an encouraging condition and the last wish of Rev. O. B. Wilson, to whose death there was touching allusion, was that the facilities at Stillman Institute might be enlarged so as to accommodate 250 pupils. Some interesting remarks were made on individual work among the colored people and Dr. Rice, whose church is already doing much in that direction, was appointed chairman of a committee to investigate what is being done by other denominations and report to the next Assembly.

After the adoption of the report of the Publication Committee the Assembly proceeded to the consideration of the Twentieth Century Fund of a million dollars.

Dr. Cannon read the overture from Louisville Presbytery and followed with a second overture signed by the most prominent men in the Church, such as W. W. Moore, L. H. Blanton, James I. Vance, W. R. Dobyons, C. E. Graham, A. B. Curry, Russel Cecil, Thos. C. Johnson, J. R. Hower-ton, Henry W. McLaughlin, T. R. Sampson, George Summey, Robert Price, Theron H. Rice, A. T. Graham, C. R. Hemphill, W. N. Scott.

The overture recommended that a million dollars be raised by the Church in the next five years, one-tenth of which was to go to Foreign Missions, one-tenth to Home Missions and the remainder for the equipment of schools, colleges and theological seminaries. That the Assembly appoint a committee with one minister and one ruling elder or deacon from each Synod who shall report to the Assembly during the five years. Another project was tacked on, the relieving individual congregations of debt, the sums raised under the encouragement of the Committee to be reported by the Committee, though not included in the fund.

The Committee on Bills and Overtures wisely stripped the overture of all the features mentioned except the plan of permanent endowment for schools and colleges and seminaries. By unanimous consent Dr. Chester, who favored the overture, got inserted a provision for some endowment of schools and colleges in the foreign field. The money is to be divided according to the wish of the donors and, when it is given to the general cause, according to the discretion of the Committee.

There seemed to be very little interest in the measure until Dr Reed took the floor and conditionally opposed it. He said that he had great respect for the character of the men who favored it and hoped that the institution of which he is professor would reap some benefit from it, if it succeeded; but that he had waited in vain to hear any good reason for the plan or for its possible success. He referred to the comparative failure of the plan proposed to the Assembly last year by the Presbytery of Enoree and adopted by the Assembly to raise as much as \$200,000 for foreign missions. He thought that it would be impossible to secure the immense sum asked for and he hated to think of the depressing effects of failure. Then such a scheme would be bound to result in an interference with the other causes of the Church. He was not like the old Scotchman who was open to conviction but who would have liked to see any one that could convict him. He was ready to receive any light that could be thrown upon the subject.

This brought Dr. Cannon to his feet in a speech which the *Atlanta Constitution* declared to be "in logic, power and appeal, the distinct feature of the Assembly." It was a plea for the necessity of Christian education. He stated that so far from the task being impossible it was easily within our reach. The Canadian Church, about the size of ours, has already raised about \$900,000 of its million-dollar fund. He stated that there were already plans on foot in the Southern Church for raising \$750,000, including the \$50,000 in Charlotte. That this would give additional impetus to those plans as well as stimulate the people to

raise the remaining amount. He said that it would not interfere with the general work because the money was not to be raised by the ordinary channels, but by appeals to individual liberality. Dr. Cannon left very little to be said and when Dr. Reed came forward to speak again he declared that his objections had been removed. He had thought that the object of the fund was Christian Education in the abstract. But this was concrete and practical. If therefore no voice should be lifted against it but his own, it would be unanimously passed. It was unanimously passed and with an enthusiasm that we trust can be communicated to the entire Church.

The Assembly took recess for ten minutes while the representatives from the different Synods got together and nominated the million dollar fund committee. This is the committee:

Synod of Georgia—Rev. Theron H. Rice, D. D., Atlanta; Samuel P. Inman, Atlanta.

Synod of Texas—Rev. W. N. Scott, D. D., Galveston; A. F. Hardie, Dallas.

Synod of Virginia—Rev. R. P. Kerr, D. D., Richmond; George E. Cas-  
kie, Lynchburg.

Synod of Arkansas—Rev. Samuel G. Miller, Little Rock; James P. Coffin, Batesville.

Synod of Florida—Rev. W. H. Dodge, D. D., Jacksonville; William Fisher, Pensacola.

Synod of Kentucky—Rev. L. H. Blanton, D. D., Richmond; A. J. Alexander, Versailles.

Synod of Missouri—Rev. J. F. Cannon, D. D., St. Louis; T. S. McPheeters, St. Louis.

Synod of Memphis—Rev. N. M. Woods, D. D., Memphis, Tenn.; J. M. Boone, Corinth, Miss.

Synod of Mississippi—Rev. W. McF. Alexander, D. D., New Orleans; C. H. Alexander, Jackson.

Synod of Nashville—Rev. George Summey, D. D., Clarksville, Tenn.; John H. Eakin, Nashville.

Synod of North Carolina—Rev. J. W. Staggs, D. D., Charlotte; George W. Watts, Durham.

Synod of South Carolina—Rev. W. G. Neville, Yorkville; C. E. Graham, Greenville.

Synod of Alabama—Rev. Russell Cecil, Selma; J. W. Larsley, An-  
niston.

Chairman, Rev. W. W. Moore, D. D.; Vice-Chairman, Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D.



Just the odds and ends were picked up on Saturday, the last day. The Presbytery of Norfolk asked that a detailed account of expenses be published by the executive committees in the church papers. The request was granted mainly in order that no discrimination should appear to be shown against the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions. The overture of the Presbytery of Nashville, asking that the Assembly fix the salaries of the officials of the executive committee, was taken from the docket. Rev. R. C. Anderson, from this Presbytery, explained that the overture did not contemplate any reduction of the salaries, but only the avoidance of such agitation as we have had. Dr. Finley reminded the Assembly that in order to accomplish the action requested, it would require the repeal of the acts of former Assemblies and the change in the manuals of all the committees. The overture was unanimously answered in the negative.

The Assembly answered in the negative some individual overtures as to a change in the Confessional statement with regard to elect infants. It said, "The language of the Confession can not, by any fair interpretation be construed as teaching that any of those who die in infancy are lost."

Dr. Lupton proposed that this action of the Assembly be printed as a foot-note in the copies of the Confession hereafter to be published. This was unanimously carried and the owners of the Confession may as well add the foot-note now with pen and ink, closing with the words, "By order of the General Assembly, 1900." This may stop the old slander as to our belief in the damnation of infants. Just before adjournment an interesting constitutional question was raised. The last Assembly declared that in the case contemplated in paragraph 55 of the Book, a Moderator of a Church Court may call a meeting of the court without the concurrence of others, as contemplated in paragraph 79. The Presbytery of Enoree asked that this action be repealed. The Bills and Overtures Committee answered the request in the negative. Dr. Cannon and Dr. Finley distinguished between the regular meeting whose time had to

be changed by an extraordinary emergency (the emergencies are generally the quarantine regulations, the yellow fever epidemic and the Mississippi floods) and the *pro re nata* meetings of paragraph 79. Judge Martin took the floor and argued that the Moderator was instructed how to call a meeting in paragraph 79, in the emergency mentioned in paragraph 75, namely, with the concurrence of the ministers and elders referred to there. But the ecclesiastical lawyers were too much for him, and when Dr. Murray came to the rescue with an amendment the case was decided.

Dr. Cannon offered the resolution of thanks and the Assembly adjourned.

#### THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

The Northern General Assembly met in St. Louis and was called to order by the retiring Moderator, Dr. R. O. Sample.

The opening sermon by the retiring moderator was on the text: "Speak unto the Children of Israel that they go forward." It covered the face of the earth, as the waters cover the great deep. The speaker was indistinct, so that many could not hear. While wanting in many secondary qualifications of a preacher, however, it was evident that he possessed the first and greatest—the grace of God in his own heart, giving him a genuine earnestness.

Three men were placed in nomination for moderator: Dr. Dickey, of Philadelphia, Dr. McKibben, of Cincinnati, and Dr. Fisher, President of Hanover College. Dr. Fisher's name was withdrawn after the first vote, and Dr. Dickey was elected on the second. His fairness, readiness, firmness and kindness as Moderator abundantly demonstrated the wisdom of the choice.

One matter in which no little interest was manifest from the start was the election of a Permanent Clerk. This is a rather desirable position, as a neat little salary is paid for a small amount of work. The matter was referred to a committee, much to the dismay of friends of some of the

candidates, who had been working for three weeks on the extempore speeches which they were to make unexpectedly on the occasion. The committee modified their disappointment a little bit by recommending that seven candidates be allowed to come before the Assembly and that a few minutes be allowed to each for his friends to tell of his peculiar claims to the place. The geographical argument was used with telling effect in behalf of Dr. Noble, of California, who was elected on the third ballot.

On the revision question it was developed that thirty-seven Presbyteries had overtured the Assembly on the subject, eight asking for revision, one for a declaratory statement, nineteen for a new and shorter creed, and nine for the appointment of a committee to consider the subject. The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported that this seemed to demand some action without in any way defining the action to be taken. So it recommended the appointment of an *ad interim* committee to consider the whole question of revision and report to the next Assembly, and the Presbyteries are asked to say at their fall meetings, whether they want any revision at all and what they want if they do. The committee is formed of nine ministers and seven ruling elders, the Moderator having been added by a vote of the Assembly. This is not a Revision Committee. It is simply a committee to find out whether the church wants to revise and in what particulars. The moderator announced the committee as follows: Drs. Herrick Johnson, S. J. Niccolls, D. W. Fisher, William McKibben, Geo. B. Stewart, S. W. Dana, S. P. Sprecker, Benj. W. Warfield and Elders Benjamin Harrison, (ex-President) Daniel R. Noyes, E. W. C. Humphrey, Wm. R. Crabbe, John E. Parsons, Elisha Frazer and Justice John M. Harlan.

After calmly waiting for the Judicial Committee to find his case against the Presbytery of New York, in the McGiffert matter, in order, Dr. Birch withdrew it, much to the relief of the Assembly. The effectiveness of Dr. Birch in having saved the Church a heresy trial by threatening one ought to be commemorated in the unyielding granite.

The case of the Jew, Wartzawiack, was simply dropped by the Assembly. He was a member of Dr. Hall's Fifth Avenue Church, was suspended by the Session, it is said against the strong protest of Dr. Hall, had his case reviewed by the Presbytery, was restored by the Session, and on some technicality the case was appealed to the General Assembly. Dr. McKibben, for the Judicial Committee, reported that in view of the complicated testimony the Assembly decline to express an opinion. This is proof positive that the Assembly is too big. Whenever the rights of the humblest member of the Church, whether prosecutor or prosecuted, cannot be even considered by the Supreme Court of Presbyterianism it is time for a change of machinery. Let us have a Northern Assembly, a Southern Assembly, a Western Assembly, a Pacific Assembly, and a Canadian Assembly, with territorial lines and local self-government, and then a grand American Presbyterian Council.

The Assembly has never elected an elder to the Moderatorship, but it made Mr. John H. Converse, of Philadelphia, Vice-Moderator and he occupied the chair several times.

The Northern Assembly had their small question up too. The Peoria Overture was said to be aimed at the Stated Clerk, Dr. Roberts, and is calculated to send a Philadelphia lawyer to an insane asylum, by its complexity. It was said that Dr. Roberts exercised too much power in the suggestion of appointments for the various committees. So it was ordered that the commissioners themselves instead of the moderator appoint the committees. The Assembly is divided into election districts, each district electing ministers and elders for certain committees for certain years.

The fact was brought out in discussing Home Missions that California is the only State in the Union or in the world where church property is taxed. A motion was passed to request release from that burden.

Above all things else, it was a Missionary Assembly; not

the Peoria overture, nor the question of revision, nor the election of a clerk, was so prominent as Foreign Missions. Besides the report of the committee and discussion following, there was a two-days Missionary meeting before the Assembly began, a popular meeting in the Washington and Compton Avenue Church on Wednesday night, and a tremendous meeting in the large Odeon Hall on Thursday night. It was presided over by Governor Mount, of Indiana, and addresses were made by him, the Moderator, Dr. Niccolls, Vice-Moderator Converse and Dr. Pentecost. Foreign Missions was in the air.

We rejoice to know that the great causes of this great church are all prospering, every board is out of debt, and a great impetus seems to have been given by the Assembly to the work of the Lord, at home and abroad. We pray God's richest blessing upon it during the coming year.

#### THE CANADIAN ASSEMBLY.

The 26th General Assembly of the Canadian Presbyterian Church met in Halifax, June 14th, in St. Matthew's Church. Dr. Campbell, the retiring Moderator, preached an able sermon from the 5th verse of the 46th Psalm, "God is in the midst of her she shall not be moved." The sermon was a review of the religious history of the century.

Principal Pollock was nominated for the Moderatorship and unanimously elected. One of the interesting ceremonies was the presentation of the pen used by the Moderators of the uniting churches in the union of 1875, Dr. McGregor, Dr. Snodgrass, Principal Caven and Principal Grant. This is the 25th anniversary of the union of these churches, a sort of silver wedding.

Dr. Torrance presented the following statistics: There are 2,942 pastoral churches, with a membership of 210 776, and about 10,118 were received last year on profession of faith. The total revenue of the church amounts to \$2,384,-897, an increase of \$114,241.

There are 37 ordained missionaries in charge of the congregations of the Home Mission field, Eastern Division.

Two catechists are employed during the winter and 41 during the summer, and \$14,000 were contributed to the Eastern Division, and \$81,000 to the Western Division.

The work of the West has excited the admiration of Presbyterians everywhere. In 25 years the number of ministers has increased from 8 to 238, the number of communicants from 432 to 24,035 and the contributions from \$5,421 to \$339,125. In these 25 years the Western section has contributed \$1,500,000 for Home Missions.

The Foreign Mission work is also prospering. The sum of \$175,000 was contributed this year, and expended in the mission fields in the New Hebrides, Trinidad, Demerara and Korea; in the Northwest among the Indians, in Japan, China, Central India and among the British Columbia Indians and Chinese.

The reports of the colleges, Halifax, Montreal, Knox and Manitoba, show progress in every department, except that there is a decrease in the attendance of first year students. Morin College, Quebec, has suspended operations, and a special committee was appointed by the Assembly to watch the interests of the Assembly in the disposal of the endowment fund. The matter of the century fund aroused great interest. Dr. Warden reported that \$760,000 of the million dollar fund had been subscribed. Dr. Campbell expressed his opinion that the fund would reach \$1,500,000.

The report of the Young People's Society showed a decrease in membership. Among the causes of decline were noted "amusements rather than study," "too many meetings," "cards and dancing."

Rev. W. S. McTavish emphasized the fact that the church is better and stronger to-day because of the enthusiasm of the young people.

Sabbath services were held in St. Matthew's Church, conducted by Rev. A. B. Winchester and Rev. John Neil, and the communion was celebrated on Sunday afternoon.

It is interesting to note the similarity between the Southern and Canadian Presbyterian Churches in the num-

ber of members, amount of contributions to the Home and Foreign field, the interest in Christian education, the homogeneity of the body, the harmony and peace which prevail throughout both churches in matters of doctrine and quality.

The Southern Church has received some valuable members from the Canadian, and asks God's richest blessing upon all its work.

#### CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Assembly held its seventieth session at Chattanooga, Tenn. Home and Foreign Mission work are both flourishing. An overture was sent down to the Presbyteries as to limiting the period of years for service by elders and deacons, the rotary system of the Northern Church.

It is interesting to note that the Church which seceded on account of Presbyterian insistence on an educated ministry, should have devoted a considerable part of the sessions to a discussion of its educational policy. It was resolved to raise a million dollar fund for the endowment of educational institutions. A small heresy debate was had in the effort which failed to discipline Rev. R. V. Foster, D. D., of the Theological Seminary, for a book he has published.

#### METHODIST.

The General Methodist Conference (Northern) met in quadrennial convention the middle of May. For the first time laymen had equal representation with the ministers. Dr. Hoss, of Nashville, delivered a fraternal address of greeting from the Southern Methodist Church, but there was little encouragement from either side to organic union.

The principal business transacted affected the organic law of the Church. Women were admitted to the Conference by changing "layman" to lay member. Dr. Buckley, probably the ablest living Methodist, opposed this as unscriptural and inexpedient. Laymen and ministers are not to vote separately, and, as a Congregational organ puts

it, "the ideal seemed to be that of a Presbyterian General Assembly in which the ministers and elders always vote as one body."

A memorial representing 1,750 ministers and 280,000 communicants, was presented, asking for the appointment of a negro bishop.

A complimentary vote was given a negro, Rêv. J. W. E. Bowen, but was withdrawn when it approached the danger of success. No negro bishop was elected or can be, hypocritical statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dr. David H. Moore and Dr. John W. Hamilton, were elected Bishops, and Dr. E. W. Parker and Dr. F. W. Warne, Missionary Bishops for Southern Asia.

A great innovation for Methodism was the removal of the time limit for pastorates, which had before been extended from three to five years.

The motion to rescind the rule of discipline with regard to worldly amusements was voted down after an exciting debate.

A majority report condemning President McKinley for not abolishing the army canteen, was defeated and a minority report condemning the canteen, but omitting all reference to Mr. McKinley was adopted.

#### UNITARIAN.

American Unitarianism celebrated its 75th anniversary in May. One of the addresses was made by Protap Chunder Mazoomdar of the Brahma-Somaj of India. The history of Unitarianism and the greatness of the Unitarians of the past, were the subjects of the themes discussed. The great names of the past do not save it from barrenness in the present, from the point of view of quality as well as quantity. Emerson and Channing have no successors.

#### SCOTCH CHURCHES.

The United Presbyterians and the Freek Kirk, who left the establishment for practically the same reason, the United Presbyterian a hundred years before Dr. Chalmers and his heroic band, have been consolidated at last. An



added impetus is than given to the movement for disestablishment of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

#### REFORMED CHURCH.

The General Synod of the Reformed Church closed its sessions at Asbury Park the middle of June. The meeting was a pleasant and successful one, there was much enthusiasm manifested in the prosecution of the work of the Church, and a twentieth century fund of a quarter of a million dollars was endorsed, the money to be used in the endowment of the venerable New Brunswick Theological Seminary. The Southern Presbyterian Church has a warm sympathy with the work and purposes of the Reformed Church and some of us are hoping for a closer connection than exists at present.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

ZION'S WATCH-TOWER AND HERALD OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE. Published by the Watch-Tower Bible and Tract Society, Allegheny, Pa.

We have before us a sample copy of the above periodical, the notable feature of which is a discourse delivered by the editor, Pastor Chas. T. Russell, before the Florida Chatauqua Assembly, March 4th, 1900.

Pastor Russell took as his text Rom. 1:16. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," and his subject was, "Which is the true Gospel?"

After paying his respects to the Calvinistic, and to the Arminian views of the Gospel, in a manner to be hereafter noticed, he states the true Gospel as follows :

"The word "Gospel" itself should be the clue—should save the intelligent Christian from being misled by the various theories of bad tidings of great misery for nearly all people, miscalled "Gospel." He who thinks it good news that one out of a thousand of the human family is to be saved and the remaining 999 to be eternally tormented, is either not a Christian at all, or he is decidedly undeveloped in Christian character, in mercy, in love, in justice. In our opinion he is at most only a "babe in Christ" who has need first of the milk of the Word and subsequently of the "strong meat" thereof, that he may grow up into Christ in all things, and be able to comprehend with all saints the lengths and breadths and heights and depths of the love of God which passeth all understanding.—Eph. 3.18, 19.

It will require all the Millennial age (which is to follow this Gospel age in which we live) to bless all the families of the earth with the joyful knowledge of divine grace in Christ. Just so surely as the forty-seven thousand millions went down into death without hearing of the Saviour, without coming to a clear knowledge of the truth, without the good tidings of great joy reaching their ears,—just so surely must they all come forth from the grave that this very Gospel message of "good tidings" may be declared to them, and that they may be tested thereby and either be accepted to eternal life or destroyed, as unworthy of life, in the Second Death."

We do not know what impression this quotation produces on the reader's mind, but to us it is evident that the Gospel according to Pastor Russell is a singular compound of Universalism, and Premillennialism. This could be abundantly evidenced by fuller quotation, but we must leave ourselves space for our author's views of Calvinism.

In order that we may "see ourselves as others see us," we quote in full what he has to say about the Gospel presented by Calvinism :

"Calvinism claims that faith in Christ is essential to salvation and it admits that faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. Calvinism requires more than a mere knowledge of Christ and belief in

him as a good and exemplary man, who died a martyr to his too extreme convictions. It requires faith in Christ's death as a sacrifice for man's sin, and at least some manifestation towards righteousness of life before any could be recognized as being of the elect church. Consequently, according to Calvinism, the elect church could not include the heathen of the present time and all the way back through the past, who have never heard of the only name given under heaven or amongst men whereby we must be saved. Stretched to its very broadest, Calvinism could not include more than one in twenty of earth's fifty thousand millions that are estimated to have lived from Adam's day until the present time. In other words, according to the broadest possible estimate of this view, more than forty-seven thousand millions of humanity, were, in the language of the Westminster Confession of Faith, "passed by" as non-elect in the divine plan.

And what does this mean—"passed by" or "non-elect?" It means, according to Calvinism, that God, who knew the end from the beginning, before creating this world and mankind upon it, determined that he would "pass by" and not elect those forty-seven thousand millions of his creatures to life and happiness, but would predestine them to an eternity of torture, and that carrying out this diabolical plan, he prepared a great place large enough to hold forty-seven thousand millions, and fuel sufficient to produce the necessary combustion there to all eternity—did all this with a full appreciation of all the awful facts and circumstances of the case.

Moreover, we remember the statement of Calvinism which many of us learned in our youth, to the effect that God's favor toward the elect is not because of any worthiness on their part, nor because of any works which they had done, but "of his own sovereign grace" he saves them from all the horrible conditions which he has predestined shall be upon the others. Now if the salvation of the elect is not because of their works or worthiness, but because of God's sovereign grace only, the simplest mind can see that God might without any violation of principle have extended that sovereign grace to others—to all, since it was not because of worthiness nor because of works, but merely of his own volition that any are saved—according to Calvinism.

The celebrated Jonathan Edwards, when preaching upon this subject in New England years ago, after picturing the awful torment of the non-elect, was asked the question, Would not the thought of the anguish of the lost mar the bliss of God's people in glory? His answer in substance was, No; you will be so changed that such matters will not affect you; you will look over the battlements of heaven and see in torment your neighbors and friends, yea, your own parents and children, brothers and sisters, and turning round will praise God the louder because his justice is made manifest.

I am glad to believe that if this matter were brought to the intelligent attention of Presbyterians in general, a large majority would be found

willing, nay, anxious, to undo the wrong and to make such reparation as would be within their power, by way of honoring the great Jehovah and attesting their appreciation of his love and his justice, as well as of his wisdom and of his power. This is just the point: Calvinism, in its anxiety to establish the wisdom and power of God, his foreknowledge and his ability to carry out his plan, has conceived of a plan which is far from the correct one, lacking both in justice and in love.

It may be argued that Love is a grace and that its exercise is not incumbent upon Jehovah; that all that could be asked or expected of him would be simple justice, and some might be ready to claim that for God to eternally torment these forty-seven thousand millions "passed by" would be in strict accord with justice. This we deny! We claim that having the power to create mankind would not justify their creation if the Creator saw that the result would be the everlasting torture of a single creature. Justice would say that power is not to be exercised to the injury of another, and that to exercise the creative power under such foreknown conditions would be injustice. And wisdom attuned to justice would say, Better a thousand times never to have created anybody than to have created one being to suffer unjustly eternally.

This statement, dear friends, is a fair, impartial statement of the Gospel according to our beloved brother, John Calvin, and those who subscribe to the Westminster Confession, and their allies. This surely is not the Gospel of which the Apostle Paul, in our text, declared, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ." Paul would assuredly have been ashamed of such a Gospel, and so are all true Christians, who have the true spirit of love and justice,—none more so, perhaps, than those who unfortunately, through circumstances of birth, etc., and hitherto without realizing what it meant, have been lending their name and influence to this great blasphemy against the divine character."

We freely admit that this view of the Gospel is horrible blasphemy, but it is blasphemy for which Mr. Russell alone is responsible; for his statement contains almost as many misrepresentations of Calvinism as there are sentences in the above extract. Take his figures to begin with—the forty-seven billions of lost humanity, which he harps on ever and ever again. Every intelligent Calvinist holds with the Confession of Faith that "elect infants dying in infancy are saved by Christ," and that all mankind who die in infancy are elect. Now put alongside of this the mortality among children in all countries except those where Christian civilization has brought forth its ripest fruit, and Mr. Russell's forty-seven billion must be reduced by two-thirds, at the least.

But except for historical effect, the matter of numbers has no place in this discussion. So far as the justice of God is concerned, one soul has the same rights as forty-seven billion of souls. And we do not hesitate to say that if Calvinism could be shown to teach that one single human being in any land, or any age of the world, had been predestined to eter-

nal perdition without regard to his character or acts, such a doctrine would be a libel upon the justice of God. Calvinism properly stated teaches that out of the host of sinners God elected a great multitude which no man can number, to be redeemed by the blood of Jesus, and each in turn to be saved by grace through faith in his name. As to the rest of sinful humanity, God simply determined to let the law take its course. They were passed by, and "ordained to dishonor and wrath for their sin." Confession of Faith, Chap. III., Sec. 7.

Now compare this correct statement of Calvinistic doctrine with Mr. Russell's statement. It will be seen that the word "sin" occurs only once in his statement, and that out of all connection with the due reward of sin. The word "punishment" does not occur at all. Pastor Russell exhausts his vocabulary of such words as "torture," "torment," "misery," "suffering," "anguish," but not a word to indicate that the doom of the impenitent is penal in its character. Here there is a man discussing eternal punishment, yet leaving all reference to sin and punishment out of his discussion.

But he not only leaves out of view this vital element in the discussion, but he skilfully insinuates that the Calvinistic doctrine of election ignores all considerations of merit and demerit. He states that "the salvation of the elect is not because of their works or worthiness." Why did he not go on to say that the damnation of the non-elect was for no other reason than because of their sin? As has just been indicated, the key to the proper understanding of this whole subject is here. While election is unconditional, preterition is grounded upon foresight of sin and continued impenitency. And no man is competent to handle this intricate and profound subject who does not keep this distinction clearly in view.

But we need not follow Pastor C. T. Russell any further; and we would not have followed him thus far nor burdened these pages with such a tissue of misrepresentation as the above quotations contain, if this man stood alone in his bitter and unfair attacks upon the fundamental tenets of our faith. Unhappily he is just one of a large, and, we fear, growing class to whom the doctrine of God's retributive justice is a red rag which stirs them to polemic fury. They quarrel ostensibly with Calvinism, but in reality it is God's sovereignty and vindicatory justice, the very pillars of his Throne, at which their blows are aimed.

The limits of this brief review forbid our going deeper into these subjects, but should time and opportunity permit we may at some later time handle these great themes more at length, and, to the best of our ability, "Assert eternal prudence and justify the ways of God to men."

Greenville, Va.

R. A. LAPSLEY.

THE NORTHWEST UNDER THREE FLAGS. By Charles Moore. Pp 402. Price \$2.50. Harpers. New York.

In the last QUARTERLY we gave a short notice of this book, but a further reading has so charmed us that, at the risk of repetition, we again

call the attention of our readers to it as a book that every one should own.

There has always been something peculiarly attractive about that region known to the historian as New France—that region of striking contrasts; the splendour of the French Court and the squalor of the Indian race; the powder and laces of the soldier of fortune and the nakedness of nature's children. The picture has its lights and shadows; its element of heroism, as well as the undercurrent of barbarism.

As we look back over the intervening years, we see the Coureur de Vois spending in a night the results of a year's work; the priest facing cold, and famine, and peril by land and water; the gallant soldiers of France fighting for an ungrateful king; the savage Indian drinking the blood of his enemy, and something stronger than blood whenever opportunity offered.

Attractive as the picture is, it is tempered with pity. When we remember that this heroism and suffering were all in vain, as the sole reminder of their splendid achievements is the French element with French names scattered here and there.

The St. Lawrence, that mighty river of the North, was discovered by Jaques Cartier, that enterprising French navigator; but Champlain is known as the father of New France, he being the first white man who looked across the dancing waters of Lake Huron.

He was followed by Brule, "the pioneer of pioneers," who reached Superior and brought back stories of metals. Then Nicolet, the interpreter, the citizen of the woods, blazed the route to Michigan, making quite a theatrical impression upon the savages, as arrayed in a Chinese robe, wrought with flowers and birds of brilliant plumage, he fired pistols in the air to awe the savages, who afterward called him the "Son of Thunder."

These discoveries were followed by the heroic labors of the Jesuits, for, to give the devil his due, they in every instance followed closely behind the discoverers.

These early journeys, however, fade before the marvelous journey of Radisson and his brother-in-law, Des Grosseilliers, who reached the extreme western end of Lake Superior and the headwaters of the streams flowing west to the Mississippi.

After another journey, when they returned laden with valuable furs, and having a prospect of a fortune before them, they were arrested for trading without a license and almost ruined by the fine.

They transferred their allegiance to England, and thus laid the foundations of the Great Hudson Bay Company.

They were followed by Marquette, the Jesuit missionary, whose heroic labors win our admiration and prevent us from sympathizing with the outcry raised a few years ago when his statue was erected in Washington as one of Wisconsin's great men.

During his journey he met Indians with glass beads coming from the

South, which created the impression that the great river emptied itself in Virginia.

Marquette believed that its mouth was in California, and to establish his belief, he determined to explore it, and therefore he should be honored as the discoverer of the Mississippi.

After that new figures appear and disappear—La Salle, Father Hennepin, Frontenac and Cardillac. The latter was a man of blood, opposed to the Jesuits and not averse to making Indians drunk in order to trade with them the more easily.

He founded Detroit, the great city that still stands, which will always be his monument.

We have thus followed the tide of French discovery, and now a new force appear, that Anglo-Saxon race, that push their way over every land.

Cabot, the navigator, discovers North America and sails South as far Virginia, which causes the English government to grant lands with lavish hands, definite enough in the Northern and Southern boundaries, but upon the West stretching out to *terra incognita*.

Virginia was first settled east of the mountains, but the land-hungry Englishmen began to covet the rich lands west of the mountains, and acting upon their desire, they soon came into contact with the French. Thus began that struggle that continued with varying success till the close of the French and Indian war.

England has scarcely hauled down the French flag and raised her own, before the War of the Revolution began, and now England and the Indians as allies were pitted against the descendants of the same colonists who pushed across the mountains to the Ohio river, with the result that the English flag in time had to come down and the American flag take its place.

Then came that generous act of Virginia, whereby she, who alone of the original States had an equitable title, turned over to the General Government all lands in the Northwest, out of which several of the greatest States in the Union have since been carved.

This imperfect review will give but a poor idea of this charming book, its style, its character sketches and its true historical spirit. J. R. B.

CRANMER AND THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. By Arthur D. Innes. Pp. 199. Price \$1.25. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

In these days of book-writing the student who has money for books is often embarrassed by the many volumes pressing upon his notice. If he wishes to make himself a thorough and well-rounded scholar, he selects books with that end in view. Then if he be a busy man, and hard students generally are, he selects books that treat a subject fully yet in a condensed form. Publishers realize the existence of this desire, and they have for these special studies on great subjects.

The enterprising house of the Scribners' Sons are always ready to cater

to the public, and they have begun the publishing of the series known as "The World's Epoch-Makers."

The object of this series is to give in a concise form the origin and progress of the most important movements that have taken place in theology and philosophy. Each volume will trace the evolution of some particular phase of human thought and culture. The volume before us traces the Reformation in England, which unlike other countries, is not associated with any striking figure

No one thinks of the Reformation in Germany, Geneva and Scotland without at once thinking of Luther, Calvin and Knox, but it is otherwise with England. We think of no character towering above the others. We see a wicked and adulterous king, a time-serving party and a cringing church, all trying to effect changes, yet all swept along by a current that none could resist.

Among these pigmy characters Cranmer's is easily the greatest, not because he was large, but because the others were so small. The truth is, there was nothing heroic or unselfish in the English Reformation, whether in motives or men, and try as we may we cannot arouse enthusiasm over it.

John Knox may have been sour and harsh, yet one's blood rises to fever heat when he traces his history and his brave opposition to Mary. He was a man who knew not the meaning of fear, whether his enemies were the devil or beautiful women. But who can become enthusiastic over a man like Cranmer? Sometimes he arouses himself and we begin to have hopes, and the next time he cringes in abject cowardice. His death was the only redeeming feature of his life, and we close his history with the feeling that there is latent good in every man if only opportunity for its display presents itself.

The book then is valuable not for its hero, but because it gives in a brief scope the events leading to the English Reformation and the reasons why it has always been a half-way measure.

#### NOVELS AND SKETCHES.

After a winter's hard study it will help the mind to turn aside for awhile to lighter literature, and for that reason in this our mid summer number we have prepared a bill of fare, some good, some passable and some excellent.

**THE CONSPIRATORS.** By Robt. W. Chambers. Pp. 266. Price \$1.25. Harper & Brothers, New York.

If any one is looking for a bright story that will entertain he will find it in this one.

The scene is laid in the little Duchy of Luxembourg, a small triangular country lying between Belgium, France and Rhenish Prussia.

William of Germany is seeking for a pretext to seize it, in which he is check-mated by the quickness of Wilhelmina of Holland.

Just at this juncture the United States sends over a Commissioner,



ostensibly to the Antwerp Exhibition, but he turns up in Luxembourg and is there quietly received as the accredited representative of the American Government, and the first foreign minister to the Independent State of Luxembourg.

A military attache' is afterwards sent, who becomes mixed up in the plots and counterplots.

The story is a good one and all of the characters are well sustained, and the conversations are bright and sparkling with wit. There is not a dull page in the book, and there is not a sentence that one cares to skip.

**THE REDEMPTION OF DAVID CARSON.** By Charles Frederic Goss. Pp. 418. Price \$1.50. Bowen-Merrill Co., Indianapolis.

Just at this time the market is flooded with light literature, for this is the season when we crave something that the mind can digest without effort.

But even those who depend upon predigested food find that there is a great difference between them, not only in taste but also in quality.

To those who need predigested mental food, something for the summer months we, without any qualifications, recommend this new book by Chas. F. Goss.

Dr. Goss, the author, is pastor of the Avondale Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati, and in this book he has been shown wonderful genius not merely as a story teller, but what is more rare, as a weaver of plots requiring the highest skill and a profound knowledge of human nature.

The story in a nutshell is that of three characters, David Carson a young Quaker; Dr. Aesculapius a quack; and Pepecta a Gypsy who had become the quack's wife.

The Quaker is a dreamer, who is introduced into the heights of mysticism, a soul untried and therefore unproved, who gradually plunges into dissipation and vice, through love of the quack's Gypsy wife before whose charms he falls.

The Gypsy wife is a beautiful pagan sinning in ignorance. She starts at the bottom of the scale of moral being and by her innate purity climbs up, just in proportion as her Quaker lover sinks. In the end however the redemption of the Quaker is effected by his own words spoken in the period of his innocence.

The book is a modern version of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, and as the picture of a struggling soul beset by the awful power of sin and darkness, it has no equal.

The story deals with sin and vice in its lowest forms, it is true, yet it is a picture of what confronts men always—and the fact that a soul struggles with these foes and in the end conquers and comes forth purified by the conflict, is a testimony to God's power as set forth in His Word.

Our readers ought to have this book, for it is not only a powerful story full of lessons for a struggling world, but it is also remarkable as a specimen of psychological study.

SOPHIA. A Historic Romance. By Stanley Weyman. Pp. 345. Price \$1.50. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

Among the writers of historical novels none excels Weyman, and the present volume will bear comparison with "A Gentleman of France," "Under the Red Robe" and "The Castle Inn."

It is a story of England under Queen Anne, and while it keeps up the interest of the reader without flagging, it also teaches us many important historical facts.

The times of Queen Anne were epoch-making times, when the important changes inaugurated by William III were crystalized and became a part of the unchangeable constitution of England.

Some take their history in the undiluted form and others prefer it mixed with romance. Ordinarily we love pure history and we mainly feed upon it, but now and then we give the mind a rest from study by reading history in the embellished garb of fiction.

JOHN MARMADUKE. A Romance. By Samuel Harden Church. Pp. 328. Price \$1.25. G. R. Putnam's Sons. New York.

Speaking of the historical novel, here is one that will rank with Hugh Wynne or Janice Meredith.

It is a Puritan story, dealing with the invasion of Ireland, and incidentally it throws much light upon what, in the opinion of many, is the darkest page in the history of Cromwell.

It shows that the terrible massacres in Ireland were due to the horrible suffering endured previously by the English settlers. There is not a dull page in the book, and when once begun, it must be finished at one reading.

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE. By Ellen Glasgow. Pp. 44s. Doubleday, Page & Co. New York.

Miss Glasgow is a well-known young lady of Richmond, Va., connected with some of the first families of the State, and for that reason her venture into the field of literature has been watched with absorbing interest.

Her first book was "The Descendant," a realistic novel of questionable propriety, about which there was a wide difference of opinion. There could be, however, no difference of opinion as to the talent displayed by the writer.

If one could overlook the shocks that his old-fashioned ideas of propriety was constantly receiving, and could forget that the book was not written by Thomas Hardy, he would be bound to confess that the writer had rare literary power, and that a new star had arisen on the horizon.

The present story, "The Voice of the People," purports to be a different story. It is a novel of social and political life in Virginia, in which a boy from the lower classes makes his way to the front and finally becomes Governor of the State.

The story has in it nothing original, and one can scarcely believe that the same pen wrote both stories.

We think that Miss Glasgow is capable of writing a much better story. That she has real literary genius she has given ample proof, but in this story she deals with politics, something that no woman can master, and in consequence she is not in her element.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By Abraham Kuyper, D. D., L. L. D. Translated from the Dutch by Rev. Henri De Vries, with an Introduction by Benj. F. Warfield, D. D., L. L. D. Pp. 664. Price, —. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York.

We have before us a volume from the enterprising Publishing House of Funk & Wagnalls Co., which is an assurance to all who have bought books of that house, that the binding, paper and printing are all that a fastidious book lover could desire.

Of the book itself we scarcely know what to say, for our space is so limited and the book is so great.

This book is of peculiar interest and value just now, because of late years there has been a great revival of the study of the Holy Ghost and His Work, and the Church at large is flooded with short tracts written by immature and untrained men, purporting to be a full explanation of the Spirit's agency in redemption, but which are really as unsound as an over-ripe egg. These embryo theologians boast that they are free from theological bias as well as theological learning, and proceed to prove the latter part of their claim by the astounding statement that they are the first men who have thoroughly treated the work of the Holy Ghost.

Even some in our own church claim that the confession of Faith is deficient in not having a chapter devoted to the "Holy Spirit and His Work."

Perhaps it would be well to remind all such that instead of having one chapter, it has nine chapters devoted to that important subject.

Then we must also remember that nothing has ever been written comparable to the works of John Owen on the Holy Spirit, published as far back as 1674, 1682 and 1693.

In our day there have also been many works, limited, it is true in their scope, yet eminently sound and suggestive.

Among these works there is none that excels Dr. C. R. Vaughn's "The Gifts of the Holy Spirit," published by our Committee, and found in the library of every wideawake preacher.

The book before us however does not compete with any of these recent works, because while they are short, and limited in their treatment, this book covers the whole ground, and that too in an original and thorough manner.

Dr. Kuyper the author is the Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Amsterdam. In 1898 he visited America and delivered the Stone Lectures at Princeton. His subject was "Calvinism" "Calvinism in History," "Calvinism and Religion;" "Calvinism and Politics;" "Calvinism and Science;" "Calvinism and Art;" "Calvinism and the Future."

These lectures made a profound impression upon the Presbyterian Church in America, and by means of them Dr. Kuyper has established himself in our hearts. He is a thorough Calvinist, an eminent and exact scholar, and withal, which is far more important, he is a man of deep spirituality. He brings to this important study not only this deep piety, but this sound learning, this judicial mind, not easily carried away by preconceived ideas, but following the truth, not for the sake of a creed, but for truth's sake.

To show the spirit with which he approaches his subject, let us give a short sentence from his introduction: "Although there is no subject in whose treatment the soul inclines more to draw upon its own experience, there is none that demands more that our sole source of knowledge, be the Word given us by the Holy Spirit. After that, human experience may be heard, attesting what the lips have confessed; even affording glimpses into the Spirit's blessed mysteries, which are unmispeakable and of which the Scripture, therefore does not speak. But this cannot be the ground of instruction to others."

The book is divided into three volumes, the first of which gives us the Work of the Holy Spirit in the church as a whole, and the other two volumes give us the Work of the Holy Spirit in the individual.

In dealing with sanctification he thus disposes of the Arminian theory that a man's holiness is the effect of his own exertion, exercise and conflict; that it is like a beautiful garment of fine linen, very desirable, but it must be of one's own weaving. This theory is not only very comfortless, but also wicked. It is comfortless; for, if true, then all our precious little ones who died in the cradle are lost, for they could not put one stitch in this raiments of their glory: Comfortless; for if the saint should happen to be behind hand in his weaving, or be take away in the midst of his days before he could half finish it, he would surely be lost.

Nor is it less comfortless for him whose death-bed conversion is utterly useless, for it came too late for the wearing of this garment of sanctification.

And it is also wicked, for then Christ is no sufficient Saviour. He may effect our justification, and open the gates of Paradise, but the weaving of our own wedding garments, he lays upon us, without insuring us sufficient time to finish them. Yea, wicked indeed is it; for this makes the weaving of the fine linen our work, sanctification man's achievement, and God is no longer the only author of our Salvation. Then it is no grace and man's own work is again on its feet."

On the subject of Perfectionism he utters no uncertain sound. He confesses that the Scripture teaches perfection in parts, but imperfection in degrees, and at the close of the chapter on the Old Man and the New, he has these suggestive words: "So he gradually dies to the old man, until, in the hour of death, he is fully delivered. God's child remains the old man's grave-digger until the hour of his own departure.

Nevertheless he dies to him so completely that at last he loses all confidence in him, thoroughly convinced that he is without excuse, an abominable wretch, a reprobate, and a deceiver, capable of all evil. And when occasionally he indulges in scornful mirth at the old man's pride and practices, it is not in boastfulness of his own work, or of his fellow men, but glorying only in the gracious work of his God."

We welcome this book, not only for its appropriateness just now when the views of many seem to be beclouded, but also for its clear orthodoxy. Compared with many of the tractates of the day, it is like a breath of fresh air from the mountain top.

POPULAR HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: By Jacob Harris Patton, A. M., Ph. D. pp. 560. R. S. Mighill & Co., New York.

The Presbyterian Church has long wanted a popular history, one that the common people would read gladly, and for the particular branch of the church, with which this book deals, it seems to answer that want.

Of course all history must have a beginning, and the author in order to avoid beginning with Abraham, starts with times of Henry VIII, and brings it down to the close of the General Assembly of 1899.

He presents the facts of history, and notes their influence, though at the same time he pays special attention to the inner Christian life of the church.

The influence of the Presbyterian Church upon the life of our country during the last half century of the colonial times he traces with much force, and in accordance with the views of his church, he also shows her influence at the present time.

He goes very thoroughly into the various divisions of the church, but dismisses with few words the separation of 1861, and the causes leading to it.

That he is fairer than many Northern writers the following extract will show:

Speaking of the famous Spring resolutions and those opposing them he says: "In justice to the limited number of the members from the free-labor States who voted in the negative, it should be stated that they were not disloyal to the Union, but they believed the Church, as such, should only act in spiritual affairs, and not even by implication take part in those that were secular.

The Southern members, then and afterwards, almost universally held the extreme view of the Church keeping itself aloof from acting on secular affairs. This may be inferred from the fact that in the Minutes of their Assemblies held during the Civil War allusion is scarcely ever made to that subject, though to all it must have been of absorbing interest."

While as a literary production it has its faults, and as a history it scarcely answers our demands, yet it supplies a need that every pastor has realized in his efforts to make his people intelligent Presbyterians.

INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS. By Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri. Pp. 346. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York,

The above is the very modest title of a volume on ethics from the pen of Dr. Thilly, who is already known to the literary world as the most excellent translator of Paulsen's System of Ethics.

Ethics from the very nature of the case is not a study of thrilling interest, however important we may deem it, and few writers have the power of enlivening its pages.

Dr. Thilly and Dr. R. L. Dabney are among the few who have this power in any marked degree.

Dr. Dabney is well known to the readers of the QUARTERLY, who were accustomed to expect something bright and suggestive as well as readable whenever he wrote. Dr. Thilly, however, is not so well known to our readers, so an introduction may be necessary.

He is the Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri, situated at Columbia, and in the University he ranks high. His hold on his pupils is remarkable, and for a long time to the writer it was inexplicable. Since reading this volume he begins to understand the reason, for rarely is there found a book on any philosophical subject more charming in style or more clear or more cogent in reasoning.

Many of his views run up against cherished convictions, yet it seems impossible to refute the reasoning, and second thought soon shows you that these convictions are rather inherited ideas or prejudices, to abandon which means to give up no principle.

Of course the first subject of his study is the theory of conscience; what conscience is.

In giving the different views he divides them into:

(1) The mythical view, which believes that conscience is the voice of God in the human soul; it is God directly speaking to us; it is something distinct from the person; something from without which tells him which way to go.

(2) The rationalistic intuitionists, according to whom man has a natural faculty, a peculiar moral endowment, a conscience which immediately enables him to distinguish between right and wrong.

(3) The emotional intuitionists, according to whom conscience is innate, but not so much a faculty of reason as it is a faculty pronouncing universal and necessary judgments. When a particular fact is presented to us, we feel or perceive that it is right or wrong. This feeling or perceiving is intuitive.

(4) The Empiricists. These deny that the conscience is innate, and attempt to explain it as an acquisition, as a product of experience. We have no special moral faculty which intuitively distinguishes between right and wrong. Our knowledge of morality is, like all other knowledge, acquired by experience. The author rejects all of these theories, and then before propounding his own views, he examines the psycho-

logical facts connected with what is generally known as conscience, for, as he says, metaphysical speculation or ethics will have to follow in the wake of psychology.

An idea of a motive or an act arises in the consciousness. At once or after some reflections, peculiar feelings and impulses group themselves around this idea; some pleasurable and others painful, according as the act is approved or disapproved. These feelings force me to the act, or keep me from it, and upon the strength of these feelings and the struggle in my mind I form judgments. What we call conscience acts before and after the act. Conscience then according to Dr. Thilly is a mere general name used to designate a series of complex phenomena, and a separate special faculty. He does not believe that conscience is innate, in the sense that many understand the term, for he sees that no one knows or feels at birth what is right and what is wrong, yet he recognizes the fact that every one possesses many instincts out of which the moral sentiments may be said to grow. He believes therefore that the conscience is not always infallible, because as it is educated it often reverses its judgments, and he also thinks that conscience does not immediately tell us what is right and wrong. In discussing the ultimate ground of moral discretion, he gives what he calls the theological view, the popular view and finally his own, which is the teleological view. According to the first, a thing is right or wrong because God wills it; according to the second, an act is right or wrong intrinsically—moral truths are as self-evident as the axioms of geometry; according to the third view a thing is right or wrong owing to the effects which the act tends to produce—the effect or end or purpose which an act tends to realize must, in the last analysis, be what gives it its moral worth.

In determining the question of the highest good, he rejects the doctrine of hedonism, that pleasure is the highest good, and lays down his own view, hedged about with many distinctions, in the following words: "We may say that human life and the development of human life is the highest good." He means by life the unfolding of all human capacities in conformity with the demands of the natural and human environment.

We have taken the pains to give his views on these points, because they do not embrace the system of ethics, but it is just here that many writers are vague and much of the language in popular use is incorrect. Many speak of conscience as if it were separate from the mind, when in reality it is the mind dealing with moral questions.

We welcome a work on ethics from such men as Dr. Thilly, and while we may not agree with him in many of his conclusions, we must admire his clearness in reasoning, his fairness in giving his opponent's views, and the charm that his inimitable style throws around an otherwise dry subject.

The time has passed when we must view with suspicion the writers of the historical school. They look at truth from a standpoint different

from ours, and as wise men we would do well to make use of the advantages enjoyed by them.

We feel sure that no one can study this volume before us without being benefited both mentally and morally.

HENRY MARTYN PAYNTER. A Memoir, by his wife, Alice M. Paynter. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago. Pp. 298. Price \$1.25.

This is a life written with the pen of affection, but with advantages such as no one except a wife could enjoy.

The subject of this life came from a long line of preachers, and he also traced his descent from the Huguenots of France, who afterwards fled to Holland. He was named after Henry Martyn, with the hope that the name would give direction to the life.

Though he was never a foreign missionary, yet he preached in every section of our land, South, North, East and West, and wherever he went God's blessing seemed to rest upon his labors. Many a minister looks back upon his seminary life as the most trying in his spiritual experience, but in this life of Mr. Paynter we read that his life in the seminary was one of great spiritual development and to that experience, no doubt, can be traced the remarkable success that attended his early preaching. After a pastorate in Vicksburg, where he boldly stood at his post during a yellow fever epidemic, and was himself among its first victims, he became pastor at Booneville, Missouri, where he was at the outbreak of the war.

Only those living in Missouri at the time know in what way the war there differed from the war elsewhere. No pen can describe, nor brush paint it. The most diabolical passions seemed let loose, and judgment fled to brutish breasts. Through this trying time Mr. Paynter passed, preaching the Gospel and abstaining from all political matters, but without trial, and after suffering imprisonment and other indignities he was banished to Massachusetts.

Nothing bears stronger testimony to the goodness of the man than the fact that he, a man banished from the South for political reasons should in a short time be supplying churches in Massachusetts.

At the close of the war he returned to Virginia, and then labored in the West. He was a voluminous writer, being the author of a *Life of Jesus of Nazareth*, in twelve parts.

Mrs. Paynter, who writes this life of her husband, is the daughter of the late Judge Moncure, of Virginia, and she inherited from her father talents which have served her well in this Memoir.

We have read the book with pleasure and, we trust, with profit.

To quote from a tribute from the late Dr. M. D. Hoge: "It reads like a romance, in which strange adventure, sorrow and joy are so wonderfully intermingled."



THE  
**Presbyterian Quarterly.**

---

NO. 54--OCTOBER, 1900.

---

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF PREACHING THE  
ETHICS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Shortly after the writer of this paper entered on his first pastorate, he preached a sermon from the third chapter of the Epistle of James on "Sins of the Tongue." At the close of the service a visiting minister came forward, introduced himself, expressed his interest in what he had heard, and also remarked that ethical sermons were both quite unusual and would be very useful in Presbyterian churches. This remark impressed him at the time, and during the nineteen years that have passed since then it has often recurred to him. In either one of its assertions it would seem to be true and important.

I. Directly ethical teaching does appear to be uncommon in our pulpits. In some quarters there is even a prejudice against it. There are places where, were a minister to expound duty at considerable length, it would be broadly hinted that his views of righteousness were becoming legal.

Where this prejudice against ethical teaching does not exist, the latter is still widely neglected. One of the worst features of the present state of religion among us is the frequent failure to receive the Bible as the infallible rule of practice as truly as of faith. Many who regard it absolutely authoritative in the latter sphere ignore it in the former. Not a few of those who are most earnest in their demand for Biblical theology seem unconscious that there

even could be Biblical ethics. This way of thinking prevails among the rank and file of our church members. As a rule, they feel that their creed ought to embrace what the Bible teaches and because it teaches it; but do we very often find one who regards it a sin to go in debt because Paul says, (Rom. xiii : 8): "Owe no man anything, save to love one another;" or one who considers himself bound in matters of dress to consult the principles of the New Testament more than the fashions of the day, or even one who holds that the Word of God is really a higher authority than the divorce courts? Now this can point in only one direction. It must indicate neglect of ethical teaching. It must show that the Bible has not been unfolded as the supreme rule of life. Were this not the case, the Scriptures would be regarded as decisive for the Christian in these and other like matters just as we are thankful to believe that it is regarded as the only way of salvation. God's Word has but to be faithfully preached to make itself felt as being what it is. His promise is that "it shall not return unto him void."

Where ethical teaching is not thus generally neglected in our pulpits, what we may call distinctive of the ethics of the Gospel is often passed over. That is, while the life of duty is insisted on and on Christian grounds, it is seldom presented as it has been transfigured and glorified in the new light of the Gospel of the grace of God. Take, for example, the duty of love. How Christ exalted it when he gave his "new commandment" that "ye love one another even as I have loved you." Yet do we often hear this command so characteristic of the Gospel expressly proclaimed and explained and applied? Is not the duty of love usually represented as fulfilled if one loves his neighbor as himself? Is not the higher ethical teaching frequently ignored, that we ought to love ourselves and so our neighbors even as Christ also loved us and gave himself up for us?

Of course, there are reasons for this neglect and also for the more aggravated forms of it already noticed. It results

from the very nature of the case. The emphasis should be put on the more important, and what is repeatedly emphasized comes to be regarded as alone important. Thus what we are to believe concerning God is more important than the duty which God requires of man. At least, the latter presupposes the former and is determined by it. Christian ethics rests on Christian theology—we have to admit that. So, too, What must I do to be saved? is a more important question than, How ought a saved man to live? Unless one is saved, he cannot live; and if he is saved, will he not continue to live somehow? It is not strange, therefore, that the Gospel should often be preached as if it were only a plan of salvation. It is thus fundamentally, and so it is this aspect of it that ought to be made most prominent.

The tendency to make it exclusively so was, no doubt developed and intensified by the moral Deism and the ethical Rationalism that prevailed generally during the last century. Regarded as the one thing then, it is only by a natural reaction, if even Christian ethics has sometimes come to be looked on as next to nothing now. Thus we can account for the prejudice against ethical preaching already alluded to. Indeed, we can sympathize with it. That must arouse distrust which has been used to hide the cross of Christ. Especially will this be so, if it is still so used. Hence, when we find the New Theology of our day substituting moral influence for atonement by the blood of Christ and preaching an ethical Gospel rather than the Gospel of the grace of God, it does not surprise us that our own pulpits should often leave the ethics of the Gospel in the background. It is its message of grace that most needs to be proclaimed; and it is not strange that we should be suspicious even of its ethical teaching, if others are striving with it to veil the sacrifice for us of our Lord.

II. And yet, while all this is so, and just because it is so, it would seem to be highly important for us still to preach and to emphasize the ethics of the Gospel. For this position the following reasons are offered:

1. We cannot otherwise be true to God himself. He is essentially and, if we may so speak, fundamentally ethical. The distinction and glory of each one of his attributes is that it is all that it ought to be and nothing that it ought not to be. The characteristic of his grace is that it both is righteous and vindicative of righteousness. He is described as the only holy one and as absolutely holy. Abraham feels that he would not be God, if he could swerve from the right. All this becomes specially clear when he reveals himself in Christ. As another has said, "The supreme glory of Christ for us, the highest which we are permitted to discern as distinct from that in which we can only believe, is his abiding consciousness of God and of oneness with him, his entire devotion to God's will even when that disclosed to him the cross with its shame and pain." In a word, I may add, his ethical excellence. And all this holds good of Christ's work. How it illustrates the importance of the ethical. Its great aim is to deliver men from sin, to restore them to righteousness, to make them what they ought to be. "Sanctify them through the truth," he prays; and the Spirit whom he sends to carry on his work is both himself the Holy Spirit and he who alone and always is the author of holiness. Nay, more, all this must be so. God cannot become our life through the indwelling in us of his Spirit, and his law not become the rule of our beings; for his law is the expression of his nature, the manifestation of his life. Though by no external restraint, yet by what Augustine calls *felix necessitas boni*, God must be and must require the ethical. He constitutes it and he cannot but constitute it as it is, for it is the essence of his essence. Unless, therefore, we emphasize it in our preaching we misrepresent him. How can we call on men to "be perfect as their Heavenly Father is perfect," if we do not show them what they ought to be and insist on their becoming what they ought to be. God is both the living and the supreme Ought. He himself is the essence and the norm of the ethical. It is the deepest meaning of his life.

2. Not to make the ethical thus prominent in our preaching is to be untrue to the Bible. As might be supposed, it is as characteristically ethical as we have just seen him to be whose Word it is. Indeed, it is on ethics that the New Testament, which is commonly regarded as in a special sense the revelation of divine grace, puts the emphasis. This is true of the Gospels themselves. They are the good tidings of the grace of God, but their evident purpose in this is that they may lay broad and deep the foundation of a new because Christian ethics, and may afford a motive adequate for its realization. Thus Christ came, not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it; not merely to deliver men from punishment, but to save them from sin; not simply to render them strong and wise and happy, but to give us his Spirit and so make us able to become "partakers" morally of the divine nature. If his teaching was often theological or spiritual in its character, it was always ethical in its aim. He revealed the love of God that it might constrain us to be like God and see what we ought to be. His death on the cross was the supreme exhibition of divine grace, but a large part of its design was that God might be just or ethical and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. He emphasized faith in himself rather than works of righteousness; but then we should remember that "this is the work of God that we should believe on him whom he hath sent," and that in view of the facts of Christianity, faith is the first requirement of ethics and the essential condition of the life of duty. Indeed, faith is itself and in its deepest nature ethical. One must be ready to do God's will, if he would know the doctrine to be believed, whether it is of him. More need not be said to show that the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour is distinctly ethical in end and at heart.

Nor is apostolic teaching otherwise. Always one in spirit with that of Christ, it is specially so in this case. James holds the doctrine of faith; but it is, that by works is faith evinced and made perfect, that faith without works is dead, and that the works, bound to appear as the fruits

of a living faith are such as "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." In a word, the whole epistle of James is a treatise on applied Christian ethics. Now this fact derives peculiar significance from the date of this book. The first to be composed of the New Testament writings, their introduction as it were, we should see in its characteristically ethical and practical trend the announcement of the distinctly practical and ethical purpose of "the New Covenant." In James' conception dogma is directly in order to ethics; and we may not doubt that he was inspired to write the first book of the New Testament to show that its immediate design was to set forth and to realize among men the ethical glory of "the life hid with Christ in God." To take any other view than this is to suppose that less intelligence entered into the composition of the New Testament than into that of books of merely human authorship. Nor are the epistles of Paul and of Peter less conspicuously ethical than we have just seen to be that of James. Take First Peter for example. We may not doubt that it exhibits what, according to the Apostle's view, is "best for Christians in the world and best for the world through Christians." Not a little significant, therefore, is it that it is really a directory of duties. Indeed, the directory occupies the central place in the epistle. What goes before the directory is declaratory, first, of the source of the new heavenly life of Christians, with its principles of conscientious fear of God and regard to man; and second, of the distinctive position of Christians in the world as a community, the temple, the priesthood, the nation, of God among men, visibly manifesting his being in the glory of redeeming love upon earth. What follows the directory is in its nature general and occasional. The main body of the epistle is the directory itself, in which the Apostle sets forth the kind of life which they ought to live in the world who here are but "strangers and pilgrims."

Nor is the kind of life which he portrays less significant than is the fact that its portrayal is the purpose of this

epistle. There is little said of duty in connection with the church or the propagation of Christianity. The duties enforced are political, social, domestic. As Dr. McGregor has said in his "Apology of the Christian Religion," "Peter's directory includes only those common duties which are natural to man so that they would have been duties of man as man through the church had never existed." The Apostle's conception would seem to have been that of Keble :

"The trivial round, the common task,  
Will furnish all we ought to ask;  
Room to deny ourselves, a road  
To bring us daily near to God."

His idea would appear to have been that in no way could the Gospel be preached so effectively as by the disciples "having their conversation honest among the Gentiles; that whereas they spoke evil against them as evil doers, they might by their good works which they should behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." Could greater emphasis be laid on Christian ethics? The inspired apostle regarded the knowledge and practice of it as that which would tend most to the divine glory.

As has been remarked, Paul's attitude toward the ethics of Christianity is the same. It is true that the directory of duties does not in his epistles, as in First Peter, occupy the central place. It does, however, hold the last place, and this in Paul's writings is evidently that of importance, for it is that up to which all that goes before designedly leads. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, for example, if it is the purpose of the first part to set forth the glory of the Church of Christ, and if it is the purpose of the second part to exhibit the spirit ruling in the Church of Christ; the common purpose of both would seem to be to afford a rational basis for that statement of general Christian duties which forms the third part and which opens with the words, "This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind," etc., and the consequence, if not the pur-

pose, of this summary of general Christian duties would appear to be the specification in the fourth part of those common duties in which, as husband or wife, parent or child, master or servant, we see the Christian go about the ordinary business of a human being upon earth. All this is as conspicuous, if not more so, in the other epistles of Paul. Is not the main design of First Corinthians the correction of immorality in the Church of Corinth? And, as President Patton has recently said, "is there not in this one letter more important ethical teaching than in any or all of the writers on ethics from Aristotle to the present day?" Is not the magnificent development of the doctrines of grace in the Epistle to the Romans in order that Paul may introduce that exhortation to Christian duty which occupies the last four chapters, with the irresistible appeal, "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God," the mercies which the epistle thus far has been unfolding? What could evince more clearly the ethical purpose of this the most dogmatic of the epistles than this unique exhibition of the doctrines of grace in order to the enforcement of the ethics of the life of Christ?

Nor is even John's attitude essentially different. The apostle of love, no one insists so strongly on the manifestation of love for God in the performance of the ordinary duties of social life. "Who so hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar, for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" "And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God loveth his brother also." This is John's view of the relation of religion to morality, of Christian dogmatics to Christian ethics. We cannot feel as we ought toward God save as we act as we ought toward men. The latter is the necessary fruit of the former. If we are "born of God," it is that we may "over-



come the world" through the observance of the law of love. Such, then, though it has been presented only in barest outline, is the prominence given by the New Testament to ethical teaching. Evidently it regards such instruction as highly important. It is that toward which the whole volume seems to tend. Can we, therefore, be true to it unless our preaching is largely and often distinctly ethical? Fidelity to the Word of God as well as to God himself requires this.

3. So also and more particularly does truth to what we may call the characteristic ethical teaching of the Gospel. There is an ethical Gospel as truly as there is a Gospel of salvation. That is to say, the New Testament is a revelation of law as well as a revelation of grace. It is the former just because it is the latter. New grace causes new duties and shows itself, perhaps, most of all in its clear revelation of these duties. Even the law of the old dispensation was conceived as given by grace and as revealing a relationship of grace. It was regarded as a crown of rejoicing, even as a matter of boasting. "Blessed is the people that hear the joyful sound of it." "They shall walk, O Lord, in the light of thy countenance." It was the rule whereby the gracious provisions of God's covenant promise were to be realized. Precisely so, only more, the law of Christ is a consequence, nay, an essential part, of the Gospel of Christ. He came to reveal the will of God for our obedience as truly as he came to reveal the grace of God for our salvation. Because he is our redeemer he has given us a commandment, and this is emphatically "a new commandment."

This distinctive character of New Testament ethics appears in relation to natural ethics. It does not supersede this. On the contrary, it sanctions it anew. The duties of man as man it restates and reaffirms. Yet in doing so it asserts its own principle. Every duty to man it regards as also and above all a duty to God. Servants, for example, are to obey in all things their masters according to the flesh, for in this they serve the Lord Christ.

Again, the distinctive character of the ethics of the Gos-

pel may be seen in connection with Old Testament ethics. This is not set aside, Indeed, Christ came to fulfil the law. In fulfilling it, however, he gave to it a hitherto undiscerned spirituality of meaning. To develop this was one main purpose of the Sermon on the Mount. Thus he re-enacted the law against adultery, but in doing so he made this sin consist in the lascivious glance as well as in the impure act.

And then the Gospel reveals entirely new duties and virtues. Having, for example, brought life and immortality to light, it introduces and demands an altogether unique attitude toward death and the grave. Thus we may "not sorrow for our dear ones who have gone before as those who have no hope;" and we ought to "be steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labor is not in vain in the Lord." So, too, what are called the evangelical virtues, faith, hope and love, though foreshadowed in the Old Testament, appear in developed form only in the New. Thus, where do we find Christian hope, or the practical knowledge of God's love as the supreme reality, save in connection with that faith which Christ both revealed and gives, that faith, which appropriates Christ as its own; which then rises to love for him of whose love for us Christ is the highest expression; and which at last, through love, realizes so strongly the present fact of God's love for us and discerns so clearly what is implied in it that it disposes and enables us to feel and to act as if the chief good of the Christian life, in addition to having been received, had been actually consummated? Once more, the originality of New Testament ethics appears, and perhaps most conspicuously, in the treatment which it requires of the offences of our brethren. In this relation it presents us with a crown of five virtues, humility, meekness, moderation, patience, forgiveness, as unique as it is glorious. But enough by way of illustration. It must be evident that Christ's law of love is, indeed, "a new commandment." The Gospel is not only largely an ethical revelation, it is a revelation of a distinct

kind of ethics. Unless, therefore, we teach and emphasize this ; unless we call attention, not merely to the law of God, but especially to those principles of it which are revealed and elucidated in the Gospel specially we must be untrue to what is a characteristic of the Gospel. That is, we must slight what is distinctive of our Lord's final and highest revelation to us. But this is not all.

4. There is a vital relation between the teaching and practice of Christian ethics and the evangelization of the world. We should suppose that there would be. It would seem that if the Gospel was to be effective, what was peculiarly characteristic of it must be presented. We find this to be the case. At least, we find that it has been the case. There can be no doubt that the early centuries of our era were the great missionary age. So general and so earnest was the movement inaugurated when Barnabas and Saul, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed from Antioch on the church's first distinctively foreign mission, that one hundred years afterward we see the church in effective occupation of the civilized world, and in less than three hundred years we behold Christianity on the throne of the empire. Now what was the method of operation, what was the instrumentality, which the Holy Spirit rendered effectual to this stupendous conquest? If we can ascertain it, we may not question that we have found a force which is at least vitally related to the evangelization of the world.

Nor are we left in doubt on this point. We can see clearly what, after the Spirit of truth and the power of the truth as it is in Jesus, was regarded as most important by that pre-eminently missionary church. Nothing could be more instructive in this respect than the celebrated letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan. In it he states the results of his judicial examination into the secret of Christianity. Through the frank confession of the Christians themselves, and through the declarations of informers and of apostates interrogated under torture, he saw into the very heart of what he had supposed was a tremendous mystery. And lo! there was no mystery. He found that after worship by

means of the Word, they went on to what he calls a sacrament. This term had been the common word for a military oath, but it now meant that which bound the Christians together in a solemn league and covenant with God.

What, then, was the supposed tremendous mystery to which they thus devoted themselves anew? Pliny found it to be simply this, that they would be conscientiously careful in relation to the ordinary duties of man to man, or, as we say, to the common duties of the second table of the law. Could anything be more significant? The very time when the church was making the most rapid progress in the evangelization of the world was the time, and probably the only time, when the characteristic feature of her worship was a solemn covenant with God to make the ethics of Christ the rule of every day life. Can we, then, fail to discern a vital relation between the prominence given to it and the coming of the Redeemer's Kingdom? It is only as its gracious law is proclaimed and illustrated that it itself can prevail.

(a) We discover one reason for what has just been affirmed in this, that conviction of sin will be largely in proportion to the emphasis put on the ethics, and particularly on that which is distinctive of the ethics, of the Gospel. This should be self-evident. One purpose of the law was to convict of sin. "It was added because of transgressions." It was intended to show men how sinful they were that they might feel themselves "shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be rewarded." And such is still the function of the law in the case of those who, though "the faith is come," have not embraced it. And if this is a design of the law as law, it is, of course, a design of the law as it has been completed and spiritualized and illustrated by Christ. He fulfilled all righteousness partly in order that we might appreciate our need of his righteousness.

Just here we touch what is exceedingly practical. Conviction of sin is the need of our age. Men do not come to Christ for salvation because they do not feel the need of it ;

and they do not feel the need of it because, whatever they may believe, few of them are oppressed by the guilt and pollution of sin. What, then, could be so timely as the general, and continued, and earnest, and solemn proclamation and exposition, and application of the law of God in all its majesty, and authority and spirituality; that law which is implied in the every constitution of nature, which was directly revealed as to its great principles around the thunderings and lightnings of Sinai, and which was spiritualized and completed, illustrated and fulfilled, by him who is himself the law because he is one with him who is himself the right? Indeed, is not the more frequent and faithful presentation of the law in this, its finished and highest forms, of the law of Christ distinctively, of the ethics of the Gospel—is not just this the most urgent need of the present hour? Owing to centuries of Christian influence the majority of those who are reached by our churches are outwardly moral. They do not have other gods, they do not bow down to images, they do not blaspheme, they do not do business on the Lord's Day. They treat their parents fairly well. They do not murder. They do not commit adultery. They do not steal. They do not tell black lies. They try not to be grossly covetous. Judged by an external though high standard, they are pretty good people. How, then, can they be convicted of the sins of which they are guilty, and from which they need to be saved as really as though, in the most flagrant sense, they were murderous or adulterous; unless they are confronted with those more spiritual aspects of the law which are often foreshadowed in the Old Testament prophets, in the Psalms and even in the Pentateuch, and which are clearly revealed in the sermon on the Mount. Preach that the sixth commandment is broken, not only by him who kills his brother, but also by him who is angry with him without a cause, and you will convict of sin many who otherwise would have remained at ease. That is, you will proclaim just the truth which is appropriate to existing conditions, and which, therefore, the Holy Spirit may

be expected to use in the works of conviction. Set forth in all its spirituality and beauty, the character and life which the work of Christ for us, and in us has taught us and rendered obligatory on us ; the faith, hope, and love, which the Gospel has revealed and requires, in all their manifestations and applications, the new view of this world as well as of the next which the New Testament's fuller revelation of the Kingdom of God has made it our duty to hold and to act on—let these things be the burden of much of our preaching, and we shall at least preach truth specially adapted to existing conditions, truth fitted to convict those whom a law less distinctively Christian would not disturb. Might it not be that if our revivals of religion were systematically prepared for by such ethical preaching, they would not, as they so often do, issue only in large gatherings, interesting meetings, and wonder and perplexity as to what it has all amounted to ?

6. We discover a further reason for this vital relation between Christian ethics and the evangelization of the world in this, that the life of Christ cannot be reproduced unless the ethics of his Gospel is appreciated. A word or two, and this will be evident. It is true that knowledge is not virtue even though Plato thought that it was. One might understand the law of Christ as perfectly as Christ himself understands it, but he could not keep it, he could not even seriously desire to keep it, unless he were given by the spirit of regeneration the new heart, and the faith which proceeds only from it ; and he could not become the subject of this divine internal work but for the meritorious life and sacrificial death for him of his substitute, the Son of God. All this is true. It is the truth of supreme as it is the truth of first importance. But just because of this, do we perceive the immense practical importance of the ethics of Christ. That we could not become holy unless he had died to make us so, is the reason why we should strive to understand, and appreciate his law. For unless we do this, we can not keep it. It is not more true that knowledge alone can not make a man holy than it is true that even grace in the

heart cannot make him so without knowledge. If we are to be "conformed to the image of God's Son," the Holy Spirit must teach us what his image involves as well as give us the power to realize it.

Now the Holy Spirit teaches us out of the truth of the Divine Word and by it. Hence, we can become what Christ died to make us only as the life and character set forth in the Gospel are so presented to us that the Holy Spirit may interpret them to our minds and apply them to our hearts. Otherwise, in an important sense, Christ has "died in vain." Though we be "saved as by fire," we can not become the large saints that his life and death were fitted to make us. And this is not all. He has "died in vain" also because we cannot, if small saints, be the witnesses for him that he would have us be. Christianity is bound to be estimated according to the character and lives of its professors. It is in them that the world confessed Christ's power. If, then, there do not appear in them those virtues, those graces, which only he could reveal or effect, how can we expect the world to acknowledge Christianity as the one way of life? In a word, Christians must be thoroughly taught the ethics of the Gospel, if they are to follow Christ truly, and unless they truly follow him, his Gospel will not have its due power over the world. May it not be that many a real work of grace in our churches ceases prematurely and is far less influential than the power with which it began led us to hope that it would be for this reason, that the invitation of Christ is not followed up by the law of Christ? Those who come to Jesus need to be shown just what he would have them be and just how he would have them live. They can become like him only as they keep his "new commandment," and they can witness effectively for him only in so far as they are like him.

5. One other reason why it is of the utmost importance that the ethics of the Gospel should be preached systematically and fully must be mentioned as I close, but it can be only mentioned. It is this: Even natural ethics, if it is to be maintained in its integrity, requires to be explained

and conformed and supplemented by the law of Christ. That this is so, the history of ethics has proved abundantly. There never has been a truly natural ethical development even as regards theory apart from Christianity. Confucius thought, perhaps, as pure an ethics as the wisdom of this world could conceive and his teaching was the most exclusively ethical that the world has heard. What has been the result? The eternal principles of right were founded even by Confucius with the politic and the expedient; and the vast empire that he may be said to have established, the greatest empire of the world, has become a prize to be striven for by more virile nations whom the law of Christ has made, even though they do often violate and even ignore it. Observation in our own community affords the same lesson. When left to themselves, men can recognize duty and appreciate virtue; for the law of God is both implied in the constitution of things and written on the heart. But do we find men by themselves either doing their whole duty or realizing true virtue? Are not their natures impure or their efforts misdirected? When they do not err by defect, do they not err by excess? Do they not need to be stimulated here? Do they not need to be checked there? They require a more exact statement of duty, a more precise representation of virtue, than their own reason, finite and sinfully perverted as it is, can give them. They must know the law of Christ, if they are to read aright the law of nature.

We can see at once why this is. The law of Christ is no after thought. Sinai prepared for it. Creation was in order to it. God himself, who is the essence and norm of right and so the supreme standard of law, made the fullest revelation of himself in it. He who taught and alone fully obeyed and perfectly illustrated it was himself the "mediator of the old covenant;" he was himself the creator of the world and so of the ethical laws involved in their constitution. He is himself "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his substance." In a word, in the ethics of the Gospel we have the crowning manifesta-



tion of eternal right. It must be, therefore, that righteousness which does not tend to the law of Christ and develop into it and by it and for it can not continue right. It must become dead and corrupt just as the whole palmetto palm is sure to die when once you cut off its crown. Ought we not, then, to preach the law of Christ, systematically, constantly, fully, solemnly, and yet joyfully? As ministers of the grace of God, may we do less? The grace of Christ has its end in his ethics, and the grace of Christ comes with power for salvation largely in proportion as his ethics is taught and practiced.

Since writing this paper it has seemed best to the author to add, in view of recent events, and specially of manifest tendencies in some branches of the Presbyterian Church, that zeal for orthodoxy, unless it be "zeal without knowledge," will put fresh emphasis on ethical preaching. Only thus can we silence the taunt of our adversaries, that we make a fetish of what we call Christian dogma and quite ignore Christian life. Only thus can we illustrate the doctrines of our creed; every one of them has relation to conduct, and cannot be understood and appreciated save as it is exhibited in its practical requirements. Indeed, only thus can we be loyal to our Confession of Faith, our symbol of orthodoxy; it has no clearer or more characteristic teaching than that "truth is in order to holiness." It may not be doubted that the widely diffused desire for a shorter and less explicit creed has found a part of its occasion, not in too much doctrinal preaching, but in too little ethical preaching. Neither the world nor the Church will appreciate or ought to appreciate the importance of doctrines unless they are presented as in living relation to actual life. If they are not so presented, the inference is bound to be drawn at last that they are not of God. And we may not complain. Does not St. Paul say? "Every Scripture is inspired of God, and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness; that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Princeton, New Jersey.

## II. THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

The Church of God on earth finds its true origin and its original constitution in the covenant which God made with Abraham as the father of the faithful. Of course we find traces of the true religion running on back to the very beginning, but we do not find any organization of the righteous into an association of God's people, which perpetuated itself and carried out the purposes of a church. God called Abraham out of the world of heathenism and set him apart, together with his family, unto the worship and service of the true God. He constituted him the father of the faithful for all time by an everlasting promise, sealed with a sign or token which was to be applied to all the male members of his race. This covenant is therefore properly considered the charter of the church's existence, a charter which has never been superseded, and is never out of date. It is therefore of the greatest importance to the church to ascertain the true meaning and scope of this promise, since upon this must depend our definition of the Visible Church. It requires but a limited examination of the literature of the church to show that these are amongst the unsettled questions. Our definitions of the church are very various and defective. The definition should state what kind of an organization the church is, and for what purpose it was established; and yet our Westminster definition, the best of all the confessional definitions, describes the church merely from its contents, as if in answer to the question, Who constitute the Visible Church? Examining the various confessions on the question of what is essential to the Visible Church, we find that this question has received no definite answer. Some mention as the note or mark of the church "the Faith" or the possession of the Word, while others mention the Word and the sacraments. None of these definitions tell us just what the church is, or as an organization what it was intended to accomplish. Protestant writers have been so intent on emphasizing the spirit-

uality of the church, as against a hollow ecclesiasticism, that they have almost forgotten that the church has any external form other than that which is produced by the internal life; and the impression is left upon us that the church is merely a voluntary association of God's people.

Now, if the church really has a charter, the examination of the charter should determine the important question of the nature of the organization, and its purpose in the world. The study of the Abrahamic covenant therefore is a question of vital interest.

As we approach this question we at once inquire, What does the promise mean, and to whom does it apply? Are there two promises or one? Do we have at first a promise of temporal good, followed by a promise of spiritual blessing, the two being quite distinct, or are all the forms of the promise different stages of one and the same covenant promise? Again, is the promise of spiritual blessing a promise of salvation in Christ, or a promise of certain ecclesiastical privileges? Does the promise embrace the natural children of Abraham or his spiritual children? These are questions which are answered differently by writers in our own church.

A careful inspection of all the forms of the promise from the twelfth chapter through the seventeenth seems conclusively to show that there is but one covenant promise in four stages of development. They are found in Gen. 12, 1-3: chap. 13; 14-16: chap. 15, chap. 17. These cannot be separate and distinct promises, for the reason that they all contain the same elements, and it is impossible to divide them sharply into temporal and spiritual promises, as some have sought to do. The promise in its earliest form unmistakably contains both elements. The temporal feature is contained in the promise, "I will make of thee a great nation." That which follows is admitted by all to be a promise of spiritual blessing, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The same is contained in the benediction, "Be thou a blessing." The second stage of the promise, (chap. 13: 15-16,) contains both elements.

The promise of the land is perfectly explicit: "All the land which thou seest to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever." The word "forever," which is evidently to be taken literally, would itself indicate something more than an earthly possession; but the impression which is produced by an unlimited possession is borne out by the promise of a countless seed. Abraham's seed are to be "as the dust of the earth." Standing by itself this might be taken to mean merely a great multitude, but as if to shut out this figurative interpretation the innumerable character of the seed is explained in the most explicit terms. "And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth, so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed be numbered." We see at once that such a promise cannot find its fulfillment in the multiplication of the natural seed, and it must therefore apply to the spiritual Israel, even to that "multitude which no man can number" depicted in revelation. In chapter fifteen there is a reiteration of this feature of the promise, and it was evidently the unquestioning acceptance of this literally innumerable seed which was "counted to Abraham for righteousness" and entitled him to the appellation, "father of the faithful." The additional features of chapter fifteen are this acceptance of the promise on the part of Abraham, and the actual conveyance of the title to the land in the ceremony of the smoking furnace and the torch passing between the parts of the sacrifices. The past tense is now employed to describe the transactions: "Unto thy seed have I given this land." In spite of this impressive transaction the spiritual part of the promise, the innumerable seed and its acceptance, remains the most important feature of chapter fifteen. Again, in chapter seventeen, which has been especially designated as containing a promise of spiritual blessings, the promise of the land is incorporated with this spiritual promise.

But the essential unity as well as the spiritual nature of these promises is abundantly shown by New Testament Scriptures. In Rom. 4:18 the apostle quotes the very

language of chapter fifteen as the equivalent of the promise of chapter seventeen. "He in hope believed against hope to the end that he might become the father of many nations according to that which had been spoken; so shall thy seed be." This mixture of the two forms of the promise shows them to be one and the same. Again we have a similar identification of chapter seventeen with that of chapter twelve. Acts 3:25 reads: "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed (cf. chap. 22:18.) These Scriptures appear to be satisfactory proof that the promises are one and are all alike spiritual; but a passage in Heb. 11 comes with the force of demonstration, as showing that even the promise of the land was itself a spiritual promise in the highest sense. "By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him of the same promise; for he looked for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God." He was not staggered by the fact that he did not himself actually possess the land, because he knew that the promise of ownership made to himself and his seed found its highest fulfillment in that heavenly Canaan to which he was going, and of which the earthly Canaan was a type. This goes to show also that Abraham's faith must have apprehended the spirituality of the promise in reference to the seed. He must have understood that however related to his earthly seed the promise in its true meaning could only apply to those who were his seed in the sense of being of his faith. (cf. Rom. 4, 12.) How could he for a moment understand that a promise which he knew imported salvation to himself, given to him in recognition of his faith, would convey a like blessing to his natural descendants without a corresponding faith? If it was a promise of spiritual blessing, of salvation itself, it could only be to the spiritually minded, the faithful.

It is not denied that chapter fifteen contains a grant of natural blessings, but only that such is its exclusive feature. It is true that the grant of the land is made specially prom-

inent here, for it is conveyed as by a deed of gift, sealed by the striking transaction of the furnace and the torch which passed between the parts of the sacrifices; but even this does not separate the promise of the land by a hard and fast line from the promise of chapter seventeen, so that it can be said, This is temporal, the other is spiritual. On the other hand the grant of the land is repeated in chapter seventeen as an integral part of this spiritual promise, and having received its special seal in chapter fifteen the seal of chapter seventeen can apply to it only in this comprehensive sense. The temporal and the spiritual, in so far as the distinction is allowable, are perfectly blended in chapter seventeen. It is well to notice that the spiritual part of the promise is just as absolute in its form as is the grant of the land. God says, "As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be the father of a multitude of nations." His name is changed to Abraham in token of this fatherhood, as a thing already in possession, "for the father of a multitude of nations have I made thee;" this in spite of the fact that his heir was not yet born. The next sentence is perhaps a reference to temporal blessings, "And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations\* of thee and kings shall come out of thee." This goes to show that while the promise of a multitude of nations is spiritual it contains a promise to the natural seed and the nation of Israel as such.

Then follows the verse which ecclesiological writers point out as certainly designating this as an ecclesiological covenant: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. As is claimed, the fact that the seed are here mentioned as parties with whom the covenant is made, makes this beyond question an ecclesiological covenant. While this is true, it should not escape notice that the church so designated is the spiritual church

---

\*Perhaps the two kingdoms of Israel referred to.

rather than the natural Israel as such. The blessing promised is spiritual, being a special, loving relation to God. God is "to be a God" unto Abraham and his seed. This means that he is to have a care over them, to be a God of special providence to them, which means all that is contained in his providential and ecclesiological name, Jehovah. He was to be, as he afterwards himself explains the relation, Jehovah, their God, that is a God of salvation to them. It is certainly true that this promise contained a special blessing for the natural Israel. God had said in the beginning that he would make of Abraham a great nation, and the seed to whom the promise was made was to come out of his loins. This implies all that is contained in God's special proprietorship of the nation of Israel; but it is at the same time impossible to hold with any show of reason that this promise was intended to secure the salvation of all Abraham's natural seed. Such a view is too plainly in conflict with their history as a stiff-necked and rebellious people, and God's final rejection of them from being his people. Paul tells us plainly that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel, neither because they are Abraham's seed are they all children." It is not therefore as though the Word of God had come to naught that the natural Israel failed to obtain the promise, for "the children of the flesh were not the children of God." Only the children of the promise, Paul tells us, were reckoned for a seed, and these were a special type to be reckoned through the line of Isaac. In other words, God acknowledged no children but the righteous. (Rom. 9, 1-5.)\* Again in chapter eleven of the Epistle to the Romans Paul teaches plainly that the true Israel, which were God's people, were the elect. God did by no means cast off his people when he rejected Israel, for "the election obtained the blessing and the rest were hardened." Paul then by his exposition of the promise to Abraham tells us plainly that it is spiritual, and applies in the highest, truest sense only to the elect.

---

\* Again we are told in Gal. 3:7 that it is "they which be of faith" that are the sons of Abraham.

In accordance with this exposition we find that the Abrahamic covenant is in its terms an absolute promise rather than a conditional promise as is usually understood. There is no specified condition or stipulation. The clause, Walk before me, and be thou perfect, is in effect as in form simply a command. To attach it to the promise as a stipulation is to destroy it altogether. If we conceive of God's saying to Abraham, "If you walk before me in a perfect way, and your children do the same thing you shall have an innumerable seed possessed of the blessing of salvation," what would such a promise be worth to Abraham as an assurance of anything. Such a promise would amount to nothing more than an announcement that God would deal with justice. It would be a covenant of law not of special blessing, and in such form could give no assurance of a spiritual following. God did not mock Abraham in this way, and Abraham certainly did not understand any such modifying clause as attaching to the promise, So shall thy seed be. The character and substance of the whole affair is found in the first communication with Abraham. There is a command followed by a definite promise. Get thee out of thy country \* \* \* and I will make of thee a great nation, \* \* \* and be thou a blessing. The covenant is absolute, its fulfillment resting not upon Abraham's strength or stability or natural goodness, but upon the infallible purpose and grace of the unchanging God. God's covenant with Abraham is simply his certified promise to Abraham that he should certainly possess the blessing. It is as absolute in form and far reaching consequence as was the covenant with Noah, which was made not with Noah simply but "with the earth," and which assured the stability and regular operation of the natural laws of the world in which we live.

The covenant with Abraham may be regarded as the most precious inheritance of the church, being nothing less than God's Covenant of Salvation with man. It contains the promise of a Saviour to the world, and the assurance of the salvation of a great multitude of men, beyond the



power of man to number. It contains, as the whole the parts, all the glorious prophecies of the church's prosperity and final glorious success. It is in fact the foundation upon which the church rests, and her hope for all time. The prophecy of "a multitude of nations" is not yet fulfilled, and will not be until the darkness that covers the earth shall have been fully illumined by the glory of the sun of righteousness, when nations shall come to his light, and kings to the brightness of his rising, (Isaiah 60) and the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Of course there is a necessary connection between the character of the seed and the promised blessing, but the absoluteness of the promise raises no objection on this score. If the promise were to the natural seed, of course it could only be conditional. Without faith it is impossible to please God, and only believers, or the regenerate, can be saved; but what the covenant promises, in so many words, is not simply that if men believe they shall be saved, but that there shall be an innumerable company of believers, or true seed, who shall be saved. In the last proposition it goes without saying that only believers, or regenerated persons, shall receive the blessing, as well as that all believers shall obtain it. The connection between Abraham's faith and the blessing is clearly announced in chapter fifteen. He believed in the Lord and he counted it to him for righteousness. This does not mean that his faith was the procuring cause of his salvation, but indicates the channel through which the blessing of salvation would be conveyed to the true people of God in all ages. Abraham's faith did not condition the promise, but the promise preceded the faith, being that upon which his faith terminated, "Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness." So also it is now reckoned to all who walk in the steps of Abraham's faith, and thus show themselves to be his seed. This promise which extends to the world, and includes the church in all the ages, really embodies for every age the Gospel message of salvation to the world.

The promise is to the faithful, that is as far as it regards responsible persons, to believers; but only those walk in the steps of Abraham's faith who in every age believe God's message of salvation and render an obedience in accordance therewith. The character of saving faith is always the same, it takes God at his word and rests upon him for salvation, but the contents of saving faith must necessarily change with the progress of God's revelation. The faith which in Abraham puts its trust in Jehovah as the God of his salvation necessarily develops into a personal trust in a personal Saviour the moment God makes known his method of salvation through the redeeming work of the Lord Jesus Christ. To the Jews who asked, What is the work of God, Christ replied, This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. To those who claimed to be the children of Abraham and yet rejected him Jesus said, If ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham. On the other hand they showed by their deeds that they were the children of another father, even the devil. He lays it down as a proposition not to be disputed that "He that is of God heareth the words of God," and draws the inevitable conclusion, from their unbelief, that they were not of God. Thus, while he had previously admitted that they were Abraham's children in the natural sense, he denies that they are such in the sense of the promise. Only an acceptance of his claim to be the Son of God could give them rank as the true children. "The bond servant abideth not in the house forever; the son abideth forever. If, therefore, the son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Thus Christ teaches plainly that among responsible hearers only those who accept him as the Saviour of the world can truly claim to be the children of Abraham. Thus we see that the covenant with Abraham, which is in a sense made with Christ, as our surety, contains implicitly the Gospel promise, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. But it is far more than this, since it gives God's assurance that an innumerable multitude shall believe—

that Christ shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; that the church shall live through all the ages, the gates of hell not being able to prevail against it; in fact, that the stream of the godly seed shall not be broken down to the end of time, this including saved infants and idiots as well as actual believers.

Let us now ask the question, How is it that a promise which in its highest sense regards only the true invisible church becomes the charter of the church visible? The answer seems to be that by the giving of the seal of the covenant, the sign of circumcision, Abraham's immediate descendants are constituted the custodians of this promise, i. e., of this Gospel message of salvation. The church can be made visible only by an external badge of profession. This badge, which was by God's express command to be placed upon all the male descendants of Abraham, constituted his family and ultimately the Jewish nation the custodians of that message of salvation, which was from the first intended not for the Jews alone but for the world. "This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every male among you shall be circumcised." This sign constituted Abraham's natural descendants externally the people of God, separated among the nations to the service and worship of the true God. It was made their business from the first to keep alive the knowledge of the true God, and before the world they stood for this profession to own and serve Jehovah as the one living and true God. God gives us his own expression of his purpose in setting apart Abraham and his family from the balance of the world: "For I have known him (i. e., recognized, chosen him) to the end that he may command his children, and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment; to the end that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him." Here we have family government and teaching mentioned as the purpose of the original organization. God thus constitutes the family an integral part of his church, teaching us that

family training is that which he first of all relies upon for keeping alive the knowledge of the true God and the promotion of righteousness ; and we may add for the carrying out of his purpose of redemption as announced in the covenant itself. This is fully expressed in the last clause of the verse quoted, "To the end that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

This appears to be the first account of any formal establishment of God's church on earth. It cannot be denied that religion is older. We see something of family religion in the household of Noah, perhaps also in that of Adam, but it is a fact also that it had proved a failure as regards the preservation and the propagation of true piety and allegiance to the true God. God formally establishes in Abraham a new plant, this time laying his command upon the head of the household and pledging his own co-operation in the carrying out of the purpose of this new organization. This being God's own establishment, he pledges himself beforehand that it shall be perpetual and finally successful. As the church is organized in the family this unit continues, so far as ought to the contrary appears, down to the end of time. The organization of the Jewish National Church recognized the family organization, and there is no record that this organization was ever repealed, on the other hand much that goes to show that it was intended to be perpetual just as the expressed purpose of this arrangement reaches forth to the final triumph of the church.

We have then in the very constitution of the visible church a feature which separates it in a marked degree from the invisible or true church. The giving of the sign of circumcision which was the seal of a spiritual covenant by no means pledged God to save the whole of Abraham's race, nor in fact any individual to which it was applied ; it simply represented the covenant of which it was a seal. That covenant did not undertake to say what individuals of Abraham's race should be saved, but pledged the perpetuity of the true seed and the final salvation of an innum-

erable multitude of God's redeemed people We have then in the Abrahamic covenant a most important foundation upon which to construct a definition of the church ; but the construction of a definition must not be attempted until further research shall show that this original constitution has never been superseded, and that it has not even in any essential point been modified, so that it still stands the unchanged covenant upon which the church of the New Testament rests.

LUTHER LINK.

### III. ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTION.

The question of the exact relation of Church and State seems still unsettled. A wide difference of opinion still exists as to what a church court should do in connection with matters not ecclesiastical. All are agreed that the church should not go into politics; that is, not very far nor very often. The state of opinion can be described somewhat by an adaptation of that "Pinaforism" current some two decades ago. The church should never inter-meddle in civil affairs, no never. What! never? Well, hardly ever.

In all seriousness this seems to be the collective mind of the Southern Presbyterian Church on this subject at this time. The action of Assemblies, Synods and Presbyteries is, at least seemingly, contradictory. One Assembly justified the action of a Synod in petitioning the civil authorities to put a stop to Sunday mails. The Assembly of 1899 refused even to have brought before it any paper relating to the Roberts case. Nearly all the Presbyteries at their spring meeting either ignored, or adopted resolutions not to petition the House of Representatives concerning the matter. Two of them adopted resolutions memorializing their respective members of the House to vote to unseat the alleged polygamist. And in the resolution passed by one of these there was not any feature of humble petition.

Also in the QUARTERLY of July, 1898, there appeared two articles wherein the writers take very adverse views on this subject. One holding the position that a church court can properly handle nothing of a civil or political nature; that the extraordinary case clause is practically obsolete, having primary reference to cases where the church officials "found themselves hampered by the civil in the exercise of their most inalienable rights, and the discharge of their most essential functions." That this clause was inserted to meet just such emergencies can scarcely be doubted.

The other writer claims that where any law is passed, or course pursued, by the State that is immoral in itself, or baneful in its effects, the church should petition the repeal of the law, and the cessation of the alleged vicious practice. The contention on this side is that the extraordinary case clause can be made to cover a great variety of cases ; almost anything indeed that may be deemed extraordinary by the body or Assembly immediately concerned. And it is true that on all questions of politics that deeply concerns the moral welfare of the commonwealth or nation, the utterance of the church should go forth.

Can anything new be said on this subject that has been already so largely and ably debated ? Can any new light be shed on the relation of Church and State ? It is possible, until the absolute limit of knowledge and wisdom be reached

Has all the Scripture bearing on this subject been searched and examined ? We think not. The one particular passage that seems to have been strangely overlooked is I. Cor. 5, 1-10, where Paul advises the Corinthians against the practice of brother going to law against brother, and that too before the heathen magistrate ; and further advice is given to obviate this scandal.

In this passage Paul's advice exhibits two phases, the direct and insistent ; and the indirect, or by way of suggestion. Directly, and with Pauline emphasis he admonishes the brethren not to go to law at all, and especially not before the heathen magistrate. And in rather a suggestive tone he tells them if brethren will have differences, let these be settled before a committee or court of arbitration composed entirely of brethren.

Just here, it seems there is an intimation that in his official ecclesiastical capacity, as an apostle, it was his duty to rebuke the sin of strife among the brethren, and this scandal in the church ; but when it comes to providing ways and means to settle these disputes concerning secular affairs, Paul ceases speaking *ex cathedra*, with the authority of an apostle. Just as he did in the seventh chapter of this

same epistle, "But I speak this by permission and not of commandment." As if to say, "It is my proper duty to rebuke your sin, but when it comes to instituting measures to settle these difficulties, I can only in a private, friendly way advise you. The question arises just here why did not Paul give or repeat the advice or command of Jesus as contained in Matt. 18, 15-17, "Tell it to the church," and let the church settle it? The answer is, that the matters in dispute were "things pertaining to this life," i. e., secular matters. These the church could not adjudicate. And Paul's suggestion is that these matters be settled before a court of arbitration composed of brethren.

Now was this idea of a court of arbitration original with Paul, or was he suggesting the use of an already well-known institution? The latter is undoubtedly the true supposition. Courts of friendly arbitration were well known institutions in that day. Also Paul in this passage uses several technical phrases and terms, chief among which is the "wise man" of V. 5. Says Prof. J. Rendall Harris, "This refers to one who formed a part of the Jewish court of justice and sat on the right hand of its president." It is well known that the Sanhedrin, the greater and the lesser, exercised authority in secular as well as in moral matters. These civil courts had the power of inflicting bodily punishment. "Both Greek and Roman law gave its sanction to the decision pronounced in litigated cases by arbitrators privately chosen. Thus the Jewish court was recognized by the heathen governments. Josephus (Ant. xiv, 10-17) gives a decree whereby the Jews at Sardis were permitted to establish a court to settle disputes among themselves. We know that the constitution of the early Christian churches was largely after the model of the Jewish societies; and as the Christians were at first considered only a Jewish sect they were allowed all the privileges accorded to the Jews. And the Christian churches took advantage of these privileges. Says Prof. Harris, "We do not grasp the fact that the early dream of a new social order involved law as well as gospel; that the church contemplated a



political isolation as well as a moral, and that the new religion was almost more of a theocracy than the old."

That it was the practice of at least some of these Christian societies to even inflict bodily punishment is shown from a passage in the *Didache*, where advice is given to hold a certain offender "in durance vile until he give back the last farthing." "Thus sins against the society were punished by the society itself." We also note that at the date of the writing of the Apostolic Constitutions Christian societies had regularly organized courts to try civil cases, and moreover these tribunals were composed of the elders and deacons of each particular church.

Now whether this widespread dual organization of early Christian societies was brought about by direct apostolic teaching, or whether it was a custom that simply passed over from the synagogue to the church, is a question in itself not very important, nor can it be answered. But we do know that this civil segregation and organization, as well as social and ecclesiastical isolation had apostolic sanction. And this sanction and its accompanying advice is useful in settling some very important principles.

It would seem at the first glance that Paul's teaching in the passage before us is in direct contradiction to the interpretation that we place on Luke xii, 13-14, which is one of the proof texts that the church is not "a judge or divider over men," and that it should not usurp civil functions. For the address of the epistle is "unto the Church of God which is at Corinth."

But a careful examination of the import of the whole passage and especially of Verse 4 will show no contradiction.

In the first place in his advice the apostle is significantly silent concerning elders or deacons, the ecclesiastical functionaries. They were to have nothing to do with settling disputes concerning the affairs "of this life." So much as to those who should not compose this court of arbitration.

In the second place a certain rendering and interpretation can easily be made of Verse 4. This verse has been

variously rendered and widely different constructions have been placed upon it by commentators. So we enjoy the usual privilege where the doctors differ.

Without any violation of grammar or forcing of verbal significance we can read the verse as follows: "If ye then have tribunals pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church." A very free rendering would be this: "If ye do institute courts to adjudicate these secular matters, select as your judges those who have not been honored by the church, those who are not elders or deacons." A writer in alluding to the development of the Christian society has this to say: "In the magisterial function of the Synagogue we may trace the outline of the Christian institution. The ecclesia either by itself or its appointed delegates was to act as a court of arbitration in all disputes among its members. The elders of the church, however, were not to descend to the trivial disputes of daily life. For these any man of common sense and fairness however destitute of official honor and position (the *exouthenemenor*) would be enough."

Two important truths are clearly established by this passage. One is that there is more than one aspect belonging to the congregation, or body of believers. Here is apostolic recognition of the civil interests, duties and capacity of the congregation. Christ, Paul and Peter elsewhere recognize the civil relation of the individual believer; and the two latter give instruction at length concerning the duties consequent upon that relation. But here is recognized the collective corporate relation. It is true in the case before us the advice is seemingly to ignore the State; but in reality it is simply to substitute for the regular civil court an irregular and voluntary one.

The second truth established is that ecclesiastical courts shall not handle anything except matters of a spiritual character. Here was a matter that deeply concerned the spiritual welfare of the body of believers; there was involved in it a moral question, even one of the ten commandments, yet the local Presbytery was not allowed to assume juris-

diction. Here is a plain intimation of the great importance of putting difference between the spiritual and the secular. Here is drawn a line deep and broad between the things that pertain to the two spheres. The spiritual rulers must not even act as civil judges even in cases of difference between brethren. So fundamental is the distinction between the civil and spiritual capacities and functions that a dual organization is necessary.

Perhaps this clashing of opinion in the Presbyterian Church, South, may be due to two causes. One of them is a failure to recognize the fact that the church or congregation has a civil and political aspect. The other is in considering everything whatever that is done by the congregation as ecclesiastical, although recognizing a species of distinction in capacity and function. Also in a general way this difference of opinion is due to an ambiguous use of the terms "church" and "church courts."

Let us further consider the Corinthian case. By divine counsel this church organized itself in a civil capacity. But in so doing it did not lose its identity as a Christian body. It did not, for the occasion and on that account, sink back and become merged into the Corinthian municipality. This court, while civil in all respects, was not a Corinthian judicatory. These courts of arbitration had the sanction of Roman and Greek law; were allowed the exercise of coercion, and the infliction of bodily punishment, and were permissively creations of the State. Yet from the view point of the State they were private or rather society institutions. In the organization, the initiatory was taken by the particular society, and its subsequent government was from within. In the case before us the court, while civil in its nature, was in a certain sense more "church" than "state." It certainly was Christian and not heathen. Yet, and here is the insistence, it was not ecclesiastical, and cannot in strict propriety be called a church court.

Let us apply this principle of discrimination and classification to present day conditions. The congregation now

has social and civil relations and capacities more complex than in apostolic times. There are many matters not at all of a spiritual nature which must be considered by the congregation, as they vitally concern its welfare. To quote from McLaren, "the spiritual function of the church needs material framework for its discharge." The congregation, for instance, must have necessary buildings and must own the land on which they are built. To acquire real estate calls for the exercise of civil functions. The State is God's ordinance to institute ways and means whereby real property may be secured to the exclusive use and management of churches, and societies of all kinds. Usually the State decrees that the title to the property shall be in the name of certain officials called trustees. These are to act as the representatives, for and in place, of the people of the congregation or society.

Let us determine the status of the trustee. Is he an ecclesiastical or a civil official? Much depends, in theory at least, upon the proper determination of this question. The question almost answers itself as soon as asked. The trustee is a civil functionary. No mention is made of such an office in the New Testament. Nowhere is a church enjoined to elect such an officer. The office of trustee is a creation of the State, and in some States the trustee must qualify before the court before he can exercise the duties of office. And in the exercise of his duties he is governed by civil, and not ecclesiastical law, and is held to account by the State.

The congregation selects or elects the individuals to fill the office, and the trustees act as the civil servants or ministers of the congregation. They represent or act for the congregation in the civil sphere.

The next step is to consider the status of a congregation electing or instructing a board of trustees. Is it an ecclesiastical or civil body? This answer is also easy. It is a civil body. No scriptural command or precedent is followed in electing trustees. There is no provision made in the Book of Order, or Discipline, for such a proceeding.

By the very nature of the case the body must be considered a civil one, for an ecclesiastical assembly cannot elect civil officers. The body thus acting is authorized by the State, and not by the Church. Were there no civil statute made and provided for such cases, the church might elect trustees, but the individuals so chosen would not be trustees solely by virtue of that election. Lastly, and this is conclusive. A congregation may in meeting pass a resolution ordering the trustees to sell real estate. The sale may take place, but it may not be confirmed by the civil court if some injustice or informality be alleged and proven. In that case if the congregation so acting be ecclesiastical then we have the church under the State, in the matter of property at least. If the congregation in its relation to the trustee be an ecclesiastical body, and not civil, then we are not yet free from Erastianism.

There is also what may be called the business and social aspect of the congregation. The membership of a particular church, or of an entire denomination may inaugurate and manage institutions of various kinds, such as hospitals, orphanages and schools. The membership of a church may be organized into a money earning band or society, the object of which, to raise funds for missions, and other church and charitable purposes. There is also the social gathering of the church people, and the eating and the drinking thereof.

There has been originated in recent years the "Institutional Church," which is an organization whose aim is the uplifting of the neglected, congested masses of the cities. Under one management it engages in all sorts of work, religious, social, educational, philanthropic and even business, for the general betterment of the people.

There is also pertaining to the membership of a church or of a whole denomination a political aspect and capacity, and corresponding duties. No one can deny the fact that the church is a most important political factor. It was intended to be. A part, an important part of its mission, is to leaven with righteousness the politics of the nations.

When this mission is accomplished then will the Kingdom of God be fully come.

This influence is exerted by the church in two very different ways. First, by the exercise of its great function of preaching the Gospel. By this men are regenerated, and being thus made better men are necessarily made better citizens. And if any considerable proportion of population is so affected an inevitable influence will be exerted upon the politics of the country. The political freedom of the nations is measured by the Gospel privileges they enjoy. In this the church has no direct dealing or relation with the State, and acts strictly within the spiritual sphere.

There are, however, times and circumstances when it is necessary for the membership of a particular church, and also the Christian population of a whole nation to make their influence felt directly upon the politics of the country. This is done either by the exercise of the right of franchise, or more directly by petition. In the latter case the individual membership may sign petitions, or it may be done by a representative assembly for the people as a whole. However, in all such cases as this, it is necessary to exercise a right or rights that are distinctly political. In all free governments no political right is any more emphasized than that of petition. It is most distinctly recognized and guarded by the Constitution of the United States.

The right, and the act of petition, therefore lie in the political sphere. They are matters provided for by the "Kingdom of this world;" are among the matters or "things pertaining to this life." It is perfectly right and proper for the church to recognize this right and advise the exercise of it just as it does in the civil matter of "paying tribute to whom tribute is due." But the right of petition like the duty of tribute did not originate in the decrees of ecclesiastical councils, nor can such a council authorize itself (or any one else) to exercise the right, thus making the act an ecclesiastical one. The right of petition is one of the original natural rights of man existing prior to any legislative enactments. Even the State, while it is the

“Institute of rights,” is not the author. The fountain of rights is with God. Says Ululford. “They are the primal prerogatives of humanity. They have not their origin in human enactments, but determine the just contents of those enactments.” The State however does properly determine define and guarantee rights. It also makes provision for the proper exercise of rights, among others this one of petition. The right itself and the exercise of it, (whatever be the burden of the petition), both lie entirely within the political sphere. The case is precisely analogous to the matter of trusteeship. The State making provision for it and not the church, all that pertains to it being for that reason in the civil sphere.

But we meet with the most earnest contention that in certain cases, and in behalf of certain causes, a petition to the State authorities may and can be a proper ecclesiastical function. And there are two main arguments used to sustain the contention.

One of these is that the subject matter of the petition has a kind of converting power in certain cases; that it can transfer the act of petitioning from the political sphere (where it naturally belongs) to the ecclesiastical sphere. For instance, if the burden of the petition be an important moral question, involving one of the ten commandments or some other vital Bible doctrine, the action is, or can be made ecclesiastical. The act of petitioning would and could only be political if the petition be to pass any law relating to the tariff. It would be nearly, if not quite, ecclesiastical if it be to prohibit lotteries, or liquor selling on week days. It would be undoubtedly, without any question entirely ecclesiastical if it be to pass a Sunday law.

The other argument is that “the Constitution,” (meaning by that the Confession of Faith) “allows the Church to petition the State authorities;” and for that reason the act of petition is an ecclesiastical function, provided the case be deemed extraordinary. The two elements, the authorization of the Confession and the extraordinariness of the case

combined are sufficient and able to transfer the action from the political to the ecclesiastical sphere.

Let us analyze this argument. It is, in substance, a claim, (1) that because any moral question can be handled by a church court; it follows that said court may suggest, originate, use and authorize to be used, any political means or measures to promote moral and religious reform, provided the situation be grave and extraordinary. For instance, should the end or object in view be the enactment of laws to promote Sabbath observance or to diminish the evil of divorce, then the importance of the end is so great that means extraordinary, means not ecclesiastical, may be used, and that the nature of said means becomes by being so used, for the purpose mentioned, transformed, and also translated into the ecclesiastical from the political. Here is a most notable achievement. Not only is the end able to justify the means, but is also able to adopt it into the spiritual sphere, and to sanctify it unto ecclesiastical uses.

It is also a claim, (2) that because the constitution, or the Confession of Faith allows a Synod to petition a legislative body, that therefore the act is a proper ecclesiastical function. But a constitution framed and adopted by a body of men for their guidance in ecclesiastical matters cannot authorize any action concerning other matters. To say that the Confession can confer authority is reasoning in a circle, for the Confession is a creation of the church. Now if the Confession in this matter be, to use one of the phrases of the Confession, "consonant to the Word of God" it would for that reason be an authority. But Scripture proof texts on this point are conspicuous by their absence.

But as a matter of fact the Confession does not claim to authorize a Synod in its ecclesiastical capacity to petition any department of the State. The language of chapter 31, section 4 is plain and unequivocal. The very terms of the clause "Synods and Councils are to handle nothing but that which is ecclesiastical" exclude all the after-mentioned matters from the category of the ecclesiastical, "humble petition" being no exception.



The doctrine of the extraordinary case clauses of the Confession has been misunderstood. The old interpretation makes these clauses exceptional. And the question has often arisen, "If it be wrong as a matter of principle for a church court to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth," how can any exception thereto be deemed allowable from a moral standpoint? How would this sound, "Thou shalt not swear, except in cases extraordinary, when under great stress of personal indignation, using only the form of sound words hereinafter provided." Now from the amount of heat that hath been gendered in the discussion of this question in the past thirty-seven years, it must be a matter of fundamental principle, that the church in her proper spiritual character, and ecclesiastical capacity should not enter the arena of politics, to which principle there can be no exception. And as a fact the Confession cannot be cited as allowing any exception.

This view or construction of the extraordinary case clauses bring them into harmony with the main clause, and relieves them of the appearance and charge of contradicting the proof-texts of the main clause.

This construction also makes these clauses to consist with the general and approved theory that church and State are coordinate ; neither being in any wise subjects to the other. For if the body petitioning be acting in the ecclesiastical capacity, then we have a spectacle we abhor, the church humbly down upon its knees begging favors from the State.

But it may be argued that this body of men is, as a matter of fact, subject to the State. True, but when the body is considered as citizens exercising a constitutional right, it is rightly subject to God's secular ordinance, the State. The body in the capacity of citizens being a part of the body politic, is subject to the whole. But as a church, that body not be a part of the political corpus, is not under the jurisdiction, or the government of the same, and has no favors to ask, or rights to demand from it.

But the question is asked, when the State attacks the church, and invades her sphere has she no right of self-protection; can she use no means for self-defence? The answer is that there is no call or occasion for the church to defend herself, or to maintain her rights. She is no maiden all forlorn compelled herself to don armor, and enter the lists to maintain her own cause. The Bridegroom in his absence did not leave the Bride unprovided with champions. She has guardians watchful of her honor and peace, and ready to do battle for her; leaving her within her own sphere to pursue undisturbed her chosen work. The members of Christ's spiritual body (especially the male members) are also members, and parts of the body politic. And in their political and civil capacities they are by the very nature of things constituted the curators of the civil and political interests of the church. Belonging to the body politic they have the right to demand their share in controlling the policy of the State in the interests of religion and righteousness.

Just at this time it is important that we should agree on the proper principal of discrimination. For instance the Assembly of 1899 was urged to "withdraw its recognition from the American Sabbath Union, on the ground that this is a society for the promotion of legislative reform." The allegation that the Union is in reality a political association is undeniable. Its avowed purpose is to influence legislation; one part of its work being to maintain a lobby committee in Washington. That such work is not one of the spiritual functions of the church is also true. But the body of believers in its political capacity should seek to influence legislation in a direct manner. It is not only proper but very desirable that the different bodies of Christians in their political capacities should combine to influence for good the politics not only of the nation, but of the nations. Not only should there be an American, but an International Sabbath Union; and also International Temperance and Arbitration Associations. Considering the growth of the divorce evil, and the consequent widespread demor-

alization, an interdenominational union, to secure from the legislatures of the different States more stringent and more uniform laws regulating divorce, would be a most timely organization.

Also just now our Assembly seems committed to the adoption of at least one feature of the "Institutional Church." The idea of the school as an adjunct of general church work is in much favor. Let us examine the status of the same. The position taken in this article is, that a school, under the control of the Christian people, the church members, of a community, in which the Bible is used as a text-book, is a devoutly-to-be-sought-for institution. But there are some assumptions and arguments used by the advocates of the Parochial school system that are subject to criticism.

It is assumed that education is a spiritual matter. That being the case the school is spiritual in character. Therefore the church being the curator and manager of all matters and institutions of a spiritual character, must found and manage schools. This assumption and argument would take the child from the control of the parent from the kindergarten period up, and place it in the hands of the church. If the school be an organic part of the church, then parents would be subject at least to ecclesiastical reprimand if they refused to patronize the school. And if any members of a particular church should organize a school of their own, they would be guilty of schism.

From the assumption that the proposed school is an organic part of the church, the "Constitution for Presbyterian Church Schools" is subject to criticism. The first important clause we meet is "The sole government of the school shall be in the hands of a board of trustees, who shall be appointed by the session." The criticism is, that a civil body, a board of trustees, can have no authority to govern the church, or any part thereof. The church cannot recognize any hand save its own in the government of its internal spiritual affairs.

But it may be answered that this board is created by the session, and its membership totally renewed every three

years, and for this reason the school is really under the control of the session. In practice this may be the case, but from the standpoint of sound principle this answer only adds to the error and confusion. A series of questions of the nature of grave conundrums may be asked just here. What authority has a session, an ecclesiastical body, to delegate its governing power to a civil body? What authority has a session to exercise authority over a board of trustees? How can a session transmit ecclesiastical authority and spiritual capacity to a teacher of a school through a civil medium, a board of trustees? In this case is not the board rather a non-conductor?

It is said also in this constitution that "The board shall have power to raise and disburse moneys." If this school system is truly a part of church work, the session would be violating the constitution to commit any such work as this raising and disbursing of moneys to anybody except the board of deacons. For to them only can be committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church.

Now if the school be an organic part of the church, and the founding and management of it be proper ecclesiastical function; then the constitutional procedure would be, the appointment of the teacher by the session, the collection and payment of the salary by the deacons, and if there be any real estate or trust funds, let the trustees hold and invest the same, turning over any rents or interest into the hands of the deacons. Let us not ignore the principles of the constitution.

But there are many who hold the doctrine that the founding and management of schools and colleges is not proper ecclesiastical function. The very method pursued in the government of the church college and also of the seminary is an admission of this doctrine at least in practice. The rulers of a college is not a bench of bishops, but of trustees who are not ordained by the laying on of hands. Now if the college or seminary be truly a part of the ecclesiastical system then the appointment of professors should be directly by a church court. In the Methodist church

this is done. Also it is admitted that the seminary governing body is not ecclesiastical, as it could not a few years ago try a professor for heresy. The term church cannot be used to modify that of school or college when taken in its exact scriptural sense, as the schools and colleges are now governed.

The contention in this article is also that an act or a work done or carried on by ecclesiastical courts or officials is not for that reason ecclesiastical. A Synod may vote (always unanimously) to accept an invitation to luncheon, or an excursion. But the vote of the body does not convert the collation into a sacrament, nor the trip by rail or boat into a sacred pilgrimage. To take a serious case: A Presbytery or a Conference may choose a board of managers to control all the matters incidental to a camp-meeting. This board secures a charter to enable it legally to appoint a police force to patrol the grounds, with power to arrest and imprison. Now if all that pertains to the control of a religious assembly be ecclesiastical, then we have another spectacle we abhor, the church wielding the sword.

Lastly as a fundamental principle, we contend that the character of an assembly is determined by the action performed. In other words, function, not name or claim, determines character. For instance, the membership of a church may be duly in assembly, and if the action taken be the election of elders the body is of an ecclesiastical nature because it is authorized thus to act by the church constitution. The next action may be the election of trustees. In so acting the character of the body is changed from the ecclesiastical to the civil; for in this matter the body is authorized to act by the State. If the next action be to petition the City Council to suppress liquor-selling on any day of the week, the character of the assembly becomes purely political.

This principle, that function is determinative, not claim, is a wide reaching one. While, so far as the writer knows, it has not been formally stated or systematically propounded, yet in substance it is widely recognized. For in-

stance, in civil affairs a jury is a body of men authorized to act in the matter of trial, but not of execution. It is a jury only when performing the specific duties of a jury as defined by a statute. Otherwise it is resolved into its original elements, a collection of individuals. It is true they might hang the accused, but they could not as a jury. For the definition of a jury is a body authorized to act in trial only; and to say that a jury can hang is equivalent to the contradiction that a body has the authority to do that which it has no authority to do.

A legislative body if acting contrary to a constitution is, while so acting, not a law-making body; for its acts are null and void when put to the test, and all are absolved from obedience to the same.

Proper function too is the determinant of official character. The occupant of the White House in the act of casting his vote is not the President, but a simple citizen. The President is an officer, not a person. The chief magistracy inheres not in the man, but in what he does.

In this discrimination between the person and the official we find the justification of revolution. The king, the governor and the legislature being the ordinance of God, any resistance to the same is rebellion and sin against God. But if the king, governor or legislature transcend their proper function, they for the time being cease to act in an official capacity and become usurpers. If they do or command to be done, anything contrary to the law of God, they in that, necessarily cease to be the ordinance of God; for God cannot authorize any evil doing, or transgression of his own law. Government is authorized by God, but not tyranny. Therefore resistance to tyranny is not rebellion. Obedience to all the mandates of the king is inculcated in the Scripture, but the person is king only when not violating in his ruling the law of God. The old maxim that the king can do no wrong is true, but only when the word refers to the officer and not the individual. Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon, but in commanding all men to worship the image he vacated his kingship. Peter and John when for-

bidden by the council to preach, refused to obey; yet Christ had expressly told them "The scribes and pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe; that observe and do." But in commanding the disciples to cease preaching they vacated Moses' seat.

So also no one is obligated to obey the mandates of an assembly that has vacated its true ecclesiastical position. The church exists only within the ecclesiastical sphere, and therefore has no authority outside of the bounds thereof. If an assembly should decree that all the voting membership should vote a certain ticket in a political campaign; enjoining the churches to enforce the same on penalty of excommunication, there would be a large secession of churches, Presbyteries and perhaps Synods. Here would be a rending of the ecclesiastical body, but the schismatics would not be the seceders; but the majority which by its unlawful action forces the separation. In this the majority ejects itself, not the minority.

It is not every assembly of believers claiming to be a church court that is such, but only that which is doing the will of God in ecclesiastical matters. The assumption that whatever a church court does is ecclesiastical, and that whatever, in the way of an institution is originated and managed by it, is a part of the church, is a heresy, and one of the most fruitful of disaster since the days of the apostles. The culmination of iniquity in that line was reached when the church (?) assumed political sovereignty, and there was brought forth that hybrid monstrosity, the Church-State.

Concerning chapter 31, section 4 of the Confession, much can be said in favor of either amending it, or omitting all after the word "commonwealth." There is a growing sentiment that the exceptional clauses are obsolete and inadequate. Two overtures to the Assembly of 1899 show the direction of opinion. There are two good arguments for omitting all after the word "commonwealth." The first is, that no provision can be made for any ecclesiastical procedure without scriptural authority. Nothing should

be retained in the Confession except that which can be supported by proof-texts. The second argument is, that it is not properly in the province of the Confession to instruct a congregation how to proceed in any matters except the ecclesiastical. The framers properly made no mention of any procedure in civil matters. In fact in an instrument like the Confession no provision can be made, for the congregations must be guided by the laws of their respective commonwealths. And in the political sphere each Synod or Council must use its own judgment when any action is necessary or expedient. In fact Presbyteries, Synods and Assemblies are compelled thus to do, as no definition of an extraordinary case can be made.

In conclusion, let us contend earnestly for the true spirituality of the church as that doctrine has been delivered unto us by the apostles. There is a distinction to be made between the practical working church, and the idea of the coming and to-be world wide Kingdom, which shall include all the kingdoms and nations of the earth. This kingdom shall embrace not only the ecclesiastical institution and its activities, but also all the institutions of Human Society, the State and its several departments, and all the multifarious humanitarian schemes and institutions. In the coming and development of this kingdom the church is so to speak the germ, the core, the heart of it. The church is the vital organ in the regeneration of society. It is the organ of communication with the source of regenerating power. It is only through the instrumentality of the church, through its divinely appointed work of preaching the Gospel and law, that men are raised to the capacity of self-government, and are incited to establish educational, charitable and humanitarian institutions. But the church as an organization must be kept separate from the institutions of the society which it is reforming. The institutions of which the church is the direct instigator must not be confounded with the church, either in theory or in practical operation.

Then if Paul's example and advice in the Corinthian case



can be used as an analogy then would it not be proper for a congregation, Presbytery or Synod whenever taking up an order of business of a civil nature, such as the election of a board of trustees; to formally, by motion, recognize the fact of transition from ecclesiastical to civil function, the body resolving itself into civil session. Also the same course would not only be proper, but highly expedient in assuming the function of petitioning any department of the State. As it can only be done by the body, as citizens, acting in a political capacity, boldly claiming the rights of petition, as did the Presbytery of East Hanover in its noble struggle, and not as some alien body in a cringing attitude treading on half forbidden ground.

Sanford, Fla.

W. G. F. WALLACE.

#### IV. EXPOSITORY PREACHING.

“God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son,” who came from above and was above all. He testified what he had “seen and heard.” The Father gave him the spirit “not by measure,” and the Spirit of God “searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God,” so that Jesus spoke the very words of God.

During the Old Dispensation, Christ spake by means of his spirit in the “holy men of God.” Sometimes also, foreshadowing his own incarnation, he would appear and speak as the “angel of Jehovah.” While on earth he “taught not as the Scribes, but as one having authority.” After his ascension into heaven, the Holy Ghost whom the Father sent in his name taught the apostles all things, and brought all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them. While it would seem that special personal revelations were given to Paul, “the chosen vessel,” and to John, the beloved. So that all the Scriptures are the Word of God, through Jesus Christ, the Word of God, for truth as well as grace came by him.

Christ, our chief Prophet, now teaches his Church by means of his Word and Spirit. While the Spirit is free, he has made us ministers of the Word, servants of the Gospel, the glad tidings. We speak what he has commanded. We go where he sends us. Hence all preaching, that is worthy of the name, is expository. All true preaching is a laying bare of the meaning of the Word. The truth that has been deposited in the Scriptures must be exposed. It is evident, therefore, that we are not to write about that kind of preaching which is expository, as compared or contrasted with other kinds of preaching which are not expository. For surely no one has the right to assume the title “minister of the Gospel” unless he tries to lay bare the meaning of the Word of God. If any kind of preaching fails to be expository, the result of such preaching will be that the faith of

the hearers will stand in the wisdom of men and not in the power of God. Then the famous saying of Milton will again be true—"the hungry sheep look up, and are not fed."

The term expository, then, as used in this essay, is not absolute, but relative, it has a special limitation, a technical meaning.

Again, expository preaching is to be distinguished from the so-called expository sermon.

The expository sermon, in a narrower sense, deals with the make-up of the sermon, not with the manner of preaching. For an expository sermon is one "in which the text is the theme, and the discussion an explanation of the text." Hence a series of expository sermons may or may not constitute expository preaching. That will depend on the selection of the texts of the several sermons. If the texts are chosen at random the sermons do not fall within the scope of this paper. If, however, the texts taken separately, or all the texts combined, cover a complete, connected, passage, section, chapter, or book of the Bible, they do constitute expository preaching.

For by expository preaching we understand the unfolding of the meaning of a connected paragraph or section of Scripture in a more detailed manner than is consistent with other kinds of preaching, *e. g.* An exposition of the high-priestly prayer of Christ, recorded in John 17. Or an exposition of the Gospel of Matthew or the epistle to the Romans or the Hebrews.

With this understanding, then, we shall consider,

First—The Requirements, the essentials, of Expository preaching.

Second—Its Advantages.

Third—Some General Remarks.

#### I.

#### THE REQUIREMENTS.

Expository preaching is not an easy task. A serious danger of such a course of sermons is, that when it grows too long it is difficult to have the vitality continued through all its length and even to its last extremity. Says a writer

in a recent (July, '96), number of the *Homiletic Review*: "Some courses started with a very vital head, but ended with a very lifeless tail." The late C. H. Spurgeon had a pathetic reminiscence of his childhood; of an endless series of discourses upon the "Hebrews." "And Van Oosterzee tells of a preacher who began an exposition of Job, with eight hundred hearers and ended it with eight; while another, lecturing on the "Little Horn of Daniel," blew his horn so long that his audience was reduced to seven."

Expository preaching is not to be made a labor-saving contrivance. Says Dr. Broadus, "On rainy Sundays, or on week-nights, the preacher who has no sermon prepared, or wishes to save his elaborate preparation for a more auspicious occasion, will frequently undertake to 'read a passage of Scripture, and make a remark;' feeling that this enterprise is attended by no risk, because, as some quaint old preacher expressed it, if he is 'persecuted in one verse, he can flee to another.'" All such methods will, of course, arouse popular prejudice against expository preaching. The first requirement is a happy selection of a passage of Scripture. For, although, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," all Scripture is not suited for expository preaching. We quote the following from "Shedd's Homiletics," (p. 154): "The excellence of expository [preaching], consequently, depends primarily upon the choice of such a portion of Scripture as will not lead the preacher on and on, without allowing him to arrive at a proper termination. Unless a passage is taken that finally comes round in a full circle, containing one leading sentiment, and teaching one grand lesson . . . the expository sermon must either be commentary or paraphrase." Not a little, then, depends on the selection of appropriate books or passages of Scripture, which have enough of human interest to attract, and enough of divine teaching to stimulate, nourish and strengthen. The right selection of a passage of Scripture having been

made, the first requirement of expository preaching has been met with.

A second requirement is found in the preacher's own mind. He must have the power to analyze, to see the details of his subject. He should, so to speak, have the historico-grammatical sense. The preacher should have an ample acquaintance with the conditions and circumstances under which the book, that is to be the subject of exposition, was written. If he can transfer himself to the position of the writer, and breathe, as it were, his atmosphere, so much the better. The background of the book before him should be clearly understood. What were the prevailing temptations, sins, sorrows and short-comings of the age in which the book was written? Never before, owing to recent discoveries, was there such an abundance of valuable material for the illustration of ancient, and especially biblical, writings. So that it does not require extraordinary powers of the imagination to comply with this essential. And it is of no small importance. For, along with his exegetical skill, this will aid the preacher to obtain an insight into the drift and purpose of the passage, and the connection of its several parts. It will also help him to adapt the old to the new. So that the old truth may be brought to bear upon the modern conditions of life, so that the preaching will become vivid, emphatic,—in short, a living preaching of the Word.

Again, there is need of the power of synthesis.

The sermonizer will "need to watch his mind, and his plan, with great care, lest the discourse overflow its banks, and spread out in all directions," losing its strong, deep current, thus becoming a dilution of divine truth, instead of an exposition. An expository discourse should have a logical structure, and be pervaded by a leading sentiment. Two features should be conspicuous in the plan and structure of an expository discourse, viz., comprehensiveness and simplicity. The lecturer should seize boldly the leading thought of the passage, and group the subordinate truths around it. For an expository lecture is not a series of little

sermons, on a number of consecutive texts instead of one, but it is the unfolding of some important truth spread over a passage of considerable length. The discourse must have unity. By all means seize the strong points, and let the lesser go. Let there be progress, movement, in the direction of some definite end. Expository preaching, on the part of the sermonizer, requires powers of analysis and synthesis. It requires much study, meditation and prayer.

A third requirement, or essential, is found in the people who are to listen to expository preaching. In our day many people are restless, careless and ignorant. All such will have to be educated before they can appreciate expository discourses. And last, but not least, if the passage is at all lengthy, the people should follow the sermon with an open Bible in hand, as was once the custom in Scotland. This alone will account for the fact that "Scotia" has given the world many a man and woman, "mighty in the Scriptures." An audience possessing Biblical knowledge will appreciate genuine expository preaching. The expository sermons of Robert Hall were very acceptable at Cambridge, but at Leicester, where the people were generally less intelligent, they could not be brought to like his method.

## II.

Having thus noticed some of the essentials of expository preaching, we shall now proceed to mention some of its advantages.

1. It is the most natural way of conveying to the hearers the meaning of the Word of God. If we were called upon to explain to the people the philosophical writings of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, etc., we should not proceed to select a sentence here and take a sentence there, and upon these separate portions to frame one or two discourses every week. But we should explain it book by book, and section by section. Expository preaching, then, would be the most natural way of explaining divine truth. And in this way also a knowledge of scriptural truth will be conveyed in its connection. A knowledge of the Bible is one thing,

a knowledge of its isolated sentences is quite another thing. Any number of separate, independent links do not constitute a chain. There are several portions of the Bible which are highly argumentative, and an examination of their separate parts will never give us a clear, well-defined idea of their whole scope and sequence. To illustrate, no one could convey to his hearers a just conception of the full meaning of the words, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation," without a clear idea of the whole scope of the apostle's argument. For the Epistle to the Hebrews has a magnificent sweep of thought. Then think of such familiar texts as, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies, etc." "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." The full force of these texts cannot be gathered from the immediate context, but must be understood from the full sweep of the Apostle Paul's argument in his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. Says Dr. Terry, quoting Hibbard, "You must place yourself in his condition, adopt his sentiments, and be floated onward with the current of his feelings, soothed by his consolations, or agitated by the storm of his emotions." Expository preaching is thus the natural way of laying bare the connected meaning of the Word of God.

2. Again, the expository method is adapted to secure the greatest amount of Scriptural knowledge to both preacher and hearers. On this point we quote Dr. J. W. Alexander: "Where no extended exposition is attempted, the preacher is naturally induced to draw upon systematic treatises, philosophical theories, works of mere literateurs, or his own ingenuity of invention, and fertility of imagination, for such a train of thoughts, as, under the given topic, may claim the praise of novelty. We are aware that with many it is far otherwise \* \* \* but the evil grows apace, whenever the rhetorical aspect of preaching attracts undue attention : and the desire to be original, striking, ingenious, and elegant,

supersedes the earnest endeavor to be Scriptural. This abuse is in a good degree precluded by the method of exposition. The minister who from week to week is laboring to elucidate some important book of Scripture has this kept forcibly before his mind. It will necessarily be the chief subject of his studies. Whatever else he may neglect, he will, if he is a conscientious man, sedulously peruse and ponder those portions which he is to explain, using every auxiliary, and especially comparing Scripture with Scripture. Supposing him to pursue this regular investigation of any one book, for several successive months, and we perceive that he must be acquiring a knowledge of the very word of truth, vastly more extensive, distinct, and profound than can fall to the lot of one who, perhaps for no two discourses together, finds himself in the same part of the canon." And when a minister of the Gospel is consecrated and at the same time "mighty in the Scriptures," knowing how rightly to divide the word of truth, he is, so far as human agency is concerned, well qualified to cause the "Word of God to dwell richly" in the hearts and minds of his hearers, and to cause them to have a faith that shall stand in the very power of God.

3. It enables the preachers to declare the "whole counsel" of God without giving offense.

There are some prominent doctrines of the Bible which are very unpopular in these days. Among others, predestination and the sovereignty of God. Again, there are many evils in the family and society. But how to expose and correct some of them, is a question that often presents itself to the mind of the conscientious sermonizer. It may be a very delicate matter to mention them in the pulpit. e. g. There is the matter of dress. A very delicate matter, indeed. Especially so, because it chiefly concerns the more prominent members of our churches. And yet we believe that the Bible ideal should not be lost sight of. Men and women should lay stress not on that "which is outward," but on character, "hidden man of the heart," and they should learn to adorn themselves with "good works"—"with a meek and



quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." I think all Christians should learn that if they are at all concerned about, or absorbed in such matters as food, and dress, and kindred things, they are living on far too low a plane. They are living beneath their Christian dignity. As citizens of an eternal and heavenly kingdom they ought to be above such things. An exposition of the first epistle to Timothy or of the epistle of James, would give the sermonizer an opportunity to "draw the bow at a venture."

Then there is the text, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers"—which is constantly being violated in more senses than one. But since this "yoking" process is constantly going on it becomes a delicate matter to speak about it without giving offence to parties who have recently sinned in this matter or are soon to become guilty in this respect. And yet what a heart-sore it is to every faithful pastor to see the evil resulting from a violation of this plain command! How an exposition of 2nd Corinthians would come to our relief. For the exposition method enables us to preach the whole counsel of God without the danger of giving personal offence.

4. Further, it will avoid the danger of composing sermons which are absolutely devoid of any Scriptural contents. Sometimes so-called sermons become a mere display of oratorical powers. They are ethical precepts, or mere literary essays. This style of preaching prevails not only among the Unitarians, but there are various degrees of approach to it in many orthodox pulpits of our land. The sermons that appear in our great daily papers are not, for the most part, Scriptural. Some of them are devoid of Scriptural contents. Then, too, there is that great abuse of wresting texts from their genuine meaning by what is called accommodation, employing the sacred words in a sense which never entered into the minds of their inspired writers. This will tend to make a sermon "lean"—it will want matter. Its great characteristic will be—*emptiness!* Says Dr. J. W. Alexander: "We could give no better recipe for the cure of this malady of sermonizers than a course of expository lectures."

## III.

We shall close this paper with a few general remarks about methods, history, doctrine, etc. Dr. R. H. Dale in his "Lectures on Preaching," says, "When I began my ministry it was my custom to preach expository sermons, in which I carefully explained and illustrated, clause by clause, verse by verse, a group of chapters or a complete book of Holy Scripture. Of late I have adopted what seems to me a better method. In the earlier part of the service, I read a dozen or twenty verses,—sometimes more, sometimes less—of the book I am expounding, beginning, of course, where I left off on the previous Sunday, and after prefacing the reading with a brief summary of what has gone before . . . . The text of the sermon is selected from the passage which I have read, unless the passage would receive effective illustration from a text taken from another part of the Bible. If the passage is a consecutive argument in support of any doctrine, or an exhortation to the discharge of a moral or religious duty, or the expression of any sentiment or emotion—this doctrine, duty, emotion, or sentiment is generally the subject of the sermon. If the passage treats of a succession of truths and duties, it is sometimes my endeavor to show how they are related to each; sometimes I take one of them and leave the rest. Occasionally the sermon consists of a review of the contents of three or four chapters which have been read on previous Sundays. Sometimes when I have finished a book, I have given a summary of the whole of it. I have found that a summary of the epistle to the Galatians was quite as exciting as a fiery pamphlet on some question of modern party politics. The advantage of this method of exposition over that which I used to follow in the earlier years of my ministry seem to be very great. It is possible to get over the ground more rapidly. I never made such slow progress as the German exegetical professor who, after lecturing on the book of Isaiah for rather more than twenty years, had reached the middle of the second chapter; but I have the impression that I was two or three years getting through the first eight

chapters of the epistle to the Romans. With my present method I began the Epistles in April, 1876, reached the end of the eight chapters in October of the same year, though I had been away for six weeks in the summer, and in February, 1877, the Epistle was finished. This method of exposition seems to me more effective as well as more rapid." This method seems to commend itself to an age in which people instinctively dread what is lengthy.

Whatever may be said of the advantages of expository preaching, it is evident that it is not very prevalent at the present day. In this respect there has been a marked decline. For the expository method certainly has the sanction of ancient and primitive usage. "As early as the time of Ezra, we find that the reading of the law was accompanied with some kind of an interpretation." Doubtless this was, to a large extent, the method of our Saviour and the apostles. The custom also prevailed among the Fathers, in the early Christian church. "Augustine has left homilies upon the Psalms, the Gospel of John, and other whole books of Scripture. Chrysostom, in like manner, expounded at length the book of Genesis, the Psalms, the Gospels of Matthew and John, and all the epistles of Paul." "In Reformation times, Calvin was an admirable expository preacher, and many of his still much-valued commentaries were delivered from day to day in Geneva as pulpit expositions.

. . . So, also, not a few of the freshest and most valuable of Luther's works were originally expository discourses." John Knox, the Scottish reformer, had remarkable powers in this direction. In more recent times the number of this kind of sermonizers is small. "The late Dean Alford used to lament its disuse in the Church of England." In the English pulpit Dr. Joseph Parker is perhaps the ablest advocate of the expository method. Dr. W. Garden Blaikie, of Edinburgh, Scotland, was also very successful with this method. Among American writers, the late Dr. Phillips Brooks has shown a lively appreciation of expository preaching. We might also mention W. R. Taylor.

But what is the cause of this decline? We have not come

across a single answer to this question. We venture to suggest the following: The cause lies partly with the clergy and partly with the people, So far as the clergy are concerned, we might mention :

1. The great evangelistic movements of the past and the present century. The evangelist, however full of Biblical devotion, is almost necessarily under the necessity of making each discourse in a manner self-contained. He addresses the same audience only a few times. He has neither time nor occasion to deliver several connected sermons. So we are not surprised to find that even Wesley and Whitefield, with all their evangelical fire, did not cultivate the expository method. The great evangelistic movements, which have swept over this and other countries, have had the tendency to take from the people their relish for expository preaching.

2. Short pastorates have for the same reason had the same tendency. When a pastor remains in the same place for only one or two years, he has no opportunity to declare to his people the "whole counsel of God," consequently he does not attempt it. Such short pastorates tend to foster in the minds of the people the spirit that is always asking, "What next?" And the expository discourse is not <sup>\*</sup>suited for such a spirit.

3. The harvest being so great, but the laborers being so few, many men have been pressed into service who did not enjoy many intellectual advantages. Most of these were very good at heart; several of them had superior minds, good common sense; but many of them were not competent to make a success of expository preaching. And, since most text books on Homiletics consider the sermon from an oratorical point of view, theological students are generally urged to follow the topical method.

So far as the cause lies with the people, we would say :

1. Our age is characterized by restlessness. We are once again in a position to appreciate the promise which the Lord gave to his people Israel, though in a different sense. "The Lord will give you rest roundabout." The

"weary and heavy-laden" are, indeed, seeking rest, but not in the divinely-appointed way, viz., by sitting at the feet of Jesus, and "learning of him to become meek and lowly in heart." The type of Christians represented by Martha is much more common than the type represented by Mary. "To receive the Word of God with all readiness of mind" is a difficult task. People are not accustomed, in religious matters, to long-sustained habits of thought. The demand is for that which is brief, spicy, popular; and there are always sermonizers who will give their people not what they need, but what they crave for. For such the expository method would be irksome.

2. Again, although we readily admit that there is far more general intelligence than was the case fifty or a hundred years ago, we do believe that there has been a decline in sound religious knowledge. Especially there where expository preaching was once in vogue. In these days of cheap literature, people have access to almost all kinds of knowledge. Science has been popularized; classic production of literature can be had almost for the asking, while the monthly, weekly and daily publications are scattered broadcast. So that it is not too much to say that the great mass of the people live in an entirely different world of ideas than they did fifty or a hundred years ago. To-day the average man takes an interest in a great many subjects. Then, the book that was in the hands of all was the Bible. And it often happened that a man's entire intellectual activity centered around the Bible and religious books. We remember reading that less than a century ago it was not a rare thing in England and Scotland to find servant girls perusing the works of John Owen. And in the Netherlands, many a theological discussion was carried on by the merchants, tailors and cobblers, as well as by the Dutch theologians. To-day most of our young people depend for their knowledge of the Bible on the Sunday school. Whatever may be said in praise of the Sunday school, it must be admitted that the instruction there given is, in general, far inferior to the old Catecheti-

cal method. Occasional exceptions do not shake the validity of this statement. And we may depend upon it that the excellence of the pulpit will, to a large extent, depend upon the receptive capacity of the hearers. We regard ignorance in religious matters as a potent factor in the decline of expository preaching.

But what is the remedy? Ministers of the Gospel, as well as the people, must be convinced of the excellence of the method. They must be educated in this matter. Catechetical instruction will be a great help to the young, and also to the parents who take an interest in the religious instruction of their children. Preachers should cultivate methodical habits of thought, so that they may possess the essentials of expository preaching. As to the rest the remedy is easily found. Horace Greeley once said: "The way to resume specie payment is to resume." So we say the only way to resume expository preaching is to resume. For although the method is by no means easy, yet seeing it has so many advantages, we heartily agree with Dr. Shedd when he says: "It is the duty of the preacher, occasionally to lay out his best strength in the production of an elaborate expository sermon, which shall not only do the ordinary work of a sermon, which shall not only instruct, awaken and move, but which shall also serve as a sort of guide and model for the teacher of the Sabbath-school and the Bible class. Probably the preacher can take no course so well adapted to elevate the standard of the Sabbath-school and Bible class instruction in his congregation as occasionally to deliver a well constructed and carefully elaborated expository discourse."

G. H. DUBBINK.

Holland, Mich.

## V. THE MONTGOMERY CONFERENCE ON RACE PROBLEMS AT THE SOUTH.

The Conference held in Montgomery, Ala., from May 8-10th, under the auspices of the "Southern Society for the Promotion of the Study of Race Conditions and Problems in the South," marked an epoch in the attitude of the South toward the tremendous issues involved.

As the first open parliament it has seemed possible for Southern men to hold for the consideration of the greatest problems any people were ever called upon to work out, the attention of the entire country was naturally centered upon the Conference.

The personnel of the Society, which now has members in every Southern State, and the programme for the Conference were a guarantee of the thoroughly representative character of the meeting as an expression of the varied and even antagonistic phases of Southern opinion on the subjects under consideration.

The Society has from the beginning announced as its sole desire to secure a more intelligent and frank statement of the issues involved, believing as Mr. Cochran well phrased it in his speech on May 10th, that "a problem accurately stated is a problem half solved." Depending not upon mechanical or theoretical solutions, but looking to the slow but sure processes of sociological and political evolution the Society offered no policy of its own to the Conference for it had none to offer. Out of such a frank and full presentation of the facts of the situation as was secured in the papers read before the Conference, and the subsequent careful study of the facts as presented, there cannot fail, however, to result not merely a better understanding of the problems at issue, but of the wisest and best politics to be pursued by those who through counsel and legislation mould public opinion and direct the affairs of public life.

Although under the rules governing the Conference, expressive of the purpose of the Society to "promote discus-

sion merely and not to favor any policy on any of the subjects under discussion," no motion or resolution of any sort was entertained by the presiding officer, it was inevitable that out of the discussion certain things should at once appear in a clearer light, and those views receiving practical unanimity of approval of speakers representing such widely different points of views, may be fairly regarded as fixed points of departure for future discussions of race problems in the South.

It is my purpose to set forth some of the things that have been more or less clearly defined by the discussions of the Conference.

1. There can be little serious dealing with the questions involved in the relation of the negro to the history of the South that fails to recognize the fact that he is a permanent factor of that history—that for better or for worse, in the Providence of God he is here, and here to stay. It has been at various time very popular to propose deportation as a remedy for the evils of the situation. Advocates of this theory have spoken as glibly of the transportation of ten million people as if it was merely the question of the shipping of a few thousand bales of cotton. But even were funds in unlimited amounts at the disposal of the advocates of this theory a generation must pass before it could be carried fully into effect were all other conditions of the problem of deportation met. But these conditions are not and cannot be met: The negro does not want to leave the United States, and particularly and in spite of the many stories of the terrible oppression to which he has been subjected in the South, does he decline to go from her borders. He long ago discovered what the North is just beginning to appreciate, that there is less racial and industrial prejudice against him in the South than in the North.

Not merely, however, does the negro not want to leave the South, but he is not wanted anywhere else. Recent events at Pana, Ill., are a standing advertisement of the fact that his importation into the industrial fields of the North will be resisted by the Gatling gun. A glance at



the map of Africa, the Mecca of all advocates of trans-oceanic colonization, will show that the dark continent has passed out of the possession of the dark races, and so far from desiring more negroes in Africa, the nations of Europe in possession of that continent are using every device known in scientific warfare, and the more destructive armament of advancing civilization, the gin shop, to make room for the sons of their own people ; while Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines furnish already as many race problems as the American people can well take care of at present.

The South has to bear its share of the white man's burden, and strange as it may seem, every effort made to lift that burden even by the transportation from one section of the South to another of this people who have for generations been the hewers of wood and drawers of water, the industrial units of its population has awakened as strenuous opposition from the Southern white man as has the attempt to import the negro miner aroused in Illinois. This is well illustrated by the excitement caused in Athens, Ga., a few weeks ago by the attempt of the celebrated emigration agent, known as "Peg-leg Williams," to induce the negroes of that section of Georgia to emigrate to Texas.

That the Montgomery Conference recognized the negro as a permanent factor in the history of the South was emphasized by the presentation of the deportation and transportation theory by an eloquent son of Georgia. There may have been some who agreed with the conclusions of the paper presented by him, but those with whom the writer has been privileged to talk were unanimous in their opinion that from the practical standpoint the paper was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory itself.

2. In view of the Mississippi constitutional amendment limiting the franchise, the pending constitutional amendment in North Carolina, and the avowed policy of the Democratic party in Alabama to secure a limitation of the franchise through the adoption of a new State Constitution it was expected that there would be intense interest in the discussion of the Franchise.

Col. Alfred Moore Waddell, Mayor of Wilmington, N. C., spoke as the representative of white supremacy, dominant under conditions of revolution, and ruling with a firm hand that brought order out of social and political chaos, and likewise a blessing to the weaker as well as the stronger race. As representing also what is believed by many to be the almost overwhelming sentiment of a vast majority of white men in North Carolina in demanding an educational qualification test at the polls, that shall secure the permanent supremacy of white men throughout the bounds of the Old North State, Col. Waddell received an attentive and earnest hearing second to that accorded no speaker at the Conference.

As opposed to the policy represented by Col. Waddell, which many believe to be a mere temporizing with the difficulties of the situation, and storing up greater evils in the future, ex-Governor William A. McCorkle, of West Virginia, defended the proposition to establish educational and property qualification tests applicable to both races alike. Thus instead of placing a premium upon education and thrift for the negro boy, and on ignorance and thriftlessness for the white boy as is done by the Mississippi law, a premium would be placed for the youth of both races upon knowledge and labor. In the interests of the poor white boy of the South it is believed that this premium upon intelligence and thrift at the polls is a prime necessity.

There was, however, no difference of opinion among any of those who spoke, that the present condition of the suffrage at the South is intolerable. One need not be surprised that Southern men resent the criticisms made upon their political methods by those living under conditions brought about by Tammany in New York, Quay in Pennsylvania and Hanna in Ohio, but when left to speak for themselves there is no uncertain ring in the Southern sentiment that demands relief from the present evils. The discussion but gave voice to the convictions of a large majority of the American people to-day, that the bestowal of the franchise upon the negro without regard to his qualifi-

cation for its intelligent exercise was a great blunder, if not a crime. In spite of the constitutional provisions for his exercise of the franchise, the domination of the white men by the negroes, however great the negro majorities may be in any community, will never be tolerated. In pleading for relief from this painful position, in which a law abiding people find themselves forced to oppose the Constitution by the demands made upon them for the preservation of their very civilization, Hon. Bourke Cochran proposing a repeal of the fifteenth amendment simply crystalized a fact in a popular phrase, when he declared that the amendment was a dead letter, and would forever continue so, "for it has been lynched."

"The Constitution has assigned him (the negro) to one place in our political system, public opinion has assigned him to another, and the position he occupies is that fixed by public opinion. \* \* \* If it were possible to enforce a constitutional provision against the judgment of the State the fifteenth amendment would be in active operation today. All the powers of the Federal Government have been exercised to put it in force. \* \* \* It is an extraordinary anomaly that the nullification of the Constitution has been accomplished, not through any spirit of insubordination to the Constitution itself, nor from any disloyalty to the government, nor from any disregard of the law, but from keen regard for the security of property and the safety of civilization. While arrayed against this constitutional provision, the Southern people would die in defence of the Constitution as a whole. They have succeeded in nullifying this provision by the approval and support of the opinion of the country; they would not have nullified it without it."

Whether public opinion has reached that stage where it is practical to propose the abolition of this historic amendment may well be questioned, but no one can read this appeal of the eloquent New Yorker to bring the actual and theoretical status into harmony, to relieve this loyal Constitution-loving people from the terrible moral incubus they

have borne so long, and this in the interests of both races, without feeling that the day that marks the repeal of this measure that has been stamped with the moral disapproval of the conscience of the nation, and has in practice proved worse than a failure, will be a new day of independence for the country.

3. It was noteworthy that while several of the speakers gave, in passing, statistics that seemed to imply the failure of the attempts to educate the negro, the cause of industrial education found practically unanimous acceptance. That the claims of this cause were presented by Dr. Hollis Burke Frissell, the successor of the lamented Gen. Armstrong at Hampton, and Dr. J. L. M. Curry, ex-Minister to Spain and agent of the Peabody and Slater funds, evidenced at once that the views presented were not the theories of empiricists, but of those who speak from a wider range of personal experience in this work than any two men in America to-day, with the possible exception of Booker T. Washington.

As an Alabamian, and representative in the first Confederate Congress, of which he and one other gentleman are the only survivors, Doctor Curry is in a position to speak with the utmost freedom and command the attention of the Southern people. A braver, franker or bolder exposition of the difficulties and duties of the times in relation to the race problem has perhaps never been made before any audience than is to be found in Doctor Curry's presentation of the needs of popular education in the South.

The neglected elements of the white population were not neglected in the discussions, and it is to be sincerely hoped that one result of the Conference will be the awakening of the people to the facts of the case with reference to the industrial and educational needs of the poor white boy of the South. The danger that faces the South to-day, is not of giving the negro too much of all that makes for his true well-being, but in neglecting to give the white boy equal industrial and educational opportunities.

3. It is a significant fact that no speaker of prominence

could be found in the whole South to advocate lynching. The two eminent speakers, who presented this aspect of the race problems in the South, Hon. Alex. C. King, of Georgia, and Hon. Clifton R. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, ex-Ambassador to Russia, laid chief emphasis, not upon the atrocity of lynchings, but upon the necessary legal remedies for this crime against law and order. Gen. Breckinridge brought out with striking force the political and social conditions at the South after the war, due to the reign of the carpet bagger, as furnishing the soil from whence has sprung this epidemic of mob violence. But the necessity for the exercise of law by the people themselves whatever the risks attending that exercise, has passed away with the restoration of law and order, and with it has passed the excuse for lynching. The two remedies proposed were a speedier trial of the accused, a limitation upon the privileges of securing continuance of trial on petty pretexts in all cases involving assaults upon the person of women, and the provisions for the taking of the testimony of the victim in the presence only of the Judge, the prisoner and the attorneys for the prosecution and defence.

5. The discussions on the religious work among the negroes developed the fact that in the judgment of the speakers this work is most effectively done when under the superintendence of white men.

The able paper read by Rev. D. Clay Lilly, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., was especially significant because of the fact that as Secretary of the Executive Committee on Colored Evangelization of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, Mr. Lilly has had exceptional opportunities for examining the results of the attempt of this church to establish an independent Negro Presbyterian Church. He showed that no one recognized the failure of this plan so thoroughly as did the negro Presbyterian preachers themselves.

The dissenting voice on this question was raised by the Roman Catholic Priest, Rev. J. R. Slattery, of St. Joseph's

Seminary, Baltimore. The work of this priest, however, has been conducted under circumstances so manifestly different from those that obtain throughout the South generally, that those who agreed with him even, must have felt that the theories presented needed yet to be put to the practical test. And in no other work is it more certainly true that an ounce of fact is worth a ton of theory.

It is a matter of some interest to note as characteristic of the training of Romish priests that the Right Rev. Father not merely misquoted the Scriptures, but based a portion of his argument on this misquotation.

He is authority for the statement that the race prejudice at Jerusalem in the days of Paul was greater than exists to-day between the white men and negroes in the South. Perhaps so, but the priest cites as proof of this statement that "Paul when he went up to Jerusalem to the celebrated first Council was on account of this race prejudice compelled to circumcise Titus the Greek!"

Those familiar with their Bibles will understand how astonished the great Apostle to the Gentiles would be to hear of this.

The papers presented on this subject by Rev. M. A. Guerry, of Sewanee, and Bishop Penick, of the African Mission, emphasized the importance of white leadership in a forceful way.

It has not been found possible in this brief review of some of the positions, that seem to have been crystalized by the discussions of the Conference, to give place to a consideration of several papers of more than usual ability. While many felt that the actual conditions of the negroes to-day did not warrant the pessimistic conclusions drawn by Dr. Paul B. Barringer, of the University of Virginia, in his paper on the "Sacrifice of a Race," it was universally admitted that the paper was one of the ablest and most scholarly presented at the Conference.

Taken as a whole perhaps few Conferences have ever been held in this country where there was such an absence of sensational features or where the papers read were uni-

formly of such a higher order. Audiences that at times taxed the seating capacity of the vast auditorium manifested an unusual interest and attention to the entire proceedings of the Conference. Not the least interested portion of the audience was the negroes themselves, several hundred of whom were in constant attendance upon its sessions, as orderly and attentive listeners.

It is safe to predict that the papers soon to be published by the Society in book form, will have a widespread influence in moulding public sentiment throughout the entire country.

Doubtless at the second Conference to be held in Montgomery in May, 1901, it will be possible to allow greater latitude in general discussions, and even also to provide for some formal expression of the judgment of the Conference concerning certain important phases of the problems discussed.

That the plans adopted for this first Conference were under the circumstances wise, and were in large measure responsible for its success, no one acquainted with the situation could question.

NEAL L. ANDERSON.

Montgomery, Ala.

## VI. THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH TOWARDS THE PRESENT MOVEMENT IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN FAVOR OF A RESTATEMENT OF BELIEF.

Professor Van Oosterzee predicted many years ago that the modern trend of religious thought, prevalent in his days on the continent of Europe, would in the course of time take hold of the minds in Great Britain and the United States. His prediction has, alas! been fulfilled. Since the days of the Essayists and Reviewers and the attacks of Colenso upon the Pentateuch, rationalism in its manifold modern forms has crossed the Channel and the Atlantic, and its victories are becoming alarming. Statements are made in our days which would have been impossible twenty-five years ago. That which formerly was decried as German infidelity is now praised as painstaking, marvelous scholarship. The secularization of the churches is steadily going on, undermining the foundations upon which our religious life is built. Reformation principles are being ignored or deliberately attacked. Our Christian denominations are threatened with dissolution by means of disintegration. The secular press almost as a unit, and a part of our religious papers, are abetting liberalism in all its forms, while the masses are in dense ignorance with regard to the doctrinal status of the churches, to which they nominally belong.

In this condition of things the question of a restatement of belief, as it is euphemistically called, has been forced upon us. Great Britain had opened this question several years ago, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the leading Reformed denomination in our country, is convulsed by it for the second time during the last decade of the nineteenth century. It is a hard task to face such a momentous question under such unfavorable circumstances.

Is it not the best policy for the several Reformed and



Presbyterian denominations to leave this question severely alone until we are forced to take it up by sheer necessity? Is such an attitude possible? Is it commendable, if it were possible? Leaders in the Presbyterian Church do not take kindly to any attempt from the outside to enter into the discussions involved in this movement. Is it our duty to abstain for our brother's sake? I doubt it. Ecclesiastically considered some of us might feel inclined to dismiss this question as having no practical value for us. Others may even maintain that it is the highest wisdom for the other Calvinistic denominations to keep quiet, because we are yet free from the agitation. Try to localize the contest ought to be the watch word these irenical brethren maintain. It's policy, savors of what the Germans aptly call *Kirchturm-Politik*, i. e., a zealous guardianship of local interests.

I maintain that it is an utter impossibility to intrench ourselves in an isolated position. The Presbyterian Church in the United States is our leading Reformed denomination. Any movement set on foot in this Church will be felt sooner or later in all the other Reformed and Presbyterian denominations. *A priori* this may be expected; *a posteriori* we are able to point to more than one instance, wherein the more influential Church has drawn her smaller sisters with irresistible force into her pathway. When a big steamer cleaves the water, all the little vessels in her neighborhood begin to dance on the waves created by her movement. When the first settlers of the New Netherlands organized their church life, this was done in harmony with the character of the Church in the Netherlands. What has become of this Church in the course of its development under new conditions? Is not the entire organization of the Reformed Dutch Church in America transformed after the model of the Presbyterian Church? Some remnants of the older polity have been left, I concede, but the Dutch has been put in brackets. Look at the present character of the Classes, Synods and General Synod, at the many Boards, and, I ask, are they in harmony with the principles of the original polity of the Dutch Church? Originally, e. g., min-

isters of the Dutch Church had no permanent membership in the Classis, which was not a corporate body, but only an assembly of churches of a certain district. They were members of the local church which they served. The idea of looking upon the several assemblies of churches as church courts, and the distinction between clergy and laymen were foreign to the genius of the Reformed Church. The introduction of all these ecclesiastical novelties may easily be traced to the influence of the Presbyterian Church and its British traditions. We cannot help ourselves, the attraction of the larger, more influential body is too much for us.

The same may be said of the other Reformed and Presbyterian denominations among us. If we are exposed to the influence of this movement of revision, cherished in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church, we certainly have a duty and a right to guard against it. All the Calvinistic denominations have an interest in what becomes of the Westminster Confession, which is our common property, in the greatest denomination of our land. The Calvinistic character of the Presbyterian Church is of ecumenical value. We can not desire this fine symbol of Calvinism to become a torso. Let us all be on the lookout that no one take our crown.

If the revision of the Westminster Confession in the Presbyterian Church were successful in a radical sense, then some one or another will be found willing to set the ball a rolling. If I am not mistaken a beginning has already been made at the meeting of the General Synod of the Reformed Church this year in the sending down to the Classes the question whether they consider it necessary to revise a part of the liturgy and to introduce new formulas, which tend to make the breach between the original and the Dutch Church, planted in America, still wider than it already is. But even if we might not unreasonably expect this question to remain, as far as we are concerned, theoretical, even in such a case we could not help ourselves taking a lively interest in a question which has become a burning

one for a Church which belongs to our family. The old adage, *homo sum, nihil humani a me alienum puto*, might be properly transformed into *Christianus reformatus sum, nihil rerum reformatarum a me alienum puto*. I at least feel concerned about the development of Reformation principles in our Reformed Churches. From my standpoint in the Reformed Church of America, I desire to discuss the matter of revision in its relation to the basic questions involved in it.

Forewarned is forewarned. If we are willing to learn and to lead our people as God-fearing and intelligent servants of Christ, we do well to watch the movement in our sister-church in its practical bearings and to find out for ourselves which are its underlying principles.

The present movement has two sides. The demand is not only for a revision of the existing symbols, but also for the formation of a new creed.

These two sides, although intimately cemented, present a different character. Revision of the existing Standards supposes that the documents contain the articles, firmly believed in the Church, although it seems to those who clamor for revision that some expressions and statements of belief ought to be remodeled. The conservative element in the Church desire a change with regard to some ambiguous and seemingly hard expressions, while the liberal party clamors for a change in the statement of belief. They want, as the saying is, to put old faiths in a new light. I do not enter into details, for I take it for granted that we all are acquainted with the points in dispute. The liberal-conservative party in the Church may be properly called the party of revision, which has an orthodox right and an heterodox left wing.

The friends of the formation of a new creed are more radical in their views. Despairing of success in their endeavor to change the character of the Westminster Confession, they prefer to set aside the historical creeds of the Reformation period and to put in their stead a condensed creed, embodying the consensus of the belief of all the individuals who

may happen to live under the roof of the Presbyterian Church. This position is unhistorical and sacrifices the entire historical development of the Church to a desired union of all the branches of the Reformed family. This party consists of enthusiastic Unitarians, radical comprehensionists and compromising pietists, who are willing to give up all the treasures of the past for a more catholic form of the Reformed Churches, although they must be aware that all the dogmatical distinctions, which have been developed in the course of history, remain intact under cover of a short creed. They resolve by an action of their arbitrary will not to see the differences. They may delude themselves by the airy phantom of their emaciated creed, but at last the dogmatical spirit will be aroused again and the churches will have to fight all the old battles over again. The Baptist denominations in our country are an object lesson in this respect. They thought to possess in their "short creed," the immersion of believers, an instrument whereby all believers might be united. But what has been the result? We have Calvinistic and Arminian Baptists, Sabbatarians and a host of other protesting bodies too numerous to mention.

Let us now take up in succession the two aspects of the movement in the Presbyterian Church. We desire to place them in a twofold light. Our first question will be: Have the Reformed Churches a right to review their standards or to formulate a new creed? The second will be: Is it expedient in our time to undertake either the one or the other? The consideration of the first question touches the principle itself, the second its application in our time.

The first question we are prepared to answer in the affirmative in both aspects.

The Reformed Church has a right to revise its standards. We prove this fact by an appeal to the Belgic Confession. In Art. VII., which treats of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to be the only rule of faith we read: "We believe that these Holy Scriptures fully contain the will of God, and that whatsoever man ought to believe, unto salvation, is sufficiently taught therein. For since the whole manner of

worship which God requires of us is written in them at large, it is unlawful for anyone, though an apostle, to teach otherwise than we are now taught in the Holy Scriptures. nay, though it were an angel from heaven, as the apostle Paul saith. For, since it is forbidden to add unto or take away anything from the word of God, it doth thereby evidently appear that the doctrine thereof is most perfect and complete in all respects. Neither may we compare any writings of men, though ever so holy, with those divine Scriptures, nor ought we to compare custom, or the great multitude, or antiquity, or succession of times or persons, or councils, decrees or statutes with the truth of God, for the truth is above all; for all men are of themselves liars, and more vain than vanity itself. Therefore we reject with all our hearts whatever doth not agree with this infallible rule, which the apostles have taught us, saying: Try the spirits, whether they are of God; likewise, if there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house."

This article is one of the grandest testimonies for the soundness in faith of the Reformed Church. We accept the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible guide and rule of our faith. It is true we are loyal to our Standards as a subordinate rule. We believe that this subordinate rule is in harmony with God's own testimony. We uphold the Holy Scriptures, by being loyal to it. We preach in harmony with it on this account. We challenge any one who doubts the scripturalness of our Standards. We do not love these Standards as a Roman Catholic loves his traditions, because we do not believe that we have in them something additional to the revelation of God in the Holy Scriptures. Such a view we reject as heretical and derogatory from the majesty of God's own truth, given us as a revelation of his will. Our Confession is nothing other than the Amen of the Church, uttered in profound adoration after she has listened to the sayings of God. It is also a fence to keep out the wild beasts from uprooting and destroying the garden of God's truth, which is entrusted to our care. To place any

of our symbols on a par with Holy Scripture is sacrilegious. It does not matter how old these symbols may be, they all are, the Ecumenical creeds included, human productions. They may be sanctioned by councils and Synods, sovereignty and divine authority belong to the Holy Scriptures and to them alone.

If the matter stands thus, then it certainly is the duty of the Reformed Church to see to it that its symbols contain nothing but what God commands us to believe. Our fathers may have been mistaken here and there in the formulation of the truth of God. We are not illoyal to their memory as confessors and defenders of the truth, if we suppose the possibility of a discrepancy between the *norma normans* and the *norma normata*, i. e., between the Holy Scriptures and our standards. If this were the case—I do not say that it is the case—may the church allow such an anomaly to exist or to continue? Our allegiance to the Holy Scripture binds us to the utmost loyalty even in matters which might be in themselves insignificant. Of course as long as the church is not aware of such a discrepancy, the standards are binding as the expression of the faith of the church. But whenever the conviction grows that some of the statements of belief need renewed investigation, it is the duty of those who are teachers and leaders to take initiatory steps to get relief, and to bring the subordinate rule into harmony with the absolute rule of faith, given unto the church by God's immediate action in inspiration. Where there is a duty, there certainly must be a right to perform this duty.

This duty of revision has been carefully attended to in many of the Reformed denominations in the past. I do not speak of the several revisions of the Presbyterian churches in Great Britain and our own country. I confine myself to the Reformed Church. I draw your attention by way of exemplification to the Belgic Confession. I quote from Schaff Herzog: "The Belgic Confession was written in French by Guido de Bres, aided by Adrien de Saravia. It was revised by Francis Junius, of Bourges, a student of

Calvin, who abridged the 16th article, and sent a copy to Geneva and other churches for approval. It was probably printed in 1562, or at all events in 1566, and afterwards translated into Dutch, German and Latin. It was presented to Philip II. in 1562, with the vain hope of securing toleration. It was formally adopted by Synods at Antwerp, 1566; Wesel, 1568; Emden, 1571; Dort, 1578; Middleburg, 1581; again by the great Synod of Dort, April 29, 1619. But in as much as the Arminians had demanded partial changes, and the text had become corrupt, the Synod submitted the French, Latin and Dutch texts to a careful revision." These historical notes reveal the fact that the Belgic Confession had gone through several trials, before it reached the form in which the Reformed Church has it now. And even among the conservative Dutchmen in the Netherlands a movement was set on foot a few years ago, demanding the revision of Article 37. We are therefore in line with the fathers of the formative period of our church, when we maintain that the churches in times of need may exercise the right of revision. Not an arbitrary desire of change, but loyalty to the Holy Scriptures must be the principle of revision, and the only purpose must be the perfection of the creed in harmony with Calvinism.

The work of revision, however, is fraught with dangers. Our fathers experienced this in a very high degree during the Arminian troubles. To avert such dangers in the future, they were wise enough to insert in their ecclesiastical rules, (*kerken ordeneigen*) a proviso in the formula of subscription to the symbols by ministers of the Word and professors of theology, which, if faithfully carried out, would make revolutionary revision-periods unnecessary. We find this proviso in the Constitution of the R. C. A., Article 2, Section 10: "And, if hereafter any difficulties or different sentiments respecting the aforesaid doctrines should arise in our minds, we promise that we will neither publicly nor privately propose, teach or defend the same, either by preaching or writing, until we have first revealed such sentiment to the Classis, that the same may be there

examined, being ready always cheerfully to submit to the judgment of the Classis, under the penalty, in case of refusal, to be *ipso facto* suspended from our office." A similar statement, *mutatis mutandis*, is found in Article 3, Section 3, in the formula of subscription, which professors of theology have to sign, before they are permitted to teach. This proviso presupposes that ministers of the Word or professors of theology may sooner or later have some *gravamina* against some of the statements of belief, contained in the symbols, and it regulates the manner in which they have to present their grievances. Such a regulation is based upon the consideration that the symbols may be revised. Public teachers and preachers, however, as individuals have no right to be anti-confessional in their public and private teaching. On the contrary they are under solemn obligation to be in harmony with the officially received body of doctrines. They are ministers not magisters of the church.

I think I have proved the right and the duty of the Reformed Church to revise her standards. The *lex condendum* of the standards has always, when necessary, to be compared with the *lex conditum* of the Holy Scriptures.

It is an entirely different question, whether we are forced, by the principle alluded to just now, to admit the right of the Reformed Church to formulate a new creed in addition to those already accepted. I formulate the question in this wise, because I deny the right of the Reformed Church to abrogate any of her creeds and to put another in its stead. We belong to the Church Universal, *ergo* we may not abrogate the Ecumenical Symbols, those precious short creeds, whereby we are united to all who believe in the Triune God. Why should we clamor for a short creed, seeing that we have three of them which cannot be surpassed? Why should we long for more Catholicity, knowing that we are in harmony with Christendom in these fundamental creeds?

We are also bound in closest unity with that part of the Church Universal which came into existence in the Refor-



mation period, and which is commonly called the Reformed Church. The treasures of faith—in our day alas! by many called traditional theology—tested and tried in the fiery furnace of persecution are and remain precious to us forever more. It would be treason to give them up for whatever reason it might be. *Non possumus.*

But it may be that circumstances require a new creed in addition to the old ones, not a mere repetition of elementary truths, contained in the latter, but a defense of the truth against new forms of error. How do creeds originate? Christians profess their faith when they have learned to believe in Jesus Christ. It is both their privilege and their duty, to make known to the world what they have found in their Saviour. Churches unite in professing their common faith. The individual form, "I believe," is changed to, "We believe." They express thereby the unity of their faith. They do this in the midst of a world, which is at enmity with God and his Anointed. With undaunted courage the churches express their faith as an act of allegiance to their Lord. They also give expression to their faith in the midst of false brethren, who try to pervert the truth as it is in Jesus.

What hinders us, if there are no other considerations, which modify our judgment, to seek unity of faith among the followers of Christ? Is it not the duty of the Reformed Church to emphasize the unity of the body of Christ in the faith? And if the world in our days shows its enmity against God in proclaiming doctrines which are diametrically opposed to the truth of God, is it not cowardice if we are unwilling to testify for our Lord and King against all who assail him? And if false brethren bring in false doctrines, may we not put up a fence against such intrusionists? May we not e. g. protect the churches against all the emanistic, evolutional, socialistic and critical fancies of many of our contemporaries, whereby the faith of the churches is undermined? Certainly we may, yea we must rise above the world and all kinds of error in the churches by proclaiming to all that the Church cometh up from the wilder-

ness, leaning upon her beloved. "Indeed she is coming up from the past, but she is ready in the present to speak to the children of this age in their own language. Here then is a task for all who desire a new creed. Hoist a banner against the naturalistic tendency of the age instead of assailing truths, which, whatever may be said of their formulation, are most surely believed among us."

We have considered the principles underlying revision, we now come to the question: Is it expedient in our time to take up either the revision of the existing Standards or the formation of a new creed?

A revision of Calvinistic standards has to be done in harmony with Calvinistic principles and in a Calvinistic spirit. The would-be revisers ought to be in perfect harmony with the systems of doctrine generally styled Calvinism. Cunningham, one of Scotland's greatest theologians of Chalmers' style, justly said: "I have nothing against the revision of the Standards provided the revisers are Calvinists." Suppose the Constitution of the United States had to be revised. Would you allow men in sympathy with monarchical or socialistic institutions, or indifferent with regard to republican principles, to do this work? It is a truism: Republicans must revise a republican constitution. Common sense teaches us the propriety of such a demand. If our Standards have to be revised, let it be done by Calvinists. We cannot allow the tearing down of our creeds or the elimination of those parts which are of vital importance.

And now we modestly ask: Is the Calvinistic spirit reigning in our Church? Are all the churches within our communion *de facto* what they profess to be *de jure*? You have no right to accuse me of slander when I maintain that a considerable number of our clergy and laymen is indifferent with regard to doctrines, while not a few are consciously or unconsciously un-Calvinistic. If this is the case, are you prepared to give the work of revision into the hands of men who are either indifferent concerning or opposed more or less to the faith of the Reformed Church? I for one say: Hands off!

Or may we suppose that those who are not in harmony with the doctrines of the Reformed Church are willing to step aside, not wishing to interfere with questions which they do not understand or do not care to understand? As far as we know anything about this movement in the Presbyterian Church, we notice that those who are the farthest removed from the officially received Standards of that Church are the loudest in their clamors for revision. The speeches which have been made public manifest clearly that even conservative and learned men are not entirely in harmony with the Calvinistic character of the Westminster Confession. The Synod of Dort has been blamed for the exclusion of Arminians as delegates. We maintain they acted correctly. People who assail the doctrines of the Church cannot take part in deliberations about revision. Mormons certainly would not be admitted as delegates to a constitutional assembly which had to deliberate about the revision of our marriage laws. People who assail the standards of the Church are rebels in point of law and by no means beligerents. A journal may take for its motto: "*Tros Tyri usque mihi nullo discrimine agetur,*" the Reformed Church cannot and may not open the doors of its constitutional assembly halls to men who are out of harmony with her system of doctrine, however learned and pious they otherwise may be. Need I answer the question, whether our ardent revisionists, who know that they are not in harmony with the system of doctrines contained in our standards, are willing to leave the revision in the hands of thorough Calvinists, who know and appreciate the truth as it is delivered unto us? I think not.

Some maintain that the revision aims at nothing else but a change of some hard expressions which are liable to be misunderstood. That there are some who desire to limit the revision to the consideration of form, I acknowledge. But why is it that we hear of heated debates, of strange theories being advocated, if only a strife about words keeps brethren apart? Do people who seek the glory of God, grow hot and animated about a mere expression, while they are

agreed to leave the doctrines as such unchanged? If this were the case, it were better for all concerned to stop the agitation at once as useless and dangerous. The revision, desired by its most enthusiastic admirers, is more than a strife about words. It affects the doctrines professed in the Reformed Churches. For this, I maintain, the time is not ripe. Our advice would be, that the ministers and members of the Reformed Church should make an earnest study of our standards in order that they learn to know what really is the received system of doctrine of said Church, let the instruction of the youth in the catechism be faithfully attended to, in order that even the young members may be able to give an account of the hope that is in them. It is high time to return to the position the Church occupied when our standards were promulgated. Then, and then only, the Church will be able to cope with the questions which might present themselves to the minds of loyal churchmen in an intelligent manner and in the same spirit of devotion to the truth which prevailed in those times. The revision, if it be found necessary, will then be, as it ought to be, a revision in the interest of the standards and not against them. In this way only we preserve and cultivate the true historical spirit which is conservative and liberal at the same time; conservative with regard to the truth, revealed to us by God himself; liberal in bringing out more clearly than ever before the expression of this truth in the standards. We honestly believe that God's Spirit has not been taken away from the Churches, but we also believe that the Churches in former times were in possession of the same Spirit. Wisdom has not died with our fathers, but it would be arrogant to maintain that it has begun its course with us. It would be a testimony of poverty to maintain that we have to nourish our souls with the preserved meats of times gone by, but it would be preposterous to assert that we may leave untouched the provisions of a former age. Some may be willing to act in such a way in order to do homage to the self-sufficient spirit of the age, we do not join them. It would be ingratitude to God if we did. We go back to

Reformation principles, but not in order to rest there as in a safe harbor, but to retrace our steps in our presert desert of unsettled beliefs and hazy theological and philosophical speculations, in order to advance in harmony with our Calvinistic principles to advanced scriptural positions

Our view of revision precludes a so-called short creed. Some emphasize such a position in the interest of Church union. If there are two kinds of Reformed Churches, as some maintain, viz., such which bear a Calvinistic type and such which are in harmony with Melanchthon's theology, it will be very difficult to find a consensus of these two types. The principles underlying these two forms of doctrine are not at all harmonious; the principle of the Calvinistic Churches being God's glory and in the salvation of men his sovereignty; that of the Melanchthonian Churches man's salvation and synergism. A formula of concord between these Churches would soon prove a *concordia discors*. Instead of promoting union the Churches would soon be filled with strife and contention. Practical considerations if nothing else would force us to acknowledge that it would be better to confine our attempts at union to Calvinistic Churches alone. But these, it seems to me, do not stand in need of a consensus. A Calvinist finds the expression of his faith in any of the Calvinistic Confessions. Let him go to Great Britain, the Netherlands or Switzerland, he will find himself everywhere at home as well as in our own Church in our country, provided the Confessions of the Churches, planted in those countries, are loyally upheld.

A new creed, if based upon the historical Confessions, would have to be either a new edition of the five points, or a declaration about some doctrines, which are in dispute or need more emphasis than is given them in the existing creeds. A new edition of the five points is entirely out of the question. The exposition of these cardinal doctrines has been done in such a masterly manner, that I am unable to see, that it can be improved by the Churches of to-day. And I have my grave doubts whether there is enough of spiritual unity in the Churches to give expression in a new

declaration to a doctrine or doctrines not touched upon or not sufficiently emphasized in the historical Confessions. The fierce controversies now raging, although our age claims to be opposed to the polemical spirit of former times, are not reassuring in this matter.

Or is it perhaps a present duty to prepare a short creed in a modern form in order to give expression to a consensus of all the opinions current in the Churches of our times? I am afraid the Churches would have little to confess. Not so very long ago the editor of one of our religious papers ventured to assert that we are practically a creedless Church. A hard saying, indeed. And yet this is the length and breadth of it. *De jure* most of the Reformed Churches of our type are Calvinistic, *de facto* we are at sea. Some of our leading men seem to believe little indeed. I doubt whether the Apostolical creed would hold all the members of our Churches honestly together, although an honest Unitarian need not step out, if the Churches discarded all the creeds save this one.

Very instructive in this respect is an episode, occurring during the first epoch of the present revision movement in the Presbytery of Chicago. One of the members of that body advocated the substitution of John 3:16 for all the standards. For him it would be sufficient to confess that our heavenly Father loves his children. It was a deserved rebuke when Prof. Herrick Johnson replied to this statement: "Let it be once imagined that the Presbyterian Church had stripped away all her creed but that, don't you suppose that the Universalists would rejoice and the Unitarians would be pleased, and that every last denomination and every individual, independent wild ass' colt that kicked against ecclesiastical fences would give some evidence of joy over the fact that the Presbyterian Church was led by that one verse of Scripture, saying: "Why, that is the creed of our Church!" This, indeed, is a fine testimony of Dr. Johnson, which holds good in all similar attempts to minimize the Confessions of the Churches. It is only a pity, that men as Dr. Johnson do not see, that in voting in

favor of revision, they put this work into the hands of men, many of whom are led by the same spirit as the man against whom his remarks were directed.

Considering all this, it seems to me that it is as inexpedient to formulate a short or a new creed, of whatever character it may be, as to revise the standards which exist in the Reformed Church.

In view, however, of the movement, which has been set agoing for the second time in the Presbyterian Church, and into which we will be dragged sooner or later, we have to prepare ourselves for a similar struggle. Forewarned is forearmed. In conclusion, therefore, I submit to the Reformed readers of our REVIEW a few theses, which embody in my estimation imperative duties for every loyal member of the Reformed Church.

1. It is our duty to agitate the necessity of the thorough investigation of our standards by the clergy and all the members of our Churches.

2. Catechetical instruction of the youth ought to be revived where it has fallen into disuse, and to be cherished as a sacred treasure wherever it is still in force.

3. Only on condition of such an earnest investigation of our standards the question of revision or the formulation of a new creed will be in order, if found necessary.

4. Let us abandon the agitation for revision, but let every pastor and professor, if they have any gravamina against any expressions or hard sayings in the standards, lay them before their brethren in solemn assembly.

5. Let the custom of former times be renewed which required of delegates to the assemblies of the Churches to express their loyalty to the standards before they entered upon the discharge of their duties.

6. Let us all uphold and defend the system of doctrines contained in our standards in the face of friend and foe, wherever it may be necessary.

7. And last, but not least, let all those who are consciously no longer in harmony with the principles and doctrines of the Reformed Church, desist from agitating questions which they already have prejudged.

NICHOLAS M. STEFFENS.

Orange City, Iowa.

## VII. THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION'S RIGHT TO CONSTRUE ITSELF.

The recent discussion of the Westminster Confession of Faith, now very general throughout the Presbyterian Church, North, has brought into especial prominence some very important issues relating to what is known as the "Elect infants" clause of that Confession. Amongst these is the question as to whether the Confession's teaching concerning the way of the salvation of "Elect infants dying in infancy" is ambiguous.

The allegation to that effect is recently growing somewhat common. Worse still, upon this is based a charge that the Confession teaches that some of these "infants dying in infancy" are lost. Heretofore, the charge and the allegation of "ambiguity" upon which it is founded, especially the former, have not been taken very seriously. But recent writings of some very worthy critics, whose views are entitled to respect and, if erroneous, to clear refutation, taken in connection with much of rash and hasty admission from less competent sources, would seem to indicate that a paper given to a calm consideration of this subject may be, in some measure, not only timely but also acceptable.

This humble contribution I now offer, not in the spirit of controversy, but solely for the sake of truth.

The probabilities are against the accusation. For two hundred and fifty years, the Westminster symbols have enjoyed distinction for accuracy in expression and for logical positiveness in affirmation. Nevertheless, if the charge of an ambiguity of so serious consequence can be proved, Presbyterians are not the people to evade responsibility. But if not, they are the people to claim that the charge should be withdrawn. Let us notice,

### I. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION.

Primarily, the interests of truth are at stake ; truth bear-



ing upon a symbol of faith accepted by millions of intelligent Christians.

Secondarily: Forget not that upon the answer to this question depends the decision as to what methods the Presbyterian Church must adopt in carrying on the whole defensive controversy over the "Elect infants" proposition. To show that this is true, is of vital strategic importance in this discussion. I shall therefore offer no apology for giving this preliminary matter full presentation in the light of the very highest authority.

Throughout the whole realm of enactments, secular or sacred, constitutional or statutory, there is one principle of interpretation widely held and firmly settled, namely:

An unambiguous instrument interprets or construes itself; or, as otherwise expressed, needs no construction, and excludes all interpretations or constructions but its own.

If its own meaning is clear and indubitable, the investigation to ascertain the meaning stops right there. But, on the other hand, if ambiguity be admitted, then the true meaning becomes a question of proof by extrinsic evidence, such as history, personal opinions, debates, etc., when properly introduced. But the relevancy and even the admissibility of this evidence, depend entirely upon the previous question: Does the instrument plainly construe itself?

A prudent debater will settle that question with decided caution.

Not merely to sustain this principle, but to *impress* it, the following quotations from eminent authorities may be introduced:

"When the text of a Constitutional provision is not ambiguous, the courts, in construing it, are not at liberty to search for its meaning beyond the instrument itself. \* \* It is not until the means of solution afforded by the Constitution have been exhausted without success, that the courts are justified in calling outside facts or considerations to their aid." (Black on Interpretation of Law, pp. 28, 29). The same writer shows that, even to settle admitted

ambiguities, recourse to debates is "a great stretch," seeing that these shed no light upon the views of those "who do not talk." Another eminent authority says :

"If the words are free from ambiguity and doubt, express clearly, plainly the sense of the framers of the instrument, there is no occasion to resort to other means of interpretation. \* \* \* The statute itself furnishes the best means of its own exposition; and if the sense in which words were intended to be used can be clearly ascertained from its parts and provisions, the intent thus indicated will prevail, without resorting to other means of construction. \* \* \* The Legislature must be understood to mean what it has plainly expressed and this excludes construction." (Southerland, Statutes and Statutory Construction, pp. 312, 313.) Hear another, to the same import:

"When the words of a statute are plainly expressive of an intent not rendered dubious by the context, the interpretation must conform to and carry out that intent. It matters not in such a case what the consequences may be." (Endlich, Commentary on Interpretation of Statutes, pp. 6 and 7). But one other:

"It is only when the language is ambiguous that the courts are called on to construe or interpret. \* \* \* The general principle on which we have insisted, that the meaning of a written law is to be found in its terms and that we are not at liberty to resort to extrinsic facts and circumstances to ascertain what the framers might have intended, has frequently been declared to apply to the Constitution of the United States."

This last quotation is from Sedgwick, who goes on and quotes Chief Justice Marshall as condemning the principle that "in any case the plain meaning of a provision not contradicted by any other provision in the same instrument, is to be disregarded because we believe the framers of the instrument could not intend what they say."

These quotations distinctly show that, just as we settle this question of ambiguity, so we decide as to whether or not we must follow Dr. Briggs and others in their long

tramp after the personal opinions of some of the members of the Westminster Assembly, or admit as evidence those unguarded expressions of individual preachers or writers found in all times and in all churches.

It is the purpose of this paper to maintain that the Confession's teaching as to the salvation of "Elect infants dying in infancy" is not ambiguous: consequently, that the Confession itself is its own best and exclusive *authority* of construction.

The whole teaching referred to is short, and is embraced in one proposition, as follows:

"Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth"

Please bear in mind that the sole question is as to the ambiguity of this proposition, just as it lies in Chapter X., Section 3 of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Before moving forward to a positive definition of ambiguity, it is important to point out some things which are not included within it, and, therefore, cannot be adduced as proving its existence.

## II. ELIMINATIONS.

1. The mere fact that a proposition has been misunderstood would not necessarily prove its ambiguity. The question might so be raised but could not so be settled. The causes of misunderstanding are very numerous and each instance of it would need to be examined, in order to be classed as proceeding from the man or the matter; whether from inattention, indolence, bigotry, prejudice, unconscious partizanship, educational bias, popular misrepresentation; and so on, almost without limit.

2. The fact that a proposition has to be studied in order to be comprehended, by no means proves its ambiguity. All can recall how blank some of the propositions, and even the definitions, of mathematics seemed when the mind first tried to grapple them. But the propositions were distinctly true, nevertheless; accurate in expression, fixed and definite in signification.

3. Closely related to this is the universally admitted principle that the use of technical or scientific language, or the language of art, by no means necessitates ambiguity. Theological terms may embody an affirmation as unambiguous as any ever written. It is with these terms as with all others; the ambiguity in sense and in particular use, must be proved, not assumed.

4. A word, phrase, clause, or proposition, is not proved ambiguous merely, by the fact that its opposite or contrasted meaning may enter into the mind, and be entertained by it. By a law of mental association, the phrase "a white man" may suggest "a black man," but it would be woefully inconclusive to say that the first phrase is therefore ambiguous. The thing that suggests the idea in the second phrase is, not the ambiguity, but the very definiteness of the idea in the first.

5. Equally inconclusive is the notion that a clause, of two phrases, is proved ambiguous by the fact that the mind can conceive and entertain *two* contrasts, one for the idea of each phrase. The possibility of the two contrasts in the clause "Elect infants, dying in infancy"—"not elect infants," as one, and "infants not dying in infancy," as the other—would not prove any ambiguity in the original positive clause.

The question is as to what this clause has here expressed as in mind. If some curious soul should spring the extraneous question, which of these two contrasts do you include as the meaning of your language? the Confession would very promptly and properly answer: I have said not one syllable about either and you have no right to infer from my language that I have any design to include either as part of my teaching in this clause.

There is no more ambiguity in the clause, "Elect infants, dying in infancy," than in the clause, "Ripe apples, hanging on a tree." What would be thought of one who would profess that he could not tell the meaning of this clause because, forsooth, he avowed himself in doubt as to whether you intended to put a "not" before the word "ripe" or be-

fore the word "hanging?" How quickly would you retort: My kind friend, who told you that I intended to put it *anywhere*? I am talking about "ripe apples, hanging on a tree"; and you know what I mean well enough; the language is not ambiguous.

6. It scarcely needs to be added that a question as to ambiguity of a document has nothing to do with the merits or demerits of its subject-matter. Whether it ought to have said more; whether less; what inferences may flow from it; these are questions for argument. But they do not belong to this discussion which is solely as to intended meaning.

It is hoped that the foregoing exclusions make lighter the work of positive argument. The question next requiring answer is: What is ambiguity?

### III. DEFINITION.

The answer must be drawn principally from two sources. The first is, the dictionaries. Probably that of the Standard Dictionary is as good as any: "Uncertain in meaning, especially where either of two interpretations is possible." Similarly, the International: "Doubtful or uncertain, particularly as to signification; capable of being understood in either of two or more possible senses."

The other source of information is the recognized works of law. In these, there is a settled doctrine of ambiguity, the principles of which are common to all documentary instruments. These fundamental principles are as applicable to this as to any other discussion of ambiguity.

Accepting substantially the definitions just given, ambiguity is regarded as of two kinds:

The first is that which arises "from the words of an instrument as looked at in themselves, and before they are attempted to be applied to the object or the subject which they describe." This is called intrinsic, or patent, ambiguity. The second is that which arises, "not upon the words as looked at in themselves, but upon those words when applied to the object or the subject which they describe." (American and English Encyclopædia of Law.)

The first arises from the phraseology; the second, from something extrinsic "referred to but not fully expressed"—or not described in such a way as to prevent it from being confounded with some other exterior object.

Is the proposition: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit:" (1) A proposition of patent ambiguity? This I deny.

#### IV. DIRECT ARGUMENT.

I. The *words* are all of settled and definite meaning. That one meaning lies in the chapter, and, as one, is sustained throughout the chapter and the book. The chapter's opening sentence shows that the word "elect" means "predestined unto life." The word "infants" is plainly defined in the immediate context as meaning those too young to be approachable through the outward call of the Gospel. The word "regenerated" is, in a sense, technical, but of absolutely clear and settled significance. There is not an ambiguous word—a word whose meaning the Confession itself does not settle—in the whole proposition.

2. The *phrases* are unambiguous. "Elect infants" are infants "predestined unto life." Charge the phrase with a thousand other things, if you will; its meaning is on its face, and the face is not in any shadow. You may wish it had said something different: or something more, or less; but whatever you may think of its reserve and caution, you cannot deny that it says plainly what it does say. And if this is true, it matters not one scintilla what language in the Westminster Assembly was proposed antecedently or subsequently. No man of any time, no man in all time, can lay upon the Confession the weight of one feather more than it has laid upon itself.

3. These phrases are unambiguous *in their inter-relations*, when forming clauses, "Elect infants, dying in infancy"—or, using the interchangeable language in the same chapter, "Infants predestinated unto life, dying in infancy"—is a clause so definite and clear and single that the man who will try to find even synonymous language for it

will be puzzled; and he who will offer to show any positive description that it may be mistaken for, may be defied.

Professor Warfield, of all his strong sayings, never said anything stronger in truth than this: "I think we may characterize the interpretation of Chapter X, Section 3 which finds a body of non-elect infants dying in infancy implied in its statements, as *one of the most astonishing pieces of misrepresentation in literary history.*" (Italics mine)

4. The *whole proposition* is unambiguous. Its distinctive affirmation rings out in clear plainness; drowns the dissonance of contemporary error, and is the first of any and all churchly symbols to sound forth the music of infant salvation—free from the discord of ceremonial restrictions and from the false notes of ghostly negations and privations in the world to come.

The proposition stands in a chapter which expounds itself so plainly that it positively precludes any construction but self-construction.

This chapter's leading purpose is unmistakable and is pursued from beginning to end. This purpose is, to tell *how* all those whom God hath "predestinated unto life"—the "elect"—are to be saved, capables and in capables.

The former are effectually called by God's word and Spirit; are drawn to Christ irresistibly; but they come freely, answering the call and embracing the grace offered and conveyed in it, as the Spirit enables. The latter, the incapables, "Elect infants, dying in infancy" and "all other elect persons" who are "incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word," "are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit," the mode of whose mysterious working is left just where he has put it—in the inscrutable Holy of holies, with himself, in hidden glory, behind the veil.

Out of all surrounding darkness, leaps in seraphic beauty, a sentence that means *salvation*, clear as the day and lovely as heaven; "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated *and saved.*"

5. It would be easy to show that this self-interpreting

power both of the proposition and of the chapter in which it is environed is in the plainest and strictest harmony with the whole Confession's system. But this will not be denied by any intelligent student.

(2). There remains the question, is the proposition vulnerable as one of *latent* ambiguity? Again I answer, No.

Latent ambiguity can never be urged against any writing unless the writing makes specific or express reference to something not clearly described or defined—and in this way doubt arises as to the application of the reference to its object, as the one indubitably intended.

From these terms of definition, it is transparent that there is no latent ambiguity in the proposition as to elect infants. To nothing extrinsic does the proposition make an express reference whereupon might arise a doubt of application as between two or more, one of which was intended.

If it be said that the Confession uses the phrase, "Elect infants" and does not specify the individuals or the class to whom it desires the application to be made; the answer is that the document uses no such language as would show that it desires or intends such an application at all. And this lack is fatal to the charge of latent ambiguity. The silence is just as unambiguous as is the utterance.

In answer to the question, What is your intended application, particular or universal, of the phrase "elect infants?" the Confession's very muteness says: None whatever. What God has not told me, I cannot tell you. This I do know: Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit.

There is no ambiguity in that teaching. None patent, as its face shows. None latent, as an essential element in the definition shows. Therefore, none at all. This is our conclusion.

#### V. IMPORTANT NECESSARY INFERENCES.

I. Let the Confession alone. It is a unit. As it stands, it can construe itself. A change anywhere may materially damage the symmetry everywhere. A body mutilated



is a body weakened. Dr. Warfield is right, the time demands, not revision, but intelligent affirmation.

2. Be serene when somebody tells you that somebody else says that the Confession teaches infant damnation. Base your defence upon the unambiguous Confession's right of self-construction. Be not drawn away from this impregnable citadel.

3. Do not excessively worry over what somebody says the Westminster Divines said. Read calmly Dr. Briggs's book "Whither" wherein he quotes seven of these "Divines" as having held to infant damnation. Listen without terror to the anonymous and spectral shrieker made by misrepresentation to walk up and down through all non-entity saying something about "infants in hell a span long."

In only one of the seven quotations does Dr. Briggs seem clearly to prove his point. But what if he had been successful in all of them? Resort to debates and to personal declarations is not held to be the highest form of evidence in settling the meaning of even admittedly ambiguous documents; and one unambiguous statement from the document's own lips can chase a thousand.

4. Dismiss the thought that anything is the matter with the Confession which is not also the matter with the Bible. The dissatisfaction with the clause "elect infants dying in infancy" arises from its unambiguous silence as to any application, universal or particular, of the word "elect." This reserve is a virtue, not a vice.

It springs from two causes: the one, general; the other, special. The former is the Confession's oath-bound allegiance to the Bible. The latter is its special awe of the whole superhuman subject of election. The Confession takes its own advice. "The doctrine of this *high mystery* of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care."

But right under its impressive silence as to the things which are not seen even in part, the purpose of God as eternity alone can show them—the church prints the words which make the salvation of infants as sure as Christ's own

avement and as broad as the compassion of the heart of him who "gathers the lambs with his arm and carries them in his bosom."

Right beneath the much traduced "elect infants" clause, are the words which the Church binds indissolubly to its teaching: "And they brought unto him infants that he should touch them; but when his disciples saw it they rebuked them; but Jesus called them unto him and said: Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." The Church thus says: My teaching is as the width of Christ's outstretched arms, and as warm as the bosom that shelters the lamb. Is not this enough?

With reverent spirit, therefore, the Confession ventures to the last limit of divine revelation. With shaded eyes and bowed head, it there pauses, lingering to adore. It hides not the light struggling down from eternity's counsels, but rejoices in it—and none the less because it comes in subdued splendor and in broken gleams. The Confession knows that, with all of the Bible's completeness, there are yet secret things which belong to God; there is yet another veil which the unseen hand is to rend in twain from top to bottom, before Jehovah's awful throne; and then we shall know who are God's elect. Here let the Confession stand before this hidden and most holy place, saying to the Shechinah within: "Speak Lord; thy servant heareth."

#### CONCLUSION.

Amongst the many defects of this paper, prepared in the midst of a busy pastor's duties, and in the heat of summer, the fault of rashness in choosing position cannot be included. I have slowly and cautiously taken my ground after patient thought and careful correspondence with brethren in whose judgment I place very great faith. It is my deliberate conviction that the Confession's Gibraltar is the unambiguously Scriptural Confession.

To surrender this stronghold would be to fall back upon the less sure utterances of individuals whom the enemy is only too eager to meet. The surrender is as unnecessary

as it might be unsafe. The Confession flies its own flag; from its own walls let it blow its own clear trumpet, to all Christendom and through all time.

Raleigh, N. C., August 20, 1900. EUGENE DANIEL.

[The position as to the unambiguous silence of the "elect infants" proposition is immeasurably strengthened by what an acute and learned friend suggests, namely: the "inveterate habit" of the Confession to *express* an opposition of meaning when it is designed.

The doctrine of so-called "intermediate ambiguity" has been intentionally ignored in this paper. It is obscure, not established, and is generally regarded as of no force.—E. D.]

## VIII. WHO WAS "DARIUS, THE MEDIAN?"—NEW LIGHT FROM BABYLONIAN TABLETS.

Those who have found difficulty in accepting as historical the narrative portions of the Book of Daniel have been perplexed, chiefly by the occurrence in them of two names—Belshazzar and "Darius, the Median"—neither of which is mentioned by the historians who have written of Babylon at the time of the close of the Jewish captivity.

It is now very generally known that, through the discovery and decipherment of the Belshazzar cylinder by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1854, and of a Babylonian tablet more recently, Belshazzar has been quite distinctly identified.

But "Darius, the Median," mentioned in Dan., v. 31, and other places, has remained unidentified with any historical character mentioned by these historians; and, what is worse, their narratives appear to have left no place for such a king of Babylon. Even the great archæologist, George Rawlinson, after discussing the claims of several characters, dismissed them as incredible, and concludes by saying: "It seems best to acquiesce in the view of those who hold that 'Darius, the Mede, is an historic character,' but one 'whose name has not yet been found except in the Scriptures.'" The quotation which he uses is from *The Speaker's Commentary* on Daniel, v. 31, showing that the learned author of that portion of this commentary had no solution to propose. Dr. Schaff, too, in an article in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, can only say, "Discoveries in Babylon have already confirmed the statements of Daniel which were denied by critics. They may be expected to do so in the future," while he expresses the hope that "some future discovery may clear up this difficulty as satisfactorily as the preceding one (that connected with the name Belshazzar) has been."

Now, it seems, discovery has lighted the way to a solution of this problem also. An article in the July number of *The Churchman*, London, by the Rev. Charles Bout-

flower, very clearly indicates the identity of "Darius, the Median," with a well-known historical character. Recently deciphered cuneiform inscriptions on Babylonian tablets seem almost to place the matter beyond the region of controversy. It is one of the gratifications of life in our age that we have access to sources of historical information about the oldest kingdoms, which were inaccessible to the "Father of history" and his contemporaries. We have writings on tablets made at the very time occupied by the short reign of Darius, the Median, as "King of Babylon," of which Herodotus was ignorant.

The conclusion at which Mr. Boutflower arrives is beset, it is but fair to say, with difficulties which, at first sight, seem formidable, and to some, may continue, after all attempted explanations, to seem insuperable. In the first place, there is no intimation in the inscriptions deciphered that the personage whom this writer identifies with "Darius, the Median" of Daniel, bore this name and designation; and, in the second, the tablets make him to be only twelve years of age, while "Darius, the Median," is spoken of in Daniel as about sixty-two, a difference of a half century.

But before allowing ourselves to be prejudiced against his conclusion it will be well for us to look at the evidence which he adduces from the Babylonian tablets that, in spite of these facts, "Darius, the Median," is no other than Cambyses, the son of Cyrus.

When we read in Isaiah (xliv. 28 and xlv.) the prophecy of the deliverance of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon, and in Ezra (i:1-4) of the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple, and then turning to Daniel (v. 31) find the assertion that after the slaying of Belshazzar, "Darius, the Median, took\* the kingdom," while in the following chapters he is seen organizing the government of the kingdom and governing it, we are liable to some perplexity. From what Isaiah predicts and what Ezra relates,

---

\* R. V., "Received." [See IX. 1. "Was made king."]

we should have expected to hear Daniel speak of Cyrus, and not of some one else as the king. How is it that Darius reigns, and yet the decree for the restoration comes from Cyrus? But, there is the same seeming confusion in the book of Daniel itself; and, yet, from its statements we may find the clue of the maze. For there we find it said (Dan. i. 21) "And Daniel continued unto the first year of King Cyrus"; and we find Daniel in Babylon (Dan. x. 1) "in the third year of Cyrus, King of Persia."

In the statement (Daniel vi. 28) that "Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus, the Persian," we have a hint of a reconciliation of these apparent contradictions.

A reign of Darius in Babylon is here represented as preceding the reign of Cyrus there.

Now, if we should find from other sources that Cyrus, after the taking of Babylon by his army under Gobryas and after its "pacification" and some months of rule under military laws, placed another person on the throne of Babylon, while he himself went on to make further conquests, and then returned to take his place as supreme ruler, the person thus receiving the kingdom would answer, so far, to the "Darius, the Median" of Daniel. Such sources have now become accessible, chiefly through the labors of Strassmeir,\* who has transliterated and translated Babylonian Contract Tablets in the British museum belonging to the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses, his son. These tablets are accurately dated with the year of the reign, in each case, together with the month and day of the month. The year, it is interesting to notice, is identical with the Jewish religious year, beginning with the month Nisan.

One of these tablets tells us of "Cambyses, King of Babylon at the time when Cyrus, his father, was king of the countries."

Another tablet is dated, 1, 3, 10, i. e., the 10th day of the 3rd month of the first year of the reign, and reads: "The

---

\*Babylonische Texte. J. N. Strassmeir, S. J.

first year of Cyrus, King of the Countries [at a time when] Cambyses was king of Babylon." The words in brackets are obliterated, but are supplied from two other tablets. Mr. Boufflower states that "there are twenty-three Cambyses tablets which are dated the first year of Cambyses," and "covering a period of rather less than ten months, viz., from 1, 1, 3 to 1, 10, 20, on which that monarch has the single title, 'King of Babylon,' in contradistinction from the more usual double title, 'King of Babylon and king of the countries.'" He continues: "Now there is reason for believing that these twenty-three tablets belong, not to the reign of Cambyses as sole monarch,\* but to his reign as king of Babylon in his father's life-time, seeing that in the three hundred and ten inscriptions bearing date the succeeding years of his reign, the single title, 'King of Babylon,' occurs, for certain, but in two instances, and are never found in the tablets which are marked with his accession year."

On the other hand he draws attention to the very significant fact that, as to the Cyrus tablets, "no dependable tablets between 1, 1, 4 and 1, 11, 6, on which Cyrus is styled "King of Babylon," is to be found. "While, on the other

---

\*Cambyses, the son of Cyrus. has heretofore been thought of only as the successor of Cyrus after his death, as "King of Babylon and the Countries," and as "King of Babylon," under Cyrus's more general rule. some years after his conquest of that kingdom. Canon Rawlinson shared in this mistake, as is evident from his assertion concerning the arrangements made by Cyrus for the government of the Babylonian kingdom: "It was not many years before he gave his son, Cambyses, the full royal power at Babylon, relinquishing it himself, as appears from a dated tablet." (*Transactions, etc.*, Vol. VI., p. 480). *Rawlinson's Egypt and Babylon*, pp. 90 and 91.

He continues: "We have only to suppose that Cyrus, in the interval between the brief governorship of Gobryas and the sovereignty of Cambyses, placed Babylon under a Median noble named Darius, and allowed him a position intermediate between that of a mere ordinary 'governor' and the full royal authority." This is an ingenious guess in the absence of light, but could not be reconciled with Daniel vi:25-28. The light has now come, and Cambyses is seen occupying this royal seat which no mere "governor" could have filled.

hand, during the short interval from I, II, 6, to the close of the year, to which no less than twenty-one first-year tablets belong, we note the striking fact that the title, 'King of Babylon,' appears in no less than six cases out of nine.' Thus, for the first year of Cyrus we have the following result :

"During some ten months, about the beginning of the year, Cyrus is not styled "King of Babylon" on the tablets, whilst during the last two months, at the close of the year, he receives that title on six tablets out of nine."

Daniel only speaks of one year of the reign of Darius, while he mentions the third year of the reign of Cyrus.

The tablets belonging to the second year of Cyrus are fifty-eight in number and his double title, "King of Babylon and King of the Countries," is found on forty-three, while only three of the fifty-eight have "King of Babylon" alone.

The interval of ten months in the first year of Cyrus is a remarkable feature in the tablets and, as has been shown, other tablets represent Cambyses as then occupying the throne, and Daniel speaks of Darius as the king at the time. Darius, then, it would seem, must be Cambyses, the son of Cyrus. Indeed there seems no way of escaping this conclusion.

The tablets give some interesting facts which cannot be noticed here, but one vividly pictured scene is of such special value as confirmatory of this conclusion that it cannot well be excluded. "The queen," the same doubtless, who came into the banquet of Belshazzar in the midst of the consternation ensuing on seeing the writing on the wall, who was, in all probability, the queen-mother, died, apparently about the close of the year in which Babylon was taken, and a tablet presents the description of a mourning not unlike that in Nineveh under Jonah's preaching.

"The fourth day Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, conducted the burial at the Temple of the Sceptre of the World." Then, after a partial obliteration, occurs the expression 'taking the hands of Nebo,' and in the following line we



catch the words, 'The son of the king.' Clearly Cambyses is the subject of the passage, and the leading figure.

A significant fact in this connexion is that "taking the hands of Bel" was the act of Assyrian monarchs who became kings of Babylon, and another is that the great Nebuchadnezzar leaves the record on an existing tablet, "and Nebo, the overseer of the multitudes of Heaven and earth, for the governing of the peoples, a righteous sceptre placed in my hands."

On this the writer remarks: "We may infer, then, from the above that Cambyses, though only styled 'King of Babylon,' on the twenty-three contract tablets so often referred to, was yet, in the eyes of the Babylonian world, regarded as an empire-ruler, the vice-gerent of his father Cyrus." Two other inscriptions are cited which very fully bear out this view of the position of Cambyses, and serve to explain the grand style of the edicts of Darius as recorded in the book of Daniel, such as that of Dan. vi. 25-28.

This going into the "Temple of the Sceptre of the World" as a significant act connected with the installation of Cambyses as king of Babylon, is found to correspond with the action of Nabonidus, the father of Belshazzar, whom Cyrus conquered and deprived of the kingdom,

Mr. Boutflower tells us, "In the year 1895, Dr. Victor Scheil discovered, in the mound of Mujelibeh on the site of Babylon, a semicircular pillar of diorite, on the flat side of which was an inscription of Nabonidus in archaic characters, drawn up in eleven columns. The king is telling how, with a view to make his reign prosperous, he went into different temples to secure the blessings of the several divinities. Among others he entered this very temple which was now entered by Cambyses—entered it, no doubt, with the same object. His words are: 'To the Temple of the Sceptre of the World, into the presence of Nebo, the prolonger of my reign, I entered. A right sceptre, a firm sword, a royal name ruling the world, he entrusted to my hands.' So, then, when Cambyses 'took the hands of Nebo,' the god 'entrusted to his hands a sceptre, a firm sword, a royal name ruling the world.'"

In the light of these inscriptions the conclusion that "Darius the Median" was no other than Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, seems most natural, if not absolutely unavoidable.

But, as has been intimated, there are difficulties in the way. How can Darius be sixty-two years old, it may be asked, if he is the son of Cyrus, and how can this statement be reconciled with that of the tablets, in which he appears as a boy of twelve, put on the throne by his father?

The answer is not difficult. There is nothing transmitted in Hebrew or East Aramaic records so uncertain as numbers. This arises from the fact that numbers were represented by letters of the alphabet; and a slight obliteration of the Ms., or carelessness of the scribe in forming a letter, often led to the mistaking of one for another. In this case there was a special liability to this, as the old Phœnician characters, like those on the Moabite stone, were used for this purpose, and sixty-two being represented by Samech Beth, and twelve by Yod Beth, an inspection of that alphabet will show that one might very easily be mistaken for the other.\* It is significant that the second number too represented by Beth is the same in 62 and 12.

That twelve is more probably the age of Darius is rendered probable, not only by the fact that he "received" the kingdom from the hands of another—"was made king," (Dan. ix. 1)—but from the tenderness of feeling exhibited by him towards Daniel to whom he had become attached; while his subjection to the will of the "Presidents and Princes" who, "assembled together unto the king" points in the same direction. This subjection was brought about by a scheme by which they entrapped him†—a scheme which

---

\*This Phœnician alphabet is accessible to all who are so happy as to possess a copy of that very remarkable summary of the best results of modern scholarship, the Self-Pronouncing S. S. Teachers' Combination Bible.

†The existence of an institution by which the young king was entrapped by the oily "Presidents and Princes," is confirmed by an independent source. "'Now, the royal judges' he [Herodotus] remarks, 'are certain picked men among the Persians, who hold their office for

they could probably not have ventured to use with an experienced ruler. His vengeance upon them when released from the binding force of his unchangeable Medo-Persian decree which he had unwillingly made may well have been the result of youthful rage at a great wrong practiced upon himself and their intended victim, Daniel.

But, it may be asked again, "How could Darius and Cambyses be the names of the same person?"

To this it may be answered that it was not, then, and is not, now, unusual for a monarch to have more than one name. The Sesostriis of Greek historians is Raamses ii. of the Egyptian monuments, and Pharaoh of the Bible. It may be true, too, that Darius—the strenuous—was originally like Pharaoh, an appellative rather than a personal name.\*

But, the objection may continue, "how could Darius be called 'The Median' and spoken of as "of the seed of the Medes" if he was Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, who was a Persian?"

The answer is that he had a mother as well as a father ;

life, or until they are found guilty of some misconduct. By them justice is administered in Persia, and they are the interpreters of the old laws, all disputed cases of law being referred to their decision.' " (Rawlinson's *Egypt and Babylon*, p. 92.)

This quotation from Herodotus throws a flood of light on such passages as Daniel, Chapter VI. and the whole book of Esther, where the contrast between the absolute monarchy of the Babylonian kings, like Nebuchadnezzar, and the rule of the Medo-Persian sovereigns, limited by unchangeable "laws of the Medes and Persians," is very strikingly brought out. But the confirmation of the accuracy of Daniel and the book of Esther is greatly enhanced when we find, also, a body of "royal judges"—a sort of Supreme Court—whose function it was to adjudicate all cases brought before them in accordance with these laws, and that this was done with an authority so "supreme" and final that it bound even the king.

\*The name Darius is not mentioned by the historians, Herodotus, Ktesias or Xenophon as applied to Cambyses ; yet, as this name was borne by several of his successors—Darius Hystaspes, Darius Nothus, Darius Codomanus—I would humbly suggest that it is not improbable that it was a title, which though unmentioned by these historians, was probably the one by which he was best known to Daniel and his contemporaries in Babylon, while Cambyses was the name best known to the Greeks.

and Ktesias\* represents him as the son of Amytis, the daughter of Astyages, the Median king, from whom Cyrus took the kingdom of Media, marrying this daughter. So, though Cambyses was the son of Cyrus, the Persian, he was also "of the seed of the Medes.†

But it may be still further objected: "If Darius was Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, how could he be "the son of Ahasuerus?"

Remembering that Ahasuerus—Hebrew, Ahasuerosh; Persian, Kkshayarsha; Greek, Xerxes; are all forms of the name Cyaxares; then, that Cyaxares was the great king who founded the realm of Media, (as celebrated among them as our Washington with us,) and then that Cambyses was the son of Amytis, daughter of Astyages, the son of the great Cyaxares, it seems quite natural that the great-grandson, Cambyses, should be called "the son of Cyaxares, i. e., Ahasuerus."

This designation, "the son of Ahasuerus," applied to Darius in Daniel ix:1, thus, instead of presenting a difficulty, helps to identify him with Cambyses, who would as naturally be called the son, i. e., descendant, of his great ancestor as that Belshazzar should be called the son of his grandfather, Nebuchadnezzar.

As it is well known that Cyrus, the Persian, having united the Median kingdom with his own, placed many Medes in

\*Xenophon, though in a different way, represents him as Median through his mother.

†When we consider the fact that Cyrus, the most politic of monarchs, made it his rule to appoint many Medes to high position in his new Medo-Persian kingdom which he formed by the conquest of the Median king, Astyages, whose daughter he made his queen, it seems perfectly natural that he should bring it about that his son, Cambyses, should be known as "The Mede." This would be specially pleasing to his new subjects the Medes; and it would not be difficult to show that it was calculated to enhance his popularity with the Babylonians also.

It will be remembered that Darius Hystaspes, having no Median blood in his veins, was at a disadvantage as a king of the Medes and Persians. A revolt of the Medes was led by a real Mede, who laid special stress upon the claim that he was "of the race of Cyaxares," i. e., Ahasuerus, just as "Darius, the Mede," is called "the son of Ahasuerus in Dan. ix:1.

high positions, from the same politic motives which led him to marry the daughter of the conquered Median king—(though we do not know how charming she may have been, and it may have been a love match too)—it is natural, on the supposition that Darius and Cambyses were the same, to read, Dan. ix-1: "In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, [Cyaxares], of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans."

Three Medo-Persian kings are mentioned in the Scriptures, "Darius the Persian," (Codomanus) Neh. xii-22; Darius the King," (Hystaspis), Ezra vi-1, and our "Darius the Median."

There has, probably, never been any doubt as to the identity of the first two; but many a puzzled interpreter has labored hopelessly over the last, and probably wished that he had been spared the embarrassment of a problem so apparently insoluble.

Now, however, I think all who love the Word of God may well rejoice that "Darius the Median" was mentioned too; for this name has become one of the links, so rapidly revealed by archæology of late, that serve to bind the narratives of the Scripture to their counterparts in the imperishable records of the monuments of the past. Some may still hesitate to accept the conclusion to which Mr. Boutflower has led us; but the great majority will feel that this name, so long a stumbling-block, has been transformed into a stepping-stone, which, along with many others, helps us to rise above the mists of doubt which have hung over parts of the Scripture narrative to a clear and satisfying view of that whole tract of the world's history with which the revelation of God's plan of redemption had to deal.

How remarkable has been God's providence in the whole progress of discovery and biblical archaeology in our day! And here the very name Darius is most suggestive.

Sir Henry Rawlinson on his ladder, on the dizzy height of the precipice on whose face he deciphered the Behistun inscription, was but following at imminent risk, and with incredible toil, an impulse which God has given to an army

of worthy compeers. That inscription was that of Darius Hystaspes, and from it was obtained the key to the vast libraries of cuneiform literature long buried in the earth, but now rising in our "age of doubt" to confirm his word. And now, at length, the Behistun key has opened another long closed lock; and another Darius, the predecessor of this one, long a sore troubler of Bible scholars, has come out into the light, with Belshazzar and Sargon and Sennacherib, Cherdalaomer, Amraphel, Arioch, Tidal and others—as their helper and friend.

Bethesda, Md.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

## IX. PHYSICAL SCIENCE, THEISTIC AND CHRISTIAN.

We hear so much of the conflict between Science and Religion, of the Decline of Faith, and of the Age of Doubt, that worldlings believe, and timid Christians fear, that there is a Conflict and Decline, and that this is the age, when Savants have abolished mind from the universe, and relegated religion to the curiosity shop. We hope to show in a brief paper that this is not the case.

Piety now, as in the days of Cowper, has "friends in the friends of science, and true prayer still flows from lips wet with Castalian dews." The younger Fichte, accounted the best posted specialist in German philosephy of his day, so recently as 1877, wrote to Zeller : "Ethical theism is now master of the situation. The attempt to lose sight of the personal God in nature, or to subordinate His transcendence over the universe, and especially the tendency to deny the theology of ethics and to insist only upon the reign of force, are utterly absurd and are meeting their just condemnation."

We hope to show in this paper that Christian apologists have no need to retreat from their position. No need to modify its broad assertion. We are not reaching forth one feeble hand, Uzzah-like, to steady the ark of God—Uzzah only delayed the ark's coming to its appointed place. Our purpose, the rather, is to cite the profession of faith of men notable in letters and science ; to show that Culture and Cultus are forever cognate ; and that physical science is both Theistic and Christian.

The poet of Modern Agnosticism in the poem entitled "Dover Beach" writes Christianity's obituary :

"The sea of faith  
Was once, too, at the full ; and round earth's shore  
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furl'd.  
But now I only hear  
Its wild melaucholy, long withdrawing roar,  
Retreating to the breath  
Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear  
And naked shingles of the world."

Now, this is pure assumption. We hope to show by actual citation and frequent quotation that the sea of faith is still at the full. Arnold was confused by the roaring of the storm. What he thought to be the movement of the tides was but the motion of the waves. Tennyson, too, but only at times was pessimistic. In "Sea Dreams" he represents a vast swelling up again and again out of a far off "belt of luminous vapors." It breaks with low, strange sound of nature's music against the heights, the "huge cathedral fronts of every age." One and then another of the sacred images of beauty fall from their pedestals. Higher and higher the storm rises; now black with venomous blackness; now mixed with awful light, at last the flood reaches

"Two fair images,  
Both crowned with stars and high among the stars  
The Virgin Mother, standing with her child  
Till she begins to totter and the child  
Clings to the mother, and sent forth a cry."

If the Christ-child and its mother stood on but a human pedestal, the allegory might be true. On the contrary, that Christ authoritatively said to the wild storm, "Peace, be still," and it obeyed Him. Therefore need not Christianity fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the sea and the waters thereof roar and be troubled, and though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. The voice of the Lord is upon the waters, the God of glory thundereth, the Lord is upon many waters.

Kaulbach's famous cartoon of the reformation represents, on canvas, the facts of history. We are prone to look upon the Reformation as merely ecclesiastical, religious and theological. On the contrary it was a renaissance, a new breathing of life. The prophecy of Kaulbach's canvas is realized history. The artist represents Luther standing, holding an open Bible in his hand; grouped around him are all the explorers, inventors and investigators of modern Europe, the physical and the metaphysical, the literary and even the geographical.

Only sophomores and the sophomoric "ex-communicate



nature from the moral order, and religion from the rational order." True, there is a small school of thinkers—for the most part, small thinkers—who have treated religion as a sort of abnormal excrescence, a kind of *lues thcologica*, but it is a declining school. As the *London Daily Chronicle*, in a leading editorial, lately said: "The members of this school must be very bewildered by the signs they see around them. While their own works be covered with dust on upper shelves, books which deal with the religious idea from the positive side, and especially from the point of view of social reconstruction find a readier sale than at any previous period of modern history." Dr. Stuckenberg, of Berlin, in commenting on German materialism, says that the falling off in sales of such books as Buechner's *Kraft und Stoff* clearly indicates that Materialism is losing ground. This book has well been called the Bible of Materialists. During the first seventeen years of its publication, twelve editors appeared. De Maillet published in 1784 a book on *Transmutation*. It had a phenomenal sale. Auxley pronounced it of no great value. La Marck published *Philosophic Torlogique* and Cuvier resisted its tenets. Librarians find these and the anonymous *Vestiges of Creation* on the back shelves and covered with dust. Indications are that *Darwin's Origin of Species* and *Descent of Man* will meet, within a generation, the same fate.

We ought not to be surprised that theistic philosophers, as Socrates and Plato and Kent are the greatest promoters of morality. All the founders of science have reasoned, from nature to God. No great secret of nature has yet been discovered by an Atheist. It is still through faith that men subdue kingdoms, work righteousness and obtain promises. The world is harmonious, for there is but one God—says he who is first Christian and then scientist. The laws of the world are simple, there, for God is sovereignly wise—says he who is first scientist and then Christian.

Thus reasoned Copernicus and Kephe, Newton and Galileo. Thus reason in our day "three physicists, who more than any others deserve the title of inventors are

initiators—Fresnel, Ampere and Faraday. These men recognized in their worship the Lord God in Heaven above and earth beneath, besides whom there is none else ; therefore they could not believe, that the forces of nature are independent of each other, and the objects of nature isolated from each other. Monotheism in religion begets the idea of Cosmos in nature. They acknowledge the will of the Lord as supreme in Heaven and in earth, in the seas and in all the deep places of the earth. Therefore they could not believe that power resided in independent and unrelated centre. Sovereign will, in religion, begets the idea of correlation of forces and conservation of energy. On these simple fundamental ideas Bacon based his *Novum Organum*, and the whole inductive system of knowledge has grown therefrom. Nor has the idea of monotheism and sovereign will grown out of the conviction of a Cosmos and correlation of forces, but vice versa. Five thousand years ago, in the valley of the Nile, the priests of Isis sang the unity of God, and Abraham recognized it, on the Plains of Mamre. The modern doctrine of the unknown was anticipated on the fane of the temple of Athene-Isis at Sais, "I am all that was and is, and shall be ; nor my veil, has it been withdrawn by mortal." It was anticipated by the known and the knowable at the burning bush on the back side of the desert at Horeb, the mountain of God, for the bush burned with fire and was not consumed—and a voice came from out the bush saying, "I am that I am."

If the Scriptures insist upon an Almighty and Omnipotent Person, science insists, in the words of Herbert Spencer, upon "the Power manifested through all existence," and in the words of Matthew Arnold upon "the Eternal Power, not ourselves which makes for righteousness." If the Scriptures insist that all things were made by him and without him was not anything made that was made, Spinoza conceived that God is the underived original and universal force, underlying and including all forces. John Fiske found God to be the Everlasting Source of phenomena and Descartes, the Universal being, of which all things are the manifestation.

Among the mighty and noble who confess Jesus are Whewell "whose range of knowledge was absolutely encyclopaedic," Spottswode, a while president of the Royal Society and a mathematician of rare genius; Clark Maxwell, who stood, by Europeans' acknowledgement, in the very front rank of scientific genius; Sir Gabriel Stokes, a foremost representative of contemporary science, and Faraday, whom Tyndall called the greatest experimental philosopher the world has ever seen.

Of all these, it is true, as Faraday said of himself: "I have never seen anything incompatible between those things of man, which can be known by the spirit of man, which is within him and those higher things, concerning his future, which he cannot know by that spirit."

Among those not ashamed of the Gospel may be enrolled Von Baer, Adolf Bostran, DuBois Raymond, Carl Semper, Sir George Mivart, Dana, Guyot and Dawson. These saw nothing unworthy of its place, any verse in Moses' account of the Creation, for they believed the record to be divine.

Dana holds that the events of creation, recorded in Genesis, were known only to the Creator; and the stately review of the ages, making the introduction to the Bible, stands there as the impress of the Divine Hand on the leaf of the Sacred Book. To any list of doubting and denying physicists we oppose these names and the names of the following: Leibnitz, Liebig, Mayer, Agassiz, Van Beneden, Pasteur, Brewster, Forbes, Graham, Rowan Hamilton, Herschel and Talbot, Andrews, Joule and Balfour, Stewart and Sir William Thomson. They each assert in their philosophy the majesty of God and exhibit in their conduct the simplicity of the Gospel.

These all are believing scientists. They agree that "all is of God that is and is to be; and God is good."

Herbert Spencer in a "Tribute to Tyndall," in the *Fortnightly Review* a few years ago divides men of science into two classes, "The one well exemplified in Faraday, keep their science and their religion absolutely separate, or as Huxley said "carry contradictory opinions in different

pockets of their brain, and do not trouble themselves about any incongruities between them." The other class occupy themselves exclusively with the facts of science and never ask, what implications they have." This remark is certainly gratuitous, as far as Faraday and a host of other religious physicists are concerned. It is important, as throwing light on the attitude towards religion, on the part of Spencer and Tyndall; and the more so, since as Spencer adds, "Tyndall belongs to neither class, and of the last, I have heard him speak with implied scorn." He did not find, nor profess to find in properties of matter and in the law of the conservation of energy, any sufficient solution for the problem of being and destiny. Perhaps the scientists, who never ask what implications these facts of science have, are of the same class as Emerson's Englishman, who had a valve in his brain to be shut down when the conversation approached the church.

The Christian faith was dear to the heart of Newton, "childlike sage and sagacious reader of the works of God." It was acceptable to the intellect of Milton, "whose genius had angelic wings and fed on manna." But not to these merely, but to philosophers and mathematicians, to geologists and biologists, to atomists and astronomers, Sir Humphrey Davy and Descartes, Haller and Pascal and Hale, Copernicus and Kepler and Young, Bacon and Jacobi and Ray, Mitchell, Maury, Hitchcock, Dana and Brewster. It is not likely that the writers of crude magazine articles can respect the truths which these men believed in and proclaimed. Let them not pronounce miracles impossible; Newton believed them possible and actual; even Mill and Huxley say, Granted a God, a miracle is to be reckoned with as a serious possibility. In the company of such men, declamation against religion avails little. Atheism, especially the superficial element therein, ought to learn dignity from science and humility even from agnosticism.

A manifesto drawn up and signed by six hundred and seventeen members of the British Scientific Association, many of whom are among the most eminent in the world,

has been deposited in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, England. This manifesto deploras "the unadvised manner in which some are placing science in opposition to Holy Writ." It declares that the time will come when the two records will be sure to agree in every particular. When Jacobi, the faith philosopher, while a young man at the university, read Kant's treatise on the proofs of the existence of God; as he read he was taken with a violent palpitation of the heart, so intense was his interest in the discussion of what is and ought to be the question of supreme concern to mankind.

Sir David Brewster was an humble but hearty believer in Christ. In his opening address to the Royal Society at Edinburg he expressed mournful compassion for the fallen stars of science, the sappers and enemies of the faith. He had only indignation for those idolators of physical law, who dared to hurl the Almighty from his throne, and for those materialists who, because they cannot somehow rub religion out of atoms, would crush it out of the heart. Sir Roderick Murchison-Virchow lately ridiculed Darwin's theory as altogether unreasonable and unscientific. Sir William Thomson, Lord Kelvin—and he is destined to occupy the place next to Newton—like Newton himself, and like Faraday, understood the invisible things of God by the things that are made, and was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. To his ingenuity we are indebted for the success of the Atlantic cable. He confesses that he is indebted to God for the ingenuity. No wonder, then, that the first message flashed across the sea was: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men," just as the first words ever sent over the electric telegraph wire: "What hath God wrought!" Sent, we repeat, by Morse, the inventor, not less reverent because more learned. Kepler never addressed himself to any scientific labor, without prayer to God.

Cuvier, great in scientific learning, was greater because a devout worshiper, and Pascal found his chief glory made more glorious when he glorified Jesus. Herschel, in his *Outlines of Astronomy*, asserts that it is reasonable to regard

the force of gravitation as the direct or indirect result of a consciousness or a will existing somewhere. The great anatomists and physiologists from Galen to Cuvier, and from Harvey to Owen, accepted the conclusion of teleology, and reverently believed in a First Cause.

At the Midway Conference of 1896 Sir J. William Dawson read a paper on "Natural Science as the Hand-Maid of Revealed Religion," in which he declared that he had had experience with something like three generations of scientific men, and he thought he had found as many truly pious men among them as in any other walk in life. For himself Huxley candidly says that his attitude against religion was determined by the dominant ecclesiasticism prevalent in his youth, which placed a fence in the way of science with a notice board marked: "No thoroughfare, by order of Moses." Huxley's wife had the following inscription carved upon his tomb, written by herself, and so it is said, inscribed at his request :

"If there be no meeting past the grave,  
If all is darkness, silence, yet 'tis rest,  
Be not afraid, ye waiting hearts that weep,  
For God still giveth his beloved sleep."

Huxley was much given to the use of vague phrases. Not unnaturally the frequent repetition of such terms as the "Unknown and the unknowable" has led many careless readers to class him as an Atheist. This, Huxley, distinctly disavows. In an article in the *Spectator* for February 10th, he says: I do not know that I care very much about popular odium, so that there is no great merit in saying that if I really saw fit to deny the existence of a God, I should certainly do so, for the sake of my own intellectual freedom, and be the honest Atheist you (his critic) are pleased to say I am. As it happens, however, I cannot take this position with honesty, inasmuch as it is, and always has been, a favorite tenet of mine that Atheism is as absurd, logically speaking, as Polytheism."

James Martineau calls attention to the saying of Hugh Miller that "Religion has lost its dependence on metaphys-

ical science." Well enough and good. Religion can do it. Bacon was the founder of Inductive Philosophy and the author of *Novum Organum*; and Bacon prayed "That human things may not prejudice such as are Divine, neither that from the unlocking of the gates of sense, and the kindling of a greater natural light, anything of incredulity or intellectual night may arise in our minds towards Divine mysteries." Louis Agassiz frankly asserts that his experience in profound scientific investigations convinced him that a belief in God—a God behind and within the chaos of vanishing points of human knowledge afforded him a wonderful stimulus in his attempt to penetrate into the regions of the unknown. He never made the preparation for penetrating into any small province of nature without breathing a prayer to the Being who hides his secrets from us only to allure us graciously on to the unfolding of them. The *Historia Plantarum* was written with the avowed purpose of illuminating the divine glory. Newton discovered the law of gravitation and he laid it down as an axiom, that God rules all things, as the Lord of the universe and not merely as the mind of the world.

Upon this basis of fact Naville argues that science is Christian; not that there is a direct connection between Christian dogma in its totality and the systems of physics and of astronomy; but because Monotheism has fortified and directed the reason and because it was by the preaching of the Gospel that Monotheism was established in the world. "All our modern science has been prosecuted in the broad and penetrating sunlight of faith in one living and personal God. Not a single theory has been proposed or experiment tried in nature except with the distinct recognition of the truth that a wise and loving mind at least may uphold the goings on of nature." Even agnostic philosophers freely admit that efficient cause is no decisive argument against final cause. Dr. Samuel Kinnis, a member of the Royal Astronomical Society and principal of the College, Highbury New Park, lately published a book, *The Harmony of the Bible with Science*. He points out that not only are

sceptical physicists in the minority, but also that men of the highest eminence in every branch of science have been and still are sincere believers in the authenticity of the Scriptures. On the occasion of the death of Arthur Cayley, Sadlerian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge a few years ago, Canon Mason made this reference to him in preaching in Canterbury Cathedral: "It is sometimes supposed by ignorant persons that a truly scientific mind cannot, unless with great reserve, accept the revealed religion of Christ. From the time of Newton and before that Cambridge has enjoyed the reputation of being the most distinguished seat of mathematical science in the world, and its teachers have been the most daring and the most exact. Every one knew Arthur Cayley to be the first pure mathematician of this century, and therefore of all centuries. He dealt familiarly with subjects of which other distinguished mathematicians have but distant glimpses. It used to be said that only one man could follow him. Not because he was obscure, but because his subjects were so lofty. People said he lived in the Fourth Dimension. If that meant that he lived in the spiritual world, the description was true. That exquisite modesty, that fascinating beauty that marked him, were the results of a life altogether devoted to God in Christ. It was often my privilege to minister to Professor Cayley the sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour and I never did so without having impressed upon me the Unseen Presence. It was impossible not to see that this strong and subtle mind was all irradiated and entranced by adoring communion with him to whom he had long consecrated every movement of his being." Strong language that, but every word true.

Our own wizard electrician, Edison, desires to be written down after this fashion, "I am one whose studies have long since convinced me of the existence of Supreme Intelligence. I could demonstrate it with mathematical certainty and one day may make the attempt. While I look upon men as so many atoms and upon each life as so much energy, I do not wish that to be construed as agnostic, nor do I over-



look man's accountability. Intelligence and morality—who can solve these mysteries? I tell you there is some where, some how a Supreme Intelligence working through the world of the seen and the unseen and in some strange, unknown fashion shaping the destinies of mankind." These all have repeated: I believe in God the Father Almighty—and this belief has fortified their reason.

Darwin cites and uses as a motto in *Origin of Species* the well known passage in *Butler's Analogy*: "It just as much requires and presupposes an intelligent agent to effect anything stately, fixedly, regularly, that is naturally, as it does to effect it for once, that is supernaturally." To him there was a grandeur in this view of life with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one, and that while this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity from so simple a beginning, endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been, and are being evolved. Fiske, in *Cosmic Philosophy*, contends that Darwinism properly understood replaces as much teleology as it destroys. Charles Kingsley questions what harm can come to religious science even if it be demonstrated not only that God is so wise that he can make all things, but that he is so wise that he can make all things make themselves.

Le Conte in *Conservation of Energy* shows that the evolution or development of the whole cosmos of the whole universe of matter—as a unit by forces within itself is proven to be inconceivable by the doctrine of the conservation of force. He shows that if there be any such evolution at all comparable with any known form of evolution it can only take place by a constant increase of the whole sum of energy, i. e., by a constant influx of divine energy, for the same quantity of matter in a higher condition must embody a greater amount of energy.

Let it be constantly borne in mind that many who hold to a doctrine of evolution, and even to Darwinian evolution, hold that his theory compels the recognition of an intelligent mind creating, forming and sustaining nature. The

Duke of Argyle relates of Darwin that he has the best reason to know that Darwin himself was very far from being insensible to this truth. The Duke says: "In the year preceding his death he did me the honor to call upon me in London, and in the course of the conversation I said to him that to me it seemed to me impossible to separate many of the adjustments which he had so laboriously traced and described to any other agency than that of mind. His reply was one which has left an ineffaceable impression upon me, not from his words only, but from the tone and manner in which it was given. 'Well,' he said, 'that impression has often come upon me with overpowering force. But then at other times it all seems ——— ;' and then he passed his hands across his eyes as if to indicate the passing of a vision out of sight."

Of himself the Duke asserts: "I know as much of nature in her geologic era as any living man, and I fearlessly say that our geologic record demonstrates, that even if the series of finite beings had both beginning and end, does not afford one syllable of evidence in support of Darwin's theory. All researches undertaken to establish continuity in the progressive development of man have proved futile. The missing link is a chimera." Now Darwin in *Origin of Species* admits that the best preserved geological section known presents but a poor record of the mutations of life; that it does not reveal any such finely graduated chain; that geology does not yield the innumerable transitional links between the species which his theory demands. He thinks this is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against his theory, and that "those who reject these views (i. e., origin of species) on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my entire theory."

If Darwinianism be atheistic, we must remember that it is not a proven scientific fact; it is only the working theory of a school of scientists. In the *Descent of Man* published as late as 1871, Darwin confesses that many of the older and honored chiefs of natural science are still opposed to evolution in every form. The most eminent palaeontolo-

gists, namely: Cuvier, Agassiz, Barrande, Pictet, Falconer, E. Forbes, and all our greatest geologists, as Lyell, Murchison, Sedgwick, have unanimously, often vehemently, maintained the immutability of species. Even more recently Prof. Tyndall, in an essay in the *Fortnightly Review*, makes the admission that the foes of Darwinianism are, to some extent, they of the scientific household; that a majority of minds of high calibre and culture, lovers of freedom, moreover, who though its object in truth be riddled by logic, still find the ethic life of their religion unimpaired. In addition to those Darwin enumerated, we mention Flourens, Buffon, De Candolle, Muller, John Hunter, Lawrence and Pouchet.

Strong in *Great Poets and their Theology* in writing of Homer says that, "God would seem to have given the death blow to the whole theory of impersonal and Atheistic evolution by ordaining at the very dawn of human history, that the greatest of epic poets should also be the first." It is important to note that Darwin resents the imputation of Atheism; both he and Wallace Huxley declare that Evolution is neither anti-theistic nor theistic any more than the first book of Euclid is. Sir J. William Dawson asserts that Evolution is destitute of any shadow of proof and is supported merely by vague analysis and figures of speech, and by the arbitrary and artificial coherence of its poets. The Duke of Argyll insists that the hypotheses of evolution make such violation of, or departure from all that we know of the existing order of things, as to deprive them of all scientific base.

To the same end is Carlyle's satire: "Ah! it is a sad thing and terrible to see nigh a whole generation of men and women professing to be cultivated, looking around in a purblind fashion and finding no God in this universe. This is what we have got! All things frog spawn, the Gospel of dirt the order of the day. The older I grow, and I now stand on the brink of eternity, the more comes back to me the sentence I learned when a child and the fuller and deeper its meaning becomes, 'What is the chief end of man?'"

To glorify God and to enjoy him forever.' No Gospel of dirt, teaching that men have descended from frogs, through monkeys can ever set that aside."

In the beginning God created, says Moses. In the beginning a First Cause caused things to be, proves modern science.

The old theory of bald materialism is dead—as dead as "dead matter." For it there remains no resurrection. Amateurs in physics and biology may from time to time deny its death and seek its resuscitation, but no first-class scientist any longer believes in it. Huxley was more ready to adopt the ultra-idealism of Bishop Berkeley, Clifford talked of "mind stuff" dwelling in matter. Even Haeckel depended upon "atom souls" as distinguished from "atom matter" for the explanation of life. Schopenhauer depended upon what he called "World-will" and Hartman upon what he called his "Unconscious." Herbert Spencer is sure of the existence of the one Eternal Energy back of all phenomena. Of this energy our knowledge is more sure and certain than our knowledge of any phenomenon of that energy; indeed phenomena are only partial manifestations of that energy.

John Stuart Mill, though he maintains that there is nothing to prove creation and government of nature by a sovereign will, is far from claiming any ability to disprove it. He declares that Evolution, if admitted would in no way whatever be inconsistent with creation. Mill recognized that the two most general results of science are: first, the government of the universe through a continual series of natural antecedents according to fixed laws; and second, the inter-dependence of each of these series upon all the rest. Now, the only theory of the government of the universe by supernatural beings that is consistent with these laws is Monotheism. Mill knew this. He abandoned Theism for Deism, when he concluded that there was no morality in nature.

Butler convinced Mill that every objection urged against Christianity was equally applicable to every theory of Divine government of the world. He convinced him that

God was as great a difficulty in the universe as in the Bible. Mill acknowledges that the Christian religion is open to no objections, either moral or intellectual, which do not apply at least equally to the common theory of Deism. Deism could not satisfy his intellect. He knew the poet's truth:

"Matter dull as it is  
 Could not occupy a charge and satisfy a law  
 So vast in its demands, unless impell'd  
 To ceaseless service by a ceaseless force  
 And under pressure of some conscious cause."

Thus he went from Theism to Deism and thence to Agnosticism and thence to Atheism. Theism, the existence of God, is an inward necessity of thought. It does not arise out of any process of ratiocination. It is a virtue rather than a science. Wace suggested that it spreads by a contagion of feeling rather than by a consecution of argument. Hence the denial of Theism on the part of Mill was but an arbitrary act of the will. He could not appreciate the message of Christ.

The concessions then of Mill are significant, "Whatever verdict experience can give in the case is against the possibility that Will ever originated Force; yet if we can be assured that neither does Force originate Will, Will must be held to be an agency if not prior to Force yet coeternal with it, and if it be true that Will can originate not indeed force, but the transformation of force from some other of its manifestations into that of mechanical motion; and that there is within human experience no other agency capable of doing so; the argument for a Will as the originator, though not of the universe; yet of the Cosmos or order of the universe remains unanswered." Even so late in life as the publication of his *Three Essays* he writes, "It must be allowed that in the present state of our knowledge the adaptation in nature affords a large balance of probability in favor of creation by intelligence. Tyndall in his famous *Belfast Address* declared that in his hours of clearness and vigor material Atheism was repudiated by his mind; then materialism seemed utterly unable to answer the question-

ings of his nature. In *Fragments of Science* he proposes the question, "Whence the nebula and its potential life"? Evolution answers the question no better than Creation. It can only give an infinite series of stages. Granted that everything comes from protoplasm, the more puzzling question remains: Where did protoplasm come from?

At a late meeting of the Victoria Institute, London, Prof. Beale, President of the Royal Microscopic Society, made a speech after forty years as professor of microscopic researches as to matter. He said he had failed to discover any facts which would tend to cause a thoughtful student of living nature to hesitate as to the existence of vitality. He pronounced himself unable to discover or frame any hypothesis which could be advanced as a reasonable explanation of the fact of any kind of living matter, without admitting the influence of infinite power, precision and wisdom. Looking from a purely scientific point of view only, the cause of all vital phenomena from the very beginning of life, in the present state of our knowledge can only be referred to the direct influence of an Almighty power. Lord Kelvin found strong proofs of benevolent and intelligent design everywhere. He declares that these proofs display the influence of a free will, and teach us that all living things depend on one everlasting Creator and Ruler. Thirty years ago Sir William Crookes published an account of experiments tending to show that outside our scientific knowledge there exists a force exercised by intelligence differing from the ordinary force common to mortals. Eighteen months ago as President of the British Association of Science, he delivered an address in which he adhered to his published statements. He preferred to reverse the apophthegm of Tyndall and say that in life he found the promise and potency of all forms of matter. Tyndall did rhetorically say that he found in matter the promise and potency of all forms of life; his more deductive assertion is to be found in the *Belfast Address*: "I do not think that the naturalist is entitled to say that his molecular groupings and motives explain everything. In reality they explain nothing. The

utmost he can affirm is the association of two classes of phenomena of whose real bond of union he is in absolute ignorance. The passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought and a definite molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously ; we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor apparently any rudiment of the organ which would enable us to pass, by a process of reasoning, from one to the other. They appear together, but we do not know why. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened and illuminated, as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain ; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such they be, and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem : how are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness ? The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable." Again in his *Scientific Limit of the Imagination*, Tyndall, in commenting on the famous dictum of German materialism "without phosphorus there can be no thought," affirms : " This may or may not be the case, but even if we know it to be the case, the knowledge would not lighten our darkness. On both sides of the zone here assigned to the materialist, he is equally helpless. You ask him where is this matter, of which we have been discoursing ; who or what divided it into molecules ; who or what impressed upon them this necessity of running into organic forms ; he has no answer." Tyndall in his *Scientific Use of the Imagination*, says : " Fear not the evolution hypothesis, steady yourselves in its presence upon that faith in the ultimate triumph of truth which was expressed by old Gamaliel when he said : " If it be of God ye cannot overthrow it ; if it be of man it will come to naught." It does not solve it, it does not profess to solve the ultimate mystery of this universe. It leaves, in fact, that mystery untouched. Granting the nebula and its potential life, the question : whence came they ? would

still remain to baffle and bewilder us. At bottom the hypothesis does nothing more than transport the conception of life's origin to an indefinitely distant past." Even if we grant that Darwinism accounts for the survival of the fittest, the more important suggestion, as President Schurman suggests, remains: "How does it account for the arrival of the fittest?" What is the origin of the fittest? The Duke of Argyle in the *Nineteenth Century* for March and April says: "Attempts to get rid of the idea of creation, as distinguished from mere procreation, are self-condemned as futile. The facts of nature and the necessities of thought compel us to entertain the conception of an absolute beginning of organic life, when, as yet, there were no parent forms to breed and multiply." Darwin, as is well known, recognized this. Matheson urges that "to prove the material universe to have been rolled out of protoplasm is not enough to destroy the supernatural; you must prove that the material universe was not originally rolled into protoplasm. The moment you concede the possibility of a force behind the germ cell propelling it forward on its upward march and directing the conditions under which it may expand, you at one and the same instant separate and unite the natural and the supernatural, and find a common meeting place for the idea of a gradual evolution, and the older thought of an immediate direct creation. Protoplasm now is as much dependent upon living beings for its existence as ever living being were dependent upon protoplasm. Given an evolution and only an evolution, find the beginning, were a harder task than any Moses proposes to us. It were as difficult to conceive of the genesis of an atom as of a planet. If creation by a mere fiat is difficult to conceive, how much more so a creation by an unbeginning evolution. There can be no evolution without an evolver." Huxley in his article on biology in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "The present state of knowledge furnishes us with no link between the living and the not living." In *Critique and Addresses* he categorically announces that the doctrine of biogenesis, or life only from life, is victorious along the entire line at the present day.



The experiments of Pasteur and Tyndall seem to have shown that if all germs of life are carefully excluded, matter never ferments, never of itself produce life, and would remain inorganic forever.

Jean Paul Richter affirms that though this age deadens sound with unreverberating materials, two miracles remain and must remain uncontested—the birth of finite beings and the birth of life within the hard wood of matter. The Monism of pantheism when it asserts the transmutation of matter into mind, of brute into man, of animal life into a moral life has not one scintilla of evidence. We know that physical forces produce the same effect every time and everywhere ; we know that the products of the forces that produce life vary under the same circumstances. Agassiz in his *Essay on Classification* shows that between two such sets of forces there can be no casual or genetic connection. He considered the transmutation theory as a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods and mischievous in its tendency. Dr. Carpenter—Darwin deems him the best fitted man in England to discuss this question—in the *Atheuecum* for 1863 says that spontaneous generation is an astounding hypothesis and unsupported by any evidence. Darwin the same year in the same publication asserts that there is not a fact nor a shadow of a fact to support the belief that inorganic elements, without the presence of any organic compounds, and acted on only by known forces could produce a living creature ; such a result is absolutely inconbeivable. Dr. Rudolf Virchow, who at the Conference of the Association of German Naturalists and Physicians at Munich in 1877, spoke severely against the dogmatism of certain scientists, declares in *The Freedom of Science in the Modern State* that whoever supposes that spontaneous generation—*generatio aequivoca* has ever occurred is contradicted by the naturalist and not merely by the theologian. He says that the theory is utterly discredited and in no wise to be accepted as the basis of our views of life. Tyndall, though he asserts that “the continuity of nature” and “intellectual necessity” compel him to ‘discern in matter the

promise and potency of all terrestrial life," yet admits that between motion which is the play of mechanical forces and the consciousness of motion which is thought there is a great gulf. Now Tyndall admits that this potency of matter is not experimentally proven; that it is "beyond the pale of experience," across the boundry of experimental evidence. What he calls his "intellectual necessity" compels him to substitute the "authoritative (?) vision of the mind"—whatever that may be—"for the vision of the eye." Tyndall is also among the prophets—he walks by faith and not by sight. Once more, Tyndall in a magazine article on "Martineau and Materialism," published in 1875, quotes a paragraph from the celebrated address to the congress of *German Naturforscher* delivered at Leipsic in 1872 by DuBois-Reymond: "It is absolutely and forever inconceivable that a number of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and oxygen atoms should be otherwise than indifferent as to their own position and motion, past, present or future. It is utterly inconceivable how consciousness should result from their joint action." He declares this to be the position that he himself has uniformly held and cites his article published in the *Saturday Review* for 1860, and his discourse on "*Scientific Materialism*," pronounced and published in 1868. Spencer, in the chapter on the "*Substance of the Mind*," declares when we talk of material or spiritual substances, it is indifferent whether "we express those in terms of these, or these or those," yet since we cannot dissect thought as we dissect the gray matter of the brain, it is sounder science to say that the living force is another than the physical fact.

Prof. Japp, in addressing the British Association for the Advancement of Science, in 1898, used the following significant language: "No fortuitous concourse of atoms, even with all eternity for them to clash and combine in, could compass this feat of the formation of the first optionally active organic compound. Coincidence is excluded and every purely mechanical explanation of the phenomenon must necessarily fail. I see no escape from the conclusion, that at the moment when life first arose a directive force came

into play." Perhaps the final word on the whole subject of vitalism is spoken by Herbert Spencer. Writing in *Nature* for October 20th, 1898, he says: "My own belief is, that neither interpretation is adequate. A recently issued, revised and enlarged edition of the first volume of the *Principles of Science* contains a chapter on the *Dynamical Element in Life*, in which I have contended that the theory of a vital principle fails and that the physico-chemical theory also fails; the corollary being, that in its ultimate nature life is incomprehensible." Ascertained science knows no "intellectual necessity" to find potential life in mere matter; it knows of no "continuity of nature" that compels it to postulate it. The hypothesis of evolution necessitates it, as both Haeckel and Huxley point out. Perhaps it was this theory that would not let Tyndall "stop abruptly, when our microscopes cease to be of use;" perhaps in this he found "the authoritative vision of the mind to supplant the vision of the eye." His evolution theory afforded the "necessity" of affirming that the "continuity of nature" demanded that the origin of life be found in matter.

Let not the young amateur chemist think to find life in his crucible or to compound it with his pestle or to cut away the mystery of its origin with a scalpel. At last let him bear in mind that the masters of chemistry and biology believe in biogenesis. Let him be modest in announcing that he has disproved it. He ought to bear in mind that the learned Francis Redi was among the first to distinctly enunciate biogenesis; that Harvey elaborated the theory; that Pasteur of the French Academy seems to have proved it. He ought to remember that Dr. Rudolf Vichow affirms that abiogenesis is "utterly discredited," that Dr. Carpenter declares it "an astounding hypothesis unsupported by any evidence;" that Mr. Darwin says it is absolutely inconceivable; Huxley declares biogenesis "victorious all along the line;" Tyndall admits that Evolution answers the ultimate question no better than Creation, and even Haeckel grants that he is unable to answer that question any better than Moses. Kant asserts that given only

matter he cannot explain the formation of even a caterpillar; the school of scientists and the totality of science agree with Richter, "Two miracles remain, the birth of finite being and the birth of life within the hard wood of matter." Humboldt pronounces it to be scientific levity, which leads men to see no difficulty in the organic springing from the inorganic, nay, man himself from Chaldean mud. Beale in his treatise on Protoplasm affirms that no one has proved and no one can prove that mind and life are in any way related to chemistry and mechanics. Huxley in his treatise on Protoplasm declares how so remarkable a thing as consciousness—and he classed sensations, emotions, volitions and thoughts under the common head of states of consciousness—how consciousness, he says, comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissue is just as unaccountable as the appearance of the Djinn when Aladin rubbed his lamp in the story. Perhaps, after all, Moses was right, God spake and it stood forth, and God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.

Tyndall did best of all in his *Belfast Address* when he asked the question: "Can you satisfy the human understanding in its demand for logical continuity between molecular processes and the phenomena of consciousness?" He answered well. Dabney and Hodge could have answered no better. "This is a rock on which materialism must inevitably split whenever it pretends to be a complete philosophy of life." And right there it has split, and no school of sensationalism will ever heal the breach. Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Sir William Hamilton in his *Metaphysics* and Coldridge in his *Essays* have fortified that rock and the latest and best research of German philosophy declares it a Gibraltar. Then the noisy waves of Materialism will ever break into spray and foam. Leibnitz used to say in his class room: There is nothing in the intellect that was not first in the sensations, except the intellect itself. The masters in Metaphysics, Kant and Hamilton and Leibnitz are met by the masters in physics, Lotze and Ulrichi and Beale. The microscope and the scalpel of the best bio-

logical science of the time are laid aside reverently and the masters bow their heads and worship.

Herbert Spencer in *First Principles* declares that: "We cannot think at all about the impressions that the external world produces on us without thinking of them as caused; and we cannot carry out an inquiry concerning their causation without inevitably committing ourselves to the hypothesis of a single unconditioned self-existent force or power is the most certain of all truth. He held with Socrates, Plato and Descartes that the principle which gave us being and personality is itself a being and a personality. He recognized that man's conscious soul is not the product of a collocation of material particles but is in the deepest sense a divine effulgence; the divine energy which is manifested throughout the knowable universe is the same that wells up in us as consciousness. In the last volume of his *Synthetic Philosophy* this passage appears: But one truth must grow ever dearer—the truth that there is an inscrutable existence everywhere manifested, to which he (the careful observer) can neither find nor conceive either beginning or end. Amid the mysteries which became the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty, that he is ever in the presence of an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed." The nineteenth century has produced no philosopher more profound than Spencer. In these remarkable passages he is seen to be an ally of religion.

Prof. E. L. Youmans, the founder of the *Popular Science Monthly*, the ablest exponent of the Spencerian philosophy in America, said: "Spencerian philosophy is the only logical halting place between the present religious position and blank materialism, and it is a halting place, and in time this will be seen." President McCosh declared that the existence of this "Indefinite and Eternal Energy" is the profoundest fact in the knowable universe." Prof. Fiske interprets this "Indefinite and Eternal Energy," as only other names for "Our Father" and "God." The key to the interpretation is simple: Man endowed with will, conscience and

affection is a result of this energp; hence these qualities reside in and proceed from this energy; now such qualities constitute a person; the energy being Infinite and Eternal, the person Infinite and Eternal—that is God. Modern philosophy has allbut adopted the Westminster definition—God is a Spirit, Infinite, Eternal, Unchangeable, in his Being Wisdom, power, faith adds Holiness, Justice, Goodness and Truth.

Our task is done; we believe our point is established. God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty. Let the pulpit beware, lest by inaccurate reference to the theory of scientists, and the indiscriminate classing of them as Infidel, Agnostic, Atheist, it make more skeptics than it cures. We may well believe that George John Romanes illustrated, in his mental and moral experience, the experience of a great class, as eminent as himself. In the earlier part of his career, in writing his book *A Candid Examination of Theism* wrote: I am not ashamed to confess that with the virtual negation of God, the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness. When at times I think, as think I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of the creed which was once mine, and the mystery of existence as now I find it at such times, I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the shapest pang of which my nature is susceptible." But Romanes escaped all this. A few years before his death he became an avowed Christian. In his last hours he wrote a poem that set forth his newly-acquired hope and sent a thrill of joy throughout Christendom.

Amen, now lettest Thou Thy servant, Lord  
 Depart in peace, according to Thy Word.  
 Although mine eyes may not have fully seen  
 Thy great salvation, surely there have been  
 Enough of sorrow and enough of sight  
 To show the way from darkness into light;  
 And Thou hast brought me through a wilderness of pain  
 To love the sorest paths if soonest they attain."

## EDITORIAL.

### THE FOOT-NOTE ON THE ELECT INFANTS CLAUSE.

While the Northern Presbyterian Church is considering the questions of revising the Confession of Faith or supplementing it with a shorter creed, the Southern Church has been discussing with some degree of animation even the addition of a foot-note to the same Confession. The last Southern Assembly answered an overture proposing an amendment of the Confessional statement as to elect infants, in the negative, adding in the resolution adopted that "the language of the Confession cannot by any fair interpretation be construed as teaching that any who die in infancy are lost."

This was seen to be such an exact and accurate expression of the truth of the matter that Dr. Lupton, of Virginia, offered a resolution, directing the Publication Committee to print this statement of the Assembly as a foot-note to the elect infants' clause in all future editions of the Confession. The resolution went to the docket and remained there for two days. There was a very general expression of satisfaction at this expedient as a convenient answer to the old slander as to the belief of the Presbyterian Church in the damnation of infants. There was a leisurely clearing of the docket on Saturday, the last day of the session, and the matter was taken up. Some spoke in favor of it, none opposed it and it was unanimously passed by the body.

It was proposed by some who objected to this action that the Publication Committee should delay obedience until the Presbyteries should be heard from or until the next Assembly should meet. But the Committee being the creature of the Assembly and of the last Assembly, not the next, has no option as to carrying out the mandate of the Assembly unless it is plainly unconstitutional. The Committee is not a judge of the expediency of the Assembly's action.

It has been very ably maintained that the foot-note is in

effect an amendment of the text, that therefore the Assembly had no right to take the action before submitting the addition to the Presbyteries to be voted on by them and enacted by a subsequent Assembly. This position involves some questions of Presbyterian history.

The Assembly of 1816 settled the status of the foot-notes to the edition of the Confession extant in that day. The first American edition of the Confession was printed without the proof-texts, A committee appointed by the Assembly brought out another edition, including the proof-texts and a few explanatory foot-notes, and the Assembly, not the Presbyteries, adopted this edition. Therefore the proof-texts are not a part of the Confession themselves. When the question arose as to the authority of the foot-notes added by this Assembly's Committee, the Assembly of 1816 answered thus:

"That the book referred to was first published with nothing but the simple text, without any Scripture proofs, or any notes of any description whatsoever. This is evidently not only from the minutes of the General Assembly, but from the numerous copies of this first edition of the Standards of our Church, which are now in existence. It is also equally evident from examining the records of the General Assembly, that not a single note in the book has been added to, or made a part of the Constitution of the Church since it was first formed and published in the manner above cited. Hence it follows beyond a doubt, that these notes are no part of the Constitution of our Church. If then it be inquired how these notes obtained the place they now occupy, and what is the character as to authority which they possess, the answer is this: When a second edition of the Standards of our church was needed, it was thought by the General Assembly that it would be of great use in itself, highly agreeable to the members of our church generally, as well as conformable to the example of the Church of Scotland, from which we derived our origin, if the Scripture proofs were added, in support of the several parts and clauses of the Confession of Faith, Catechism and Form of Government. A committee . . . accordingly appointed by the Assembly, reported along with these proofs the notes which now appear in the book, and which were approved by the General Assembly, and directed to be printed with the proofs in the form in which they now appear.

"On the whole, in the book containing the Standards of our Church, the text alone contains the Constitution of our Church; the notes are an exposition of principles given by the highest judicature of that church,



of the same force while they continue with the other acts of that judicature, but subject to alterations, amendments, or a total erasure as they shall judge proper."

This same Assembly in the exercise of its prerogative dropped two of the foot-notes from future editions, one saying that a Synod was a "larger Presbytery" and the other dilating on the sin of manstealing in the Larger Catechism questions on the Eighth Commandment.

The Assembly of 1831 appointed a committee to edit another edition of the Standards. This committee proceeded to eliminate the other foot-notes remaining, the Assembly having conferred upon them the power to prepare the edition for publication without further approval of the Assembly.

In the Assembly of 1836 an overture was presented to restore some of these foot-notes, especially the one with regard to manstealing, on account of its bearing on the slavery issue. A committee brought in the following report in answer to the overture:

As the notes \* \* \* were introduced irregularly, never had the sanction of the Church, and, therefore, never possessed any real authority the General Assembly has no power to assign them a place in the authorized Standards of the Church, and does not deem it necessary to take the constitutional measures to effect their restoration."

Moore and Baird in their Digests report this as having been adopted by the Assembly. But the records show that the whole subject was indefinitely postponed by the Assembly and hence the minute quoted from the Assembly of 1816 is the last word of our Highest Court and is conclusive as to the right of an Assembly to add an explanatory clause to the Confession, which shall have not the force of the Constitution itself, from which it is separate, but which has the same force with the other acts of the Assembly.

Remains the question of expediency.

The argument against the insertion of the foot-note is of an opposite character. It is claimed that the Confession already teaches that all infants are saved and that it is the generally accepted belief of the Church that all infants dying in infancy are elect and that therefore elect infants

dying in infancy include all infants dying in infancy. It is pointed out with truth that the contrast intended here is not between elect and non-elect infants dying in infancy and elect infants growing to the age when they are no longer incapable of being called by the ministry of the word. That is the chapter that treats not of election or who are to be saved, but of effectual calling, or how the elect are to be saved.

Others contend that the foot-note is a breaking up of the harmony of the Confession, that it is silent on the question as to whether all infants dying in infancy are elect because the Bible is silent. This issue of the QUARTERLY contains an able presentation of this view from the pen of Rev. Eugene Daniel, D. D.

We believe that the Confession is silent on the question of the salvation of all infants who die in infancy. The history of the doctrine would indicate this. Strange to say, Augustine was one of the first who taught the damnation of infants, although he taught also that their sufferings were of the mildest character.

The Roman Catholic Church, accepting Augustine's view, assigned a separate place for unbaptised infants called the *Limbus-infantum*.

John Calvin pushed away all the cobwebs of tradition and boldly declared that it was not a question of the baptism or non-baptism of infants, and not even a question of whether they were the children of believing parents or not, but that the Holy Ghost did his work of regeneration in the infant heart. Some of Calvin's expressions on this subject are exceedingly clear, if we interpret others by them, in which he speaks of some infants being saved we can argue that he believed in the salvation of all. For example, in his controversy with Servetus he speaks thus, *Institutes*, book 4, chapter 16, paragraph 31: He adduces the declaration of Christ, that "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him;" (g) and concludes that infants who are incapable of believing remain in their condemnation. I answer, that in this passage Christ is not

speaking of the general guilt in which all the descendants of Adam are involved, but only threatening the despisers of the Gospel, who proudly and obstinately reject the grace which is offered them; and this has nothing to do with infants. I likewise oppose a contrary argument: all those whom Christ blesses are exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God; and as it is known that infants were blessed by him, it follows that they are exempted from death.

Again in controverting the Romanish doctrine of baptismal regeneration he says, *Institutes*, book 4, chapter 16, paragraph 26: By this I would not be understood as implying that baptism may be despised with impunity; for, so far from attempting to excuse such contempt, I affirm it to be a violation of the covenant of the Lord: I only mean to evince that it is not so necessary, as that a person, who is deprived of the opportunity of embracing it, must immediately be considered as lost. But if we assent to their notion, we shall condemn all, without exception, whom any circumstances whatever prevents from being baptized, whatever faith they may otherwise have, even that faith by which Christ himself is enjoyed. Moreover, they sentence all infants to eternal death by denying them baptism, which, according to their own confession, is necessary to salvation. Let them see now how well they agree with the language of Christ, which adjudges the Kingdom of Heaven to little children. But though we should grant them every thing they contend for relative to the sense of this passage, still they will gain no advantage from it, unless they first overturn the doctrine which we have already established respecting the regeneration of infants.

Here is another passage which is not so clear as to the salvation of all, but we may argue from it that all are saved since all admit that some are saved. For if the plentitude of life consists in the perfect knowledge of God, when some of them, whom death removes from the present state in their earliest infancy, pass into eternal life, they are certainly admitted to the immediate contemplation of the

presence of God. As the Lord, therefore, will illuminate them with the full splendor of his countenance in heaven, why may he not also, if such be his pleasure, irradiate them with some faint rays of it in the present life ; especially if he does not deliver them from all ignorance before he liberates them from the prison of the body? Not that I would hastily affirm them to be indued with the same faith which we experience in ourselves, or at all to possess a similar knowledge of faith, which I would prefer leaving in suspense ; my design is only to check their foolish arrogance, who presumptuously and securely assert or deny whatever they please.

Zwingli has taught clearly that all elect children who die in infancy are saved, and that all who die in infancy are elect.—Schaff.

While Luther taught the baptism of infants as necessary to salvation, opinions were divided in the Westminster Assembly, though we believe that the great majority of them all accepted the doctrine that all infants dying in infancy were elect. Dr. Twisse, however, left this on record. He was the prolocutor of the Assembly but was in a beggarly minority as to his supralapsarian views. "Many infants depart this life in original sin, and consequently are condemned to eternal death on account of original sin alone. Therefore, from the sole transgression of Adam condemnation to eternal death has followed upon many infants."

The Synod of Dort had already made the distinction between the children of believing parents and others. "Since we are to judge of the will of God from his word (which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not by nature, but in virtue of the covenant of grace, in which they, together with the parents, are comprehended), godly parents have no reason to doubt of the election and salvation of their children whom it pleaseth God to call out of this life in their infancy.

In view, therefore, of the controversy on this subject we think that the Westminster Confession was silent on the question as to whether all infants are saved. But, at the

same time, it was far from teaching that any were lost. This is the statement which our Assembly has made and ordered to be printed as a foot-note. We hope that the matter will remain where the Assembly has left it, because we are convinced that if much further discussion of the subject is entered into, and the hesitating views of some of the people are further expressed as to the salvation of all infants, there will be a loud demand for the revision of the Confession in this particular.

In the meantime the Northern Presbyterians through their Presbyteries are voting on the question of revision, and we hope to report the general opinion in the next QUARTERLY.

## CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

### HUDSON'S LAW OF PSYCHIC PHENOMENA.

**THE LAW OF PHYSIC PHENOMENA.** A Working Hypothesis for the Systematic Study of Hypnotism, Spiritism, Mental Therapeutics, Etc. By Thomas Jay Hudson. Seventh Edition. Chicago. A. C. McClurg and Company. 1895.

The author holds that for every branch of science there should be a working hypothesis. Gravitation supplies this for Astronomy, as the atomic theory does for Chemistry. So far, however, there has been none formulated for mind. Liebhault, he says, has discovered the law of Hypnotic phenomena in the principles of Suggestion. Adopting this he lays down three general propositions, applicable to all phases of psychological phenomena: 1. Man has two minds, the Objective and the Subjective; 2. The Subjective mind is constantly amenable to control by Suggestion; 3. The Subjective mind is incapable of inductive reasoning.

The Objective mind is merely the function of the brain, cognizes the material world by the five senses, is the outgrowth of man's physical needs, his guide in his struggle with his material environment, and its highest function is reasoning. The Subjective mind cognizes its environment independently of the senses by intuition, is the seat of the emotions and the storehouse of memory, and performs its highest functions when the Objective senses are in abeyance. Each of these minds is a distinct entity, so that every man is a trinity, soul, mind, and body. The Subjective mind is controllable by its own Objective mind (Auto-Suggestion), as well as by the Objective mind of another. The Objective mind can reason both inductively and deductively, but the Subjective can reason only deductively and is incapable of controversial argument. The Subjective mind is endowed with perfect memory, and knows intuitively the fixed laws of nature, mathematics, music, and the measurement of time. As the Subjective mind is incapable of controversial argument, so a sceptical audience demoralizes it.

These principles, it is held, will explain all the phenomena of Hypnotism, Mesmerism, Psycho-Therapeutics, Spiritism, Phantasm of the Dead, and Miracles. There are three schools of theories as to Hypnotism: 1. The Nancy school holds that the physiological conditions are determined by mental causes alone; that the phenomena can be best produced in healthy bodies and well-balanced minds; and that the phenomena are always the result of Suggestion. 2. The Paris school teaches that Hypnotism is the result of diseased nerves; that the phenomena can be produced without Suggestion; and that everything can be explained on the basis of cerebral anatomy or physiology. 3. The school of Mesmer holds that the hypnotic condition can be induced without Suggestion; that a subtle fluid goes from the operator to the patient and produces the hyp-

notic effects ; and that the effects can be produced at a distance and without the knowledge of the subject. Hudson seems favorable to the last school and opposes the physiological teachings of the Paris school. He holds that the hypnotic condition can be induced without Suggestion, but that all the subsequent phenomena are determined by Suggestion. Any one can mesmerize or hypnotize ; the conditions of success are calm, serene confidence on the part of the operator, and willingness in the patient. Telepathy, the direct intercourse of mind with mind, is an assured fact, and is the normal means of communication between animals. Man can influence animals telepathically ; cases often occur.

Hudson believes in Psycho-Therapeutics, or the power of the mind to heal the body. We can heal our own diseases and the maladies of others as well. The conditions are confidence on the part of the healer and passive willingness in the patient. Healing can be effected at a distance and without the co-operation or knowledge of the healed. The hypnotic state in both healer and healed is most favorable for success, and natural sleep is the best hypnotic state. He has healed friends, himself asleep and they at a distance. It is done telepathically by the power of Suggestion. Christian Scientists are astray in their theory, nevertheless, they can and do often heal their patients by Hypnotism and Suggestion. The Subjective mind has power over the body and can cure its ills. The practice of mind-healing promotes the health of the healer. Material remedies are not to be ignored, as beyond their physical effects they help to give confidence.

Spiritism, or Spiritualism, as it is commonly called, is false in its philosophy. Its phenomena are facts ; rappings, lifting of furniture, slate-writing, etc., all occur as real phenomena, and the mediums are not necessarily dishonest. These phenomena, however, are not produced by the spirits of the dead. This is demonstratively proved by the fact that communications have been received from pigs and from fictitious persons that never lived ; the mediums believing that the names given them were those of dead persons. Telepathy, Suggestion, Clairvoyance, and Clair-audience explain all the phenomena. Mind, Subjective, has direct power not only over its own body, but also over all other matter.

Spiritism suggests a kindred subject, Phantasms. Phantasms of the absent, living or of the dead, are of real occurrences ; they have been observed by several at the same time and they have also been photographed. What are they ? They are the embodied thoughts of Subjective minds. Profound sleep, natural or artificial, is the one indispensable condition of their creation. Intense emotion causes the Subjective mind to project them. They are embodied thoughts, not souls ; they never manifest but one idea, that one which caused them, and they are not controllable by Suggestion. They are of three species : 1. From one living person to another, limited to that person and fading when its mission is accomplished. 2. From a dying person to the world, limited to one locality, which it haunts until its object is effected. 3. From a living

person confined to one locality, nor sent to any particular individual, but impresses whoever inhabits the place it haunts, creating a kind of atmosphere.

Suspended Animation and Premature Burial are next discussed. Many cases of Premature Burial occur, because Catalepsy is mistaken for death. It has been proved by facts that the tests of death relied on by physicians are not infallible. Air is not essential to life. The Fakir of Lahore, with nostrils and ears filled with wax, was placed in a locked box and deposited in a brick vault which was guarded by British soldiers, and, remaining therein six weeks, was afterwards resuscitated. Catalepsy is not a disease, nor always the result of disease; it belongs to the domain of Hypnotism, and is purely a sleep of the objective senses, a rest of all the vital organs. There are four kinds: From Hypnotic Suggestion; Epidemic; Self-induced; and that arising from disease. The patients are always conscious and controllable by Suggestion; let no Suggestion of death be made to them, but always of life, if you would restore them. The only sure test of death is the decay of the tissues of the body, mortification.

The Subjective mind is the most potential force in nature; the most beneficent when properly used and directed; the most destructive when abused. It does not lend itself readily to the propagation of crime; no one does under hypnotic influence what he is not disposed to do when in his normal state. Spirit mediums too often show in their conduct and character the folly and wickedness of tampering with this high and holy power.

He finally applies his theory to Christ's teaching and acts. Christ understood, believed in, and applied his theory of Subjective mind, Suggestion, Telepathy, etc. His miracles were not acts of supernatural or superhuman power; they were real occurrences, and show that he knew the power of the Subjective mind and the force of Suggestion. They were all miracles of superhuman knowledge, in that he knew how to heal the sick and raise the dead by the power of the subjective mind. He knew the one indispensable condition of success; faith on the part of both healer and healed. Salvation is by Faith, which is not trust in Christ as the atoning Saviour, but is merely belief in eternal life or the immortality of the soul. All that believe in immortality will survive death, whether good or bad; their condition of happiness or misery in the world to come depending on their conduct in this.

We have limited this review to an exposition of the doctrines held in the book under discussion. There is no space left for criticism. We shall simply say that the phenomena treated are interesting, that the duality of mind explains nothing, that the mind under proper conditions has unwonted power over matter and other minds, and that Christianity is not belief in immortality, but trust in an atoning Saviour.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.



**THEOLOGY OF THE WESTMINSTER SYMBOLS.** A Commentary, Historical, Doctrinal, Practical, on the Confession of Faith and Catechisms and the Related Formularies of the Presbyterian Churches. By Edward Morris, D. D., L. L. D., Emeritus Professor of Systematic Theology in Lane Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio, 1900. Pp. xvi, 858. 8vo. Cloth.

Dr. Morris is a distinguished minister in the Northern Presbyterian Church ; for nearly thirty years a professor in Lane Theological Seminary, first, of Church history, but afterward, and chiefly, of systematic theology. Sitting beside the ending of his career, clothed with honor by the great Church which he has so devotedly served, encircled by a multitude of cherished students whose minds he has joyfully led into the delights and awful solemnities of the science of religion, it is now his privilege to look upon the work of his pen and tongue and heart with the emotions of a man who has thought earnestly, felt truly, lived devoutly, and taught effectively. The vision is that of the great, good, successful servant of God whose feet are about to turn away from the gates of the sacred academy to the coronation hall of heavenly glory. His younger brethren delight to anoint him with affection, and to beg for him the peaceful benedictions of his God and their God.

The volume before us is no mushroom. A ripe scholar, a profound thinker, a laborious writer, a man of wide reading, it took the author twenty years to gather its material, and three years of comparative quietude to compose its pages. Every statement of fact has been extensively verified ; every conclusion has been re-thought perhaps a thousand times. He has persistently gone to original sources, and none of the literature bearing on his subject has been overlooked. His own mind has been charmed by the Westminster Symbols, and all his comments and expositions have been those of a true friend. He has not been professional, but sympathetic. He has advocated what he believes, and interpreted what he loves. He has not been blind, but watchful, even at times critical. It is not the product of the mere book-maker, but of a theologian with an awful reverence for God, the strongest sort of appreciation of religious truth, a firm belief in the value of systematic theology, and with a brave and bold love for the Calvinistic creed, which Dr. Morris has given us. He is not a fault finding critic of the Presbyterian standards, between the lines of whose composition the reader can plainly see that he hates the subscription to the Confession of Faith which his conception of good policy has enforced upon him ; he is not one of those pitiful friends of Calvinism who defends it by explaining it away ; he is not one of those intemperate disciples of the great Genevan who can see no blemish in anything that is called Presbyterian ; he is never flippant or superficial, never cringing nor maudlin, but always dignified, massive, clear, intelligent, instructive in all the account which he gives. The book shows that it took twenty-three years to make it, and that it took even the ripest scholar to make it in twenty-three years.

Dr. Morris hands this volume over to his pupils as a legacy, commits

it to them as a trust, charges them to cherish its Calvinism and to spend all their days in the effort to perfect it for he believes that Calvinism is susceptible of endless improvement. He thinks there may be progress in Calvinism, but none away from Calvinism. In that thinks he truly.

The author has been very systematic in ordering his expositions and comments. There are fifteen lectures, as follows :

- I. Historical Introduction.
- II. The Holy Scriptures.
- III. God in His Being.
- IV. God in His Attributes.
- V. Man.
- VI. Christ, the Mediator.
- VII. The Plan of Salvation.
- VIII. The Process of Salvation.
- IX. The Christian Life.
- X. The Law of God.
- XI. Civil Relations and Duties.
- XII. The Church of God.
- XIII. Sacraments, Ordinances, Worship.
- XIV. Eschatology.
- XV. The Westminster Assembly.

This scheme follows the usual divisions of modern theology, and beautifully systematizes the teachings of the Symbols. The reader's logical faculty is constantly satisfied, while the comprehensiveness and orderliness of the Symbols constantly exhibited. So does this able hand gather the doctrines of the Symbols into fifteen baskets for the convenience and delectation of his readers.

The first lecture, in addition to valuable historical matter, is a strong and edifying polemic in favor of creeds in general, while in the last lecture we have a discriminating and appreciative review and estimate of the Westminster Assembly in particular. The lectures lying between these two are devoted to the exposition and defense of the body of doctrine contained in the Westminster Symbols, with constant comparison with other Symbols of the Reformed Faith.

Dr. Morris agrees with Dean Stanley that Trent's chapter on Justification and Westminster's on Holy Scripture are the ablest presentations of dogmatic truth in the whole series of religious symbols.

"Compared with the Tridentine decree of Justification, this chapter (on Holy Scripture) furnishes a striking illustration of the difference between Protestantism and Romanism. That decree is a marvel of dialectic skill, clear in distinction, poised in proposition, elaborate in language, and skillful in its summation of the doctrine affirmed. It was the last and best word of Rome in answer to the Reformation, and it was a word of unparalleled sagacity and weight. In several respects it excels even the finest Protestant deliverances on the same vital theme. It crystallizes in the amber of its error some spiritual truth, and so blends one.

with the other that we find it hard to discriminate between them. It is a fabrication of the finest logic, combined with the shrewdest sense of adaptation, and for more than two centuries it has held its place as a marble pillar in the temple of Roman belief. But the Presbyterian chapter on the Holy Scripture far surpasses it, if not in logical acumen or elaborate verbiage, still in simplicity of statements, in breadth and power of expression, and above all in true spiritual adaptation. The first was papal and continental and of Latin stock; the second, though insular, was thoroughly Protestant, and full of Saxon sense and blood. The one was an elaborate construction in defense of fatal error; the other was an earnest proclamation in favor of divine truth. The aim of the one was to strengthen the power, enlarge the glory, establish the supremacy of the Church and the hierarchy; the aim of the other was to exalt God and his inspired Word."

This single extract reveals the formal and precise style in which our author writes, the spirit and temper with which he considers the Westminster Standards, the superlative admiration which he has for these documents which he seeks to interpret, and his own sublime confidence in the inspiration, infallibility and authority of the Holy Scriptures as the only trustworthy source of a true and safe theology. In his judgment, which is a perfectly true judgment, the position which these symbols assign to the Holy Scriptures will forever buttress both them and their system against Romanism, rationalism, mysticism, and agnosticism. This, perhaps, is their crowning glory, their utter subordination of the individual reason and heart, as well as the ecclesiastical council, to the Word of God. There is liberty to think and feel and decree, but liberty is bounded by the lids of the Sacred Book. In doctrine, in discipline, in worship, whatsoever is not commanded is forbidden,—this is at once the central principle of the Westminster Symbols and of the entire Protestant struggle. It is the master chapter in these masterful formularies. Could a vote be taken to-day, after the lapse of centuries, in the Westminster Assembly upon the question: which chapter in the Confession of Faith is worth more than any other? the Assembly would unanimously declare in favor of the chapter on Holy Scripture.

It is, consequently, an error to think, as do some, that the chapter on the Decrees was the dynamic chapter in Westminster theology. It is the dispute over this dogma which has made it so conspicuous. It was not the genetic and formative doctrine of that Assembly. The Scriptures being the authoritative source of all theology, and the inductive and scientific method being the method of that Assembly, it was the exegesis of Revelation which put this doctrine into their hands, and the natural and logical manner of organizing facts which articulated it into their theological system. The attacks upon this dogma have been upon sentimental and rationalistic grounds rather than upon biblical grounds. Preconceptions of man and God, rather than faithful exegesis of Holy Scripture, have led to the rejection of Westminster's doctrine of the

Eternal Decree. Dr. Morris book is very fine at this point, —in showing that Westminster's doctrines of God, of man, of Christ, of atonement; of pneumatology, of eschatology, were all exegetically and logically deduced from Holy Scripture. The prominence and pre-eminence which Westminster's doctrine of the Decree has obtained is the result, not of convention and agreement, but of controversy and debate. It is the point at which anti-Calvinists have supposed they had the best chance of overthrowing the system which magnifies God and minifies man. The Westminster Assembly met to systematize Scripture, not formulate a doctrine of God's Decree; that doctrine fell out naturally, logically, and necessarily as a result of being faithful to Scripture.

Upon the question as to the order of the divine decrees, Dr. Morris says, and truly, that opinion was divided, some of the members being supralapsarian and some sublapsarian, and he thinks in the final draft of the Confession, the high Calvinistic party gained, slightly, the advantage. It is hazardous to dissent from opinions so intelligently and scrupulously formed as are his, but we have been accustomed to look upon the symbols as distinctly and decidedly on the side of low Calvinism.

Dr. Morris repels on his 358th page, and in many other places, the criticism that the Plan of Salvation, as drawn by the Assembly, was cold and harsh because of the emphasis laid upon the sovereignty of God in defining the nature and scope and beneficiaries of the gospel scheme. "A wise and just theology will rather recognize this plan as at the beginning conceived in love, and is executed under the inspiration of a love which shrank from no toil or sacrifice requisite to secure the desired reconciliation." In all the costly provision for the salvation of sinners, stated with fullness, and promulgated with affirmativeness, those divines could not have imagined any other fountain in the heart of God but one of love.

Upon the scope of the heavenly scheme of mercy, Dr. Morris says, "There is little doubt that the divines of Westminster followed Calvin and his theologic successors closely, in regarding the Gospel as a scheme which from first to last contemplated the elect only." In this particular the author, in a calm, earnest way, shows that he is personally out of sympathy with this intense particularism of the Symbols. A broader and more extensive application of the essential principles of the Gospel would more thoroughly satisfy his own heart; an application after historic New School methods, if we mistake not. But Dr. Morris has not played the partisan in this able exposition of these famous Symbols.

We do not think the author (p. 813) is correct in representing Calvin as teaching that God created the reprobate in order to damn them. It is a point over which there is a dispute among Calvinists.

Upon the question of the condition of subscription to the Symbols by ministers and their subsequent loyalty to them, we regard the views of the author as expressed in the following quotation as too lax:

"Two special facts should be thoroughly noted here: first, that the spirit of the present age, in Presbyterian circles, as elsewhere, as con-

trasted with the temper of the seventeenth or even the eighteenth century is irreconcilably adverse to all narrow or dogmatic domination by the Church, as well in subscription as in belief. And secondly, that some broadening of the rule becomes more and more needful as any branch of the Church like our own grows in numbers and area, comprises a wider variety of material and machinery, becomes continental rather than insular or provincial in its activities. "

Nothing needs a creed so much as that iconoclastic thing, "the spirit of the age," or a constitution, like that expansive thing, a "continental Church." The bigger the horse, the more spirited the animal, the tighter ought the reins to be held.

The last topic in Dr. Morris' book is the Revision of the Symbols. To this subject he devotes a section of five pages. "The Symbols of Rome are irreformable" because its creeds are inspired and infallible. There may be additions and sundry enlargements in the statement of doctrine, but the papal formularies of faith can neither be revised, amended, nor expurgated. The Confessions of Presbyterians, on the contrary, are not thus unalterable; the right of revision is "inherent and unchallengeable." To revise a venerated creed requires, "not only a large philosophic ability, adequate theological and historical knowledge, and thoughtful appreciation of the work imposed, but also such depth of spiritual experience, such a degree of maturity in the Christian life, such a sense of special communion with God, and such intimacy with his Word, as shall qualify them personally to perform that task with success to the edifying and enlargement of the Church." The story of attempted revision by the Northern Presbyterian Church is an interesting one. "Our beloved Church will always be broader and freer, more practical and earnest and spiritual, more irenic in its teaching and more friendly to all other evangelical sections of Protestantism, for the experience and lesson which that noteworthy effort taught it."

That "noteworthy effort" failed, as it ought to have done. The lesson taught is that the right of revision is not "inherent and unchallengeable." The right to make a new creed is indisputable, but the right to revise historic documents is intolerable. No Church could legitimately revise the Apostle's Creed or that of Nicea. They belong to the past and their integrity cannot be legitimately altered. The Presbyterians have accepted the Symbols of Westminster; they may withdraw that acceptance, but they cannot change the deliverances of that body which has been dissolved, and was neither an ecclesiastical nor Presbyterian body. Just as well undertake a revision of the acts of Cromwell's Parliament.

The most "noteworthy effort" at revision was made by the Cumberland Presbyterians. They "had one leading thought before them, and that was to so modify the Westminster Confession as to eliminate therefrom" the objectionable features of hyper-Calvinism. The result was a new creed and not a revision of an old one. That Church does not hold the Symbols of Westminster.

The conditions of successful revision, as pointed out by Dr. Morris, do not now exist. The "times" are not sufficiently spiritual on the one hand, nor sufficiently dogmatic on the other, to justify any successful creed-making. The hour is not ripe. There are no dissidents ready to "go to the stake" for their peculiar faith. There are none who think so clearly and feel so truly that they are willing for any personal sacrifice for the sake of their doctrine. No permanent creed ever issued except in storm. Let the Symbols remain intact. If they are wrong Providence will bring about the ecclesiastical revolution which will irresistibly result in a new statement of doctrine, sweeping all others out of the way, and taking possession of the mind and hearts of Presbyterians as did the Symbols of Westminster.

The modification of a phrase, the elimination of a word, the addition of a foot-note, is but dangerous trifling with the creed. Let the text stand, until the Church, if ever, feels the necessity of making a new text—of pulling down the house and building from the ground up.

It is easy to talk about change, and to clamor for change, but when wise and calm men sit down together to make the changes flippantly demanded, following the Westminster method of quoting a text from Scripture for well-nigh every word used in the statement, the task has uniformly proved discouraging.

But Dr. Morris says the very attempt to revise the Confession has made his Church "broader and freer," "more practical and earnest," "more irenic." Since his Church has put its creed into debate its rate of increase has declined, its power in the world has been reduced, and its internal peace and harmony has been disturbed. If it is a "broader and freer" Church it is a smaller and more troubled Church—smaller than it would have been had it maintained the anti-revision rate of increase. "The new conceptions of the essential Calvinism, embodied in the revision proposed" are less productive than the old conceptions of the unrevised Confession. If the futile effort at revision did harm, would success have been ruinous?

He who doubts his weapon will turn back in the day of battle. He who puts his cause into dispute will surely find his opponent. The church which "foot-notes" its creed is on the way to doctrinal controversy, division and the serious impairment of its usefulness. Let our church, which has ordered its first foot-note, be warned. Every Assembly will have to consider a doctrinal overture, and distracting disputes are inevitable. Who can foresee the end, or foreseeing it, who can safeguard the consequences?

R. A. WEBB.

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: By Abraham Kuyper, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Amsterdam. Translated from the Dutch by Henri D. Vines, with an Introduction by Rev. Professor Warfield, D. D., LL. D., of Princeton. New York and London. Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1900. Large 800. Pp. XXXIX—664. Price \$3.00.

This is a great treatise on a vital theme. Many treatises have recently

been published on the Holy Spirit, but this excels them all. It is one of the good signs of the present day that so much is thought about and written upon the person and work of the Holy Spirit. The recent books have treated this theme from various points of view, yet no single one of them can claim to be a complete treatise on the subject. One of the best of these is our Dr. Vaughan's "The Gifts of the Holy Spirit."

The work before us is much more elaborate than any of these recently published. It may be safely said that since John Owen's great treatise on this subject was published in 1674, and in numerous editions since, no treatise so complete and satisfying as Dr. Kuyper's has been given to the Church. We are sure that it will long hold an honored place in the literature of the subject of which it treats, and that its service to the Church of Christ will be large and abiding.

The author is one of the foremost living theologians in the world to-day. Indeed, we do not know of one who should be named second to him. He is the honored leader of the Reformed or Calvinistic Church in Holland to-day, and by his various and ceaseless labors he has done great things for that church in the Netherlands. He has gathered about him a circle of younger men like Dr. Bavink, who are well fitted to carry on his work when he has to lay it down.

Dr. Kuyper is a most prolific author. This is forcibly shown by the fact that it takes five pages of the volume now under consideration to give a list of the titles of his multifarious writings. He is editor of a daily and weekly newspaper, which have been very useful. The weekly, *De Hrauw*, has been specially helpful to the cause of evangelical religion, as represented by the Free Church in Holland. He is also influential in educational matters and in the public affairs of his native land which he has served so well in many ways. Altogether Dr. Kuyper is one of the most influential personages in the life of Holland to-day.

A few years ago he visited this country, and delivered lectures at Princeton and at other places further West. His Stone lectures on Calvinism at Princeton are masterly expositions of this great system. Several of his books have already been translated, so that his grand work for the evangelical faith is now becoming known to English readers. This work gives promise of great usefulness, for it will be sure to reach a wider circle of readers, since it is written in much more popular style than some of the others.

In the book before us the author confines himself very closely to his theme. He looks at it, however, from every point of view, and treats every legitimate detail pertaining to it. He does not discuss the Person of the Holy Spirit at all. On this aspect of the Holy Spirit he simply assumes the accepted historic doctrine of the Church in regard to the deity and personality of the Third Person of the adorable Trinity. This leaves him free to treat carefully and completely of the work of the Holy Spirit. To this task he addresses himself with consummate ability and scholarly completeness.

In such a brief notice as this is intended to be only a brief description of this splendid treatise can be given. We wish mainly to commend it with great earnestness to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*.

In the portly volume now before us the three volumes of the Dutch original are combined. And as there is no "padding" of any kind in the book its contents are exceedingly rich and full. In the first volume or division of the treatise the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church as a whole is outlined. In the other two volumes, or divisions, the Spirit's work in the individual believer is elaborated at great length. In the first volume there are ten divisions and thirty-nine short chapters; in the second, seven divisions and forty-one chapters; and in the third, three divisions and forty-two chapters. This makes in all one hundred and twenty-two chapters on as many related aspects of the subject. This statement of details is made to reveal the wide scope and great thoroughness of the treatment accorded the subject in hand. But this simple statement gives no adequate idea of the splendid manner in which the treatment of each topic is elaborated. The book must be read to be appreciated.

In the first volume there are profound and lucid discussions of the activity of the Holy Spirit in creation, in providence, in the production of the Holy Scriptures, in the incarnation of the Son of God, in the apostolate, and in the Church generally. Here then is much that is penetrating in thought, and of great practical value.

In the other two volumes there is an equally thorough going discussion of the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual soul that becomes the subject of His renewing grace. This discussion begins with a careful exhibit of the spiritual condition of man as sinful upon which the Holy Spirit is to do his renewing work. Man's helplessness is strongly assisted. Then the discussion follows out the work of grace in the soul in a manner which leaves nothing to be desired. Incidentally, almost every aspect of Christian experience is alluded to as this exposition is conducted. The new birth, preparatory grace, quickening grace, are very thoroughly elucidated. Conversion, faith, repentance, and the whole course of the believer's experience under sanctification are expounded and elaborated. On these topics we cannot enlarge further than to say that the discussion is of rare insight and value.

The standpoint of the author in general is boldly and avowedly Calvinistic. The courage and consistency with which this system is maintained and expounded is quite refreshing in these days of timid advocacy, and of toning down of this great historic system. This book, we are sure, will serve as a bracing tonic to the Reformed churches of the Presbyterian order in this land.

More particularly the treatise reveals the author's sympathy with the federal type of the Reformed theology. He constructs his system as the basis of the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. He does not, however, push the covenant principle so far as some of the Dutch theo-



logians of a former age did. In general his position on the point seems to be quite the same as that in our own Westminster Standards. With our author, at this point, we are in hearty sympathy.

Another fine feature of the discussions is the fresh and pertinent illustrations used by the author. This makes the treatment exceedingly attractive, and these illustrations illumine almost every page of the treatise. He reminds us of our own Dr. Dabney in this respect, and did space permit we should certainly quote some of these useful illustrations. Many of these will doubtless become known by quotation in other writings.

In addition, the Scripturalness and spirituality of the whole discussion must commend it warmly to all devout minds. The high intellectuality of the treatise is fully equalled by its deep spirituality. With penetrating insight into truth, there is joined the warm glory of holy emotion. This combination is admirable. The head and heart are both revealed in the treatise.

The author, further, believes in the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. He regards these sacred records as of divine origin, both in their contents and form, and he holds them to be the only infallible rule of faith and life, as well as the authoritative source of Christian doctrines. His trumpet has always a clarion tone, and it never utters an uncertain sound.

We cordially welcome this guest in its attractive English dress. The translator and publishers have rendered a splendid service to the churches in this land by giving us this great work in such an attractive English dress. Let every minister read it. It will brace his intellect and refresh his soul; it will increase his devotion to the Calvinistic system and greatly enrich his future preaching.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

#### KUYPER'S WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. ANOTHER REVIEW.

This is the dispensation of the Spirit, the Father and the Son having completed their part of the work in the economy of redemption. It is manifest, however, that the Third Person in the Trinity has not received, and does not, the attention which he deserves. This is true among the people, in the pulpit, and in the press. It is frequent that we hear the Spirit, even in prayer, referred to by the use of the pronoun "it;" an irreverence which is unfortunately fostered by our accepted vernacular version of the Bible. The preacher fails in many instances to give due prominence to the work of the Spirit, while the press, both periodical and permanent, has by no means exalted him as it should.

Of the comparatively few treatises that deal exclusively with the Holy Spirit, most of them discuss the questions that concern his personality, and this in the way of argumentation and dispute. Of books that confine themselves to the setting forth his wonderful work, in the whole literature of the Church only rare examples can be found. This apparent

neglect is, however, to a large degree supplied by excellent treatment in works of more general character. In monographs on the functions of the Spirit, Owen's Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit stands at the head in English literature. Our own Dr. C. R. Vaughan has made the latest creditable addition to it.

Dr. Kuyper is a resident of Amsterdam, and is said to be the best known man in Holland. We can well believe this when we know that he is the editor of a daily political newspaper, the organ of the anti-revolutionists, whose leader he is as a member of the Second Chamber of the States General, and that he is also editor of a weekly religious paper, and the professor of dogmatics and also of Hebrew in the Free University of Amsterdam. He is also a lecturer and prolific author of valuable books.

His work on the Holy Spirit is probably his most valuable production. It clearly shows the influence of Owen, whose position on all important questions he takes and whose order of treatment he follows. He is, however, much fuller, and is up to date. Some parts of the discussion are of comparatively little interest to us, because of their reference to local opinions:

He divides the treatment into three facts. A. The work of the Holy Spirit in the Church as a whole, discussing the creation, recreation, the Old Testament, the incarnation, the Mediator, the Pentacostal outpouring, the apostolate, the New Testament, and the Church of Christ.

B. The beginning of the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual, wherein he treats the man wrought upon, the sinner, preparatory grace, regeneration, calling and repentance, justification, and faith.

C. The continuance and completion of the work in the individual, including sanctification, love and prayer. It is strange that in so comprehensive a treatment, involving as it were the whole range of Biblical truth, there is no discussion of the work of the Spirit in connection with the sacraments.

It is needless perhaps to say that Kuyper is an orthodox Calvinist and that this treatise will doubtless be for many years the standard work on the offices of the Holy Spirit.

The translation by the Rev. Henri de Vries is well done, and the work of manufacture is in the best style of the printer's art. We are indebted to the Funk & Wagnalls Co. for some excellent publications.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

Lexington, Va.

THE END OF AN ERA. By John S. Wise. Pp. 474. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

Most of the books published at this day are as much alike as two peas, especially the works of fiction that fall from the printing press like the leaves of autumn.

This book, however, is an exception. It stands alone in the book world, and the book world is that much the worse.

The author is John S. Wise, at one time a lawyer and a Repudiation leader in Virginia, but now a lawyer in New York. His family is an old one, and his father, Governor and afterwards Gen. H. A. Wise, was one of the great men of Virginia, whose fiery eloquence and caustic wit still points many a moral and adorns many a tale in the Old Dominion.

As a general rule, no one would claim that John Wise is a favorite with Virginians who have never forgotten his advocacy of negro rule or his consequent affiliation with the Mahone ring, but even the most intense hater of Mr. Wise would never accuse him of lack of sense. He has the brightness and the pugnacity of the Wises, together with their intense egotism, which, however, we have always thought pardonable, and in this book he has given full sway to these charming characteristics.

Egotism may make a man an unpleasant companion, but it also makes him a charming story-teller, and that truth is strikingly exemplified in this book.

It is a delightful story, bristling with egotism, yet as sparkling and fresh as the mountain air. Beginning with his advent into this world, while his father was United States Minister to Brazil in 1846, he takes the delighted readers through all the scenes immediately preceding the war and also embraced in it, the position of his father giving him access to the most distinguished people North and South.

We have vivid pen pictures of the life of that day, whether on plantation or in the city, of the distinguished participants in that awful struggle, together with battles and camp life.

We doubt if there was any man in the Confederate army who saw as much, or had as many varied experiences, as the author, yet we must remember that he was the son of an ex-governor and a general, which gave him unusual advantages.

There is not a dull page in the book, and the reader when he lays it down will not only wish it had been longer, but he will know more accurately the men and women that made Virginia the mother of States and statesmen than if he had mingled personally among them.

It is a valuable acquisition to the history of the war, dealing as it does with one phase of it, and every Southern man ought to read it and hand it down to his children to be read by them.

The reader, however, should be prepared to have his sense of the fitness of things shocked more than once, for Mr. Wise is lacking in reverence and taste.

**WINTER ADVENTURES OF THREE BOYS IN THE GREAT LONE LAND:**  
By Edgerton R. Young, Author of "By Canoe and Dog-train,"  
"Three Boys in the Wild North Land," etc. With illustrations from  
drawings by J. E. Laughlin, and from photographs. Sq. 8 vo., pp.  
377. Cloth, \$1.25. New York. Eaton & Mains. 1899.

This story follows closely the author's previous popular work, "Three Boys in the Wild North Land," carrying the adventures on into the winter and spring. It is a distinct volume, however. Its scenes are laid in

the Hudson Bay country. It is a Christian book, dealing much with the habits and life of the Indians of the north country and making a most fresh and entertaining book. The careful attention paid, in an attractive way, to the religious features of the land and people described, adds to its interest. It may be introduced safely into the hands of our boys. The author has been a faithful and successful missionary in the regions which he describes, and is widely known for his books and lectures.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES : A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-School Lessons. With Original and Selected Commentaries, Methods of Teaching, Illustrative Stories, Practical Applications, Notes on Eastern Life, Library, References, Maps, Tables, Pictures, and Diagrams. 1900. By Jesse Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty. 8 vo., pp. 388. \$1.25. New York. Eaton & Mains. 1899.

With so full an account of that book as this given above, under its title, and so truthfully given, too, there is little need for further statement concerning its nature and contents. From use of the same work in previous years, we can heartily commend this volume as one of the very best aids to the study of the International Lessons.

THE LIVING AGE, Boston, Mass. Among the magazines and reviews of mushroom growth and shoddy pretensions this staunch old magazine of 56 years' growth and respectability stands pre-eminent for cleanness and scholarship.

Here we have the cream of the European Quarterlies skimmed by the hand of one who knows good cream when he sees it, and the man who feeds upon such rich food week by week will soon grow fat in a literary sense.

We all know by bitter experience how exhausting it is to one's pocket-book to take many magazines, yet without them one falls behind intellectually.

But how much more exhausting it would be to take such Reviews and Quarterlies as the Contemporary Review, Fortnightly Review, Edinburgh Review, Good Words, The Spectator, National Review, The Academy, The Saturday Review, Nineteenth Century, and Temple Bar, to say nothing about others in a foreign tongue. In the Living Age we have articles from all of these, and thus keep abreast of what is going on at home and abroad.

For example, there lies before us now a copy of the Living Age for June 30. The first article is from the Quarterly Review, written by Ferdinand Brunetiere, in which he with a Frenchman's spiciness and daring undertakes to show Englishmen why the French side with the Boers in their war.

Then from the Nineteenth Century we have a well-written article on Woman's Brains, in which the writer gives some interesting statistics to prove that while the male brain may have an advantage in size of 10 per cent., it is a difference which certainly offers no warrant for carrying

hat ancient belief in man's intellectual superiority beyond a very moderate limit.

The Living Age has been a weekly visitor to our study for many years, and we have yet to find a copy that does not have in it at least one article that stimulates the mind as well as informs it.

LET THERE BE LIGHT. By David Lubin. pp. 526. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York.

This is a book written in the interest of Socialism. Six workmen, realizing that something is wrong in the industrial and social conditions under which they labor, seek the cause of these evils.

They trace the evils to the defects of the prevailing religious systems, and in order to remedy them, they formulate new creeds and organize a new Church. Without endorsing for a moment the conclusions reached, we recommend the book to those seeking original thought in the sphere of sociology, and who are not startled too much by ideas out of the usual track.

Such books do good, if the reader will sift the wheat out of the chaff, and will discount the attacks on religion, which are too often the sole stock in trade of social reformers. That there are evils in society and that in many ways the times are out of joint no one will deny who has given a moment's thought to social questions, or who has mingled with the workmen in their homes, but the remedy is not to be found in religious changes, however desirable they may seem, but rather in the stricter application of the doctrines of the Bible to existing conditions.

The trouble is not with the Bible or even with the Church, but rather with those in the Church who have made a gain of godliness.

THE MESSAGES OF PAUL. Arranged in historical order, analyzed and freely rendered in paraphrase, with introductions by George Barker Stevens. Pp. 268. Price \$1.25. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York.

This volume belongs to the series, The Messages of the Bible. It is not a substitute for the Bible, but an aid to its intelligent understanding. The paraphrase, while free, is remarkably true to the original, and by means of it the ordinary reader will be able to understand more clearly many of those things written by Brother Paul, which Peter says, are hard to be understood. The paper, type and binding, reflect credit upon the publishing house of the Scribners.

There are some subjects that parents feel ought to be broached to their children, yet how to do it has always been difficult. To such parents the following book by Dr. Stall will be valuable :

WHAT A YOUNG BOY OUGHT TO KNOW : The first book in a Self and Sex series to boys and men. By Sylvanus Stall, D. D. Vir Publishing Co. Hale Building, Philadelphia. Price \$1.

This little book is designed to answer in an honest and reverent way the questions which arise in the mind of every boy concerning his own

origin and how he came into the world. It tells just what every boy should be told about, the design and care of the reproductive organs and in such a way as to beget reverence and inspire purity of thought and life. For purity, clearness and intensity this book is without a rival in literature of its class. The author understands his subject and handles it in a most scientific, artful and interesting manner. It has been read and commended in highest terms by such persons as Drs. Theodore L. Cuyler, Joseph Cook, Josiah Strong, Bishop Vincent, Anthony Comstock, John Willis Baer, Edward W. Bok, Mrs. Alice Lee Moque, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Dr. Kate Waller Barrett, and many other equally eminent persons, and we desire to commend it most heartily to the attention of physicians, teachers and parents everywhere.

WILLIAM STERLING LACY: Memorial, Addresses, Sermons. Pp. 199. Price \$1.25. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va.

Many years ago when the writer was a member of the Synod of Virginia he saw for the first time the subject of this sketch. He was then bent with disease, and with hair prematurely gray, but with eyes of tenderness and intelligence and manners both affable and affectionate.

As the years rolled by he learned to know him better, and when the wires flashed the sad news that Lacy was no more, we felt that the world and the Church had lost one by whose coming both had been blessed.

The picture that comes to us now is that of a gentleman in every sense of the word; a Christian in whose face the reflection of another world had already begun to shine; a scholar whose tastes were refined and whose knowledge was exact; and a bishop who as Presbyter, pastor and teacher, exemplified fully the requirements laid down in Timothy.

Opening this volume at random, our interest was at once aroused, and as we read his reminiscences of the war, his sermons and his hymns, we recognized why he had always exerted such a fascinating influence over men.

He died in his prime, and his loss will be felt, but we who knew him shall always recall him as one who was brave and cheerful in suffering, and who was always a Christian gentleman.

In this little book from our committee, we have enough of his writings to give the picture of the man, and we know of no better book for family reading, or for public use.

MAN AND HIS DIVINE FATHER: By John C. C. Clark, D. D. 12mo Pp. 368. Price \$1.50. A. C. McClurg & Co. Chicago.

This is the latest treatment of systematic divinity from the point of view of the conservative theologian, and the author in reaching his conclusions, takes into account the most recent results of scientific inquiry.

In the discussion he touches upon the philosophy of mind and spirit, moral sciences, and the rights of men.

He presents God and man, as we know them by revelation and psychology, and considers their relation to each other as shown in the Bible.

The work is scholarly and instructive. He gathers together in a compact form their explicit statements regarding the Old Testament, and in so doing he has done good service to us who still stand by the old landmarks.

THE NEW TESTAMENT VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: An Essay. By Rev. James Ramsey Donehoo. Pp. 130. Price, 75c. The Westminster Press. Philadelphia.

The above is the unpretentious title of a book that deserves a better name.

The fact that the late Dr. Wm. Henry Green of Princeton writes an introduction for it, ought to be proof of its thorough accord with our Standards.

The author seeks to secure the best possible testimony as to the authorship, nature and authority of the books of the Old Testament, outside of these books themselves. Believing that such testimony could be found in the New Testament, he sought to find the attitude of our Lord and his disciples toward the Old Testament.

He gathers together in a compact form their explicit statements regarding the Old Testament, and in doing so he has done good service to us who still stand by the old landmarks.

We believe that an occasional novel, if it be a good one, is a help to the ministry, not only in its effect upon their style, but especially upon their imagination. Below, therefore, we lay before them brief notices of some of the books of the day, with which men ought to have a passing acquaintance.

THE GIRL AT THE HALFWAY HOUSE. A Story of the Plains. By E. Hough. Pp. 381. Price \$1.50. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

Shakespeare would never have made Juliet ask, What's in a name, if he had seen this book, for we can recall no book where there is a greater contrast between the name and the story. The name is commonplace and meaningless, while the story is by no means commonplace. It opens in Virginia with a vivid description of a battle that has been penned since the days of Stephen Crane. Then it slips to the West, at the time immediately succeeding the Civil War, when thousands of both sections were drifting to that region to build up the new West. A Northern captain meets and in the end marries a Virginia girl whose lover was slain in the battle of the opening chapter, in which this captain was himself an actor.

The charm of the book is the true picture of the plains it gives—that vast region where the skies are clear and the air rare, and the people charming; where the conventionalities of society are unknown and where the cowboy flourishes, for despite his bad reputation and his carelessness with firearms, we always did love a cowboy.

The taste for them lingers long, and though many years have elapsed since we slept with them, cheek by jowl, we find our pulse beating in sympathy whenever we read a book like *The Girl at the Halfway House*.

**THE PARSONAGE PORCH.** Stories from the Note-Book of a Clergyman. Pp. 250. \$1.00. Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

Preachers have always been famous for good stories. From their rich fund of experience they can easily weave romances and history. They see the sad side of human nature and often the worst side, but in the long run they find more pleasure in life than any other profession. These are stories from the experience of an old minister, and they are related in a style very pleasant and attractive. The story of a "Misunderstood Dog" is equal to anything Mr. Ernest Seton Thompson ever wrote.

Altogether the book is one appealing to one's love of humanity as well as of animals, and whoever reads it will be the better for the reading.

**THE REIGN OF LAW,** a Tale of the Kentucky Hemp Fields. By James Lane Allen. For sale by Sutcliffe & Co., Louisville, Ky. Price \$1.20, prepaid.

This story is one of a rough country boy in Kentucky whose grandfather, several generations back, had been expelled from his own church because of liberality towards other denominations.

The young man is possessed with a desire to get an education and to enter the Campbellite ministry. By dint of saving he enters the Bible College and begins the study of his profession. At every turn he is met by the same spirit that banished his ancestor before him, a spirit that causes him to study the beliefs and attend the services of the sects denounced, and which in the end causes him to question the truth held by each, for wherever he went there he found the same spirit of religious narrowness and division. Finally his attention is turned to Darwin's works, and a study of these leads him to deny inspiration and Christianity itself.

Being expelled from the Bible College and the church he returns home where his narrow-minded father and mother treat him with a cruelty akin to that of his professors. An attack of pneumonia that brings him to death's door touches their hearts and in a measure restores the old-time relations, yet he decides to leave home and give himself up to the teaching of Science.

A young girl whose ancestors had been among Kentucky's aristocracy, but whom the fortunes of war had brought to the hard lot of a country school-teacher, goes forth with him.

Such in brief is the story, but its charm consists in the vivid word painting for which Mr. James Lane Allen is famous. No writer in our language is as true a student of nature as he, and as you see spring bursting upon the world, the opening buds and blooming flowers, or the fall with its fruit and grain, or winter with its sleet and snow.

When you eliminate Mr. Allen's poetic prose you leave little else to be desired, for the moral of few of his stories is healthy.

This story in its moral lessons is certainly not one to put into the hands of the general readers, for it is an open attack upon the Bible and



the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Many of the evils he denounces are real evils and undoubtedly cripple the work of the Church and bring disgrace upon the cause, but the antidote is not the substitution of the Reign of Law.

RED BLOOD AND BLUE. By Harrison Robertson. Pp. 324. Price \$1.50. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

In certain respects this is an old story, while in others it is new. A young boy of lowly birth whose father has left him the legacy of a dishonest reputation determines to live it down and make a name for himself. He falls in love with the daughter of one of the oldest families in the State, and finally wins. The story is not original as it has often served its purpose, but the treatment is decidedly fresh and fine.

The pen picture of Southern life, and the sad description of the broken down Southern aristocracy is worth the time you will spend on the book. The moral is excellent and the sentiment pure. It is a book that will help to make the North understand the peculiar conditions of the South in the dark days immediately succeeding the civil war.

Those who have read "How the Derby was Won," by the same author, will be prepared to welcome this new book.

DOINGS IN DERRYVILLE. Lewis V. Price. Pp. 212. Price, 60c. United Society of Christian Endeavor.

Not long ago Governor Rollins, of New Hampshire, in his Fast-Day Proclamation, startled Christian America by saying that there were towns in New England that were relapsing into paganism.

He of course brought down upon his head abuse in plenty, but still the fact remains that in New England, once the centre of religious influence, there are men and women who are virtual pagans.

The book before us attracts attention from the first because the introduction is written by Governor Rollins, who, no doubt, recognized in this story a confirmation of his claims.

It is the story of a New England town, which, through the migration to the cities and the entrance of foreign population, had lost its Christian character and become as pagan as China.

A young girl is compelled to move there, and at once, through a Christian Endeavor Society, begins the work of reclamation. A Sabbath school soon follows, and then a church under a young minister of consecration and self-denial.

There may be some prejudiced enough against such societies as to refuse to recognize the good in them—but all fair-minded persons must confess that among some they do good—that certain sections by training and education are just suited to such work.

Then those who know human nature will easily understand why such a society can reach men and bring them together, when a church organization in the beginning would be impossible.

**THE GRIP OF HONOR.** By Cyrus Townsend Brady. Pp. 246. Price \$1.50. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York.

Paul Jones, the eccentric yet brilliant naval commander of the Americans in their first war against England, is now the hero of more than one book. This story centres about him, and to a certain extent it is a defense of him against his enemies.

The story is that of a brave young Irishman who escapes by the skin of his teeth many dangers and finally marries the girl of his choice.

The story is commonplace, and the style is more so, while there is nothing in the style to atone for either.

Its main value is the light it throws upon the character of Paul Jones.

**PINE KNOX.** A story of Kentucky life. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

Those of us who have read Fox's stories of Kentucky life, or even James Lane Allen's, are always ready to hear about that brave and chivalrous people, while those of us who have lived among them are also ready to have painted for us that beautiful blue grass land.

This story unfortunately is neither one or the other. It deals with the Kentucky mountaineer, and is thoroughly saturated with abolitionism, and the old flag with Andersonville and Libby prison as side-lights.

It is not a book that will be enjoyed in the South, and in the style there is nothing elevating or instructive. It is about fifty years behind the age, and it may be laid on the shelf with Uncle Tom's Cabin.

**UNDER ORDERS, OR NOT HIS OWN MASTER.** Cloth Gilt Top, 75 cents; Linen Cloth, 40 cents; Paper, 25 cents. Advance Publishing Co., Chicago.

This is a missionary sketch, showing that there is no fiction as strange as truth. A young man gives up the comforts of a cultivated home and the love of a devoted woman, and braves the dangers and hardships of Tierra del Fuego. It is a book pitched upon the plane of "In His Steps."

**THE CHILDREN'S SUMMER.** By Mattie B Banks. Pp. 449. Price \$1.00.

The American Tract Society, New York.

Miss Banks, the writer of this book, has already won quite a reputation for children's stories. Her stories do not present impossible children, but those of the same flesh and blood as we see about us daily. There is a naturalness about her characters that is not often found in the average Sunday school work, while the motive of the story is always healthy and manly. When we remember the trash found in our libraries, we wish we had more books of this type and more writers like Miss Banks.

**FRESH AIR.** By Anna B. Warner. Pp. 161. Price 75 cents. American Tract Society.

This is an admirable book, for more reasons than one. In the first place it is printed on heavy antique paper, illustrated and illuminated with marginal designs on each page and attractively bound in cloth. Then the story is a good one with an excellent moral. We who live in

the midst of fresh air have little conception of what the poor in the slums have to endure. In recent days in every large city there are godly men and women whose charity takes the practical turn of bringing these waifs of the slums in contact with the pure air. In this story of Lippet and Tip we have a practical illustration of the blessings of such work. This is a book for the Sabbath school library.

The Sunday books for the young have always been hard to find, books occupying a middle place between the dry biographies of the past and the trashy religious novel of the present.

We commend the three books named below, as being suitable to occupy a place in the Sabbath School Library:

FATHER JEROME, a Story of the Spanish Inquisition. By Mrs. H. A. Clark. Pp. 293. Price, \$1.00. American Tract Society, New York.

This is a story of Protestantism in Spain with graphic accounts of the horrors of the Inquisition.

Father Jerome, the hero of the story, is a Jesuit priest who is brought under the influence of the Gospel and becomes a convert to Protestantism.

He is arrested and tried by the Inquisition, and is tortured in the most horrible manner.

He finally escapes through the aid of a band of gypsies whom he had once befriended, and then meeting his future wife, they leave Spain for Wittenberg, where they live in peace.

Altogether it is a healthy story that every boy and girl ought to enjoy, and teaches the rising generation truths of the past that they ought to know.

PRO CHRISTO, A Story of a Royal Huguenot. By Mrs. H. A. Clark. Pp. 330. Price, \$1.25. American Tract Society, New York.

In 1889 there was written by a Miss Stillman, of Alabama, a charming story called, "How They Kept the Faith, one of the finest books of its class that we have ever read.

The story before us, by Mrs. Clark, is an exact reproduction of "How They Kept the Faith," the names only being changed. The plot of the story from the opening to the end is the same, and in many places the conversations are identical.

It is a serious matter to bring the charge of plagiarism, for no one of us knows the exact facts. Yet, without pronouncing judgment in the matter, we must say that it is one of the most exact coincidences we have ever known.

Owing to our calling attention to this coincidence in the columns of the Presbyterian Standard, our Committee has taken the matter up as an infringement of their copyright.

We would advise those who wish to have the story in its best and original form to buy "How They Kept the Faith."

# SOUTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY,

CLARKSVILLE, TENNESSEE.

THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT has nine professors, and its Schools and Degree courses offer unusual and improved combination of study, along with flexibility of detail.

FIVE DEGREE COURSES, as follows: (1), Master of Arts; (2), Bachelor of Arts; (3), Bachelor of Science; (4), Doctor of Philosophy (three years residential course).

Every student is taught the English Bible, as a necessary part of a Christian Education, and is rewarded for faithful work in this as is in other studies.

THE DIVINITY DEPARTMENT has six instructors. The complete course leads to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

Board, including furnished room, fuel, lights and attendance, from \$2.00 per week to \$4.00 per week.

The location is healthful, the community excellent, and the moral and religious tone unrivalled.

The whole time of a Physical Director is given to the new and completely equipped Gymnasium.

Free tuition to ministers' sons and candidates for the ministry.

In the Academic Department, one hundred and eighty-four dollars will pay for tuition, incidental and library fees, room, furniture, board, fuel and lights.

Send for a Catalogue; or, better still, write for full particulars to

GEORGE SUMMEY, Chancellor,  
CLARKSVILLE, TENN.