

The University of Chicago
Libraries



THE
PRESBYTERIAN
QUARTERLY.

GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., EDITOR.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.,
R. C. REED, D. D.

VOLUME XVI.

1902-1903.

Per.



RICHMOND, VA.:
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, PUBLISHERS.

BX 5901

Pa.

v. 14

1922-23

c. 1

Gen

PRINTERS:
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VA.



Q. 1111
C. 1111

CONTENTS.

VOL. XVI.

Abernethy's <i>American Literature</i> ,	148
<i>Acts, the Credibility of the Book of</i> ,	444
Adamic Principle in Theology,	Luther Link, 485
Adamic Principle in Theology, The,	R. A. Webb, 1
Addams' <i>Democracy and Social Ethics</i> ,	450
Aglen's <i>Lessons in Old Testament History</i> ,	438
Alcock's <i>Under Calvin's Spell</i> ,	589
Anderson's <i>Daniel in the Critics' Den</i> ,	444
Archæology, Modern, and the Old Testament, Wilbur F. Tillett,	303
Authority, The, of the Scriptures,	E. C. Gordon, 166
Ball's <i>Light From the East</i> ,	145
Ballard's <i>The Miracles of Unbelief</i> ,	141
Banks' <i>The Christian Gentleman</i> ,	591
Banks' <i>The Healing of Souls</i> ,	586
Banks' <i>Windows for Sermons</i> ,	300
Baptism, Is it Initiatory?	Luther Link, 318
Benjamin Morgan Palmer, D. D., LL. D., ...	J. H. Nall, 77
<i>Bible for Children, The</i> ,	582
Bible Lands, A Pastor's Visit to,	E. T. Wellford, 402
Blessing the People,	R. C. Reed, 540
Bohemian Church, The,	T. C. Barret, 373
Bourne's <i>The Teaching of History and Civics</i> ,	299
Bowyer's <i>Gabriel the Acadian</i> ,	590
Briggs' <i>The Incarnation of the Lord</i> ,	442
<i>Call, Qualifications and Preparation of Mis-</i> <i>sionaries</i> ,	146
<i>Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges:</i>	
<i>Song of Solomon</i> ,	443
Candidate Problem, The,	391
Candler's <i>Christian Auctor</i> ,	294
Chamberlain's <i>The Evolutionary Philosophy</i> ,	451
Christianity, Historical,	A. W. Clisby, 470
Christian Vocation,	John H. Patton, 130
Church Merchandise and Festivals,	George W. Lawson, 103
Church Union,	David James Burrell, 384
Church Union,	J. H. McNeilly, 531
Clark's <i>Training of the Church of the Future</i> ,	448
Cobb's <i>Rise of Religious Liberty in America</i> ,	296
Colleges, The Denominational,	George Summey, 207

Conan Doyle's <i>The War in South Africa</i> ,	452
Concerning the Collection,	<i>C. L. Mauze</i> , 564
Confirmation, Theories and Practice of,	<i>Louis Voss</i> , 461
Conscious Sins,	<i>Hugh W. White</i> , 338
Converse's <i>Uncle Sam's Bible</i> ,	298
Creed, Cumberlandizing the,	388
Criticisms and Reviews,	132, 268, 426, 569
Cumberlandizing the Creed,	388
Cuyler's <i>Recollections of a Long Life</i> ,	439
Dante, Poet, Politician, Protestant,	<i>Frank M. Bristol</i> , 68
Davis' <i>Belshazzar</i> ,	298
Davis' <i>Elements of Ethics</i> ,	<i>Jas. A. Quarles</i> , 268
Davitt's <i>The Boer Fight for Freedom</i> ,	452
Dead, The Egyptian Book of the,	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , 30
Delitzsch's <i>Babel and Bible</i> ,	446
Denominational Colleges,	<i>George Summey</i> , 207
Divine Authority of the Scriptures,	<i>E. C. Gordon</i> , 166
Dixon's <i>The Leopard's Spots</i> ,	143
Doctrine and Life,	<i>R. L. Benn</i> , 218
Doyle's <i>Presbyterian Home Missions</i> ,	295
Duty Towards the Negro, Our,	<i>Thornton Whaling</i> , 510
Editorial Greeting,	93
Education Work in Kentucky,	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , 518
Egyptian Book of the Dead,	<i>F. R. Beattie</i> , 30
Ellis' <i>Adnah, a Tale of the Time of Christ</i> ,	590
Ely's <i>Introduction to Political Economy</i> , ...	<i>J. E. Fogartie</i> , 135
Explorations Showing Man's Original Capac-	
ities,	<i>T. E. Converse</i> , 365
Expunging the Latin Thesis,	<i>W. A. Alexander</i> , 536
Ezra's Act of Faith,	<i>T. M. Hunter</i> , 264
Faith and Some of Its Consequences,	<i>J. S. Foster</i> , 261
Faith, The Philosophy of,	<i>G. B. Strickler</i> , 149
Federal Theory of Imputation,	<i>W. T. Hall</i> , 453
Festivals and Church Merchandise,	<i>George W. Lawson</i> , 103
Flint's <i>The Trust: Its Book</i> ,	299
Frank's <i>The Shrine of Silence</i> ,	447
Fulleylove's <i>The Holy Land</i> ,	587
Future of Infants, The Eternal,	<i>R. Q. Mallard</i> , 58
Galatians iii. 27-29, and Infant Baptism, ...	<i>L. Tenney</i> , 503
Gaye's <i>The Great World's Farm</i> ,	590
General Assembly of 1902,	<i>Russell Cecil</i> , 225
General Notes,	93, 225, 384, 531
Gibson's <i>Mission Problems and Methods in</i>	
<i>South China</i> ,	449
Goodsell's <i>Nature and Character at Granite</i>	
<i>Bay</i> ,	451
Goodspeed's <i>Messiah's Second Advent</i> ,	147
Grant's <i>Christendom Anno Domini MDCCCI</i> ,	296
Gray's <i>Musings by Camp-Fire and Wayside</i> ,	300

Gregg's <i>Dictum of Reason on Man's Immortality</i> ,	294
Guerrant's <i>The Mormons</i> ,	592
Hapgood's <i>A Survey of Russian Literature</i> ,	589
Harding's <i>The Gate of the Kiss</i> ,	298
Haupt's <i>Biblical Love Ditties</i> ,	443
Hawkins' <i>A Wee Lassie</i> ,	452
Heathenism, The New, J. O. Rust,	199
Henderson's <i>Education and the Larger Life</i> ,	588
Herndon's <i>Bible Studies on Christian Baptism</i> ,	146
Higher Education and the Denominational Colleges,	George Summey, 207
Hill's <i>The Angel of His Presence</i> ,	590
Hints on Pastoral Visiting,	W. M. Anderson, 100
Historical Christianity,	A. W. Clisby, 470
Homiletic Notes,	126, 251, 410, 548
Horner's <i>Daniel, Darius the Mede, Cyrus the Great</i> ,	444
Horton's <i>Birthright Membership of Believers' Infants</i> ,	448
Howell's <i>Literature and Life. Studies</i> ,	588
Humorousness, Ministerial,	O. P. Fitzgerald, 551
Hymn-Book, The New,	96
Immutability of God, The,	C. T. Caldwell, 263
Imputation, Federal Theory of,	W. T. Hall, 453
Infant Baptism, and Galatians iii. 27-29, ..	L. Tenney, 503
Infants, The Eternal Future of,	R. Q. Mallard, 58
Initiatory, Is Baptism,	Luther Link, 318
Insurance, The Best,	W. O. Cochrane, 567
Jacob at the Jabbok,	W. H. Neel, 126
Jefferson's <i>Doctrine and Deed</i> ,	586
Jowett's <i>Brooks by the Traveller's Way</i> ,	447
Kent's <i>History of the Jewish People</i> ,	139
Kentucky, Educational Work in,	F. R. Beattie, 518
Kenyon's <i>Loiterings in Old Fields</i> ,	451
Kenyon's <i>Remembered Days</i> ,	451
Knowing How to Abound,	Harris E. Kirk, 559
Ladd's <i>Philosophy of Conduct</i> ,	Fraser Hood, 285
Lang's <i>The Church and its Social Mission</i> ,	450
Last Sunday in the Year, A Question for, ..	J. H. Lacy, 557
Latin Thesis, Expunging the,	W. A. Alexander, 536
Liberty of Man and Sovereignty of God, ...	Chas. O'N. Martindale, .. 351
Library of the Young Pastor,	407
Life and Doctrine,	R. L. Benn, 218
Lily, Lessons from the,	T. M. McConnell, 418
Love Like the Sun,	Russell Cecil, 251
Lovett's <i>James Chalmers</i> ,	450
Ludlow's <i>Incentives for Life</i> ,	586

Lyman's <i>Preaching in the New Age</i> ,	446
MacArthur's <i>Around the World</i> ,	587
MacArthur's <i>Bible Difficulties and Their Interpretation</i> ,	445
MacArthur's <i>Current Questions for Thinking Men</i> ,	579
MacArthur's <i>Sunday Night Lectures on "The Land and the Book,"</i>	447
MacArthur's <i>The Attractive Christ and Other Sermons</i> ,	585
MacArthur's <i>The Old Book and the Old Faith</i> ,	582
McCauley's <i>The Bible in Story</i> ,	300
McClure's <i>A Mighty Means of Usefulness</i> ,	147
McLaws' <i>Jezebel</i> ,	298
Man's Original Capacities, From Recent Explorations,	T. E. Converse, 365
Matheson's <i>Times of Refreshment</i> ,	447
Measure of Success, The True,	R. C. Anderson, Jr., 399
Merchandise Methods in the Church,	George W. Lawson, 103
Merejkowski <i>Christ and Anti-Christ</i> ,	450
<i>Methodist Year Book, The</i> ,	301
Meyer's <i>The Prophet of Hope</i> ,	591
Miller's <i>Presbyterian Christian Endeavor Manual</i> ,	584
Miller's <i>Problems of the Town Church</i> ,	300
Miller's <i>The Master's Blesseds</i> ,	591
Ministerial Humorousness,	O. P. Fitzgerald, 551
Missionaries, Method of Selection,	S. H. Chester, 548
Modern Archæology and the Old Testament,	Wilbur F. Tillett, 303
Muirhead's <i>Philosophy and Life</i> ,	299
Murray's <i>The Ministry of Intercession</i> ,	592
Nash's <i>History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament</i> ,	145
Negro, Our Duty Towards the,	Thornton Whaling, 510
New Heathenism, The,	J. O. Rust, 199
New Hymn Book, The,	96
Newman's <i>Manual of Church History</i> ,	R. C. Reed, 432
<i>New Psalms and Hymns</i> ,	142
Northern Assembly of 1902,	R. C. Reed, 239
Notes,	93, 225, 384, 531
Notices of Recent Publication,	145, 294, 441, 582
Objections to Federal Theory of Imputation,	W. T. Hall, 453
Old Testament and Modern Archæology,	Wilbur F. Tillett, 303
Palmer, Benjamin Morgan,	J. H. Nall, 77
Palmer's <i>The Threefold Fellowship</i> ,	W. McF. Alexander, 132
Parable of the Good Shepherd,	J. L. Reed, 553
Pastoral Visiting, Hints on,	W. M. Anderson, 100
Pastor's Library, The Young,	407
Pastor, The, in the Sunday-School,	T. M. Hawes, 97

CONTENTS.

vii

Pastor's Visit to Bible Lands, A,	<i>E. T. Wellford,</i>	402
Patterson's <i>Broader Bible Study,</i>		294
Pattison's <i>The Ministry of the Sunday-School,</i>		584
Penrose's <i>Opportunities in the Path of the Great Physician,</i>		585
Philosophy of Faith, The,	<i>G. B. Strickler,</i>	149
Potter's <i>The Citizen and the Industrial Situ- ation,</i>		590
Potter's <i>The East of To-Day and To-Morrow,</i>		588
Practical Notes,	97, 244, 399,	548
Practice and Theories of Confirmation,	<i>Louis Voss,</i>	461
Principle, The Adamic,	<i>R. A. Webb,</i>	1
Pulpit Manner and Utterance,	<i>Charles R. Hyde,</i>	244
Pure Religion,	<i>E. P. Mickle,</i>	257
Purves' <i>Faith and Life,</i>		441
Purves' <i>The Sinless Christ,</i>		585
Radan's <i>The Creation Story of Genesis i.,</i> ..		443
Recent Explorations and Man's Original Ca- pacities,		365
Recent Publications,	145, 294, 441,	582
Reformed Church in America,	<i>David James Burrell,</i>	384
<i>Religious Systems of the World,</i>		445
Reviews and Criticisms,	132, 268, 426,	569
Rice's <i>History of the International Lesson System,</i>		148
Richards' <i>For Whom Christ Died,</i>		585
Riggs' <i>History of the Jewish People,</i>		141
Robbin's <i>Christian Apologetic,</i>	<i>F. R. Beattie,</i>	576
Roberts' <i>The Presbyterian Hand-Book,</i>		585
Sage's <i>The Claybornes,</i>		207
Salvation is of God,	<i>W. T. Palmer,</i>	421
Saussaye's <i>The Religion of the Teutons,</i> ..		445
Scofield's <i>Fifty Spoken,</i>		440
Scofield's <i>Hezekiah's Revival,</i>		440
Scofield's <i>Stress-of-Weather Christians,</i> ..		440
Scriptures, The Divine Authority of the, ..	<i>E. C. Gordon,</i>	166
Selden's <i>Story of the Christian Centuries,</i> ..		146
Selection of Missionaries, The,	<i>S. H. Chester,</i>	548
Seminary, New Theological,		94
Seward's <i>How to Get Acquainted with God,</i> ..		148
Shiell's <i>The Story of the Token,</i>		297
Simpson's <i>Life of Ulrich Zwingli,</i>		587
Sins, Conscious,	<i>Hugh W. White,</i>	338
Smith's <i>Eternalism, a Theory of Infinite Jus- tice,</i>		584
Smith's <i>The Integrity of Scripture,</i>		577
Snow, What it Says,	<i>T. M. McConnell,</i>	420
Southern Assembly of 1902,	<i>Russell Cecil,</i>	225
Sovereignty of God and Liberty of Man,	<i>Chas. O'N. Martindale,</i> ..	351

Spalding's <i>Religion, Agnosticism, and Education</i> ,	442	
Speer's <i>Missionary Principles and Practice</i> ,	580	
Speer's <i>The Principles of Jesus</i> ,	147	
Spirit's Ministry to the Believer,	George L. Bitzer,	410
Stagg's <i>Calvin, Twisse and Edwards</i> ,	R. A. Webb,	569
Success, The True Measure of,	R. C. Anderson, Jr.,	399
Suitable Shoes for Rough Roads,	T. M. McConnell,	419
Sunday-School, The Pastor in the,	T. M. Hawes,	97
Swett's <i>Sarah the Less</i> ,		452
Talling's <i>Extempore Prayer</i> ,		296
Tennant's <i>The Origin and Propagation of Sin</i> ,		442
Tenney's <i>The Young Man of Yesterday</i> ,		591
Terry's <i>Moses and the Prophets</i> ,		583
Theological Seminary, The New,		94
Theology, The Adamic Principle in,	Luther Link,	485
Theology, The Adamic Principle in,	R. A. Webb,	1
Theories and Practice of Confirmation,	Louis Voss,	461
Thompson's <i>Hand of God in American History</i> ,		296
Tillett's <i>Personal Salvation</i> ,	R. A. Webb,	426
Tolstoi's <i>What is Religion?</i>		297
Torrey's <i>How to Pray</i> ,		592
Torrey's <i>How to Promote and Conduct a Revival</i> ,		448
Torrey's <i>Gist of the Lessons—1903</i> ,		584
Tuttle's <i>The Gift of Power</i> ,		449
<i>Tucentieth Century Addresses</i> ,		295
Unconscious Influence,	T. M. Wells,	423
Union of Churches,	David James Burrell,	384
Union with Reformed Church,	J. H. McNeilly,	531
Vance's <i>The Rise of a Soul</i> ,		147
Varley's <i>Christian Science Examined</i> ,		591
Vaughan's <i>Sermons</i> ,	R. A. Webb,	573
Visiting, Pastoral, Hints on,	W. M. Anderson,	100
Wages of Sin, The, and the Gift of God,	Geo. W. Patterson,	128
Waite's <i>History of the Christian Religion</i> ,	P. P. Flournoy,	288
Welsh's <i>The Challenge to Christian Missions</i> ,		449
Warneck's <i>The History of Protestant Missions</i> ,		145
Weinstock's <i>Jesus the Jew</i> ,		437
White's <i>The Communicant's Manual</i> ,		592
Windt's <i>Finland as It Is</i> ,		300
World, The, Already Lost,	Edward Everett Smith,	127
<i>World-Wide Evangelization</i> ,		295
Ye That Love the Lord, Hate Evil,	E. T. Wellford,	266
Young People's Movement, The,	R. C. Reed,	45
Young's <i>Neglected People of the Bible</i> ,		444

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

Prin.

MANAGING EDITOR: GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D.,
F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.

VOL. XVI. JULY, 1902. No. 1.

- I. THE ADAMIC PRINCIPLE IN THEOLOGY. R. A. Webb, D. D.
 - II. "THE EGYPTIAN BOOK OF THE DEAD." F. R. Beattie, D. D.
 - III. THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT. R. C. Reed, D. D.
 - IV. THE ETERNAL FUTURE OF INFANTS. R. Q. Mallard, D. D.
 - V. DANTE, THE POET, THE POLITICIAN, THE PROTESTANT. Rev.
Frank M. Bristol.
 - VI. BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER, D. D., LL. D. J. H. Nall, D. D.
 - VII. GENERAL NOTES.
 - VIII. PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.
 - IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.
 - X. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.
- CONTENTS TO VOLUMES XIII., XIV., AND XV.

RICHMOND, VA. :
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, 1001 MAIN STREET.

\$2.00 A YEAR 60 CENTS A COPY,
IN ADVANCE.

Address all Exchanges, Books, Manuscripts, etc., and all other editorial matter, to GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., Managing Editor, Monteagle, Tenn., and all letters on business matters to WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.

The Presbyterian Quarterly:

A Theological, Philosophical and
Literary Review.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY.

GEORGE SUMMEY, D. D., LL. D., *Editor.*

G. B. STRICKLER, D. D., LL. D., R. C. REED, D. D., F. R. BEATTIE, PH. D., D. D.,
Associate Editors.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY will be devoted, as in former years, to the discussion, in somewhat more elaborate form than is practicable in the excellent weekly papers of the church, of the great problems of religious and theological life, and of the work of the church, and to the careful review of current and new literature. It will be the aim of the editorial management to conduct it along conservative lines, while, at the same time, there will be due exposition of the views of those who affect the more advanced ideas. A cordial invitation is given to all who desire to publish their best thoughts upon any of the questions of the day, or who have practical ideas or methods to suggest to their brethren, to make use of its pages. It is believed that the publication of such a periodical as THE QUARTERLY has in the past been a stimulus to many of the best of our writers. Many more are invited to give to others, in this permanent form, the benefit of their thinking and of their experience.

The articles will, as a rule, have the names of their authors attached, and will be published on their responsibility.

To bring THE QUARTERLY within the reach of a larger number of ministers and others, it will be published for two dollars a year, in advance, or two dollars and fifty cents if payment is delayed. Subscriptions will be continued unless the publishers are notified to discontinue.

All remittances are to be made to MESSRS. WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, Richmond, Va.; not to any one of the Editors.

All communications touching editorial matters, manuscripts, books, exchanges, etc., are to be addressed to the Managing Editor, REV. DR. GEORGE SUMMEY, Monteagle, Tenn.

[From the *Christian Observer*, July 16, 1902.]

A PLEA FOR THE READING OF THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINES.

BY REV. S. M. TENNEY, HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Every minister of the gospel has other duties to perform than that of preaching from the pulpit and from house to house; he has his obligations to the church at large and to the truth in its worldwide mission. There is a sense in which every minister is sent unto the [whole] world. So there are many reasons why a minister, in his reading and study, should reach beyond the immediate needs of his local church.

First, then, I contend that the minister should read theological magazines to strengthen his mind. If the mind of the preacher is to be kept vigorous and fresh, if it is to increase and become stronger, he must read and study something more than what the people at large read; he must read something that will require study, thought, and will tax his mind. I really believe that this kind of reading, invigorating the mind and keeping it abreast the times, will solve our "old age" or "dead line" problem for the church.

Then, if a minister has a mission to the church at large, he must keep abreast of the thought and movements of the church. Much advance is being made that will aid in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and strengthen the strongholds of faith, and this we should know.

The ministry needs to read this kind of literature to be able to defend the truth. In 1893, dear old Prof. Wm. Henry Green, of Princeton, said to the writer, in answer to an inquiry: "I believe that the rationalism of Germany, which has swept over Germany, now is at its height in England and Scotland, has as yet just touched our shores, and that the day will be when it will sweep our entire country. The struggle is yet ahead." To those of us who notice the tone and the increasing number of books from such men as, I will not say Drs. Briggs, Francis Brown, Washington Gladden, but the younger men, as Pro-

fessors Sanders, Kent, Day, Rhees, McGiffert, and others, this prophecy seems to be true.

We must prepare for these things; the mere reading of a few popular church papers will not prepare us; the reading of a few costly books will not do it. We must be in constant contact with the giants on both sides.

I need not further say that much valuable matter in the study of the faith comes out in this form that never sees publication in book form. For instance, a most valuable study of that difficult passage "baptism for the dead" was contributed by the late Dr. Talbot W. Chambers for the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* of 1892; a valuable article, entitled "God-inspired Scripture," was written for the same Review by Prof. B. B. Warfield, of which the lamented Dr. G. T. Purves said that it far surpassed the work of Dr. Cremer, the great lexicographer, and was an unanswerable argument for inspiration. Of many other such contributions as appear from time to time I cannot even speak; but the point is this, that all this valuable matter we miss, for it never appears in book form, and we never see it unless we take our theological magazines.

I must say, too, that in these publications we become quite well acquainted with the drift of present-day publications, the greater part of which the ordinary minister cannot afford to purchase. These magazines, through their book reviews, are a kind of "go-between" the many book writers and publishers and the man of ordinary means, who must keep abreast of all that is best; and, too, it is no mean help to the minister of little means who finds in these reviews wise counsel for making his book purchases.

[The Rev. Mr. Tenney will pardon the publishers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY for making use of his excellent remarks—so terse and true—and their adding that in the QUARTERLY the ministry have a medium of expression, by the stronger minds among their brethren, of the trend of thought in theological directions. The QUARTERLY is published with this end in view, and they will find it a valuable aid in their studies, and the most economical means of keeping abreast of these advancing times. No teaching elder can afford to do without the theological magazine.]

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
Publishers of the Presbyterian Quarterly.



BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER, D. D., LL. D.

(SEE PAGE 77.)

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 59.—JULY, 1902.

I.

THE ADAMIC PRINCIPLE IN THEOLOGY.

THE origin of our race is Adamic; its probation and apostasy were Adamic; its guilt and depravity are Adamic; its redemption, as far as it is redeemed, is Adamic. This word *Adamic* is the italic word in our language, having more meaning and distinction than any other. Without it, human history would be an enigma, mental philosophy a puzzle, and theology but a vain logomachy. Anthropology and soteriology both turn upon it as a pivotal word.

What, then, is its import in theology—what underlying, informing, and shaping principle does it symbolize as it stands in the vocabulary of the science of religion?

To this question three typical answers have been proposed, giving three fundamental hypotheses as to the nature of the union between Adam and his posterity, and as to the nature of our participation in his guilt and depravity; and the constructive influence of these theories reaches into soteriology. One class of theologians translates the word *Adamic* by the word *parental*; another, by the word *realistic*; and the third, by the word *federal*.

I. According to parentalists, Adam sustained no other relation to his posterity than that of a father to his children; and this relation ruled the whole Edenic probation, and all the consequences of the fall, as they flowed down to the race. This is the key to all the arrangements and consequences of the covenant of works. As a race-father, Adam sinned; as children, all mankind heir his misery and the defects of his character. The Adamic principle, then, to them is precisely and definitely the law of genetic transmission.

This is exactly the position of semi-Pelagians and Arminians. It is admitted that many Wesleyans use language that is apparently contradictory to this statement, but they are exceptions to the prevailing type of Arminian theology, and it is not our duty to harmonize them with their system. Dr. Miley, a distinguished Methodist, in his *Systematic Theology*, says upon this point: "Arminianism has not the exact and comprehensive formulations of doctrine which we find in some other systems, as, for instance, the Lutheran and the Reformed or Calvinistic. No general synod or council has ever taken this work in hand; yet in other modes the leading doctrines of the system are set forth with satisfactory clearness and fullness. Respecting the genetic transmission of depravity, there is full accordance with other systems of theology. Expressions are frequently met, particularly in the older Arminianism, and in the Wesleyan, which, at least, imply a judicial ground of the common depravity, but never in contradiction of its genetic mode. The tendency is towards the recognition of this law as the sufficient and whole account of it. This is definitely and explicitly the view of Dr. Whedon." This author also refers to Raymond and Summers as holding with Whedon.

Richard Watson, an Arminian of wide influence, does characterize Adam as "the head and representative of the race"; but he qualifies that representation so as to identify it, in fact, with the parental theory. Watson endorses Isaac Watts; and Watts held that the results of Adam's sin flowed down to posterity because he was the universal father of all mankind. But if we are forcing Watson into a position which he does not hold in reality, the seventh, of the twenty-nine articles of religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will sustain the assignation which we have made. "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually." The antecedent of "that" is "original sin" or the "corruption of the nature"; the verb indicating the mode by which this corruption appears in every man is "engen-

dered"; and the source from which this corruption is *engendered* in every man is "Adam"; all men are further characterized as his "offspring." The emphasis is clearly upon the law of propagation from Adam down through the whole race. On any consistent interpretation, this article accounts the common native depravity simply a genetic transmission—a propagation according to a law of nature which is generic to all orders of propagated life—"like begets like."

But what is this law of genetic transmission by which this school would rule our union with Adam and all the consequences of his paternal conduct upon his children? Its advocates shall be permitted to state it in their own language, as follows: "It is a law of organic life that everything produces its own kind. This law was divinely instituted at the very beginning of life. It has determined the results of propagation through all the geological ages and in all organic orders. It is the determining law of species, and gives us the orderly forms of life. If it were made known simply that life is propagated in other worlds, sober science would promptly affirm the reigning of the same law. The offspring are a reproduction of the parentage, not only in anatomical structure and physiological constitution, but also in qualities of instinct and disposition. This is clearly seen in the higher animal orders. The lion of the present is the lion of all previous generations. The ferocity of the tiger is a derivation from its earliest parentage. The meekness and gentleness of the lamb of to-day were in the blood of the paschal lamb many ages ago. Man himself is the most striking exemplification of this law. Historically, the diversities of human condition are very great. There is a vast scale from the lowest barbarism up to the highest civilization. The habits of life engendered by location and the modes of subsistence widely differ. Governments, religions, customs, all things which strike the deepest into the nature of man, equally differ. Yet in all the constitutive qualities of humanity man is always and everywhere the same. This universal and abiding identity is a genetic transmission from the progenitors of the race down through all its generations. . . . As the law of genetic transmission rules in all the forms of propagated life and determines the likeness of the offspring

to the parentage, and as it was sufficient for the transmission of the primitive holiness to all the race, it must be a sufficient account of the common native depravity. To deny this sufficiency is to assume that simply under the law of nature the moral corruption of Adam would not have been transmitted to his offspring, and consequently that they must have been born in holiness. To assume an intervention of retributive justice, on the ground of a common participation in the sin of Adam, as the only sufficient account of the universal native depravity, is to imply the same results. . . . The sufficient account is in the law of genetic transmission. There is no requirement in either nature or scripture or reason for any other."

Indisputably, this tenet is the central principle of the Arminian anthropology and soteriology. Its destruction will, for Methodists, necessitate the construction of a new theology. Let us now unfold its logical implications, and see what they are, and how tenable they are.

1. This hypothesis logically denies the penal character of our Adamic inheritances. The law of heredity, even in the hands of extremists, does not inculcate, *ex necessitate*, the offspring in the crime of the parent, and judge them worthy of a like condemnation. The rugged sense of mankind buffets with scorn the damnation of the child for the father's sin. The child of a thief is not, *ipso facto*, a thief himself; neither does a lewd parentage necessitate unclean children. That law is barbaric which punishes the son for his father's transgression. On the contrary, the children of such lineage are often perfectly exemplary. Were it not so, crime committed by one ancestor would forever damn the whole line. The scriptures are equally explicit upon this point. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." It follows, therefore, from reason, from jurisprudence, and from scripture, upon this hypothesis of a mere parental connection with Adam, that all our inheritances from him must be of a non-penal character whatever else may be said about them. Adam's position in Eden was that of a parent only; the parent miscarried when put upon probation; the re-

sults of the miscarriage must be inevitably entailed upon all his posterity; yet not as punitive evils, but only as pitiful misfortunes, as natural predispositions, as weaknesses of constitution. According to the logic of the system, and according to some of its exponents, native depravity is not native demerit; it is sin in the sense of abnormality and disorder, but it is not guilt, amenable to damnation. Original sin is thus resolved into original calamity. Sin improper; not sin proper.

But it may be asked, "Wherein consists the gravity of such consequences? Suppose the results as here indicated be admitted in their baldest form, what prevents their acceptance?" The reply is twofold.

(1) The holders of this hypothesis cannot construct a theodicy; they cannot vindicate God in connection with the race's moral and spiritual history. They admit the facts of depravity and death—the fact that all children are born into the world depraved, and that all men are born to die—that these results come without their personal agency, and that they cannot be put out of their destiny by their most earnest and intelligent endeavors. In other words, under this hypothesis no man is responsible for his depravity or his death. How can God be justified in thus depraving man's character, albeit he does not punish for the depravity, and in thus putting all men to death indiscriminately, who have committed no evil? The Calvinist challenges the Arminian to vindicate God in creating all men so hurt in their bodies that they all inevitably go down to the grave, and so damaged in their moral constitutions that they inevitably commit personal sin and fall under his damnation. Whether the inheritance from Adam be conceived as penal or not, it, with fearful uniformity, brings man to the grave, and, apart from the atonement of Christ, just as inexorably lands him in hell. In such a system, death and hell are ultimately the results of a non-penal connection with Adam's sin, which no man voluntarily established for himself. Let us put the case sharply in interrogatory form, "Why did God take away the character of Judas, and kill his body?" The Arminian will answer, "Because he rejected Christ." But, "Why did he reject Christ?" The answer must be, "Because he was depraved." But, "Why was he depraved?" The answer must be,

“Because he happened to be the son of a sinful father.” Then the whole catastrophe was the result of an unfortunate birth-connection, which God constituted, and over which Judas had no control. The logic of the parentalists grounds death and hell in an unfortunate birth. The son perished, under the righteous and merciful government of God, for the father’s sin! This, in our judgment, is far harder than the doctrine of the Calvinist, who traces these same results to the guilt which man contracted in Adam; in his scheme the son and the father were confederated together to do evil, were conspirators against the kingdom of God, and shared like treatment in the divine court-room, because they shared alike in the crime with which they were charged. Calvinists teach that men suffer because they were *particeps criminis*; Arminians, because they were *particeps naturae*. With the one evil is grounded in a common criminality; with the other, in a common humanity. According to the one, men die because they are sinners; according to the other, because they are human. Does God smite babies just because they are human? Monstrous!

(2) The inferences from the position that native depravity is not guilty and blameworthy cannot be harmonized with the scriptures. A sound exegesis bars the parentalistic hypothesis as much as a sound theodicy excludes it. From a large list of passages one or two will be selected as proof-texts.

Psalm li. 5: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.” The parentalistic interpretation of this text thus renders its meaning: I was born of one who was guilty, and who was infected with corruption. But the word translated “Iniquity” generally means guilt; yet it does not necessarily and exclusively have this signification, and so the dictionary does not settle the question beyond dispute. But it is contrary to the fundamental ethics of the Old Testament to conceive of marriage and its necessary consequences as iniquitous and sinful in themselves. If David derived his depraved nature from his mother in consequence of the fact that he was born of her tainted substance, then the conclusion must follow that marriage is in itself unclean; and this conclusion is contrary to the scriptures. The traditional interpretation is the only tolerable one, that David here means to utter his conviction that the sin of which he was

guilty sprang out of a depravity which had made him a sinner from the very moment of his conception.

Genesis viii. 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." This language teaches, in defiance of exegetical jugglery, that this evil imagination did not arise in man, but was in him from the very commencement as innate blameworthiness. "Declarations in general of a constitutional character of the human heart are not declarations of a distinct, determinable volition of the individual, but declarations of the constitutional character of human nature."

Mark vii. 20: "That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man; for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are they which defile a man." Our Lord roots these evils in the heart, and pictures them as springing from it spontaneously and universally. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a tree that is without any moral character bring forth such fruit. Men do not gather grapes from bramble vines, nor figs from thistle bushes. According to parentalists all these evil fruits result from an unfortunate and irresponsible moral weakness and spiritual deformity.

Ephesians ii. 3: "Among whom we also had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." After reminding the Ephesian Christians of their former state, the apostle declares that they, as well as all other Jews and heathen, were by nature the children of wrath. Their very natures were the objects of divine wrath. Their innate, natural, constitutional characters with which they had been born, were the objects of God's punitive justice. Underneath personal and self-determined acts of sin, underneath the rejection of Christ, there lies something in man's very nature which exposes him to the retributive wrath of God. These two impingements—the one upon the equity of God in ordaining the law of taint by entailment, and the other upon that sound and sober exegesis which finds all divine movements against men based, not upon the accident of birth, but upon criminality—sufficiently discount the hypothesis of "depravity without demerit."

2. The doctrine of parentalism logically imports the propagation of moral and spiritual character by the law of genetic transmission, without, however, propagating the ethical qualities of the character. The children of fallen Adam have inherited his depraved character, because of the operation of the law that "like begets like," but his children are not culpable on account of the inheritance; it follows, therefore, that the Adamic character was transmitted, but not its ethical quality. The exact derivation from Adam is "depravity without demerit." The difficulties upon this point are at least twofold: (1) It is just as impossible to separate character and its ethical quality as it is to separate substance and attributes, or the matter of sin and the quality of sin. Character, when the word is not played upon for a purpose, implicates the notion of moral quality. What sort of a moral thing is "depravity without demerit?" (2) But if the disjunction between character and moral quality could be successfully effected it is next to impossible to see how character could be propagated by genetic transmission. Character is spiritual in its nature, and cannot be bred like physical qualities. The whole notion is materializing and debasing in its nature. If the conception were true, a Society for the Breeding of Improved Characters would be the desideratum of our times, and we might have character fanciers as well as pet-stock fanciers. The redemptive problem would be to change the breed of mankind.

3. This law of genetic transmission should rule in the instance of regenerated and sanctified parents, and determine their offspring in subjective holiness. Why should the Adamic connection prevail in such instances and not the immediate connection? Why should the child follow the Adamic parentage and not the regenerate parentage? It is answered by the parentalists that it is because in the present life the sanctification is not complete. Then why does not the child of regenerated parents come into being with partially sanctified characters, so as to be like its parents, partly holy and partly unholy? But the Arminian theology teaches a doctrine of entire sanctification, and so the reply cannot be made in respect to such that their children are not born holy because they are imperfectly sanctified. To this phase of the question the parentalists reply, "The regenerate or sanctified

state is specially a gracious state, and not of the original constitution of man." The fact that it is gracious limits the operation of the law. But the law is, The child must be like its parentage. In regeneration a new nature is imparted, by the Spirit, it is true, but the change is really in the nature of the parent, and according to the law ought to go out from the parent into the offspring, and condition his being. If Adam had stood his probation, his holiness would have been propagated. There is no escape from the conclusion, that this law must logically erect a line of regenerate men, who could truthfully say, "We have Abraham to our father."

4. The hypothesis of the parentalists destroys the parallelism between the "First" and the "Second" Adams. The career of the race began under moral government modified by the covenant of works, and that career must be finished under moral government modified by the covenant of grace. Each of these covenants had heads who were the parties of the second part in the covenants. Each Adam sustained the same relation to his posterity, "As in Adam, . . . so in Christ." If the first Adam's public and representative relation to his posterity under the first covenant were only parental in its nature, then the second Adam's public and representative relation to his posterity under the second covenant must have been parental also, else there is no real propriety in designating him the second Adam, and there is no true parallelism between them. If the Adamism of the first covenant was only parental, then the Adamism of the second covenant is paternal also. But the very supposition that justification is derived from the second Adam by genetic transmission is absurd in the extreme. Watson admits the parallelism of some sort, and the admission carries away the notion of a parental headship from both covenants. But in another place this subject will be more carefully discussed.

Inasmuch as the parental union between Adam and his ordinary descendants implicates the doctrine of depravity without demerit, and inasmuch as it implicates the genetic transmission of character, and inasmuch as it implicates the generation of a regenerate line from a regenerated ancestry, and inasmuch as it implicates the destruction of the Pauline parallelism between the two Adams, we are bound to dismiss this hypothesis of a mere

parental union as the formative, ruling, principle in theology, and its dismissal is the dismissal of Arminianism.

5. The hypothesis, that like begets like, if applied for the explanation of original sin, requires the assumption of a "species" sinner. According to a sound science, not every quality of organic life is propagable, but only such qualities as are specific—such qualities as are essential to the identity of the species. The properties of any given group of organic beings are classified as essential qualities and accidental qualities. The essential qualities are those which constitute the identity of the group and are inseparable from it; the accidental qualities are those which may be taken away from the group without in the least affecting its integrity and completeness. The propagation of these essential qualities is necessary to the perpetuation of the species; but the accidental qualities may or may not be reproduced in the offspring. If original sin be propagable, if it appears uniformly and unavoidably in every generation of the human race and in every individual of each generation, it would be at once put into the category of the essential qualities of the group of beings called man, and would be necessary to the very identity of the race. Man without it would not be man, but some other sort of being. We would thus be compelled to think of "the new creature" of the gospel as a distinct "species" of man, and not as "the old man" transformed and transfigured in moral and spiritual character. Is regeneration a transmutation of "species"? If so, then we would have a *genus homo*, differentiated into a species sinner, and a species saint. Then all the principles of natural science would require the law of generation—the law that like begets like—to rule both species, and so deriving by generation a line of saints as well as a line of sinners.

Such a classification is clearly inaccurate. There is strictly and scientifically speaking no *genus homo*, and there is no species sinner, and no species saint. The human race is a species, and those qualities which are propagated by generation are the essential qualities of mankind, so that the law, like begets like, when applied to man, means that every child is human. Sin is one of the accidents, not one of the essentials, of human nature. It can be detached entirely from humanity without destroying its iden-

tity. Every descendant is sinful, but the controlling law is not the law that like begets like. Saints and sinners are not two species of mankind, but two moral varieties of men; and the persistency of the one variety—the sinful—is not explainable by the law that “like begets like,” causes the father to beget idolatrous sons, then demands of logical and natural consistency, applied to the other variety—the variety of saints.

6. Neither does the second commandment, as is contended, necessitate the assumption that sin is a *virus* in the blood, descending from father to son, indefinitely, as scrofula is supposed to be propagated. The sanction of the second commandment is in these words, “For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.” It is God, not nature, who is the active agent in the “visiting”; the thing visited is “iniquity,” not the consequences of sinning; the subjects of the visitation are those children which “hate me,” not all children descended from wicked parents. The language is definitive and descriptive of the *persons* “visited,” and not explanatory of the *mode* of the visitation. It tells us *which* sons will be visited with iniquity, not *how* they will be visited. But if the commandment has its eye upon the law that like begets like, then its annexed reason would be centered in the fact of the mode of the descent of iniquity from father to son.

If the “iniquity is visited” by propagation, by the law that like begets like, why should it be arrested at the third or fourth generation? The father being idolatrous, the son would be idolatrous, by the application of our natural law; the grandson would, for the same reason, be idolatrous also; then the great-grandson would, by the operation of the same law, be likewise idolatrous, and still further, the great-great-grandson, the fourth generation, would also be idolatrous under the reign of the same law; now why would the law cease to operate at this point, at the fourth remove from the original? The logic of the case would demand its operation *ad infinitum*.

But it is said that God stays the operation of the law, “like begets like,” at the fourth generation by his almighty power.

But how can this be when the great-great-grandson (the fourth generation) is, by the terms of the hypothesis, himself an idolater, and so the fountain of a new series of generations? If the law, "like begets like" causes the father to beget idolatrous sons, then the same law ought to require that the great-great-grandson beget idolatrous sons, seeing he himself is an idolater. There would seem to be no principle by which to arrest the operation of the law, once it has been put in motion.

But let us suppose that the son of the idolatrous father, instead of following his father, repents, and "loves God and keeps his commandments," then the second part of this great commandment requires that God "show him mercy"; being a son of an idolatrous father, he ought to be visited with iniquity, but loving and obeying God he is entitled to mercy. Which principle will rule in such a case, the law of nature, or the law of grace? Has not the complication arisen in consequence of taking the matter out of the sovereign hand of God, and placing it in the hand of the impersonal law of nature—the law that like begets like?

There is another crushing difficulty with this interpretation. If the mode of the visitation of the "iniquity" be by propagation, by the law that like begets like, then the "mercy" ought to be thought of as descending to its beneficiaries in the same mode. Is any man reckless enough, in advocating a theory, to teach that "mercy" "runs in the blood"?

We come back to the conclusion that the language of the second commandment is definitive and descriptive of the persons whom God will on the one hand, smite, and on the other bless. He will smite down to the third and fourth generation, indefinitely, those who "hate" him, and will bless thousands, an indefinite number, all those who "love" him. There is not in it a scrap of dogmatism about the law of like begetting like.

7. The eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel annihilates this Arminian contention, that original sin is a virus in the blood, transmitted from father to son under the operation of the law that like begets like. The Jews in the Babylonish captivity, standing upon this very premise, charged their unhappy situation upon their ancestors. "The fathers," said they, "have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are on edge." Our fathers, they said,

did the sinning, and we are doing the hurting for it. "As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel." Then he lays down the principle of his moral administration, and that principle is not the law that like begets like, which law he expressly repudiates as applied to his moral government. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." This is God's moral law. The soul that does the sinning is the soul that shall do the suffering; the teeth that eat the sour grapes are the teeth which will experience the hurting. "If a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, . . . he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God." If this just man beget a wicked son, what will be the result? Will the law that like begets like reign over the case? The prophet says, "If he beget a son that is a robber, . . . he shall not live; he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him." But suppose this just man beget a good son, what will be the result? "If he beget a son that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like, . . . he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live." Here is God's reduction of the active principle of his own administration, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." No matter what may be its ancestry, whether good or bad, its own moral facts will determine the divine treatment of it. A good ancestry cannot sanctify a bad son; a bad ancestry cannot damn a good son. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

It would seem to be impossible to square this scripture with the doctrine that sin or holiness "runs in the blood" with the doctrine that the natural headship of Adam is the determining law of God's administration in the earth. The theologian would seem to be driven to some other principle of explanation than that found in the natural law of propagation, the law that like begets like.

II. The realistic mode of construing the Adamic union and of tracing its consequences in our race history has never been a dogma of the church, though it has had many eminent expositors.

and defenders. There are several important variations of the general conception of the hypothesis. In modern times Jonathan Edwards taught it under the notion of a "constituted oneness, or identity, of Adam and his posterity"; Dr. S. J. Baird, in his *Elohim Revealed*, sets it forth under the notion of a numerical unity; and Dr. Shedd, in his *History of Doctrine, Theological Essays*, and his *Dogmatic Theology*, exhibits the same doctrine under the form of a specific unity. The essence of the doctrine is the same; the divergence is in the mode of its conception and statement. All hold that Adam and his posterity were some sort of a real, substantive unit, so that what the unit did every individual comprised in the unit did. Edwards thought that this unit was constituted by the sovereignty of God, and that his power was the cause of its continuity; Dr. Baird conceived of the unit as mathematical, and set up this interpretative language, "Our oneness does not express the fact merely that we and Adam are alike, but that we are thus alike because the forces which are in us and make us what we are were in him, and are numerically the same which in him constituted his nature and gave him his likeness. The body which is impelled by two diverse forces, x and y , moves in the direction of neither of them, but in that of a different force, z , the resultant of the two; yet is neither of the forces lost, but merely modified, each by contact with the other. The new force, z , is simply x modified by y . So, in the successive generations of the human race, so far as their traits are the result of propagation, so far as they are the offspring of their parents, theirs are but the same identical forces which were in their parents, only appearing under new forms." Adam he conceived as the race-unit, and the "parallelogram of forces" is resorted to as explanatory of his history.

Dr. Shedd states, expounds, and defends the doctrine of specific unity by elaborate and formal argumentation. Concerning the existence of a specific human nature he says, "In the order of nature, mankind exists before the generations of mankind; the nature is prior to the individuals produced out of it." This specific nature is then invested with rational and voluntary powers: "But this human nature, it must be carefully noticed, possesses all the attributes of the human individuals, for the indi-

vidual is only a portion and specimen of the nature. Considered as an essence, human nature is an intelligent, rational and voluntary essence, and accordingly its agency in Adam partakes of the corresponding qualities." This generic human nature did not exist in abstract form, but was at the very first individualized and personalized in the Adam of Eden: "Adam, as the generic man, was not a mere receptacle containing millions of separate individuals. The genus is not an aggregation, but a single, simple essence. As such, it is not yet characterized by individuality. It, however, becomes varied and manifold by being individualized in its propagation, or development into a series. . . . The individual, as such, is consequently only a *modus existendi*, the first and antecedent mode being the generic humanity, of which this subsequent serial mode is only another aspect or manifestation." It follows, therefore, that when Adam sinned, the human genus sinned, and, inasmuch as it is a law of propagation that the whole of the genus must descend into each of the species, every individual propagated by Adam must be a sinful, depraved and guilty creature. If there could be a transmutation of species, in time a holy child might appear as a sporadic character; but as this whole evolutionary hypothesis is, according to Dr. Shedd, a delusion, and as the species is always persistent and uniform, such a result is an impossibility; and so the race-history must be persistently and uniformly sinful, except as supernatural grace may interfere in the production of exceptions. "The individual Adam and Eve were no more guilty of this first act (of sinning), and of the whole of it, than their descendants are, and their descendants are as guilty as they."

There is a deep distinction between the parentalists and the realists. In the first scheme, the depravity of the race is conceived as an evil, but non-penal, inheritance; in the second, the very substance of human nature is conceived as corrupted and guilty and criminalized, and as so passing down to all mankind from the original pair.

There are many grave objections to realism, which bar its theological acceptance.

1. It rests upon a very doubtful, if not absolutely false, philosophical basis. It is well known what a long and furious contro-

versy once raged in all the universities of Europe between realists and conceptualists or nominalists, and that the best results of that debate were with the nominalists. The stoutest advocates of the Scotch or Common Sense School of Philosophy—Reid, Brown, Hamilton—are, at least, modified conceptualists. The *universalia ante rem* of the schoolmen is abstract reality, a contradiction in terms; the *universalia in rem* is only the individual by another name; the *universalia post rem* is the psychological concept derived by the mind from an examination of individuals and only symbolizes objective reality. The realistic explanation is based upon an exploded philosophy, and is encumbered by all that besets that philosophy. There is no such realistic entity as *humanity*. It is an abstract term.

2. Realism implicates the propagation of Adam's personality by traduction. We know nothing of an impersonal humanity, having concrete and objective existence. Humanity conceived as impersonal has no substantive being; it exists only to thought; it has only ideal, conceptual existence. In the first instance, personalized humanity and Adam were identical. If that humanity was transmitted to posterity, *ex traduce*, it was not first depersonalized and then transmitted, but it was transmitted in its personal form. We are compelled to think of personality as of the essence of humanity. It follows inexorably from this premise that the personality of Adam was transmitted by generation to each of his descendants, so that the formula is exactly and literally true, Adam was every man and every man was Adam. There are but two conceivable modes of escape from this absurdity: (1) It may be assumed that generic humanity had its own generic personality, and that it is this generic personality which is transmitted to posterity. This supposition, however, would necessitate the doctrine of a dual personality in Adam, and inferentially in every parent; for, *ex hypothesi*, Adam had a generic personality, that which belongs to humanity, and in addition thereto his own specific and private personality. The same would be true of every parent; but we are conscious that we are one person and not two. (2.) The other alternative refuge from the absurdity which makes every man a personal Adam is the assumption that all personalities are generated out of the personality of Adam, so as to

give each man a distinct personality of his very own. Then it must follow that personality can be propagated like bodies. But what is the real difference between propagating the personality of Adam and propagating the person of Adam? The theory must not resile from the generation and propagation of personality itself; nor must it recoil from the propagation of Adam's person, since there is no generic person to be propagated, and since the creative power of God cannot be introduced to relieve the difficulty. It is of the very essence of the theory that the generic humanity, which was created in connection with Adam, has, by successive naturalistic abscissions, furnished each individual with his human essence and personality. We come back then to our initial charge, that realism implicates the propagation of Adam's entire personality, or a fractional part of it, to each of his descendants.

3. Realism implicates the divisibility of the soul. One of the most orthodox doctrines in philosophy is the simplicity and unity of the soul; for if the soul can be divided, all its faculties can be divided, else you may have all the faculties of the human spirit inhering in one fraction of the essence and the other fraction without any faculties whatsoever, and consequently utterly impotent. Conceive of the faculties as distributed between Adam and Cain, and then you must think of Cain as having some of Adam's memory and some of his consciousness. This is such an absurdity that metaphysicians teach with uncompromising dogmatism the simplicity and indivisibility of the human soul, and a rational argument for the immortality of the soul has been founded upon its very indiscerptibility. Divisibility has for ages been set down as one of the differentiating marks of matter. According to traducianism, generation is precisely the mode by which the Adamic unit is broken up into the multitude, without the interposition of any divine fiat. Dr. Shedd admits the charge of divisibility, but seeks to void the argument by postulating that it is a divisibility that does not imply materiality. But that sort of divisibility is an appeal to our ignorance, for his proposition in this respect is utterly unthinkable; and what does he or any one else know about a divisibility that does not divide, for his

premise carries that absurdity. But let us grant the premise for argument's sake, and it still remains that he admits the point charged, namely, the divisibility of the soul—its essence, its faculties, its dispositions, its memory, its consciousness, its personality, its moral and spiritual history. Each descendant has the whole soul of Adam, or a part of it: if the whole, then each man is Adam himself; if a part, each man is a fraction of Adam; and if he is a fraction of Adam, what proportion of himself is himself and what proportion is Adam? If the whole genus of man was in Adam, and only a fraction of it descends to the individual, is the individual a complete man? "If there may be division and derivation of invisible substance in the case of the body, there may be in the case of the soul. It is the invisibility and imponderability that constitutes the difficulty, and if this is no bar to propagation in respect to the physical part of man, it is not in respect to the psychical part." The assumption of two distinct laws of propagation, the one psychical and the other physical, seems to be born of the exigencies of debate rather than of the exegesis of the case.

4. Realism fails to ground our responsibility for the first sin. If the theory fails in this respect, it fails at the very point which it was designed to strengthen and relieve of difficulty. "The human nature acted in and with the two sinless individuals (Adam and Eve) in and with whom it was created. In them it was tempted by Satan, and yielded to the temptation." But impersonal nature cannot act, be tempted, yield to temptation, etc. So we have the hypothesis of "the free agency of mankind in Adam." "The first sin of Adam, being a common sin, not an individual sin, is deservedly and justly imputed to the posterity of Adam upon the same principle upon which all sin is deservedly and justly imputed, namely, it was committed by those to whom it is imputed." The object is to ground the righteousness of the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and that ground is alleged to be participation in it by those to whom it is imputed. Otherwise the imputation would be undeserved and unjust. The participation was organic and substantial: the generic nature sinned by using the personality of Adam, or by

using a personality of its own; for nothing less than a personality possesses free agency, and nothing less than a free agent is capable of being tempted, of yielding to temptation, of committing sin. If the race committed the first sin by acting through the generic personality, we come back to the doctrine that Adam had a dual personality, and further, to the position that the species is responsible for the acts of the genus. But if the race in sinning in Adam used Adam's personality and free agency, what has been gained in the argument? In every true sense of the supposition, Adam, not the race, did the sinning. Realism construes the "nature" as acting through the "personality"; it therefore makes the nature the seat of free agency instead of the personality, as in the orthodox philosophy. How can I be held responsible for what the nature does? The attempt to show that the "I" of each of Adam's children was present in and with the generic nature, so that in some substantial sense that "I" sinned and fell with him, seems a jugglery with language. There was a sort of participation of the posterity in that first sin, else there could have been no imputation; but if that participation were merely a participation of nature—a mere community of substance in the act of sinning, a mere summation of mankind in a unit at the moment of sinning—while such a conception might explain the depravity of the race, it cannot explain the guilt of that depravity. A corruption of heart, so originating, would be unfortunate and ruinous, but in no strict sense of the word, could it be guilty. Men do not feel that the child is guilty on account of birthmarks; yet those marks may be hideous deformities. The birth-deformities of character are felt by all men, and declared by scripture to be immoral and hell-deserving: these psychical deformities could not have originated in the same manner as the physical deformities, else monstrosities of body would be as culpable as native monstrosities of soul.

5. Realism implicates our participation in all ancestral history. On the supposition of a real numerical or specific oneness of mankind with Adam, every individual, derived from him by ordinary generation, is a sharer in all his deeds. If, on account of that oneness, as is alleged, each man participates in the guilt

and depravity of Adam's first act of sin, upon the same ground and for the same reason every descendant must be a moral and spiritual partaker in the entire physical and psychical history of Adam, at least up to the moment of the birth of Cain, the moment of the first individuation and personalization of the generic nature. Dr. Shedd seeks to void this conclusion by saying, "The acts of Adam and Eve after the fall differed from the act of eating the forbidden fruit in two respects: 1. They were transgressions of the moral law, not of the probationary statute. 2. They were not committed by the entire race with and in Adam." This rejoinder does not set aside the inference of a unity of race-history based upon the oneness of race-nature. (1) If the acts of Adam and Eve after the fall were not race-acts, those before the fall must have been such. (2) The probationary statute under which the first sin was committed was rooted in the moral law, and so cannot on this ground be differentiated from subsequent sins of the Eden pair. (3) If it was the nature of the Eden-law, as being positive and probationary, which grounded the participation in the first sin, the whole ground is shifted. The central position of realism is that the oneness was in essence; hence the downflow of guilt and depravity; hence the change of the statute from a probationary one to a moral one could not affect that oneness, and so could not affect the downflow of consequences: the assumption is a change of premise from a realistic basis to a federal basis. (4) If "unity of nature and participation" ground imputation, then as long as there is unity of nature there must be participation, and so imputation; until the birth of Cain there was numerical and specific unity of nature, and there must have been participation of all mankind, not only in all the sinful acts that lie between these two boundaries—the creation of man and the birth of Cain—but in every act of every kind, for it is the genus as qualified by Adam that descends into the species. There is no good reason for restricting the qualities to that of the first sin alone. Now, one of those acts in the interval preceding the birth of Cain was the parental act which individuated him, and so the logic runs into the absurdity of making mankind the father of Cain, and, further, as Cain was a part of mankind, he was, at least partly, the father of himself. "Imputation, even in this

case," says Dr. Shedd, "would not lie upon any individual persons of the posterity, for there are none, but only upon the non-personalized nature." What an inconsistency! The first sin of Adam lies upon personalized posterity, but the second and subsequent sins of Adam and Eve lie only upon non-personalized nature! Then what nature was transmitted from Adam to posterity, the personalized or the impersonalized? If the personalized, it was Adam's person; if the impersonalized, then all of Adam's acts are transmitted, for here is precisely where they lie, namely, upon the non-personalized nature. Theology has found the task of defending the imputation of Adam's first sin hard enough; it certainly will not accept the responsibility of defending the imputation of Adam's whole history to his children.

But this implication has a wider and more complicated application. Generic humanity, as deposited by creation in the first pair, was qualified by their conduct, and as thus qualified was transmitted by generation to each individual of posterity; each individual, thus receiving it, qualified it by his own conduct, and then transmitted it to his own offspring, and so on to the end of time. Thus the humanity of each individual has been qualified by a long line of ancestry. The practical results are singular and in some instances startling. What if Adam was regenerated before the birth of Cain! The first son of man qualified humanity with murder, and ought to have propagated a line of murderers to the end of time! Noah qualified it as it was deposited with him with righteousness, and ought to have propagated a line of righteous and obedient sons! Abraham qualified it with faith, and the Jews were right in saying, "We have Abraham to our father"! The principle must rule the series. How many times has an individual of this generation been saved and lost in his ancestry! What, under these implications, would be the *status* of that child which is born of a believing mother and a non-believing father!

6. Realism attributes creative power to parents. "In every case of the generation of organisms, there is no production of any really new substance by creature-parents, but only a reorganizing of existing particles. But we believe a soul is a spiritual atom,

and is brought into existence out of non-existence. Have human parents this highest creative power?" Dr. Thornwell¹ mentions two wonders which realism must achieve. "It first propagates the nature, and next, as the indispensable condition of the nature, it creates the person in whom the nature is to appear. The person is as truly the effect of the causal energy of the parent as the communication of the nature. Here there occurs to us a difficulty which we crave to have solved. The nature of Adam and his posterity, we are told, is one, because it descends to us by generation. The essence of generation is to reproduce the same. If, now, the law of generation establishes an identity of nature between child and parent, why not also an identity of person? If the person is as truly its product as the nature, how comes it that the generated person should be different, while the generated nature is the same? If to generate is to propagate, why not the person be propagated as well as the nature?" If my personality was not propagated, then it was created; if created, it was either by God or by my parents; it was not by God, according to the traducian hypothesis; then it must have been created by my parents. Then the creature owes worship to its creator.

7. Realism destroys the parallelism between Adam and Christ. This parallelism is drawn by Paul in the fifth chapter of the Romans. "As by the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life: for as by one man's (Adam's) disobedience many were made (constituted) sinners, so by the obedience of one (Christ) shall many be made (constituted) righteous. . . . As sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteous-

¹ In Lec. XIII., Vol. I., *Collected Writings*, Thornwell advocates Realism; but in his Review of Baird's *Elohim Revealed*, published in the same volume, he vigorously combats Realism. How is the inconsistency to be explained? Was he a Federalist or a Realist? The lecture was written in 1859, and the review in 1860. Consequently his last and matured views were against Realism. For proof, see *Southern Presbyterian Review* for July, 1876. His editors ought not to have presented the writings of this great master with such inconsistencies. Dr. Thornwell never prepared the lecture for publication; it was discovered by his editors, and given to the public by them. Dr. Thornwell, however, sent the review to the press himself.

ness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." In the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians the same comparison is made in sharp language: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." These scriptures, supported as they are by others, teach that condemnation and justification come in the *same mode*, but through different persons. One man, Adam, offended against God, and so brought condemnation and death upon all his posterity; another man, Christ, pleased God, and so brought justification and life upon all his posterity. The persons are antithetical; their work is antithetical; their posterities are different—of the first, all mankind, of the second, elect mankind; of the first, all descended from him by ordinary generation, of the second, all descended from him by extraordinary generation—that is, by regeneration; but the mode by which the consequences of the antithetical conduct of these two Adams descended to their respective posterities is parallel. As comes justification from Christ, so came condemnation from Adam, and *vice versa*. The true *Adamic principle* is the one which will run this parallelism. At this point the realistic principle utterly breaks down, and discloses its unscripturalness.

The following points are necessary to show the real parallelism. (1) We are to see two Adams in comparison—the Adam of Eden and the Adam of Calvary. (2) We are to see two posterities—the posterity of the first Adam and the posterity of the second Adam. These posterities are constituencies, both designated by the sovereign authority of God—all mankind were, by the elective appointment of God, made the constituency of Eden, and some mankind by the same sort of election were made the constituency of Calvary. In both cases the reasons for the divine choices are hidden. We can no more divine the reason of God in making all mankind parties to the covenant of works than we can discover his reason for making elect mankind the parties to the covenant of grace. (3) We are to see in the parallelism the first Adam sinning, offending God, and the second Adam pleasing God, doing righteously. Both were metaphysically peccable; both were metaphysically able to stand their respective probations. (4) A judgment of condemnation was passed judicially upon the first Adam, embracing in the judgment all his posterity; a judg-

ment of judicial justification was passed upon the second Adam, including in that judgment all his elect posterity. (5) Death as a penalty followed the sentence of condemnation; life as a gift of grace judicially followed the sentence of justification. (6) These results flowed down to the respective posterities from the two heads in the same manner. As by Adam, so by Christ. The *Adamic principle* must be such a one as will run this parallelism as a weaver's shuttle flies back and forth in the loom.

Will realism meet and satisfy the demand? It is claimed that it will interpret the covenant of works: will it interpret the covenant of grace? The Calvinistic theology is clear and strong in teaching that Christ is the federal head of his elect posterity; that his righteousness is immediately imputed to the elect; that upon the ground of that imputed righteousness God pronounces a judgment of justification upon the people of Christ; that he then infuses a subjective character of holiness, beginning the infusion in regeneration and perfecting it in the gradual work of sanctification. Is there in our theology anything like a generic redeemed humanity, unified in Christ and individuated in his elect people by regeneration? Is the humanity of the elect sanctified in the second Adam as it is alleged to have been corrupted in the first Adam? The very notion of a generic redeemed humanity carries us to the mystical theory of the atonement. The order in soteriology is (1) justification and (2) sanctification; the parallel order in anthropology must be (1) condemnation and (2) depravity. The realistic order in anthropology is (1) depravity and (2) condemnation; and the parallel order in soteriology ought to be (1) sanctification and (2) justification; but this order cannot be maintained in soteriology, and its failure under grace proves its incorrectness under law. In respect to the two heads—Adam and Christ—character preceded and grounded legal standing; that is, Adam was first depraved and then guilty, and Christ was first righteous and then justified. But in respect to both posterities legal relations preceded and grounded character; that is, all men were first guilty, and because guilty, corrupt, and the elect are first justified, and then sanctified. These orders are not chronological, but logical. Because God justifies the elect, he sanctifies them, and because he has condemned men

he creates them in a state of depravity. "As in Adam, so in Christ." The realist must be willing to apply his Adamic principle to the second Adam, else it is not truly Adamic.

Dr. Shedd labors to break down this deadly parallelism, but he unconsciously puts the head in comparison with the posterity, while Paul compares head with head, and posterity with posterity. Again, because some things which may be affirmed of Christ cannot be affirmed of Adam, he leaps to the conclusion that the parallel has been improperly drawn by the federalist, but the precise point in the comparison is the *mode* of the descent of results from heads to members, and the affirmation is that the descent follows the same order under the two covenants. In order to vitiate the argument, he draws five points of difference between the case under the covenant of works, and that under the covenant of grace: (1) "Christ suffered freely and voluntarily for the sin of man, but Adam's posterity suffered necessarily and involuntarily." But neither Paul nor the federalist denies this proposition; but the error of its author consists in representing Christ and Adam's posterity as antithetical: the parallel is drawn between the wrong parties. Rightly constructed, it would read: Adam was a free agent under the covenant of works, and Christ was a free agent under the covenant of grace. (2) "Christ was undeservedly punished when he suffered for the sin of man; but Adam's posterity are not undeservedly punished when they suffer for the sin of Adam." Here the false comparison is repeated. There was a sense, too, in which Christ did deserve his sufferings; but the parallel rightly constructed runs: Both Adam and Christ were dealt with righteously by God. (3) "Christ was a substitute when he suffered, but Adam's posterity are principals." Again we see the false comparison. Adam was a substitute when he sinned; Christ was a substitute when he wrought out redemption. (4) "The purpose of Christ's suffering is expiatory; that of the suffering of Adam's posterity is retributive." Again we see the false comparison of persons. Both these propositions are true, but they do not touch the Pauline antithesis. (5) "The guilt of Adam's sin did not rest upon Christ as it does upon Adam's posterity." But the point is not relative to Adam's posterity; but does the guilt of Adam rest upon Christ by imputation? We

submit, the parallelism has not been broken down, and that the proposition still stands, "As in Adam, so in Christ;" and, further, that realism cannot run this parallelism, and because it cannot, it must be abandoned as a fruitless hypothesis in theology.

8. Realism seriously compromises the sinlessness of Christ. Theology teaches that the Son of God took to himself, in his incarnation, a true body and a reasonable soul, a *bona fide* human nature. That nature which he thus assumed must have been one of three kinds—generic humanity in its entirety, or a fractional part of generic humanity, or a human nature created especially for him by the supernatural power of God out of the substance of the Virgin Mary. The hypothesis denies that it was a new creation, and that supposition is at once eliminated. Insuperable difficulties encumber the idea that Christ's humanity was the genus of the human species; for if Christ assumed generic humanity, he redeemed generic humanity, so that, if any be lost, his humanity is saved, while his person is in hell; but, according to a sound philosophy, the whole genus must descend into each of the species, while according to this hypothesis the genus is in heaven and the species in hell. If Christ assumed generic humanity as a whole, he took to himself that humanity which was corrupted in Eden, and which has been still further qualified by the sinful history of the race. The only supposition that is tenable for a moment is that the human nature which Christ took was a fractional part of generic humanity derived by him from his mother, but this fraction was a part of the corrupt and guilty whole, and was consequently itself guilty and corrupt. In either case, then, whether Christ's humanity was generic or specific, it was depraved, and the scriptures are thereby contradicted. The only escape from this disastrous consequence is the assumption that Christ's humanity was sanctified in the very moment of his miraculous conception. But the doctrine of the miraculous conception does not thoroughly relieve the case. (1) The human nature of Christ was, *ex hypothesi*, about four thousand years older than the miraculous conception; if it was sanctified by that miracle, it was corrupt during all the period preceding the incarnation: "As such simply, his human nature was like that of Mary and David, fallen and sinful." In the pre-incarnate period,

Christ's human nature existed, not individuated, it is true, but really and truly existed before conception and birth, and as thus existent, was sinful and fallen, not being sanctified until the miraculous conception. The implications are two, (a) the pre-existence of the human nature of Christ, and (b) pre-existence in a fallen and sinful state. The fraction of the generic human nature which Christ assumed was not your or my segment, else we would have had our fraction appropriated by another person, and we would have been non-existent; but the human nature which Christ assumed was his own appropriate abscission; its existence antedated the incarnation, and up to the moment of conception was unholy. (2) If the human nature of Christ had such a pre-existence, the incarnation was necessary for other than redemptive ends, or the supralapsarian soteriology is correct. (3) If Christ's human nature was sanctified by his miraculous conception, then he was antecedently to that moment unholy and in need of sanctification. Theology knows the doctrine of the justification of Christ as a federal head, but it is ignorant of any need for his purification in the subjective sense. Realism implicates the moral character of Christ, and if that character be even flected or blemished to any degree, the redemptive sacrifice which he made is vitiated. The doctrine infolds dangers to salvation itself.

Resumé of the argument against realism: (1) Its anthropology rests upon an exploded philosophy. (2) It implies the propagation of personality as well as the propagation of nature. (3) It postulates the divisibility of the soul. (4) It fails to ground our responsibility for the sin of Adam. (5) It entails all ancestral history upon posterity. (6) It imputes creative power to parents. (7) It destroys the Pauline parallelism between the two Adams, and the mode of the transmission of their bane and blessing to their respective posterities. (8) It involves the sinlessness of Christ.

III. The Adamic principle is, as to its nature, *federal*. The nature of our union with the two Adams, and the nature of our interest in the sin of Adam in Eden, and the nature of the participation of the elect in the redemption of Christ, are determined and defined by covenants, and not by the fact that Adam happened to be the first father of the race, nor by any realistic identity

between him and the race. The basis is in a contract, sovereignly made by God.

In attempting to conceive the case, we may think of man's career as having been originally projected under a naked form of law, or under some modified form of law. Moral government, pure and unconditioned, places its subject upon a perpetual probation; makes no provision for the termination of the contingencies of his surroundings, nor for the removal of the possibilities of his falling, nor for his recovery in case he does fall; its demand is for perfect and perpetual obedience while the probationer is exposed at every moment of time and at every point of duty. Its language to its subject is, "Obey perfectly, and while you obey, and only so long as you obey, shall you live; disobey at any moment or in any particular, or to any degree, and that instant you die." It consequently makes the probation of its subject coextensive with the duration of his being; there is no provision for justification. Under such a scheme there is no possibility of redemption; for a law that demands perpetual innocence from a perpetual probationer demands, on its obverse side, the perpetual death of the transgressor. Suppose a substitute under such a scheme of government, and that substitute would be, like the principal, upon a never-ending probation; he could never reach a moment in time nor a point in his vicarious work where the sovereign could say, "It is enough; I am satisfied, the law is satisfied, and every interest involved is conserved." The career of the substitute would be perpetually exposed in consequence of his perpetual peccability, and consequently the fate of his beneficiaries would always be in jeopardy. That man never had any history under naked law is proved by the fact that God is to-day dealing with him under a conditioned form of government. That first condition was the covenant of works, which was superimposed in Eden by God in the exercise of his sovereignty. The language of this modified form of law was, "Obey for a limited period of time, and in respect to a particular matter, and then live for ever." Here was a provision for terminating the probation, and granting justification to the subject. As to the particular specified, Adam sinned, and failed to secure the promised blessing. Having begun his moral history under a modified

form of government, God now superimposed another modification, the covenant of grace, the language of which is, "Obey in a substitute, or federal head, the penal and preceptive law, for a limited time, and then be forever justified." Christ gloriously succeeded under these conditions, and secured the justification of all his elect people. Man's whole moral history began under a pactional form of government, and it must be completed, in heaven or in hell, under that same form.

Every covenant has parties, stipulations and sanctions. The parties to the first covenant were God, as representing the Trinity, as the party of the first part; and Adam, as representing all those descending from him by ordinary generation, as the party of the second part: the union between Adam and his posterity was made by the sovereign will of God. The parties to the second covenant were God and Christ—God as representing the Trinity, and Christ as representing the elect; the union of Christ and the elect was made by the sovereign will of God. The stipulation of the first covenant was, explicitly, obedience to a positive prohibitory statute, and implicitly to the entire moral law; in the second covenant the requirement was obedience to the preceptive and penal parts of the moral law: the probation in both was limited. The sanctions of both covenants were life and death—justification and condemnation.

The fundamental form of God's government over man is the *representative*. The constructive principle in anthropology and soteriology is the representative. All merit is pactional; all demerit is pactional. All facts in man's moral history are to be construed as the results of keeping or violating God's covenants. The interpretative principle in all theology is the federal—the principle of substitution and imputation under covenants.

A full exposition and defence of the federal theology is forbidden by the limits necessary to this article; nor is fullness of exposition and defence needed, because it is the historic system of Protestant theology, and well-known of all who have even a small acquaintance with the Queen of the Sciences.

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

II.

“THE EGYPTIAN BOOK OF THE DEAD.”

THIS is a very ancient subject. It is to be hoped that its discussion may not be as dry as the theme is old. Though it may lead us to think of tombs and mummies, of strange gods and the nether world, it is the desire of the writer that some exposition of this strange old literature may also bring out some things of living interest for our own day.

Our theme carries us across the seas to the lower valley of the Nile, and bids us tarry a while in that wonderful land known in the olden time as Mizraim, and in later days as Egypt. Truly this is a strange and romantic country. It is the land of the fertilizing Nile, the gloomy Sphinx, and the lofty pyramids. It is the fabled region of the lotus, the ibis and the phoenix. It is the scene of buried tombs, crumbled temples, and deserted palaces. It is the great stage whereon the Pharaohs, the Ptolemies, and the Caliphs acted their important parts in the drama of human history. Strange land of myth and fable, of romance and reality! And how wonderful its awaking in our own generation, when the earliest and the latest civilizations meet and stand in striking contrast!

In its great antiquity, in its early civilization, and in its thrilling history, Egypt is a land of intense interest. A thousand years prior to the days of Moses, and two thousand years before the age of Pericles, the Egyptians were an educated, civilized and, in their way, a highly religious people. Egypt was, indeed, the cradle of civilization, and the fountain of learning for the world. Hither Pythagoras, and after him Herodotus and Plato came to complete their education, and thence they carried many things which entered into the still nobler structure of Greek culture. Here, too, letters were known, and writing practiced long before the days of Moses, who was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. Here, also, architecture and sculpture, brickmaking

and clothweaving, trading and shipping, bookkeeping and statistics, and many other elements of civilized life had their birthplace. Here they greatly flourished on the banks of the placid Nile, and under the deep Egyptian sky, when most of the rest of the world was a wild waste.

But we must hasten to our proper theme, "The Egyptian Book of the Dead." This title scarcely brings out its real meaning. It is sometimes called, "The Ritual for the Dead," and "The Funeral Ritual"; but even these titles fail to do full justice to the original idea. The literal translation of the original is the "Book of the Coming Forth to (or by) the Day (*Renouf*)."¹ Its contents in general have reference to the coming forth of the soul in the nether world to the judgment seat of Osirus, and to the bliss which follows acquittal there. It recounts how the soul is to be prepared for this eternal destiny.

In seeking to get some general idea of this strange, weird piece of ancient sacred literature, three general aspects of it may be considered.

First, some general understanding of the mythology and religious beliefs with which it is connected is requisite in order to grasp intelligently the scope of this book.

Secondly, a general description of this old literature will serve to give a narrower, though a still rather general, view of the book itself.

Thirdly, some account of its contents, and of the purpose it served in the religious life of the Egyptians will complete the survey.

I. First, then, the mythology and religion of Egypt is to be sketched in broad outline. This is no easy task, for Egyptologists are by no means agreed among themselves as to how this mythology and religion should be regarded, alike as to its origin and main contents. The sources of the Nile long hidden in the heart of Africa have been discovered, but the sources of the Egyptian people, and their ancient civilization are not yet clearly discerned. The Rosetta stone has enabled scholars to read the secrets of the hieroglyphic and hieratic inscriptions on temples and tombs, but the secret of the origin and growth of the early religion of Egypt has not yet been set forth save in general terms. Schol-

ars like Champolleon, Naville, Brugsch, Renouf, Lenorman, Birch, Lepsius, Maspero and Meyer differ widely in their views in regard to the problems of religion among the Egyptians. One thing, however, is perfectly clear, and that is that religion, including belief in deities and in a future state, were large and controlling factors in the life of Egypt in the very earliest times. Almost everything in heaven and on earth was deified, and the beatifications of the dead in the future state had a large place in their religion.

Three things are to be noted concerning the religion of ancient Egypt. First, the early belief therein expressed in deities; secondly, the prevalence, in later times, of animal worship, and, thirdly, the belief in the reality of the nether world. Such explanations as may help to an understanding of the place of "The Book of the Dead" may be given of these three particulars.

First, a great deal has been written upon the question of the first form of religious belief and notion of deity in Egypt. It has been debated whether the earliest form of religious belief was monotheism, henotheism, ancestorism, fetichism, or animism. Into this whole debate we cannot enter. It may be safely said that the debate lies between monotheism and henotheism, for the reason that ancestorism, which scarcely assumes definite form in Egypt, really depends on belief in deity, and it is now made pretty clear that fetichism and animal worship are products of religious degeneration, and consequently belong to later times. Still the problem of a primitive monotheism, though suggested in Egypt, is much more obscure than in India. The oldest inscriptions seem to indicate that in very early times many deities were held in reverent regard by the Egyptians. It may have been, however, that at first these were not really separate gods, but different names or titles for the one chief deity; but, in any case, it seems that the unity of monotheism, or even of henotheism, was by degrees broken up into the multiplicity of polytheism, even in very early times.

In any case that aspect of the Egyptian religion with which "The Egyptian Book of the Dead" is associated was decidedly polytheistic, though some of the polytheistic elements may be later interpolations in the literature. In some cases a sort of

ancestral worship is suggested, and certain phases of animal worship appear in "The Funeral Ritual" of the book.

The great gods of ancient Egypt do not appear in such definite groups as in those of Olympus among the Greeks, with Zeus at the head, or as in the Pantheon of Rome, with Jupiter supreme. They appear rather as dynasties or families. They constitute a race, rather than a group, and they sometimes stand in the relation of father and son to each other. It is a curious thing, too, that even after animal worship came to prevail, and the bull and the ibis, the hawk and the cat, the jackal and the crocodile were in the temples and held in sacred regard, the great ancient gods were still held in the deepest veneration. The deity and the animal are, indeed, often blended together, or even interchanged, so that one or another of these animals is taken to represent any particular deity. Departed men, also, seem in some cases to have been deified in the future life, or at least to have been identified with some of the gods, as, for example, Osirus and Ra.

In the mythology proper of Egypt, the gods have also various myths connected with them. Many of the gods are sun gods, and hence the sun myths, and there are deities for morning and evening. Various solar myths have consequently arisen in this connection, and different sections of Egypt, as Memphis, Thebes, and Heliopolis, have their several forms of this myth with local coloring.

We have space to mention only a half a dozen or so of the multitude of gods exhibited in the Egyptian mythology. The god most commonly found is *Ra*, the sun god. He is praised as the creator and ruler of the world in certain hymns which occur in the fifteenth and seventeenth chapters of "The Book of the Dead." He is sometimes identified with *Tum* and *Horus*. *Osirus*, of whose myth Plutarch has told us at length, was the sun god of Abydos, as *Ra* was the solar deity of Heliopolis. He is the best known of all the deities of Egypt. His father was *Seb*, the earth, and *Nut*, heaven, his mother, while his wife was *Isis*. He had a brother, *Set*, who was his bitter enemy. *Horus* was the son of *Osirus*; and, according to the myth, he was the avenger of his father, and became his successor. *Ptah* is the god of Memphis, and he came to be represented by the sacred bull. *Amn* was

the god of Thebes, and *Chem* was the god and patron of agriculture. *Anubis* was also a son of *Osiris*, and he had very much to do with the affairs of the nether world. *Thoth* was the moon god, and he was the patron of truth and enlightenment. These are the chief deities of which "The Book of the Dead" makes mention. *Osiris*, *Thoth*, *Horus*, and *Anubis* were the most active in the spirit world, and all were more or less like men in their feelings and wants.

These gods had temples, which were more like abodes for the gods than places where they were to be worshipped by assembled multitudes. This worship, especially in later times, became quite elaborate, and was conducted chiefly by the priests. There were solemn processions, and the gods were carried about the streets on various occasions. In country districts they were carried about the villages, and even through the fields, so that all the people could see them.

The second thing in the Egyptian religion is its animal worship. This feature is not easily understood in relation to the deities. We have already pointed out that certain of their deities were represented by animals. *Horus* was represented by a hawk, *Hathor* by a cow, *Anubis* by a jackal, and so on. This explains, in part at least, how the images of the gods are represented by the body of a man and the head of a beast. This is quite different from the mythology of Babylon, where the head of a man is put upon the body of a beast. This order is reversed in Egypt.

The question of the origin of animal worship, and of its relation to the veneration of the great gods, is much discussed in our own day. Some are inclined to think that these animals were regarded as the symbols of the gods, others that they simply represented certain qualities which the gods possess. Perhaps there is something in both of these views; yet, historically, it seems pretty plain that animal worship came after the belief in the great gods. Indeed, animal worship seems to have been a degeneration from divine worship. Still it must not be forgotten that animal worship did not supplant the worship of the old gods, for in even later times both subsisted side by side.

The prevalence of this animal worship was extensive. Almost every form of animal life was held to be sacred, though in one

district one animal rather than another would be held sacred. This was the universal, popular form of worship in later times, as, for example, when Alexander conquered Egypt, or Herodotus sojourned on the banks of the Nile. Herodotus gives a long list of sacred animals, and he tells us how they were cared for and fed and honored by the Egyptians. Manetho also tells us of it at length. The monuments, too, reveal this phase of the religion of later days in Egypt, and embalmed mummies of various animals tell the same story. Juvenal thought that Egypt was a contemptible place, because even a Roman citizen could not escape the vengeance of the people of Egypt when he had merely killed a cat. It is needless to enumerate the animals which make up this sacred category.

The third feature of the religion of Egypt which bears upon "The Book of the Dead" is the large place which belief in the future state and the realities of the nether world held in it. No other people have ever bestowed so much care upon the bodies of the dead as did the Egyptians. Their present life was colored largely by the thought of death and what lay beyond it. It was largely an other-world system. Diodorus tells us that the Egyptians looked upon their earthly homes as *inns*, and on their tombs as their eternal abodes. The life in the world to come is regarded as a continuation of this life, and its experiences are framed as the model of the present earthly life. Hence almost everything in this life was conducted with reference to the other life, and much that we learn concerning their religion is gathered from tombs and the funeral ritual.

These tombs, especially those of the rich and noble, were elaborate and expensive. Even their ruins impress us with this fact. These tombs usually consisted of three sections. The first was a chamber above ground, entered by a door which usually was left open. Here the *Ka*, or double of the dead person, was supposed to live, and to receive visits and offerings. Secondly, there was a passage or corridor, built inside with masonry, and in which various images or statues of the dead were placed. Thirdly, another passage, sunk some depth into the rock, and ending in a hollow vault, where the sarcophagus of the dead was laid, and which was usually closed up by blocks of stone, completed the

structure. The utmost care was taken to protect and preserve the dead body in these wonderful tombs, where the mummies are now found. In all of this there is a hint of their belief in the resurrection of the dead.

The body was also very carefully prepared for burial. Much time and great pains was taken in the process of embalming the dead. The usual period for complete embalmment was about eighty days. The internal organs were carefully removed. These were not thrown away, as some suppose, but were buried by themselves in small boxes. Special care was taken with the burial of the heart. Then the body was wrapped round and round with long strips of cloth, and various ointments were used, till at length the embalmment was completed. The tomb being prepared, the body was laid in its stone coffin, and the solemn funeral procession, with mourners and attendants, took place. Magic words from "The Book of the Dead" were used at the burial, and such articles as the dead man might be supposed to need in the world to come were placed in the tomb. In particular, various chapters and sections of "The Book of the Dead" were inscribed on the coffin, on the wrappings of the mummy, or on papyri, and placed within the coffin itself.

In regard to the article of death itself, and the state of men after death, a few additional explanations are needed to understand the relation of "The Book of the Dead" to the future life of men, according to Egyptian belief. The soul, escaping from the body at death, has two principal elements. One is called *Ka*, and the other *Ba*. The *Ka* is the image or spiritual body of the man. It is the likeness of the man, or a sort of non-substantial double, as Herbert Spencer might say. Renouf calls it the genius of the man. It is something like the Scottish wraith. After death it stays about the tomb, though not in the body. It needs food and requires guidance. It is also exposed to certain dangers, from which it is to be protected. The magic formulæ of "The Book of the Dead" are useful for this purpose. The *Ba*, on the other hand, is the soul, or spiritual essence proper, of the man. It may leave the tomb entirely, and may be subjected to many changes, wanderings and hardships in the invisible realm. It is this part of the man that is capable of entering into animals, and

other forms of existence. This capacity of the soul gives rise to the Egyptian form of transmigration, as distinguished from that of the Greeks and the Hindoos. It is transformation rather than metempsychosis. The *Ba* of the man may enter into any object it desires, and the transition is not necessarily the result of his former actions, good or bad. There is no very definite moral element in the Egyptian transformation. In this respect the Egyptians differ especially from the Hindoos. It need only be added that it is in the light of the experience of the *Ka* and the *Ba* of the man in his various experiences in the spirit world that "The Book of the Dead" is to be understood and interpreted. Otherwise it is an enigma.

II. We now proceed to the second main branch of our subject, and try to give some general description of "The Book of the Dead." This is the most famous relic of the somewhat extensive literature of Egypt. It can scarcely be called a single book, scarcely even a collection of books. It is a collection of chapters, as we now have it, with often very little logical or organic connection between them. These parts originated at different periods, and at first may have been handed down by tradition, though they must have been committed to writing in very early times, as is shown by the very early monuments and tombs with their inscriptions. In later times these inscriptions were written on papyrus rolls, and thus preserved as a sort of literature. Many chapters are also found on the walls of tombs, on the coffins of the dead, and even on the mummy wrappings.

They were written in hieroglyphic and in hieratic forms of signs or letters. This is true both of the inscriptions on the tombs and on the papyrus rolls. The hieroglyphic are in perpendicular columns, and the hieratic in horizontal lines. The one is ideographic in its nature, the other is cursive. The whole is a fine example of early Egyptian writing, and both have curious vignettes in different colors at their heads.

It is claimed that the god *Thoth* was the author of the book, and in this way it came to be regarded as of divine origin. This, of course cannot be proved, although as the supposed god of truth, it was natural that the name of *Thoth* should be associated with the book. There are many difficulties in the way of getting a

correct conclusion in regard to the original contents of the book itself. No two papyrus rolls contain the same number of chapters, and the texts are generally more or less corrupted by later additions and annotations. Indeed, in many respects "The Book of the Dead" is like the Talmud, and the Old Testament Scriptures, for there is the original text, and then the explanatory and expository additions which have gathered about this text.

Naville says that in its growth or evolution the book passed through four stages. The first was during the old Middle Kingdom down to the thirteenth dynasty, about 2000 B. C. This was written only in hieroglyphic characters. The second, or the Theban stage, was down to the twentieth dynasty, or to about 1200 B. C. This was written in both hieroglyphic and hieratic characters. The third was after the twentieth dynasty down to the Ptolemaic period. This was written in hieratic letters only. The fourth period consists in the versions and recensions of the Ptolemaic times, when the number and order of the chapters were made more uniform and more closely connected, although the precise number of the chapters has not been settled even to our own day.

There are two main papyrus rolls of the book available for scholars. The one is in Turin, and is called the *Turin Papyrus*. It is written in hieroglyphic. The other is in Paris, and is known as the *Louvre Papyrus*. It is written in hieratic. Most scholars regard the *Turin Papyrus* to be the best and most complete. A fac-simile of this was published by Lepsius about 1874, and it is this which lies before the writer, as well as the *Louvre Papyrus*, as he pens these lines. The *Turin Papyrus* contains one hundred and sixty-five chapters, and is the most complete form of "The Book of the Dead" extant. The date of the *Turin Papyrus* is not known. Renouf thinks that it was not before the twenty-sixth dynasty, which would be about 700 B. C. Still the chapters themselves grouped together are assuredly older, many of them being of quite high antiquity, while some of the oldest chapters are thought to have been omitted from this *Papyrus*.

"The Book of the Dead" viewed generally is essentially mythological in its nature. It stands related to the various myths and legends, which are associated with the deities and mythological personages which are concerned with affairs of death and the

future state. Hence *Ra* and his family, *Seb* and his household, *Thoth*, and *Osirus*, and *Horus* and *Anubis*, and *Set* and *Nut*, and the dragon *Apop* are often referred to in the book. This fact fully justifies giving the attention we have to the mythology of Egyptians, and to their belief in the future state, in the early part of this article. The mythology, the nether world, and "The Book of the Dead" are most intimately related, and can only be understood in their relations to each other; and the view taken of the mythology will color with the interpretation of "The Book of the Dead" itself.

By way of further general description, it need only be added that the book relates to the passage of the soul through the underworld, and its beatification in the future state. The literal title of the book, "The Book of the Goings Forth to the Day," suggests this. It is, therefore, the guide-book of the soul, for all its experiences in the nether world, as it pursues the path that leads to the bliss of the better life. It contains prayers to be offered, and magic sentences to be uttered, sometimes by others for the soul, and sometimes by the soul itself, to ward off danger, and to secure for the soul an easy passage through the underworld. It also tells how the parts of the body are to be reconstructed, how the spirit meets the body, and how the gates of the nether world are opened before him. The knowledge of these words of magical value for these ends is most necessary; and hence the man who would have a happy passage must be careful to learn them when still alive. Chapters or fragments of the book are often found in mummy cases, in such a way as to indicate that they were placed there for the dead man's soul, or *Ba*, to use in his passage onward through the lower world.

It may be interesting to add that the beatification of the dead thus reached is largely a reproduction of existence upon this earth, only in a richer and nobler condition. It is the new heavens and the new earth of the Egyptian mythology. The man eats and drinks, and moves about, as in his former life. He eats bread and drinks beer. He partakes of flesh and fowls, and rests under the shade of the sycamore trees. The cool north breezes refresh him, the gods provide for him his food, and he sits at the table of *Osirus* and *Ra*. He drinks milk and wine from vessels

provided by *Anubis*. He washes his feet in a silver basin, which *Phtah* has sculptured. He owns land, and plows, and sows, and reaps, and we are told that the fields are so fertile that the corn is seven cubits high, and its ears two cubits long.

The happy dead are not confined to one place, nor are they restricted to the human form or figure; neither are they limited to only an earthly mode of existence. They have the range of the universe, and may assume any shape or form they please. In twelve chapters of "The Book of the Dead" are recited the various forms of these transformations, and how they are to be effected. They may assume, voluntarily, the form of the dove, the serpent, the bird, *Benu*, the crocodile, the hawk, a soul, the lotus flower, the heron, or any of the gods. There is really no limit to the will of the dead in the matter of these mutations. The highest result of it all is identification with *Osirus* and the other chief deities. But of all of this we cannot now write at length.

III. We now hasten to our third topic, and proceed to give a brief account of the contents of the book that tells of all these strange experiences of the soul in the under-world of the future life. Here, of course, we are compelled to the utmost brevity.

As already stated, the collection of ritual hymns which compose "The Book of the Dead" contains one hundred and sixty-five chapters, according to the *Turin Papyrus*. Some of these chapters are quite brief, consisting of only a line or two; others are quite extended. The first, the fifteenth, the seventeenth, the eighteenth, the sixty-fourth, the seventy-eighth, the ninety-ninth, the one hundred and twenty-fifth, the one hundred and thirtieth, the one hundred and forty-third and forty-fourth and forty-ninth are among the longest. The one hundred and twenty-fifth is far the most important chapter, and of this one we shall say something later on.

Each chapter has a title surmounted by a peculiar *vignette*, more or less elaborate, which represents the subject of the chapter. This is a sample of illustrated literature long before the art of printing was invented. Some of these *vignettes* are almost like cartoons. The chapter titles are interesting, as the quotation of a few will show. The first chapter, "The beginning of the chapters about the going forth by day, and the carrying of the shades

into the nether world, to be said on the day of burial." Chapter II., "A chapter about coming forth by day, and living after death." Chapter IX., "A chapter about passing over the *Amenti*, on the day of passing through the grave." Chapter XI., "A chapter about going out against one's foes in the nether world." Chapter XV., "Adoration to *Ra* when he rises above the eastern horizon in heaven." Chapter XVII., "A chapter concerning the resurrection of the shades." Chapter XX., "A chapter about the crown of truth speaking." Chapter XXXIII., "A chapter about repelling any reptile." Chapter XLIV., "A chapter about not letting a man die in the nether world."

There are many chapters about "going out by day." Chapter C. is a chapter about reuniting the soul with the deceased. Chapter CXXIV. is a chapter about going in towards the circle of the gods in *Osirus*. Thus the passage of the soul and its experiences may be fully followed out. Twelve chapters deal with the transmutations of the departed into various birds and beasts. Chapter LXXVII., "A golden hawk." Chapter LXXVIII., "A sacred hawk." Chapter LXXXII., "Ptah." Chapter LXXXIII., "Phœnix." Chapter LXXXIV., "The bird *Shenti*." Chapter LXXXV., "The soul." Chapter LXXXVI., "A swallow." Chapter LXXXVII., "A snake." Chapter LXXXVIII., "A crocodile." Chapter LXXX., "A light-giving god." Chapter LXXIX., "The chief of the royal circle of the gods." In each of these twelve cases there is a *vignette* at the head of the chapter representing the thing into which the mutation takes place.

Before taking up the one hundred and twenty-fifth chapter, as our concluding topic of exposition, a few brief quotations from several of the chapters may be of interest as revealing the general character of the contents of this remarkable book. These quotations are made at random almost, that they may the better illustrate the book just as it stands. Chapter I., "Oh! *Osirus*, bull of the *Amenti*, says *Thoth*, Oh! King of Eternity! I am the great God in the sacred bark; I fought for thee; I am one of these chief gods who make truth the words of *Osirus* against his foes on the judgment day. Thy kinsmen are mine, *Osirus*; I am one of those gods begotten by *Nut*," etc. Chapter XV., line 28, we have adoration to the sun in these terms, "Praise to thee who came

in time, and became like the creator of the substance of the gods. Praise to thee who hast come to the home of the holy souls of *Amenti*. Praise to thee, chief of the gods, illuminating the *Tuat* with his splendors. Praise to thee, luminous wanderer," etc. Chapter XXXIII., where the crocodiles, who deprive the deceased from magic power: "The great one fell down on his side. The gods reestablished him. My soul comes, it speaks with its father, and rescues the great one from the eight crocodiles. I knew them by their names, as well as those that make them live. I am the one who rids his father of them. Back! crocodile of the west, living upon the wandering stars. Back! crocodile of the east," etc. Chapter LXXVIII., line 29, where transformation into a hawk is described: "Lift up your faces. I see you. I rise as a sacred hawk. I am mummified in *Horus*." etc. Chapter CXLIV., "The gates of *Aanu* on the dwelling of *Osirus*. Hail! says *Horus*, Oh! first gate of the god with a motionless heart. I went on the way. I know the name of the god that keeps thee," etc. Then follow twenty other adorations at twenty gates in twenty sections of a long chapter in the book, and thus the quotations might be multiplied, but these must suffice to illustrate the general contents of the book.

Ere this article closes, some account of the one hundred and twenty-fifth chapter of "The Book of the Dead" must be given. This is far the noblest chapter in the whole book, and it is connected with one of the most important experiences of the soul in its passage through the nether world to its final beatification. The title of it is, "A chapter about entering the hall of the two truths, and about separating a man from his sins, that he may see the face of the gods." The whole chapter consists of sixty-nine hieroglyphic lines or columns, making about four thousand words in an English translation. It describes the judgment process according to the Egyptian religion. *Osirus* is seated on his throne, according to the elaborate *vignette* which accompanies this chapter, in the hall of judgment. Near him are forty-two assessors acting with him, to each of whom the deceased is to confess one of the forty-two sins of which he may have been guilty, and from which he wishes to be set free. The deceased is brought into the hall of the two truths, as the place of judgment is called.

He here makes his confession, led by *Thoth*, the god of truth. His heart is then weighed in a pair of scales by *Horus* and *Anubis*, over against an emblem of truth ornamented by an ostrich feather in the other scale. If the heart stands the test, it is presented to *Osirus* as fit for final beatification, and *Thoth* makes a record thereof on a slate. Other details there are, which cannot be now explained, touching this whole process. These are illustrated by the remarkable *vignette* which accompanies this chapter.

A few quotations are made from this chapter to show how remarkable are its contents: Line 1, 2, "Homage to you, masters of truth; homage to thee, the great god, the master of truth. I come towards thee, my Lord; I appear to contemplate thy splendour. I know thee, I know thy name. I know the names of these forty-two gods who are with thee in the hall of the two truths," etc. Then follow the forty-two negative confessions, which show a good deal of ethical richness. Only a few of these can be quoted. "I did not make my relatives unhappy." "I had no acquaintance with evil." "I did not do what the gods hate." "I did not cause any one to be hungry." "I did not cause any one to weep." "I did not kill." "I did not utter a lie." "I did not plunder the temples." "I did not tamper with the weight of the balance." "I did not take the milk from the suckling." "I did not steal cattle." "I did not oppose any god in his going out." "I am pure, pure, pure." And so the confessions run till the whole round of forty-two is made, and the departed spirit is ready to appear before *Osirus*, and obtain his reward in complete beatification, that is the felicity of a heavenly state.

This must conclude the present study of this strange book, though very many more things of unusual interest might have been added. The article is concluded with one or two simple reflections.

First, it is hoped that what has been written here may stimulate some readers to become better acquainted with the history of Egypt, and, especially, to understand the history of religion in that remarkable land. The science of Egyptology deserves the careful attention of all who are desirous of possessing a general literary culture of a broad and comprehensive sort.

Secondly, our study shows how largely religion enters into the

civilization of ancient Egypt. It was in many respects the inward impulse of its philosophy, its poetry, and its practical life. The two main facts in this religion were, a belief in some sort of deity, and in an immortal future state. From the Christian point of view, the forms of those beliefs are quite defective in the Egyptian system, yet they were potent factors in the early civilization of the Nile valley. The same may be said of the culture of Greece and Rome, of India and China. Religion had a large place among the people in all these lands, with their respective forms of culture. The same is true, in a far higher and generically different way, with the Jewish and Christian systems. These have been the heralds and conservators of true culture and permanently advancing civilization. This does not mean that there must be connection between church and state in the matter of religion, but it rather implies that the individual members of the community are to be actuated by the principles for which our religion stands, as between God and man, and as between man and man, being mindful both of this life and that which is to come. A purely secular and non-religious civilization is doomed to decline, and the disintegration of such a civilization is sure to come, sooner or later. Here are lessons for our own land and day.

Thirdly, the inherent religiousness of man is very evident from a study of such things as "The Book of the Dead." Man spontaneously expresses himself in terms of religion. Man did not slowly develop himself from a non-religious to a religious state. Indeed, there are pretty clear indications that the first form of belief in God was monotheistic, and that the law of degeneration is the one that rules in the realm of the merely natural development of religions among men. It also becomes evident that where there has been steady progress, as in Judaism and Christianity, it is the result of the supernatural activity of God in revelation and redemption, and in setting before men lofty ideals, and planting in them mighty motives, and thereby providing the true philosophy of religion, and a sufficient remedy for sin, and the good hope of everlasting life and eternal beatification through Jesus Christ and him crucified, risen, ascended and glorified.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

III.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S MOVEMENT.

THIS is frequently referred to as one of the distinctive features of religious life in our age. Even a slight familiarity with history acquaints us with the fact that no age has many distinctive features. Man has been here quite a while, and his nature has undergone no essential change. His life, in all its various phases, has been expressing itself continuously. Certainly at this late date, we should not expect to find this life embodying itself in many new forms of expression. "History repeats itself." "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done, is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." The possibility of novelty in life-expression was supposed by Solomon to be exhausted even in his day.

The young people's movement is not a "new thing under the sun." If an epidemic of any kind prevails among the older people, the younger will catch it. The religious fanaticism which swept over Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and carried millions of men on those wildly turbulent and disastrous expeditions known as the crusades, infected the children also. This gave rise to a young people's movement in Germany, which grew to be forty thousand strong, and a like movement in France, which grew to be thirty thousand strong. This was a movement, not only widespread, but of tremendous power. It soon acquired such momentum as to sweep all obstacles out of its path. The voice of kings had no potency to stop it. This movement was made up, in large part, of boys under twelve years of age, but included many girls, and a few gray-headed men in their second childhood. They organized for a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels. Thousands perished amid the frozen passes of the Alps, other thousands along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, which refused to open, as in the days of the exodus, and give them

passage; and yet other thousands, through treachery, were doomed to slavery among the Moslems of Africa.

It is easy to get up movements among young people. Their warm blood is restless for movement. It only requires that some one shall point out the channel in which it shall move. Once started, the movement grows with little encouragement. There is nothing remarkable, and little that is novel, in the young people's movement in our day. It is somewhat new in the form of its organization, in the details of machinery by which its purpose is carried out. It is widespread because the material is widespread. It manifests itself through various organizations, having minor differences. Its name is legion—almost exhausting the letters of the alphabet for initials: Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Y. P. C. A., B. Y. P. U., U. S. F., B. Y. P., Y. P. S. C. E., and many others. They report an aggregate membership of 6,374,000. These figures give some idea of the width of the movement.

It will give a more practical character to our study if we confine our attention to one of the organizations. We select the one which is best known, most active, most popular, most cosmopolitan and most numerous, the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. This society reached its majority on the 2d of February, of this year. It has had a lusty growth, escaping all the diseases incident to childhood and youth. It has been the object of much caressing, of many tender endearments, of very cordial and long-continued praises. The father of this child has been exceedingly congratulated, and this one act of paternity has made him to be known, and to be much honored all over and all around the world. There have been few discordant voices, so few as to be drowned in the great tidal wave of commendation. Indeed, it has been rather a serious matter to utter a discordant note. In many sections of our country it has meant loss of ecclesiastical standing, discount of religious zeal, and accusations of a fossiliferous condition of soul.

While the child was young and tender, it would have been cruel to speak to it in unkindly tones, or to speak about it in terms of disapproval; but now that its cuticle has had twenty-one years in which to toughen, one should not be charged

with hardness of heart if he venture to prick it a little. Of course, one could not think to inflict a serious wound, much less to touch the vitals. This were impossible, even to the dagger of an Ehud, or the spear of a Goliath. We shall go no deeper, perhaps, than the epidermis.

The essential features of the Y. P. S. C. E., according to President Clark, are "its prayer-meeting pledge, honestly interpreted, the lookout, prayer-meeting and social committees, and the consecration meeting. The constitution is entirely flexible in all other points according to the needs of the local church." So says President Clark, and if any one can speak for the society with authority, certainly he can. We shall accept his denotation of the essentia, and proceed to look at the robustious youth with a somewhat critical and inquiring turn of mind.

1. The prayer-meeting. What is the object of a prayer-meeting to be conducted by the young people, and in which every young person present is pledged to take some public part other than singing? Is the object purely devotional? Is it deemed necessary for the young people to hold a prayer-meeting of their own in order to the healthful development of their religious life? If so, then the necessity must be due to one of two causes; either the church prayer-meetings are not sufficiently numerous, or they are not equal in merit to those of the young people. Do the young people feel the need of more frequent prayer-meetings than the church furnishes? After feeding on the ordinances provided by the church, is their hunger not satisfied? This can hardly be the cause for the young people's prayer-meeting. They were not showing such ravenous appetites for the spiritual nourishment provided by the church prayer-meeting. Then the second cause suggested must be the true one: they feel the need of a young people's prayer-meeting, because it better meets the demands of their spiritual life than the old-fashioned prayer-meeting. Is it true that the young people can make a better prayer-meeting than the older people, under the leadership of the pastor? If so, how account for it? Is some young boy, or girl, a more competent leader than the pastor? Are the prayers of the beardless neophytes more edifying than those of the white-haired saints? If so, why not let the older people have the benefit? Instead of

having two separate meetings, let Johnnie or Mary take the book, and let the pastor retire to a seat near the door. Let the youthful cotemporaries of Johnnie and Mary chime in with their expositions and exhortations, and sentence prayers, and let the elders and deacons become silent beneficiaries.

(a) It may be said that, while the young people cannot conduct a better prayer-meeting for all classes, they can conduct a better prayer-meeting for their own class. They know their own needs, and they can minister to their own needs. Young people, it may be said, need a different diet from the older people, and they know better how to prepare that diet. So wise a man as the late Dr. John Hall quit preaching sermons directly to young people, because he said the conviction grew on him that the old and young did not need a different diet. He said that children as soon as they leave the nursery take their place at the table with the family, and the head of the house helps all from the same dishes. So he believed that the children and their parents should sit in the same pews, and the preacher should feed both on the same diet. Possibly it may be replied that these children of the church are still in the nursery. But children in the nursery do not feed themselves. They, above all, need a nurse to prepare and serve their food.

(b) It may be said that the church prayer-meeting is staid, stale and stereotyped, and for this reason is unpalatable and unprofitable to the children. Their taste demands something more bright and cheery and diversified. They like a meeting with a deal of snap and go about it. There is something in this. Young people are not fond of a dull time, and this is one thing that they strive to avoid. The ideal young people's prayer-meeting is one that is spiced here and there with a bit of humor, that is startled now and then with a bit of novelty, and made to think well of itself all the while by the interchange of a good bit of complimenting. Mr. Amos R. Wells, an expert, gives much advice along these lines. "Begin the meeting in some unusual way." "Open directly with some abrupt and striking word on the subject." To secure variety in opening, he gives sixteen different ways of opening. Then when the meeting is open, it must be kept on the go. "Do not sing a cheery song as if it were a dirge, or a prayer

song as if it were 'Captain Jinks.' Now and then have the society sing prayer hymns with bowed heads." "Make hymn chains by selecting different stanzas from different hymns, fitting them into some theme." "Get a bit of spice if possible into every report." "The note of sprightliness and jollity is a most important one to incorporate in the secretary's report." Besides giving sixteen different ways for opening, Mr. Wells gives thirteen ways for closing. Ruts must be avoided by all means. Then it is a matter of great importance to keep the members feeling good. "Do not use every opportunity to find fault, but do use every opportunity to praise. Fill your report with praise, and make it somebody's special business to speak to every one that does well in the meeting." "A secretary's report should rarely find fault, and then only in an impersonal way; it should often praise, and may even call names. Such praise seems authoritative, and is a great stimulus to the society." "The president may greatly stimulate the zeal of every committee by noticing all its good work, and praising it publicly before the society." In attempting to carry out such advice as the foregoing, the smart boy finds his opportunity. He never lets a meeting go by without securing some applause. "Take off your gloves," says Mr. Wells, "anything that hinders applause has no place in a Christian Endeavor Convention."

A meeting conducted in the spirit of the foregoing instructions is, no doubt, more to the taste of the young people than the sober and sometimes sombre meeting of the older people. But there may be doubt as to its being an improvement in the way of developing devoutness of spirit. At any rate, if such are the methods for securing a good prayer-meeting, the old should adopt them too. But what a strange thing that our inspired guide to a holy life should have omitted all reference to abruptness, novelty and fun as aids to the cultivation of piety.

(c) It may be said that the young people's prayer-meeting is needed to accustom the young people to the sound of their own voice, train them to self-possession, and so develop leadership. Is it certain that we need so many leaders? Do we need that all the girls, as well as boys, should be trained to leadership? When all come to be trained leaders, who will do the following? "Be

not many teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment: for in many things we all stumble. If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man." Does not James admonish us to beware of leadership, because it involves the use of words, and words are the supreme point of danger? Is it not just here that our young people are especially disposed to recklessness? They sling words around with rather a loose hand, and are encouraged to use considerable spice. May they not do a good deal of stumbling by a free use of the tongue?

Moreover, if we have one ideal for a young people's prayer-meeting, and another ideal for the church prayer-meeting, will training in the one fit for leadership in the other? Will a hearty participation in the young people's prayer-meeting, and a fondness for it, cultivate in one a love for the other kind of prayer-meeting? As a matter of fact, do the young people show a growing disposition to attend the church prayer-meeting?

(d) It may be said that the young people's prayer-meeting attracts young people who are not members of the church, and thereby forms a valuable agency for bringing this class of outsiders into the church. It would seem that if the Y. P. S. C. E. can contribute to the growth of the church in any way, this would be the way, by winning the young people. Is there any evidence that it does thus contribute to the growth of the church? Statistics bearing on this specific point are not available, but church growth during the rapid development of the society has some bearing on the subject. President Clark says that the society flourishes most among Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists and Disciples. We may note the record of church growth among the first three named. The two branches of the Presbyterian Church in which the society grows untrammelled are the Northern Presbyterian and the Cumberland. The soil in both these churches seems to be perfectly congenial, and the young people have utmost liberty to carry out the principles of the society. The rate of growth in the Presbyterian Church, North, in the past seven years is one and one-half per cent. In the Cumberland Presbyterian there has been no growth. On the contrary, that church reports 3,946 fewer members now than seven years ago. The rate of growth in the Congregational Church has been

a little over one per cent. The rate of growth in the Northern Methodist Church has been one per cent. In the M. E. Church, South, the rate of growth, for some years past, has been less than one-half of one per cent. In all these churches the normal rate of growth is more than twice that indicated by these figures. The declension is so marked that in the recent conference of the M. E. Church, South, in session at Dallas, Texas, the bishops, in their address, called attention to it, and said that something must be seriously wrong.

It is during these very years of comparative barrenness that the Y. P. S. C. E. has challenged the attention of the world by its marvellous expansion, and its mammoth conventions. As growth, at all times, in church membership is principally from the young, this alarming want of growth is fairly conclusive proof that the Y. P. S. C. E. is not showing itself an influential agency in winning the young people to Christ.

(e) It may be said that the young people's prayer-meeting discovers and brings out material for preachers. If it develops piety and trains for leadership, we might naturally expect to see it giving to the church many hopeful candidates for the ministry. But, alas! this expectation is disappointed, so far, at any rate, as the Presbyterian Church is concerned. The decline in the number of candidates has been more marked than that in the number of members. In the last seven years the falling off has been considerably more than one-third.

There may be abundant reason in the good accomplished to justify the young people in holding their own prayer-meeting, but studying it with a friendly eye, we have failed to see it. We have failed to discover how mere babes in knowledge and in Christian experience can edify each other better than pastors and experienced Christians can edify them. It is somewhat difficult to understand how a few broken sentences from a frightened girl, or an irreverent witticism from a smooth-faced boy, or a startling, abrupt word injected here and there by a skillful leader can minister in any considerable measure to the needs of the spiritual life.

2. The prayer-meeting pledge. This pledge embraces two distinct things (a) a vow to attend all the meetings unless hin-

dered by some cause that will satisfy conscience. There is no time limit to this pledge. The member engages publicly and solemnly to discharge this specific duty with absolute fidelity for an indefinite time, *i. e.*, "honestly interpreted," as long as life shall last. Is it a wise thing to bind ourselves to specific duties for a life time by religious vows? This was a method of religious culture adopted at an early period by many in the church, and found its exemplification in the various orders of monks and nuns. Does the success which has attended it in the Roman Catholic Church commend it to us? Is there not danger that many young people will take this vow without seriously weighing the step, then break it under temptation, and thereby do serious and permanent hurt to the religious life? Has not this result been witnessed in many Christian Endeavor Societies? Mr. Amos R. Wells is an expert in Christian Endeavor work. He is managing editor of the *Christian Endeavor World*, and the author of many writings in the interests of the society. In a little book of practical hints, he says: "If the society is getting lax in the matter of pledge observance, why not have at each meeting, for a while, a five-minutes' paper on some section of the pledge?" Again he says: "Do not hesitate to require your society to sign the pledge again in order to weed out the unfaithful members." Still again he says: "A study of what the Bible has to say about covenants would prove stimulating to pledge keeping." Here is the physician prescribing remedies, and that implies a recognition of disease. Is it not a somewhat serious disease, "laxness in the matter of pledge observance?" One thing which the Bible has to say about covenants is that "it is better not to vow than to vow and not to pay."

(b) A vow to take some public part other than singing in every meeting. Is this vow a wise one? Does it cover an obvious duty? There may be seventy-five or one hundred young people in attendance. How can it be made to appear that it is the duty of every one to take some public part other than singing in the meeting? What need for so many participants? What can they all find to do? There are not more than three or four distinct exercises appropriate to a devotional meeting, offering prayer, reciting scripture and exhortation. To allow all to fulfill their vow, the prayers must be limited to one sentence, and the singing

to one verse. Is this the way to conduct a devotional meeting? Necessity is the mother of invention, certain little devices have been introduced just to enable the members to fulfill their vow. A favorite one is calling for particular hymns, and members who can do nothing else sometimes have lively competition putting in their calls.

The object of this vow is to accustom the young people to give public expression to their religious sentiments. It is supposed that both boys and girls will be greatly benefited by overcoming their natural timidity and reserve, and learning to pray and to talk in religious meetings with perfect self-possession. Is this to be taken for granted? Are we to assume that the timidity and reserve which are natural to young people, especially to girls, are sinful, and therefore a barrier to the rise and progress of religion in the soul? Has it been demonstrated that the destruction of these traits, and the acquisition of an imperturbable self-complacency always result in growth in grace, and the development of a beautiful type of piety? Do we not sometimes see as a result youthful effrontery and flippant self-conceit? In nearly all our congregations there are smart young men, and in some congregations pert young misses, who very promptly avail themselves of the opportunity of making their presence known. They push themselves into positions of leadership, and frequently give an irreverent and frivolous tone to the meetings.

3. It is worthy of note that this same prayer-meeting pledge is taken by all the members. Whatsoever the boys pledge themselves to do, that the girls pledge themselves to do; "there is neither male nor female." The girls take their turn in leading the meeting, in offering up prayer, in expounding scripture and in exhortation. The propriety of this will not now be discussed. It is merely meant to call attention to the fact that it is contrary to the traditions of our church, and has been condemned as contrary to scripture by the highest court of the church, North and South. Are we prepared to yield to this aggressive tendency to give woman a part in the public worship of the church from which she has hitherto been excluded?

It may be said that each local society can regulate this to suit itself. It is insistently emphasized that every local society

is completely under the authority of the session. If, therefore, the session do not wish the girls to lead in prayer, they only have to say so. This sounds very well, but things are not always what they sound to be. It is a thing not unknown for the members to yield obedience to the session while at home and then go directly in the face of the session when away from home. Indeed, it is a thing not unknown for a Y. P. S. C. E., to show an insubordinate spirit toward the session even at home. One of the features of the Y. P. S. C. E. is the interdenominational union. These unions meet monthly. In these meetings the influence of others than our own denomination is controlling. The same is true in the great annual conventions. In the thronging thousands, the representatives from our own and one or two other conservative churches are but a handful. They are young and impressionable, and inevitably they come to think that the views and customs which prevail among their more progressive and more numerous associates are preferable to those of their own church. They soon come to identify conservatism with old fogyism, and then they become restive under the restraints imposed by those for whose judgment they have ceased to have respect. This, then, is to be considered, Will not the interdenominational fellowship result in bringing the whole organization to the acceptance of those views touching woman's position in the church which are now held and practiced by the most advanced wing of the body?

4. Another essential feature is the consecration meeting. This is held every month. The object is to give religious experience, testify for Christ, and renew vows. Is it certain that the monthly repetition of a service of this kind will be conducive to the spiritual welfare of the young? May we not reasonably anticipate one of two results? Either the members will make strained efforts to furnish a new experience every month, and then be led into insincerity; or they will fall into stereotyped forms of expression which have no meaning. Is it not somewhat perilous for young people, naturally giddy and thoughtless, to acquire such familiarity with the forms of sacred worship as no longer to feel any special awe, or reverence for them? A genuine consecration of the soul to God is the highest act of devotion in which one can engage. There ought not to be a necessity for a public

formal repetition of this act monthly. If there be such necessity, the probability is that the appropriate mood cannot be made to keep time with the monthly appointment, and oftentimes the formal consecration will be nothing more than form.

5. One other essential feature is the prayer-meeting, lookout and social committees. There is no objection to cultivating the social side of church life. No doubt the interests of religion may be served by a judicious method of promoting kindly social intercourse among the members. But it is to be considered whether there is not danger of overdoing the thing when provision is made in the permanent machinery of the organization for emphasizing the social side of religion. Young people are rather more disposed to be social than to be religious. There is a strong trend in their natures toward turning the devotional meeting into a social affair. They are certain to have a hilarious time before and after, especially after. The social committee has entrusted to it a very popular branch of the society's work. The duties which devolve on it are very much to its taste. The result is that this department is likely to flourish, even though all other departments should languish. Young people are not always severe in their judgments, nor cautious in their discriminations. Hence it may easily happen that the evening devoted to the sociable will be spent in boisterous abandon in the very same room in which their devotional meetings are customarily held. Moreover, the exercises of the evening devoted to pleasure will be opened and closed with prayer. Thus no broad line is drawn between an evening of merry-making and an evening of worship. Is there not just here a danger that this mingling of the serious and the social, the pious and the playful, will blur the true scriptural conception of worship? In the effort to divest religion of all gloom, and to impart to it a bright and cheery air, so as to conform it to the taste and temperament of the young, may we not go perilously near to destroying the sense of reverence and fail to evoke that consciousness of guilt which should make every sinner, be he old or young, feel very serious and deport himself very humbly when dealing with God?

6. Besides these essential principles, there is one other that demands consideration—its loyalty to the church. The Y. P. S. C. E. lays claim to no merit that has been more insistently adver-

tised than this. The general public is assured, over and over again, that each local society is in thorough accord with the denomination to which it belongs, and entirely submissive to the authorities of the church of which it forms a part. How much does this mean? In the Presbyterian Church, the session exercises rule, or is supposed to do so, over the congregation. Loyalty to the church means submission to the session in all matters involving the doctrines and polity of the church. Suppose a session should disapprove of interdenominational union, on the ground that it endangers some of the distinctive doctrines and principles of our church. Suppose a session should propose to the society under its jurisdiction to withdraw from those who walk disorderly. What would loyalty and submission require? One would think that a flock of docile little lambs would, in such case, yield ready obedience. But, according to our observation, such would not be the result. We have known it tried in more than one case, and the response has been, "You can kill us, but you can't change us." No local society is a *bona fide* Christian Endeavor Society, unless it have those essentia which President Clark lays down; and if it have all those, it will be in such close sympathy with all other Christian Endeavor Societies as to make interdenominational fellowship necessary to its life. But interdenominational fellowship and submission to the session are compatible only when the session can give up, as not worth contending for, certain distinctive principles of our church.

Of course, loyalty to the church and submission to its authority do not mean that the young people give up their right to deliberate and vote in the call of a pastor; but how about their using the whole power of their organization to determine a matter so important as the call of a pastor? Recently a talented young brother visited a vacant pulpit on invitation of the session. He preached to the delight of the congregation. A committee from the Y. P. S. C. E. waited on him, and asked him if he loved their society. He frankly confessed that, whereas he had once been a lover, closer and more protracted acquaintance had chilled his affections. They notified him that no call would be extended. In another church, a congregation met to call a pastor. While the name of an excellent brother was under discussion, a member of the Christian Endeavor Society rose to his feet, and objected

to him in the name of his society. That settled the question. Other like instances are known to the writer. It would hardly be a rash generalization, from the facts observed, to say that no church with what is called a "live" Christian Endeavor Society would dare to call a pastor who for any reason was unacceptable to the said "live" society. Is it a felicitous use of language to say that an organization is submissive when it not only seeks to control, but actually does control in the most important matter pertaining to church administration? It is a little like the submission of the Jesuits. They vow absolute obedience to the pope, and then see to it that no one can be pope who would dare cross their wishes. There are strong men in our church who are barred from some of the influential pastorates of the church because of their known opposition to certain features of the Christian Endeavor Society. Is not the matter taking on rather a serious aspect when one's standing in the ministry of his church is tested by his attitude, not toward the young people, but toward some of the principles embodied in this organization? If a pastor of lax views touching the position of woman in the church organizes his young people into a Christian Endeavor Society, and teaches the girls to take part in the conduct of public worship, he thereby practically determines the character of his successor. When he vacates the pulpit, a man of correspondingly lax views must be found to take his place. Otherwise, the loyal and submissive young people will be up in arms. Thus it has already come to pass in many of our congregations that one of the test questions when a preacher is nominated for the pastorate, is, "Is he a Christian Endeavorer?"

In the foregoing criticism it is not meant to imply that there is nothing good in the Y. P. S. C. E. A society that has received the endorsement of so many wise and good men, through all these years of its existence, must have something in it commendable. But is the good so manifest and so extensive as to justify us in giving the society the full right of way in our churches, and in letting it fix unchallenged our estimate of its merits? Is it so good as to be free from evils, and its tendencies so healthful as that they may safely be left to develop *ad libitum, et ad infinitum*?

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

IV.

THE ETERNAL FUTURE OF INFANTS

IN THE LIGHT OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION AND OF HOLY
SCRIPTURE.

THINKING on the above-named subject, one day, on my way to a sick-room, as I left the electric car, my attention was arrested by that sad emblem of maternal grief, a white crepe streamer, with printed notice reading, "Lydia Lillian B—— died at such a time, aged eleven months and sixteen days." At the other end of the short block (there was one house between) was an octogenarian drawing nigh the same bourne, and since dead! Death at both ends of the life-line! The babe, I was informed, had died of cholera infantum, which slays its thousands every year, and is largely, from various causes, a city disease. Whether improved sanitation, in perfect drainage, careful plumbing, and honest inspection of milk and water supplies, has anywhere reduced town bills of infant mortality, we have as yet seen no disproof, or even questioning, of the current statement that one-half the race die in infancy! What becomes of this mighty host is a deeply interesting problem. A glance at the infant's form, its spinal column evidently intending it for erect posture and movement, and early dawning of reflection and reasoning, would suggest the belief of a different destiny for these little ones from that of the myriad orchard blooms, which in nature's wastage never come to fruitage, and the countless young of animals, from innumerable causes, cut off before maturity. "Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth!" Reason infers, what revelation affirms, infant immortality. Of all the dead, without exception, it is said in scripture, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, but the spirit unto God who gave it."

Admitting their immortality, which none will dispute who

credit human immortality at all, what becomes of these young spirits at death?

The Romanist faith, while sending all baptized infants, dying ~~such~~, directly to heaven, invents for the unbaptized dying infants (a far mightier host) an obscure region, not exactly hell, but not heaven, as their everlasting home, and coolly debates whether their punishment for Adam's sin, and his inherited sinful nature, will be one of positive suffering or simple negation of heavenly bliss, and urges, therefore, the necessity of speedy baptism as essential to salvation.¹

Protestantism, on the contrary, the religion of the Bible, knows of but two places beyond the grave, heaven and hell. With us the inquiry takes the final form: Which of the two is now the home of departed infants, and will be to such, departing, to the end of time, and their residence for all eternity? Pursuing the order of the Confession, which gives, first, man's definitions, and then God's proof texts, I discuss—

I. THE ETERNAL FUTURE OF INFANTS, DYING IN INFANCY, IN THE LIGHT OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSON OF FAITH.

This aspect of the inquiry takes on a new interest because of modern assaults, from within and without, upon a certain section of our Confession of Faith. The old slander, which one might reasonably have hoped forever laid in its ignoble grave—that Presbyterians teach “that there are infants a span long in hell”—has been revived in scarcely less slanderous and insulting form. Fiction even takes part, if it did not lead the hue and cry. Paul Leicester Ford, in his *Janice Meredith*, represents a Presbyterian mother as changed from a tender, lovable woman into a severe, harsh, unattractive being, and the transformation wrought by two sermons (they are not among his published sermons) preached by Jonathan Edwards, “in his brief term as president of Nassau Hall,” convincing her that “her four babies were enduring everlasting torment.” The novelist perhaps overlooked the slight circumstance that Edwards, though president of Princeton, was a Congregational and not a Presbyterian minister! The charge

¹ *Den's Theology*, Vol. III., page 339. De pœnis parvulorum in solo peccato originali decedentium.

was repeated, some time since, from Plymouth pulpit by one at the time a Presbyterian minister connected with Chicago Presbytery, and with the similar use of Edwards; and, echoed by another metropolitan pulpit, this time Presbyterian, and by a Presbyterian pastor, it has been taken up in concert, and repeated in chorus by less familiar voices, viz., that the now-famous clause in the chapter "Of Effectual Calling" about "elect infants" does teach infant damnation.

What, then, is the actual teaching of the Confession of Faith in confessedly the only clause bearing directly on the subject in dispute?

Here the writer may be permitted to quote from a sermon preached in the Napoleon Avenue Presbyterian Church, and published in the columns of the *Times-Democrat* of New Orleans, by its request, but covering the wider field of the broader assault.

It is a matter for congratulation that thus a multitude of readers, many of whom never heard before of the Westminster Confession, have had, through the courtesy of the secular press, the reading of the two entire chapters containing the obnoxious statements, and so Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Christian and infidel, have thus had the opportunity of examining at first hand our credal statements, and of judging for themselves, not only what Presbyterians, North and South, believe, but, what perhaps is more interesting, if not more important at this juncture, what they do not believe.

I quote, leaving off the numerals, which, with the fragments they indicate, like the artificial arrangement of verses in the Bible, sometimes interrupt the flow of thought and even obscure sense:

"Let us now come to the other clause. Here again we have a right to complain of similar unfairness of quotation, so we give the whole chapter—Chapter X.—'Of Effectual Calling.' This describes what is ordinarily called regeneration and conversion, but here described from the standpoint of God's agency in it, 'All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his Word and Spirit out of the state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; en-

lightening their minds, spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God; taking away the heart of stone and giving unto them a heart of flesh, renewing their wills, and, by his almighty power, determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ, yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace. This effectual call is of God's free grace, and especial 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 in it. Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through his Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth. So also are other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word. Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and, therefore, cannot be saved; much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they profess (did they anticipate comparative religion), and to assert and maintain they may be is pernicious, and to be detested.'

'Now it is freely admitted that, construed by itself, the clause in question might seem to teach the election and salvation of some dying infants, and the non-election and perdition of others. But it is but fair to us to say this sense or inference, for it is only such, is repudiated by the entire body of Presbyterians, and the doctrine taught only by one or two ancient writers of mark. We do not so understand it when subscription is made. But, again, after a renewed and careful study, I am convinced that it was meant positively to teach no such repellent doctrine as the damnation of any infants, as such. And my reasons for so believing are several. First, note this fact: The original draft of this section read, 'Elect of infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth.' Elect of infants would clearly have meant to describe a certain number of infants belonging to the mass of

infants dying such, and, taken out of the mass, are saved, leaving the rest to perish; but note, they expunged that, and wrote, without the 'of,' 'elect infants dying,' etc. Observe, further, they do not say elect and baptized infants, etc. Leaving off baptized lets in the unbaptized babes. Again, observe this clause is not in the chapter defining the eternal decrees of God, but that defining effectual calling, or application of sovereign grace.

"Beginning with adult sinners, they show first how the elect among them are saved, viz., by voluntary, intelligent, and personal acceptance of gospel terms; but how about other elect, as infants and idiots, who, dying as they are, cannot understand the way of life through faith and repentance? Recollecting that there were two classes of infants, those dying such and those living to maturity, they say, 'Elect infants dying in infancy,' as well as feeble-minded adults, are saved by the Spirit without the Word, and by the sovereign pleasure of Almighty God, working when and where he pleaseth.

"At the most, they simply go as far as 'thus saith the Lord' warrants. All the elect will be saved, because God ordains the means as well as the end, and he will save all the adults through personal faith and repentance, and all the infants and incompetent adults, by the power of the sovereign Spirit, working when and where and how he will, not only effectually calling a Paul in his manhood, but sanctifying a John from the womb.

"So far, then, from our Confession being committed to infant damnation, it not only proves the possibility of infant salvation by pointing out the way, but gives, in connection with scripture representations of man's fallen nature, the only hope for the infant dead, to-wit, the sovereign will of an electing God. Our creed really teaches infant salvation by proving and explaining the possibility without the word, and holds out the hope at least for all dying in infancy, or born feeble-minded, and in this, I am of the opinion, it is alone among the credal statements of Christendom."

To this allow me to add these three remarks: First, my authority for the statement about the expunging of the preposition "of" from the first draft: *The Baird Lecture for 1882*, by Alexander Mitchell, D. D., LL. D., emeritus professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, joint editor of

Minutes of the Westminster Assembly, page 408. Reference in the margin to *Minutes of the Westminster Assembly*, page 162, *sec. 534*; and which, by the way, he construes as we have done. Secondly, no one that we have ever heard of has ever charged the Westminster Confession with teaching the damnation of non-elect idiots, yet, if it bears the meaning ascribed to it in the one clause, it must in the other. Thirdly, there is, therefore, no occasion for the revision of this clause in the chapter on "Effectual Calling." Our Confession of Faith is a piece of solid masonry, not built on the lines of Corinthian ornamentation, it may be, but of Doric simplicity, possibly not of marble, but of granite. What if a stone or two offend our idea of beauty, the plummet reveals no deflection from the perpendicular, and removal might imperil the whole structure, and be the wished-for signal for tearing down much, and rebuilding with inferior material, and out of plumb with the rest. Indeed, this wordy war is not so much against expression of truth as truth expressed! The world, and some in the church, will be content with nothing less than the destruction of the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty in Human Salvation, but as it happens, that would only leave the more difficult task of eliminating it from the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, and could not be done without the aid of higher critics of the infidel stamp.

So much for our Confession of Faith on the eternal future of infants.

II. THE ETERNAL FUTURE OF INFANTS, DYING SUCH, IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Our first observation is, that there is no positive assertion, in so many words, of the salvation of any infants dying such in the Bible, as, for example, after this form, "All infants dying infants go to heaven." It is, however, an inference which comes by "good and necessary consequence," a rule of interpretation announced by the Confession itself, and a just rule, especially where applied to divine statements, because the contents of every proposition, explicit or implicit, used by God must be known to the Omniscient. Of course, there is peril in man's application of the rule, but that does not forbid its sober and careful use.

First, then, as it is Bible truth that all the elect will be saved, it was safe to say "elect infants dying in infancy" will be saved, for this is the end of their election or designation by the sovereign grace of the Lord. As for the seed of believers dying in infancy, the Abrahamic covenant, the charter of the church of all dispensations, secures their salvation. Read in full, that covenant runs thus, "I will be a God to thee, and I will be a God to thy seed after thee." It means as much and the same in the one clause as the other. It is only as children of the covenant coming to responsibility reject or refuse to claim the privileges of their spiritual birthright that they forfeit its advantages; but baptized infants of believing parents, dying before the possibility of disavowal of the covenant, reap all its advantages. We maintain, therefore, that circumcision under the law, and baptism coming in its room under the gospel, are divine and visible pledges of the salvation of the children of God's people dying in the irresponsibility of infancy. The marvellous contrast between David's mourning over the deaths of two of his children has always seemed to me proof that he, inspired man of God and sweet singer of Israel, firmly believed in infant salvation, or at least considered the covenant as securing the salvation of the seed of the righteous, perishing before maturity. There is no note of hope in the heart-broken wail over the miserable end of his wretched, handsome son Absalom, hurled, by Joab's darts, in red-handed rebellion against God, king and father, into eternity: "Oh! Absalom, my son Absalom, would God I had died for thee; oh! Absalom, my son, my son." But joy of future meeting throbs in his other utterance over his dead babe: "But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

I never in all my life knew one with such robustness of intellect and strength of will and independence of thought and fearlessness in searching for and announcing truth, as Rev. Dr. Charles Colcock Jones, of Georgia. Yet never did I ever meet one who more thoroughly submitted intellect and will and life to ascertained doctrine and precept of the Word. A "thus saith the Lord" was with him a finality, and beyond it he would not as expounder of God's book take one step! Now in my early ministry I heard

him preach a discourse at the funeral of the firstborn of a pastor of the old Midway Church, and he distinctly took and openly held the ground that the infant children of the covenant dying in infancy the Bible taught are saved, and beyond that he only would go in hope. This was probably the position of the framers of the Confession.

It will not, I hope, however, be called presumption if "I also declare mine opinion." Here I may be permitted again to use my own material:

"As for myself, I believe in universal infant salvation; that is to say, in the salvation of all infants in pagan or Christian lands, dying in infancy, baptized or unbaptized, and I think I have, by 'good and necessary consequence,' warrant for that belief. I purposely forego what some regard as a proof-text, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of heaven,' and for several reasons. First, because the exegesis which bases the Saviour's supposed claim of heaven for them, viz., on their innocence, is anti-scriptural, and, secondly, because, while Calvin, who, by the way, on the strength of one passage of at least doubtful interpretation, is accused of teaching infant damnation, uses the incident and words with skill and force against the Anabaptists, who refused children baptism, and incidentally teaches infant salvation through sovereign grace, it has seemed to me that Jesus was there defining membership in the church on earth, his kingdom, viz., children of God's people and childlike adults. Passing by the baptized children of the covenant dying babes, to whom God promises to be God, and whose salvation is acknowledged as sure, finding in my Bible that the reasons assigned for human perdition are all or mainly such as are impossible to babes; such as sinning against the natural light of reason and conscience, willful transgressions of law, rejection of the gospel, grieving the Spirit away, I infer from the Word itself the salvation of all infants dying any where, baptized or unbaptized.

"What a lovely light this belief lets fall on the myriads of little mounds holding the dear, small bodies from which countless young spirits have fled from pagan and Christian homes to the bosom of the children's great Friend; even infanticide, horrible,

unnatural crime as it is, is robbed of some of its dreadfulness, if of none of its guilt, by being overruled to infant salvation!

“As Henry Rogers, in his *Greyson's Letters*, beautifully phrases it, ‘The arch-enemy has in this case outwitted himself; he has been even rendering heaven more populous, much against his will, hounding into the everlasting fold the young lambs of the flock, who would otherwise have lost themselves “on the dark mountains.”’ ”

I close with a fine passage, awakening tender memories in parental hearts not a few, sound in theology, exquisite in poetry, from Bickersteth's *Yesterday, To-day and Forever*, reminding of a sweet thought of Harbaugh in his *Heavenly Recognition*, possibly familiar to the poet, that as babes add so much to our earthly homes, something analogous to this should be in our Father's house; that is to say, while saved infants will ever grow in knowledge and advance in character, they will ever retain about them certain indefinable infantile graces, making them inexpressibly dear to such an one as Paul the aged, and all like him, triumphant but battle-scarred saints.

A babe in glory is a babe forever.
 Perfect as spirits and able to pour forth
 Their glad hearts in tongues which angels use,
 These nurslings gathered in God's nursery
 Forever grow in loveliness and love,
 (Growth is the law of all intelligence),
 Yet cannot pass the limit which defines
 Their being. They have never fought the fight,
 Nor borne the heat and burden of the day,
 Nor stagger'd underneath the weary cross;
 Conceived in sin, they sinned not. Though they died,
 They never shuddered with the fear of death;
 These things they know not and can never know.
 Yet children of a fallen race,
 And early to transgression like the rest,
 Sure victims, they were bought with Jesus' blood,
 And cleansed by Jesus' Spirit and redeem'd
 By his omnipotent arm from death and hell;
 A link between mankind and angelhood;
 As born of woman sharer with all saints
 In that great ransom paid upon the cross;
 In purity and inexperience
 Of guilt, akin to angels. Infancy
 Is one thing, manhood one. And babes, though part

Of the true archetypal house of God,
Built on the heavenly Zion, are not now,
Nor will ever be, massive rocks, or fluted shafts
Of columns, or far shadowing pinnacles,
But rather as the delicate lily-work
By Hiram wrought for Solomon of old,
Enwreathed upon the brazen chapters,
Or flowers of lilies round the molten sea.
Innumerable flowers thus bloom and blush
In heaven. Nor reckon God's design in them
Frustrate or shorn of full accomplishment;
The lily is as perfect as the oak;
And Sharon's roses are as beautiful
As Lebanon's majestic cedar crown."

ROBERT QUARTERMAN MALLARD.

NEW ORLEANS, *April*, 1902.

V.

DANTE, THE POET, THE POLITICIAN, THE PROTESTANT.

THE Christian religion has been the inspiration of the world's greatest music, art and poetry. The Hebrew mind was essentially poetical. It thought in pictures, it spake in metaphors. Intellect was overshadowed by imagination. The didactic clothed itself in the many colored robes of rhetorical figure. Language fell into the forms of poetry as the thunder of the sea, the sighing of the winds and the murmur of the streams of nature assume a cadence, rhythm and measure. So these great Hebrew thinkers and teachers, Moses, Job, David and Solomon, yes, and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel—

“Spake in numbers, for the numbers came.”

The gospel which had been prophesied in 2,000 years of wondrous song was heralded on the morning of Christ's birth by a poem writ in heaven, by a strain of music from the skies. Christ's own teachings are rich in metaphor and simile. In his profoundest philosophy of life Jesus appealed to the imagination; he clothed his ethical ideas in poetic figures. And in spirit, if not in form, every parable was a poem. When Christianity came in contact with the world-thought it found a mental and moral attitude which had been inspired by a poetic appeal to the imagination. The philosophers were not ruling the common mind; they never had ruled it; they never can rule it. The people were what their poets had made them; they always will be. The common mind does not deal with abstractions, it reasons in figures; it thinks not with its intellect, but with its imagination. That is why the ideal teacher taught the people in parables or in word pictures.

In the gospel a new system of religious truth presented itself to the imagination. Before its hopeful glories the old emblems,

symbols and figures of life, of death and of futurity lost their charm and fascination. The people began to dream new dreams and to see new visions. Old things were passing away, all things were becoming new. At first, the converted mind was filled with the evangelistic spirit. Every new disciple of Jesus became a new light and a new voice. Later, the converted mind fell into contemplation and philosophy; it essayed to solve and explain the mysteries of religion. Theologies were evolved. Definitions were demanded and constructed. Creeds were written. Ecclesiasticism developed. The church as an organic religious institution rose and grew in authority and power. Religion, in time, became formal, ceremonial, perfunctory; preaching and teaching became scholastic. The soul asked for bread but received a stone; it asked for the rose and the lily, but was given a thorn; it thirsted for the water of life and was offered the ashes of theology. But the pent up longing, hunger and thirst of the Middle Ages, a thousand years of unsatisfied feeling, of suppressed imagination, finally burst forth in the song of Dante, who poured all the philosophy and science and theology of the schools and church into that sublime epic of the Soul's Destiny, the Divine Comedy or the Vision of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise. Again the power of poetry asserted itself. The new mind said: "This is the highest, noblest form of thought." Here is the first truly great Christian epic, the first poetic embodiment of the scheme of salvation. From that day to this the Christian doctrines of salvation have been creating the new music, art and poetry of the new heaven and the new earth.. They have been appealing to the soul's faith, hope and aspiration through a regenerate imagination. Thus Dante becomes the forerunner of Tasso and Ariosto, Milton, Tennyson and Browning, if not, indeed, of Shakespeare and Goethe.

Dante Alighieri was born in 1265; he was a Tuscan, like Raphael, Michael Angelo, Petrarch, Boccaccio and Galileo. He was born sixty years before Wycliffe, the morning star of the Reformation, and seventy-five years before Chaucer, the first of the truly great English poets. He antedated Milton by nearly three hundred and fifty years. Quite an interesting parallel may

be noticed in the characteristics of these Christian poets, Dante and Milton. The Italian gave his childish mind to study and soon became master of the scholasticism of his time. Although no scholar in the thirteenth century could have been as universal in knowledge as the most learned man of the seventeenth century was, nevertheless, all that was then to be known in science, history, philosophy, theology and classic lore had been acquired by Dante. With both of these superlative minds the theme of transcendent importance was religion. They reasoned on humanity, on divinity, on time, on eternity, on life, on immortality, on the relation of humanity to divinity, on the moral value of conduct, on the basis of character, on the philosophy of destiny. They lifted their mighty minds to the task of penetrating the origin and final consequences of sin, the mystery and meaning of redemption, the character and work of Jesus Christ, the inscrutable ways of providence, the justifying power of grace, the possibility of a future endless life. Surely themes like these which challenge the contemplation of master minds and evoke the noblest song of the ages, may well be worthy of our study. Religion is a subject which appeals to every pure heart and exalted intellect, to every man of profound sensibility, virile convictions and refined imagination.

Dante, like Milton, was born in troublous times, and he was so constituted that he could not keep out of the trouble. He was a patriot. That is to say, like the great English poet, he took an active interest in the welfare of society, in politics, in the affairs of his country. These men could not, as do so many, be merely passive, indifferent patriots, citizens receiving the blessings of law and liberty, of social organization and general civilization, without a thought of rendering unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. In one respect Dante was equally with Milton an ideal patriot; he took an active, conscientious interest in the political condition and welfare of his country. Doubtless the great poets, as a rule, have been like him. It was true of Homer the Greek, David the Hebrew, Virgil the Roman. It has been true of our own poets, Lowell, Whitman, Longfellow, Whittier, and of the English poets from Chaucer to Milton and from Milton to Tennyson and Browning.

In Dante's time, as in Milton's, society was disturbed by a religio-political conflict. If in this far-off day the student is not interested enough to care whether Dante was a Guelph or a Ghibelline, it is of interest to know that Dante protested against the union of church and state, and insisted that the spiritual and secular, the ecclesiastical and political, should not be combined in the government. He contended against the secularization of the church. He believed it should attend to its own spiritual and ecclesiastical business, and not interfere with affairs of state. He had the spirit of our fathers who laid the foundations of this republic. The first protest of this first great protestant was against what we may call the temporal power of the papacy, the political assumptions and ambitions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. It would not be true to affirm that Dante had as advanced notions as we Americans have on this subject of ecclesiastical non-interference with affairs of state. He went no farther than to insist that the political should be independent of the ecclesiastical and the ecclesiastical independent of the political. The church, in his view, should not possess temporal power. That was a courageous position for one to take in such an early day. It was the first strenuous protest of a great intellect against the secularization and corruption of the church. No man up to his day had come so near our modern idea of a republican as Dante. Government then was mostly municipal. Rome, Pisa, Venice and Florence were governments in themselves, and Dante believed in their republicanism and resisted the encroachments of both ecclesiastical and imperial power. Municipal independence, free, self-government, was his high ideal. His politics do not seem to have been relished by either the imperial or the ecclesiastical powers. Each party, in turn, claimed him, and he was crushed between them as between the upper and nether millstone. By the machinations of a Pope of Rome he was banished from Florence, and from that day the cloud of melancholy rested upon his spirit. That his nature was soured and embittered need not seem remarkable when we consider his intense patriotism, his love of Florence and his pride in the glories of Tuscany. An exile from his own beloved Florence, he proved to be its greatest genius, and

even to this day that city mourns that his mighty ashes sleep in Ravenna, the city which gave him a welcome. Of the three greatest poets of history it must be said they were not appreciated by their own.

“Seven wealthy towns contend for Homer dead,
Through which the living Homer begged his bread.”

John Milton, the greatest scholar, republican and poet of the seventeenth century England, sat in darkness like—

“The blind old bard of Scio’s Rocky Isle,”

and in that darkness was neglected and forgotten, that, too, in an age which the splendor of his intellect alone rescued from utter shame and degeneracy. Dante Alighieri, the most consummate poetical genius since Virgil, if not the most original and richly imaginative epic singer since Homer, was a wanderer on the face of the earth, seeking in Italy, France and even England that sympathy and literary fellowship which were denied him in his own beloved but cruel Florence. Have we not in this exile of Dante another proof that great minds sing their noblest songs out of the depths of great sorrow rather than from the heights of joy and spiritual exaltation? There seems to be a wise philosophy in this. Ease and luxury, the blandishments and caresses of society, soften men. Vigor and virility come from conflict, struggle, opposition, effort. The lightning flashes of genius and the thunders of true eloquence belong to the grandeur and sublimity of the storm. Men are pushed, crowded, fought to their greatness. As the steel strikes the spark from the flint, so adversity from a conviction-inspired genius may strike the splendid flashes of immortal eloquence, and as the angry gusts of the tempest wake the Æolian harp to its deepest, most mysterious music, so the sorrows of a stormy, troubled life may rouse the gifted soul of the bard to his most sublime song. It may be doubted whether a Moses, a Paul, a Savonarola, a Homer, a Socrates, or a Dante had ever been heard of by this age had not the wisdom been crushed from them like the sweet fragrance from the bruised roses.

Dante had but little if any aristocratic blood in his veins to corrupt his original genius. It would seem that the ancestor

of whom he was proudest was a Crusader who acquitted himself valiantly and was slain in the holy cause of the cross, of which he was a famous knight. He is the only relative Dante found in Purgatory. The poet dared not even assign him to Paradise. The greatness of Dante's genius impresses us most profoundly when we consider that he stood alone in his age, focusing in his transcendent imagination all the glory that had been gathering for a thousand songless years. At best, he could gather inspiration only from such far off intellects as Virgil and Homer and the Hebrew bards, while Milton had all these, with Shakespeare, Spenser, Tasso, Ariosto, Chaucer and Dante himself in addition, to gather wisdom from and to emulate. Dante, then, was the morning star of the new intellectualism. There his splendid genius hangs on the verge of night, on the horizon of a new born morning, where the age of darkness and chaos ends, where the age of reason and harmony begins. Dante's song and soul were a prophecy, they held the promise of which our enlightenment and liberties are the fulfilment. Had there then been living seers like Isaiah or Daniel they might have foretold that after such a soul as Dante had appeared and such a song as his had been sung, there would evolve a Renaissance, a revival of learning, a Reformation, an English Revolution, a French Revolution, an American Republic, free alike from ecclesiastical and political tyranny—

“Broad based upon the people's will.”

Dante sounded the reveille of freedom. Heine calls him the “Catholic Homer.” Yes, “Catholic,” since all Latin Christians were then Catholic. But had he lived in later ages he would have stood with Savonarola, or with Luther, or with Milton, or with Cromwell, or with Washington, on the firing line, with the advancing hosts of religious and political liberty. He, however, most surely would have burned with certain other reformers, and would have died with Huss, Bruno, Savonarola and Cranmer, a martyr to liberty of thought, independence of judgment and freedom of conscience. He escaped the diabolical Inquisition, which closed the mouth and put a fetter on the brain of Galileo, and which fertilized the soil of Europe with the ashes of truth-honoring and

liberty-loving thinkers who caught his spirit in later years. He had in his moral constitution good martyr stuff. He had the courage of his convictions, and suffered exile for them. He had proven his mettle on the field, and he possessed the martial spirit which distinguished his ancestor who was slain in the Crusades. He was a remarkable combination of soldier, statesman, scholar, philosopher, patriot and poet—by all measurements the greatest brain, the most noble soul of his age. He was a pure man, the incarnation of lofty conscience. His ideals seemed visionary to the grovelling mind of the thirteenth century. They were ideals worthy of Thomas Aquinas, of Bernard, of St. John, of Elijah, ideals worthy of the best minds of after ages, of Angelo, of Knox, of Milton, of Burke.

Dante saw the corruptions of the church, and did not hesitate to rebuke them. With command of the most vigorous rhetoric and the most strident, magnificent eloquence the world had heard since Cicero or Demosthenes, he arraigned the Romish hierarchy for its crimes against liberty, purity, justice, charity and gospel truth. He laid the crimes of oppression, simony, tyranny, sensuality and political murder at the very doors of the church. He was persecuted, but he used his pen as warrior never used his sword against his persecutors. Perhaps one of the most reasonable interpretations of the "Divine Comedy" which has appeared is that which represents this great epic as a religio-political attack on Rome. This was the theory of Rossetti, the commentator on Dante and the Professor of Italian in King's College, London. If this interpretation be the true one, then Dante was the first distinguished *Protestant*, antedating Wycliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," by a lifetime, and preceding Luther by more than two hundred years. Dante embodied both the intellectual and moral spirit of the dawning Renaissance, for we shall find that the epoch was characterized by mental and spiritual reaction from the policy of Rome. Dante was followed by Petrarch and Boccaccio, who imbibed the literary taste and the anti-papal politics of the exiled Tuscan. They added elegance to the Italian language, and used their classical wit in a subtle exposure of the corruptions of the priesthood, and the oppressive political ambitions and intrigues of the papacy. The first re-

publican, the first Protestant, the first poet of superlative intellect, Dante was the torch bearer of a new age, the new voice of prophecy and hope crying in the wilderness: the cry once more needed as of old was, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." Dante's relation to the new intellectual awakening was initiative, creative. He was its father. His brain was its cradle, his heart its primal fountain head. All the culture of the Renaissance was the harvest of his sowing. He made possible not only the art of Cimabue and Giotto in his own time, but he was the inspiration of Raphael and Da Vinci, of Titian, and Michael Angelo. Dante painted the frescoes of the Sistine Chapel, because his song filled the soul of Angelo with the conceptions which he only copied on the Sistine walls. Dante awakened the Italian imagination, hence he created the art which made Florence, Rome and Venice splendid. Indeed, Giotto, who painted Dante's portrait, was the poet's disciple; so in later years was Michael Angelo. Savonarola, the reformer and martyr, was a student of his work, and found in his life and song an inspiration to his own mission.

The literary value of Dante is found not only in the art of his work, the originality and sublimity of his great epic, but in his influence on all subsequent literature. The Tuscan flavor given to the Italian language made it a fine literary language, and Dante gave literary perfection to this Tuscan element. Perhaps no man contributed more elegance, vigor, richness and literary possibility to the Italian, than the author of the "Divine Comedy." He did as much for that language as did Chaucer for the English. Petrarch, Boccaccio, Tasso and Ariosto were all indebted to Dante and his regenerative, if not creative, influence on the language which they used with such a grace and power. This was in itself a noble work. To have enlarged, purified, invigorated, perfected a language, to have fitted it for the expression of a people's deepest feeling, holiest hope and aspiration, grandest faith and conviction, was to have elevated the thought and imagination of a people, and to have transfigured their entire character and life. Dante brought to his task a learned and philosophical mind, and in the realm of theology was a master of the entire Catholic scheme of salvation. His familiarity with history, mythology, classic lore and the science of his time is evident

in his great poem. No less evident is it that he studied nature, not only with a poet's fine imagination, but also with a scientist's detail and a philosopher's penetration. The Ptolemaic system of astronomy in particular had been a theme of profound interest to him, and his poem in its location of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise is based on that system. His theology belonged to the Middle Ages; it was the corrupted Christianity of Romanism. Hence we may regard his notions of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise as the Roman Catholic system, and his poem, if not a subtle attack upon that system, was an illustration or exposition of it. That the "Inferno" created a sensation when it appeared may well be imagined when we consider that in his journey through hell Dante found men who had figured prominently in the history of his country. Sad to say, some very interesting people were doomed to everlasting Inferno. Plato and Socrates were there, with many a poet, philosopher, artist and warrior. But, most startling revelation of all, not a few priests, bishops, cardinals and popes were consigned to the regions over the entrance to which was the melancholy legend: "Who enter here leave hope behind." Certain then late distinguished citizens of Florence, Pisa and Rome were found in that infernal abode. Indeed, so personal was the poem that the very names, birthplaces, professions and crimes of these doomed souls were given in the poem. The leading families became interested to know who of their departed kindred were in hell, and what was the character of their punishment. The fact is, so many of those who had been powerful and influential in church and in state, were by Dante consigned to Inferno, and so few were by him found in Paradise, that we must recognize this poem as an arraignment of society and a protest of a great intellect and a newly awakened conscience against the corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church. It was the signal of the coming Reformation. It was the prophecy of Protestantism. Dante was the first great Protestant.

FRANK M. BRISTOL.

Metropolitan M. E. Church, Washington, D. C.

VI.

BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER, D. D., LL. D.

“How is the strong staff broken, the beautiful rod!” We came but a little while since from his burial. The scene is fresh in mind; it has not faded in the least. Our hearts are still aching and bleeding, and the tears still flow, as we think and speak of him. But it is a holy sorrow, purified by the unselfish, gentle, ennobling memories which he has left with us. And so it would be a greater grief if we might not recall him in thought and speech, and dwell fondly, tenderly on his life and character. Just now we are asked to write about him, as we knew him, his life, his work; and we know not how it can be done with adequacy of treatment, with that perfect judicial composure of mind so necessary to a just estimate, and within the brief space of time allowed, in which to make proper selection from the abundant material available, the deep impressions of nearly twenty-five years of intimate association, as well as the tributes from a thousand sources, all testifying to the exalted worth and nobility of the Christian gentleman, the patriotic citizen, the true and tender husband, father and friend, the kind helper and comforter of the poor and the sorrowing, the loving guide of the erring and sinful, the eloquent orator, the wise counsellor, the faithful preacher of the “glorious gospel of the blessed God,” the model pastor, the profound theologian, the scholar of wide and varied learning, the man of God! The request, to which these pages are a feeble and inadequate response, comes to the writer as a command which may not be disobeyed, calling for such service as this faltering hand can render, in memory of the greatest and best-loved man of his day!

BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER was born in Charleston, S. C., on January 25, 1818, and departed this life from his home in New Orleans, La., May 28, 1902, being in his eighty-fifth year. He was one of a family noted in the history of this country from

the early settlement of the colonies. William Palmer, the ancestor of the American family of Palmers, came to these shores on the first ship that arrived after the *Mayflower*. From that day to the present there has been no time when there was not some representative of the family rising above the average in distinction for ability and character, in the ministry and in other walks in life; and among the numerous descendants have been many, both of men and women, of great eminence for ability, learning and piety. They came of English ancestry on both sides, father and mother, both running back to the colonial times.

Next to William Palmer was his son, Samuel Palmer, one of the first students of Harvard, the first college in America; having graduated, he entered the ministry, and attained distinction as a learned and pious man of God; he died in 1755, at the age of sixty-eight years.

A son of this Samuel, Job, it next appears, moved to Charleston, S. C., some time before the Revolutionary War, making that his home, and dying there at the age of ninety-seven years. He had two sons, B. M. and Edward. The elder of these, B. M. Palmer, D. D., was a graduate of Princeton College, New Jersey, and was for many years pastor of the Circular Church, Charleston. The second of the two was the Rev. Edward Palmer, who was the father of the Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D., the subject of this brief sketch.

The two brothers just named married two sisters, daughters of Captain Jared Bunce, a sea captain running into Charleston in the early coast trade, a man of high repute, both in his native State, Connecticut, and in Charleston, the home of his adoption. Three of his daughters married ministers of the gospel; and it is recorded of them that they were all remarkable women, distinguished for intellectual attainments and piety.

The mother of our Dr. B. M. Palmer was Sarah Bunce. She was born in Weathersfield, Conn. She was a woman of remarkably strong mind, highly educated, refined, a great reader, a deep thinker. She was noted for her exalted character, her devotion to her duties as a pastor's wife. She had a sunny disposition, which made her a general favorite, but especially with the young. She died at the age of sixty years, leaving four children, two

daughters and two sons; of these four, but two survive—one son, the Rev. Dr. Edward P. Palmer, pastor of the church at Harrisonburg, Va., and Mrs. I. M. Hutson, of McPhersonville, S. C. Dr. Palmer's father did not decide to enter the ministry until after his marriage. Then he went to Andover, Mass., entering the Seminary without the usual preparatory and collegiate course. But such were his attainments that Yale College bestowed upon him the degree of bachelor of arts upon examination. Returning to South Carolina, he took up his life-work as a minister, and lived there to the good old age of ninety-four years. Well do we remember his appearance the last time that we saw him in New Orleans, as he walked along Prytania Street, erect, moving easily under his weight of years; and while not permitted to hear that last sermon, which he preached in his elder son's pulpit, we have often heard it spoken of and described as a very remarkable discourse for a man in his nineties, remarkable for vigor of thought and of utterance.

During the early years of the life of Benjamin Morgan Palmer, he was the pupil of his gifted mother, and almost her constant companion, and we are told that she took entire control of his early education. Under her guidance he acquired the rudiments of his education, and was deeply grounded in those principles of life and conduct for his faithful adherence to which he became so distinguished in after life, laying the firm foundations of character which so ennobled him, and made him one of the greatest figures of his century. Early in his life, his parents removed to Walterboro, S. C., where he attended school. At the age of fourteen he had mastered all that was there taught, and all that his mother could teach him of the arts and sciences. Hence it was decided to send him to college, and in 1832 he entered Amherst College, Massachusetts. There he took one year's course and a part of a second year, when he returned home, and for two years engaged in teaching. Not much is known of these early years of his life. But there is some reason to believe that, in some respects, they were years of struggle and conflict, mental conflict, doubts and temptations assailing; but they were passed safely under the watchful eye and loving guidance of that wise mother, and of the strong, faithful father, that true man of God; and the

period taken from his collegiate course was not lost time. He was young, and could well afford to await the maturing of mind and the settling of principles, with the ripening of character, all of which was immense gain. Meantime, he was not falling behind, but was moving steadily forward. It was a period of discipline and self-training, by the diligent improvement of which he was better fitting himself for the great tasks which, in later years, he set before himself. In 1837 he was enabled again to enter college, taking the senior course in the University of Georgia at Athens, Ga., graduating thence, with distinction, in 1838. On January 1, 1839, he entered the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C., completing the course there in due time, and at once entering upon the work of the gospel ministry, to which his whole life was unreservedly dedicated, and from which he never, for one day, turned aside, under any circumstances or for any purpose.

He was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Charleston in April, 1841, being then twenty-three years of age. His first charge was at Anderson, S. C., but he had been there only three months when he was called to the pastorate of the First Presbyterian Church, Savannah, Ga., which call he accepted, and removed at once to Savannah, and was installed pastor of the church by the Presbytery of Georgia in the spring of 1842. But one year later he was called to become pastor of the church at Columbia, S. C., now the First Church, which call he accepted, removing to Columbia early in 1843. While fully engaged in the work of the ministry and in the duties of his pastorate, he yet found time to engage in such literary work as fell in line with his ministry, and became, with such men as Drs. Thornwell, Smythe and Howe, and others like minded, one of the founders and editors of the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, which has since exerted a great influence for good, maintaining sound views of Christian theology and ecclesiastical polity. With this periodical, both in its original form and in that of its successor, THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, Dr. Palmer has retained his connection throughout his subsequent life to its close; and his pen, until his increasing blindness made it impossible for him to write, enriched its pages with the product of his fertile and versatile thought.

In 1853 he was called to the chair of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Seminary at Columbia, and undertook that important work in addition to the duties already incumbent on him. He continued in these manifold labors until 1856.

In 1855 he made a tour of the Southwest in the interest of the Columbia Seminary, during which tour he visited New Orleans, and was brought into contact with the First Presbyterian Church of this city. From this resulted a call to the pastorate, then vacant, when the church was in a condition requiring just such a man and minister and pastor. The call was extended him in the fall of 1856, and accepted by him; and he removed to New Orleans in December of the same year, was installed pastor, and remained in that happy relation to the end of his life. It may be remarked just here that, as might have been expected, many other fields have been opened to him, and large inducements have been offered him by those who sought his services. Some of the most prominent churches, both North and South, have invited him to their pulpits; and various institutions of learning have tried to secure him as professor or head. In 1860 he was elected to the chair of Pastoral Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1874 he was invited to the chancellorship of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, of which he was one of the projectors and founders, and on whose directorate he has served from the first until his death. In 1881 again he was tendered the chair of Pastoral Theology in the Columbia Seminary.

In 1868, with Dr. Henry Martin Smith and Dr. Thomas R. Markham, he led in the movement which resulted in the establishment of the *Southwestern Presbyterian*, a weekly family and church publication, the property of the Synod of Mississippi, of the board of which he has been president from the beginning down to the day of his death. As in the *Review*, so in the paper, his have been among the most important contributions. It is not too much to say that, by means of them, he has in great measure moulded the sentiments and shaped the policy of the church.

This sketch would be incomplete if it omitted reference to the domestic life of Dr. Palmer. In this he was peculiarly happy. He married, October 7, 1841, Miss Mary Augusta McConnell, of Columbia, S. C., a step-daughter of the Rev. Dr. George Howe,

for so many years a professor in the Columbia Theological Seminary, under whom Dr. Palmer had studied. Mrs. Palmer was born in Liberty county, Ga., in August, 1823. Her father was Robert McConnell, M. D., who was of Scotch-Irish extraction. He was a practicing physician in Liberty county. Mrs. Howe's maiden name was Walthour. She was of a prominent family, an uncle, Mr. George Walthour, being a wealthy planter, who was often a member of the State Legislature. Mrs. Palmer was educated partly in Hartford, Conn., but graduated from the famous school at Barhamville, near Columbia, under the well-known Dr. Marks, one of the most distinguished educators of young ladies of those days. She was a woman of lovely character, uniting gentleness with great force, of remarkable prudence, with unyielding firmness in maintaining principle, and in acting in accordance with her convictions of right, truth and duty; thoroughly domestic in her tastes, devoted to her husband and children, she was, at the same time, a model pastor's wife, exerting great power for good among the people of the church and community. To Dr. and Mrs. Palmer were born six children: Benjamin B., who was born in Savannah, Ga., in July, 1842, and who died in infancy in 1844; Sarah Frances, born in September, 1844, died July 16, 1863; Mary Howe, born in September, 1847, the wife of Dr. J. W. Caldwell, professor of Chemistry in Tulane University, the only one of the six surviving her parents; Augusta B., born in June, 1849, died in February, 1876, married Mr. D. D. Coleock, of New Orleans, and left one daughter, her only child, named for her mother, Augusta Palmer; Kate G., born in August, 1852, died in October, 1871; Marion, born in January, 1856, died in February, 1873. The grandchildren are: Miss Fannie Caldwell, Rev. J. W. Caldwell, Jr., and Prof. Benjamin Palmer Caldwell, of Tulane University. Rev. J. W. Caldwell, Jr., is pastor of the Carrollton Presbyterian Church, New Orleans.

Mrs. Palmer died suddenly on November 13, 1888. Since that sad occurrence, Dr. Palmer's surviving family have been kept around him, clinging closely together, under his guidance, affording him those loving ministrations so necessary in his loneliness, and enjoying the rich benediction of his daily life, his

exalted example of submission to the will of God in sorest affliction, together with the vision of his evident ripening for, and constant advance towards, the perfect life upon which he has now entered. Happy the home where the "God of the covenant" has dwelt through all the years, where the sweet and holy ties of grace have sanctified and glorified the strongest, tenderest affections of human nature. Better than the richest earthly possessions is the precious legacy left behind them for their posterity, the "good name rather to be chosen than great riches," and "better than precious ointment." Truly, "the memory of the just is blessed." And the honor and exceeding joy were given them, before their departure, of witnessing the faith of their grandchildren, as these followed in their footsteps.

Reverting to the mention of Dr. Palmer's younger brother, the Rev. Dr. E. P. Palmer, it is to be noted that his son, the Rev. Dr. Wallace T. Palmer, has been, during the past two years, co-pastor with his uncle, and survives him in the charge of the large and important church to which they two have so harmoniously and efficiently ministered; and this was regarded by our departed father in Israel as one of the crowning mercies of his old age, that God had given him such a co-worker, not only bearing his family name, but deserving his love and confidence, to whom he could and did safely transmit the care of the flock.

Thus far the family history has claimed attention, together with the simple narrative of the leading facts of the life of our venerated leader. May we not now try to get a glimpse of the man? Thousands have seen and heard him. For long years, probably, not many strangers came to the city of New Orleans, and remained over the Sabbath, who did not make it a point to hear him preach. They do not need any description of his person and appearance, or manner and voice; once seen or heard, these would not soon or easily be forgotten. In figure, small and slight, and rather stooped; yet on the street or in the pulpit, and very peculiarly in personal contact and private intercourse, there was a dignity, a grace of bearing, an indefinable air of power, all unconscious, which could not be mistaken, and which seemed to be thrown off over all who came anywhere within the charmed circle of his presence and influence; so that the stranger who saw

him for the first time would be irresistibly impressed and drawn to him, and would ask who he was, and when told that it was Dr. Palmer, would receive the reply with satisfaction. I never knew or heard of one who expressed any disappointment. Yet there was never the least ostentation or assumption of superiority; far otherwise. The truth was happily expressed by one who said, "He is the most unassuming great man I ever saw." Or, sitting in his congregation for the first time (let us suppose), whatever may have been the preconceived ideas of the man with which you had come, you speedily lost sight of every thought except that you were listening to a man who had a message from God, and who came in the spirit and power of that message. As his soul looked forth through his eyes, and spake through his lips, he appeared as one transfigured; so that you felt, as one of the little girls of his flock put it, "Oh! mother, isn't Dr. Palmer just the most beautiful man that ever was!" And speaking for God, he was always equal to the occasion; he measured fully up to every demand that could justly be made. May I illustrate my meaning? I sat one Sabbath in the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, and had the opportunity, for some moments before the service began, of noting the size, style, fittings, etc., of that magnificent house of worship, before the preacher, the Rev. Dr. John Hall, entered his pulpit (whom I had not previously seen); and the remembrance is to this moment very distinct, of the deep impression made, as that great man stood in his place, and conducted the service; it was just this, "The man fits and fills the place; he is exactly adapted to all the surroundings; he and they blend in perfect harmony; the symmetry is complete; all things here are in due proportion." And the impression grew upon me, as the preacher announced his text, developed his theme, and unfolded the truth, "For what can the man do that cometh after the king?" (Eccles. ii. 12.) So it was always, in my experience, with Dr. Palmer. Among the many discourses, addresses, etc., which it was my privilege to hear from his lips, there are two—as different in character as they were widely separated in point of the time of delivery—which I can never forget; nor can any one, I feel sure, who heard either, ever forget it: the one was his wonderful speech before the General

Assembly of 1870, at Louisville, Ky., delivered during that great debate which was called forth by the message from the Northern Church by the commission of which the Rev. Dr. H. J. Van Dyke was chairman, with whom were associated the Rev. Dr. Backus, of Baltimore, and the Hon. H. E. Dodge, of New York, all of whom had spoken with great earnestness. The speech of Dr. Palmer was, I think, the most pathetic, soul-stirring utterance to which I ever listened. The other was the sermon delivered by request, on January 1, 1901, "The Centennial Sermon," as it is called, when for one hour and a half he held spell-bound the listening thousands. Because of his impaired vision he was unable to make or use any notes; yet he swept through all history, massing the facts, as an immutable foundation, laying bare the principles of the divine government, and flooding all souls with the light of eternal truth, the certainty of God's absolute sovereignty, with the supreme duty and responsibility of man. The characteristics of this discourse were the copiousness and aptness of illustration, the felicity of expression, the sublimity of conception, with the holy unction, the mighty spiritual power which bowed the multitude as before the majesty of God revealed through his Word, spoken by his servant, who seemed as if he were one of the prophets of old! The interval between these two discourses was nearly thirty-two years. They were utterly unlike, yet in each the speaker was (as we say) "at his best;" and easily, without apparent effort, rose to the very highest summits of sanctified human eloquence, carrying all with him.

Intellectually, Dr. Palmer was the recognized peer of any of the really great men of his time, his eighty-four years covering two full generations. Certainly, invidious comparisons are not in the slightest degree called for or designed; nothing would be more distasteful to him. I will not, therefore, enter upon any such attempt as that of measuring him by the mental stature of any one. Suffice it to say that he was a profound thinker, who was not content simply to follow along the pathways beaten out by the laborious feet of others; nor was it necessary that he should do so, although ever ready generously to accord the highest meed of praise to men who have grappled with the great themes of philosophy and theology, yet he was an explorer for himself, delighting

in the original study of God, his works and Word. A master of logical reasoning, he brought up out of the depths the mysteries of revelation, developing, simplifying them by the processes of orderly thought, clothing them in his own inimitable style of purest, most beautiful English, placed them within reach of all, so that they could not fail to understand. If not greater than some other man or men in some single element of intellectual power, there were few, if any, who combined as many elements as he. His genius was not that of isolation, disporting upon some lofty, but lone eminence; it was comprehensive, reaching out in many directions, drawing to himself from all quarters, with rarest powers of combination, showing himself master of all sources of knowledge operations of the human mind. He delighted most of all, however, in the philosophy of the plan of salvation, justifying the ways of God to men. A student, in the best sense, all his life, Dr. Palmer's learning was wide, as well as accurate, showing that he had not been willing to be ignorant of any of the branches of human learning; this was often manifested in the examination of candidates for the ministry, in which he was ever one of the kindest, yet most thorough of presbyters.

As a theologian, Dr. Palmer was thoroughly evangelical, conservative, accepting the Word of God as the original and final source of authority, and the standards of the church in their obvious, historical import. Here he planted himself. Holding the great distinguishing principles of the Reformed and Calvinistic theology, he felt that he had beneath his feet an immovable rock, a foundation that could never be destroyed. He held to those doctrines, not only as distinct propositions, but as a whole, a complete system, derived from and built upon the clear and undoubted teachings of scripture, as the mind of God. To the last he clung to that system in its integrity, as one not to be tampered with; he could not bear the thought of change in the long-established and accepted creed of the church. Possibly, it is but justice to him to state that he was not ignorant of or indifferent to the various and varying proposals to revise, amend, etc., the Confession. Among his last utterances to his brethren here was his emphatic and solemn dissent from and protest against any attempt of the sort; and he gave his reasons for that opinion and

advice, as he did for every position taken by him. As a fundamental in his creed was the doctrine of the spirituality of the church; he held this, also, to the last; indeed, he was only the more firmly established in his convictions on this subject with the passing years, and in view of the development of the tendencies of the times. But there is not time or space left for entering into the full exposition of his views on such topics; nor is it necessary; he had given no uncertain testimony touching them all; his voice had been heard throughout the whole church. I do not hesitate to affirm the conviction that as a teacher of theology he would have ranked with Thornwell and Dabney, had he devoted himself, as they did, to that department of work; nor would he have fallen below or behind them in authorship and in theological authorship, had he felt himself called thereto, as they were.

Dr. Mallard, in his brief address upon the occasion of the funeral services, made reference to the fact that we had been in the enjoyment of the privilege of a pastor's conference among ourselves, meeting every two weeks for that purpose. We have an organized association of our Presbyterian pastors in the city, of which Dr. Palmer has been the chosen head during all the years of its existence. He always insisted that each member should take his turn in leading, calling one after another to the chair for the evening. But it may well be imagined that we looked up to him as the life and guide of our work; and I am sure that each one of us will give his willing and grateful testimony that it has been equal to a training both in doctrine and polity, to attend upon those meetings, to engage in the discussions that came up in order as laid out for us generally upon his own suggestion, and to have Dr. Palmer lead or close the treatment of the chosen topic.

In his preaching Dr. Palmer was strictly scriptural, evangelical, topical rather than expository, ascertaining the doctrines set forth in his text, developing these in orderly and proportionate manner, with clearness and precision of method, bringing truth and duty home to the conscience, with most fervid appeal under all the solemn sanctions of eternal judgment, pleading with his hearers by the mercies of God in Jesus Christ. The pulpit was his throne. He had found his vocation as preacher of the "glori-

ous gospel of the blessed God"—"the happy God," as he loved to read and cite it. This was his chosen sphere of activity, the pulpit and its correlated ministrations. Here he was without a peer, preaching, praying, guiding the inquiring soul, dealing with the dying, bearing them into the presence of the gracious Saviour, comforting the sorrowing, taking them upon his own heart; into how many homes of his people, of our people, of us his brethren in the ministry in our times of grief, has he entered, the "Son of Consolation!" I have known him, in response to a telegram, take the first train and go hundreds of miles to carry the message of comfort and hope to a brother minister, whose wife lay dead in the home made desolate by her sudden removal, and ready to be borne forth to the burial; there he sat down in the midst of the broken circle, and, with the word of love and the prayer of faith, brought the mourners under the outstretched wing of the divine Comforter; then, after the burial, he returned to his own home, leaving a heavenly benediction behind.

Throughout this community, throughout this land, there are thousands who can tell of just such ministrations. Think how they have multiplied during the more than sixty years since he was licensed to preach the gospel. Think, too, how he had grown in his special adaptation to this particular form of ministry; what vast stores of experience he had acquired; how deeply he had drunk from the fountain of love and sympathy under the discipline of his own surpassing sorrows; and he was as ready to go, withal, to the home of the lowliest, as of the most exalted; to sit beside the bed of the laborer, or that of the man of science, and tell each the same sweet, old story of Jesus and his love. It will not be matter of surprise or of doubt, therefore, when it is affirmed that it has been the great, warm, loving heart of this man, by which, more than all else, this people have been drawn to him. He has reached out in all directions; he has denied himself to none who have needed him, to none to whom he could bring succor for body or soul.

In a ministry of forty-six years, as pastor of the same church, and in this one community, where not a few have signally failed to maintain themselves with credit, it has been made manifest that, after all, it is character which counts. Mockers are not

wanting here; no one has ever, so far as I have known or heard, sneered at this one man; men and women, who have denied and derided his Lord, have been ashamed to assail him; his moral standard has been so high and pure; his hand has been so open to minister relief; his generosity has been so ready and free, yet careful not to let his left hand know what his right hand did, so unassuming, gentle, lowly in spirit. I write these lines, not in the spirit of flattery, but because there have been those abroad in the land (not here, not among us, who have known better) who have seemed to form the idea that he was unyielding, unrelenting, unforgiving, even unloving. There could not possibly be a greater mistake; nor could graver injustice be done the noblest of men. No man was ever more free from all malice, envy, bitterness toward any human being, any disciple of the Lord, any branch of the church. There was no man of broader sympathy, more catholic spirit. Witness the outpouring of the great masses of the people, mourning the loss of their dearest friend and benefactor. Look over the assembled multitude gathered around his coffin, silent, weeping; Protestants of all denominations; Roman Catholics, priests and people; Jews, men of the world. At the hour for the beginning of the service at the church, mark the throngs that lined the streets, who could not find entrance into the church, and note the strange stillness on the streets in every part of the city, as the cars stop, wherever they might be, and all work on that great system is suspended for three minutes, and all stand silent and reverent in token of sorrow, and as a tribute to the dead. He was no hard, stern man, whose death evoked such sympathy, such sorrow, such mourning; as I never saw it before, so fully and literally illustrated, "the mourners go about the streets." Not thus do men and women, young and old, show the love and grief of their hearts for the death of a cold, hard man; not thus for one who was merely great. Love begets love. They loved him living, and mourn him dead, because he loved them, and laid out his life for them, for the welfare of the community, for the land he fondly loved, and for the church to which he gave his life, and would have laid it down a willing witness to her priceless heritage of truth. That is the key to his character, devotion to the truth; that lost, he felt and knew that all was lost. Principles are

eternal; they make character. When they are sacrificed, it goes with them; and when these, truth, principles and character, are gone, nothing is left. He stood true to this ideal, in pestilence, in war, in the more trying times that came later. In all the controversies in which he has borne a conspicuous part, this was his sole contention. This is, by no means, an apology for any position assumed or principles maintained by him; far from it. He made no apology for himself; he owed none. He was simply true to truth and to his Lord, the King in Zion. I only desire that those who had not known him personally, and who had no opportunity of learning what manner of man he was, may form some correct judgment of him, and appreciate the singleness of purpose and honesty of heart which actuated and governed him in all those matters. One thing is very certain; that is, that no matter how widely men differed from him, when they came into personal contact with him, and conversed with him, or heard him speak, on any of these topics, they were irresistibly drawn to him, and came gradually to see more and more as he did, and to think as he thought; or, if not so, they no longer judged him harshly as unkind or unloving, or even as wanting in patriotism, as has been more than hinted; and some of his most ardent admirers have been of those who had once been most sorely prejudiced against him, whose prejudices all vanished when they really knew the man, and felt the warmth of that great, loving heart.

Greatest of living preachers, he was one of the meekest of men, lowly in spirit, absolutely wanting in self-assertion, never consciously or by intent over-shadowing others. He was one of the very best, most appreciative of hearers, absorbed in listening to the message brought by any of his brethren. More than one can tell how, after he had preached, perhaps with the depressing thought—"Dr. Palmer is sitting there listening, and the people would so much rather hear him, and he could deliver a message to them so much better than any I can speak"—that dear man would be the first to meet him at the close of the service, with a warm grasp of the hand, saying, "My brother, I wish to thank you for that sweet exposition; it went to my heart, and did my very soul good!" Or, as on one occasion known to the writer, he said to the preacher, "It required great courage to stand before

that congregation, constituted as it was, and speak such solemn truths as those which you have uttered; yet it gave no offence, because it was done in such manner and spirit, and I believe we ought to do more of that sort of preaching." Especially did he delight to encourage any of his younger brethren, just when they most needed it. Nor, on the other hand, did he shun to reprove or warn, if he saw a brother going astray; or to point out a fault where he saw one worthy of mention; but he did such things in so fatherly a way as to bind one to him most tenderly. He was so tender himself and considerate, never speaking to wound, but only to help.

When confronting error, resisting evil, defending truth, he was as "bold as a lion;" there was then no shrinking or shirking, no compromise or concession. Drawing the line clearly, there he took his stand, there he remained, immovable, unyielding. He scorned hypocrisy, and when he had to denounce fraud, sham, deceit, he could be terrible indeed; but only against the wrong.

THE ILLUSTRIOUS DEAD! Let me call to mind some of those of our own beloved church, whom I have seen or heard or known, within the forty years of my acquaintance with him of whom these lines are written, and who are in some sort associated in thought with him; I only name them as they come to mind: George Howe, A. W. Leland, James Henley Thornwell, Robert Louis Dabney, Stuart Robinson, Moses Drury Hoge, William Brown, George D. Armstrong, B. M. Smith, F. A. Ross, J. A. Lyons, T. V. Moore, William S. Plumer, J. B. Adger, Thomas Smyth, John L. Girardeau, T. E. Peck, T. R. Welch, John Leighton Wilson, I. S. K. Axson, A. A. Porter, G. H. W. Petrie, S. K. Talmage, Joseph C. Stiles, Henry M. Smith, T. R. Markham; not a complete list by any means; to the number could readily be added not a few others who were co-laborers. I mention not the living. They are among us, and known in our day. Not many of his generation, but a few grand old men, who will feel a sense of loneliness coming over them, walking among the shadows of life's evening, as they realize that now he is gone, and their veteran ranks grow thinner.

"Our Peerless One is gone—Palmer ascended!
 The towering mind,
 The tongue inspired, the spotless name and fame;
 The guiltless life as white as driven snow;
 The sturdy patriot wed to native land,
 And larger still the lover of mankind;
 The princeliest soul of all the great Southwest,
 His country greater for his being there;
 The soldier of the Cross, calm, unafraid;
 The hero facing fevers, furors, giant wrongs;
 The ensign-bearer of God's heraldry;
 The man of God, God's great ambassador;
 Our Elijah and Elisha both in one;
 All this through many a gracious, glorious year,
 And whole decades — and this all passed away!"¹

J. H. NALL.

¹Dr. L. P. Bowen, in *Southwestern Presbyterian*, June 12, 1902.

VII.

GENERAL NOTES.

EDITORIAL GREETING.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY has recently come again into the hands of its former publishers and manager. They will seek most earnestly to make of it that for which it was established fifteen years ago, viz., a true exponent of the principles and life of our church, as well as a thesaurus of the best and most mature thought of the church in more elaborate form than the weekly religious press can conveniently use. The QUARTERLY'S principles will remain the same, so far as the doctrine and life of the church are concerned, as in the years past. It will stand for conservatism, as against the advanced ideas of the day, but will seek to base its conservatism upon an intelligent and scholarly view of the word of God and of the progress of learning.

In deference to the wishes expressed by many, there will be added such new features as, it is thought, will increase the interest and usefulness of the periodical. Besides the more profound studies of theology, philosophy, history, and literature which its pages will contain, as hitherto, there will be added departments of General Notes, for less elaborate treatises and the record of current thought and events, and of Practical and Homiletic Notes, for the giving of practical suggestions, methods of treatment of subjects and texts, and other matter which may be of use to ministers and others in everyday work. Careful criticisms and reviews of books, as well as briefer notices of recent publications, will be continued. In each issue it is hoped that there will be at least one article from the pen of some of the many capable writers whom our church numbers in her ranks outside of the roll of her ministers. Provision has also been made for a leading article in each number by some representative writer of our sister evangelical churches. It gives the management special pleasure to announce this feature, as it is one which will signalize the fellowship which it is the glory of our church to recognize among

the true people of God, and will tend to bring us all closer together in life and work as we are already in purpose and heart.

The Managing Editor of the QUARTERLY will have associated with him Drs. G. B. Strickler, of Virginia, R. C. Reed, of South Carolina, and F. R. Beattie, of Kentucky. These brethren will take larger part in shaping the periodical than the Associate Editors have done in the past, and will themselves contribute frequently to its pages.

In this renewed effort to make a periodical worthy of our beloved church, its publishers and editors earnestly ask the hearty co-operation and loyal support of the ministers and officers of the church, and of all others who have an interest in the permanence of its literature. They invite, as well, suggestions as to its various features, whether mechanical or literary, and will gladly do whatever they can to increase its value to all who read it. They will also welcome contributions from all who may desire to put their ideas in permanent literary form and to give others the benefit of their thoughts. They feel confident that the stimulus that will thus be given to our writers will be helpful both to themselves and to the church.

It is regretted that there has been unavoidable delay, largely incident to starting out upon a new enterprise, in the issuing of this first number under the new *regime*. The succeeding issues will appear at shorter intervals, however, and it is hoped that nothing will interfere with the subsequent prompt appearance of each number.

For the benefit of those subscribers or libraries accustomed or desiring to bind their volumes, there are appended to this number suitable title-pages and tables of contents for Volumes XIII., XIV., and XV.

THE NEW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE Synod of Texas last fall framed a formal constitution for a theological seminary, and directed the Board of Trustees to which they entrusted the work of raising funds and making an organization to take steps to open the Seminary as soon as the sum of one hundred thousand dollars was raised for its maintenance. That end has lately been reached, and the seminary is announced to be opened for work in the coming autumn. Two professors, besides the president, have been elected, and announcement is made, according to the Synod's order, that first-year students only will be received. Rev. Robert A. Webb, D. D., of the Clarksville Divinity School, has been

elected to the Professorship of Theology, and Rev. R. E. Vinson, of Charleston, W. Va., to the Professorship of Biblical Languages. Dr. Webb declined the call, however, and will remain in his present most useful place. No other has yet been named for the place declined. Dr. Thornton R. Sampson will, it is understood, also be a professor.

The Synod of the Empire State of the West is to be congratulated upon reaching this point in its development. Everything indicates the rapid growth of the church in that quarter, no less than the growth of the material and educational interests of the section. One cannot ride over its broad prairies, and through its flourishing cities and towns, and fail to realize that the State is a mighty empire within itself, with resources proportioned to the great expanse of the territory and the richness of the soil. Attending a meeting of the Synod, one feels a breeziness and life and vim found nowhere else in our church. Everything is full of hope. And it is an energetic hope, too; not an idle, dreamy expectation of great things and great days to come. The ministers, elders and church are alive and awake, full of work, full of zeal, full of faith. However small may be the beginnings in any department of the church's life, they are ready to take hold of them and develop them. So is it with their scheme for theological education. They intend to make it the very best, in both strength and character. Witness the men whom they have called to the work.

In the development of this enterprise, while honor is due to a score of men for energy and self-denial, special praise must be given to the indefatigable and vigorous agent of the seminary, now its president, Rev. Thornton R. Sampson, D. D., and to the constant, persistent efforts of Rev. S. B. Campbell, D. D., who has allowed no difficulties to discourage him or obstacles to prevent his steady movement towards the great end for which he has striven for years past. The temporary work at Austin, some years ago, under the able direction of Drs. Dabney and Smoot, prepared the way for the present development, and by its rich fruitage, in the short period of its active existence, stimulated the Texans to special effort. The well-known loyalty of the people of that section to their own State and institutions insures the success of the new Austin school. The institution now formed is welcomed to the sisterhood of theological seminaries.

THE NEW CHURCH HYMN-BOOK.

THE QUARTERLY notes with special pleasure the recent appearance of the church's new Hymn-Book. A short article in its pages, some years ago, seemed to inaugurate the discussion, or, at any rate, to voice a feeling which was already generally prevalent, that led later to those measures which have given us this book. It was not so much for an improved collection of hymns and tunes that it pleaded as it was for some one book, whether new or one of the old collections, which would be recognized by the entire church as her only authorized collection, and that might become the basis for that uniformity throughout the church which was so desirable, and yet which was at that time so entirely wanting. In addition, there was need for something so stable and generally accepted that there would gather about it those associations, in a healthy and helpful sentiment, which would endear the book, by long and general usage, to the hearts of the people. The church has been to a certain extent experimenting in this connection. Different collections had been, in one way and another, approved, and it was not uncommon to find in the same city as many different books used as there were different churches of our order. Some of the collections were admirable in their way, but the very number of them, with the introduction of new ones from time to time, was leading our people, in different sections, or even in different congregations in the same community, entirely away from one another. In addition, the church was consenting to competition with herself, to some extent, and losing not only the advantages and associations growing out of uniformity, but defeating her own publication interests when she had in the field her own published collection. She was also losing that advantage in economy of manufacture and sale which would be secured only by publishing large editions for wide-spread purchase and use. It now remains to be seen whether the effort now making to bind the whole church together in uniformity in this part of her worship will be successful.

The faithful members of the committee to which the duty of producing this collection was entrusted deserve all praise for their work. It was arduous and delicate, requiring great patience, no less than the finest poetical and musical taste. That they were sound in the faith, and careful to preserve the principles of the church in their expression through this praise book, goes without saying. They went about their work in a way which has commended itself almost universally, and the result is that they have produced a book which has thus far been remarkably well received.

VIII.

PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

THE RELATION OF THE PASTOR TO THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

There are some relationships that are understood the moment we understand the terms in which they are stated. The relation of a man to a woman is understood, if we know that the man is a husband and the woman his wife, or if the man is a father and the woman his daughter. And so, there is light upon this topic, in the very terms in which it is stated, for by them we know that the pastor is the shepherd and the children in the Sunday-school the lambs of his flock. As a matter of course, the pastor "shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom." Now, this is the whole matter in a nutshell, or rather, in a poem; but, in order that I may be practical and make some "points," without which a preacher would be too much like ordinary mortals, let me say—

First, that the relation should be one of mutual affection.

It is claimed that during the historic Hampton Roads conference, Mr. Lincoln said if he could write the word "Union" at the top of a blank sheet of paper, the other side could write anything they pleased underneath. If you will let me write the word love at the top, you may write anything you please below, and even if you put something there that is mechanical or unwise, love will overrule it for good. But if we cannot write the word love at the top, nothing else that may be written will be of much avail. I heard a great teacher say, "An unloved pastor is an unmitigated curse to any church," and if that be true, then he is an unspeakable blight to the Sunday-school. If the pastor does not love the Sunday-school, and the Sunday-school does not love the pastor, then surely it is time for a wise providence to interfere.

Second, the relation should be one of inspiring leadership rather than direct control.

The pastor should not be, in any sense, the "boss" of the Sunday-school. He should be capable of being the superintendent, and the school should feel that he is capable, and even desire that he should be superintendent; but, except in cases of emergency, he should not superintend. He can render far better service as an inspiring leader. Now, what is a leader? There is a humorous definition, given in politics, which says a leader is one who goes the way the crowd is going, only a little in advance. If by that is meant one who simply catches on to the popular drift of things, no matter what it may be, and rides into favor by advocating that, he is not a leader, but a demagogue. But if it means one who is wise enough to discover the best thought of the best people, the concensus of opinion of those who ought to know, and tact enough to adjust himself to that, and adjust that to himself, without compromising principle, and at the same time without changes that are too radical, and then, with a genuine enthusiasm, can go to the front and say, "Come on, this is the thing to do," he is an inspiring leader. Now, if there is a pastor reading this who thinks I am a "trimmer" and lacking in backbone because I say this, he has my profound sympathy, for I can see by that that he is a blunderer in the Sunday-school, interfering with its prosperity and a disturber of its peace.

Thirdly (pardon me for saying this, but what would a preacher be without his thirdly?), the relation should be one of sympathetic and suggestive helpfulness to the whole school, rather than the special teaching of a select class.

The pastor belongs to the entire school, and, in my judgment, makes a serious mistake if he devotes himself to a special class. It is not a wise and economical use of the force that he can give to the school to concentrate it on a few scholars in one class every Sunday, rather than coming in touch, in some way, with every class and every scholar, and every teacher, which is his precious privilege, but one of which he cannot avail himself if he is not free from special class work. Nor do I mean that the pastor is to take the platform, at a stated time every Sunday, and make a "talk on the lesson." That practice can become exceedingly monotonous, besides growing "stale, flat and unprofitable." Young minds, and old ones too, sometimes delight in surprises, and I have known instances where it was positively refreshing to have the pastor come and go, without any formal address, having accomplished his mission far better by laying his hand on a boy's head and patting the cheek of some wistful-eyed girl, meanwhile putting in a word of good cheer to the teacher, and

thus passing through the school, with a smile and a benediction, do more good to all than if he had taught a class or made a formal address. It would not be wise to follow this plan every Sunday, for it would grow mechanical and be accepted as a matter of course. "When they seldom come, they wished for come; and nothing pleaseth save rare accident;" and I would not be surprised at all to know that, occasionally, the pastor impresses the Sunday-school with his value by remaining entirely away for a Sabbath, and then the following Sunday making a ringing address.

Finally (what a cheering word this is, if a man really means it, and makes it good), the relation should have for its main object the transfer of the material of the Sunday-school into the church.

In fact, this should be one of the definite aims of the entire school, for what shall it profit a boy if he gain the whole Sabbath-school, and lose the church? If I were asked to state the aim of a Sabbath-school, I would say it is threefold: (1) To teach the Bible; (2) to develop character; (3) to lead the children to the acceptance of the Saviour, and membership in the church. And it is this last aim that gives consistency and force to the other two. Leave out that, and the others are, in a measure, meaningless. Now, there is a kind of twofold transfer of the material of the Sunday-school into the church that should be the aim of the pastor, and in which he should have the hearty co-operation of the officers and teachers. First, there is the bodily transfer, so to speak; and what I mean by that is to have a church-going Sunday-school. It is indeed a happy thing if the pastor can go into the Sunday-school with such winsomeness of manner as will cause the children to want to return his visit, and come over into the church. And, then, it is a still happier thing, if the pastor, with the children before him in the congregation, can so speak as to cause them to feel it good to be there and want to come again. (The officers and teachers can help very much in this "bodily transfer," and one of the best ways is by going regularly to church themselves. Alas! I have known superintendents and secretaries and teachers who did not teach very powerfully, by example, in this direction.) But the chief transfer is the spiritual, to which the bodily transfer should lead. The pastor, in his relation to the Sunday-school, should keep in constant touch with each teacher concerning the unconverted members of the class. It is wise for both pastor and teacher to keep lists of their names, praying over them one by one, and watching tactfully for those times when "a word in due season" may be spoken. Oh! what a mutual

joy is theirs when, out of this mysterious combination of human effort and divine power, the souls of the children are born into the kingdom, and one by one they come, confessing their Saviour, like blossoms unfolding of their own accord, under the gentle compulsion of the sunlight.

T. M. HAWES.

Louisville, Ky.

SOME HINTS ON PASTORAL VISITING.

WE sometimes hear this department of ministerial work termed a bore and irksome, yet its importance is generally conceded. But, while generally conceded, it is not carefully studied and actively applied as it should be. While this department in our seminary instruction may appear seemingly subordinate, upon more careful reflection it becomes of paramount importance, because it teaches how practically to use and apply the rich and varied knowledge gathered from the other departments. A man may be ever so rich in lore, ever so learned as a theologian, and may be able, with strong, clear sermons to present the truth, but unless he can get a close grip on his people by pastoral contact, and both apply and search for the truth of the preached word, he will at least miss securing and gathering a part of his legitimate harvest. At a recent banquet of the alumni of one of our theological seminaries, one of its most distinguished alumni, having been called upon to point out the defects of our theological training, emphasized inattention to this department as one of the defects. There is a growing sentiment amongst us that it is not enough to be a fine preacher, a strong, clear theologian, and a ready writer, if one be an indifferent pastor. On the other hand, it goes without saying that the characteristic of being a good pastor will not take the place of a lack in the other departments. If there is any disproportion in the two parts of a minister's life, it should be in favor of his study and preaching, although more pastors make success than preachers.

Our ministers, however, should aim at an evenly balanced ministry. They should desire and purpose to be both good preachers and good pastors. I would have it said of me, "He is a good pastor, and a good preacher too," rather than, "He is a splendid preacher, but a very poor pastor;" or, "A splendid pastor, but a miserable preacher."

One of the first questions that confronts us in the study of this subject is this: "What is it that differentiates a pastoral visit from

any ordinary social visit?" This problem worries a great many young preachers, and they sometimes mistakenly conclude that all visiting is useless and worthless. A little reflection will show that three points distinguish the pastoral from the social visit.

1. The very fact of the visit being made by a pastor is the first element of distinction. The pastor is always the pastor. He is not merely the pastor on Sunday and Wednesday, but every day and hour in the week. His only business is to be pastor. He should so conduct himself, and so feel toward his work, that he will ever be conscious of this fact, and, almost unconsciously to the people, impress them with this fact. Whether he makes a long or short visit, comes on occasion of pleasure or sadness, he is a pastor for the sake of his work, in his Master's name coming in contact with his people. Whatever interest he may develop in them, toward himself, for his Master's sake, is so much pastoral work accomplished.

2. That which still further differentiates the pastoral from the social visit is religious conversation. This need not be dry and formal, nor sad and solemn; but may be joyous, hopeful, and helpful. An artful pastor can preach and teach very much of the gospel in the average turn of conversation, emphasizing principles of truth and righteousness, illustrating by incidents, and enforcing by relating events involving both the use and application of Scripture; or, he may with a passing thought indicate the duty of family worship, infant baptism, private prayer, Bible study, and the many other valuable points in the life and conduct of the home or the life of the individual. He should do all this in such a way that every member of the family present will be glad of his visit, and anxious to have him come again. A little rule that may be hid away in the memory, not to become a law in the life, but a guide as to discretion, is this: *work along the line of least resistance.*

3. The third point that still further differentiates the social from the pastoral visit is a service of worship. This is the highest functional capacity, and the clearest distinction of his office and relation to the home; and this whole question needs careful, discriminating study. Be sure to remember that there is no iron-clad law in the scriptures, in the standards, or in any other statute book, to my knowledge, that requires any set form in family worship. You are not compelled to read the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm, and pray for everything, visible and invisible, temporal and eternal, at every one of these services; there is no law requiring that you kneel in a certain posture, or that you kneel at all; there is no law com-

elling the scriptures to be read: they may be repeated from memory. The pastor is not compelled to forego the privilege and duty of family worship until requested by the family he is visiting, but may dare to suggest a word of prayer. Very often, if not in the majority of cases, standing in family prayer will be more convenient and appropriate than kneeling. And in very many cases it will be desirable to "have a word of prayer" without reading any scripture at all. The pastor should feel free enough with the homes of his people to suggest "a word of prayer" with every visit, unless it be clearly inconvenient.

The wise pastor is always watchful for occasions of pastoral work, and grateful for any intimation on the part of others as to occasions in the lives and homes of his people that need his care. A little act in time saves nine. In cases of sickness or sadness, or trouble in business, or for other reasons, especially in case of death in the home, a visit from the pastor is very appropriate and appreciated. Don't wait to be sent for, or stand back on ceremony—go! As to the frequency of pastoral visits, this is to be determined by the size of the congregation, the character of the work, and the needs of each particular case. But frequent contact with the people is helpful to the entire work. The pastor who plans his visitations in the spirit of prayer, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will find a growing fondness for this work, and a rich source of supply of themes for pulpit treatment. He will thus be enabled to carry on the study of men, together with the study of books, which should make him practical and strong.

The length of the visits need not provoke much discussion. They need not be long, ordinarily should not be long. It is the fact and character of the visit, rather than its length, that the people value. In the case of business men, a call of a few minutes, with a hearty hand-shake and a word of cheer, has the weight and influence of a pastoral visit. Special attention should be given to the sick or the aged, or to visiting friends of any of the families. By this means the pastor enters the inner circle of the heart of the people, is the better calculated and prepared to draw out of them better service, to the cause that he represents.

There is another form of pastoral work which should not be overlooked, viz., that which can be done within the pastor's study. The first class of this kind is that which may be done with a pen, such as writing letters to the successful for honor, or the unsuccessful in business, the sorrowing for any cause, the stranger, the tempted

and struggling one. Postage and stationery are never wasted in this direction. And many times in this way the pastor is only making an opening which he may the better enter later, and which will result in edifying, or leading to conversion, as the case may be.

Another class of this kind of work is the contact and influence which the pastor may have with those who visit his study. You may lay down this general rule: *ordinarily have a prayer with every one who consults you in your study about anything.* Do this behind a locked door, to avoid interruption, and in almost every case it will prove peculiarly effective, and emphasize the fact that you are a pastor. Let us hope that our schools of instruction will give more attention to this department of ministerial work, and that the splendid work of our fathers, accomplished by self-developed powers, may be equalled, if not surpassed, by their well-trained sons who enter, thoroughly equipped, for this practical and important side of their ministry.

W. M. ANDERSON.

Nashville, Tenn.

MERCHANDISE METHODS IN THE CHURCH, OR CHURCH FESTIVALS AND SCRIPTURE.

THE church festival has become an established and conspicuous factor in modern religious activity. At first much opposed, in its various forms of suppers, bazaars, lectures, and theatricals, the opening century finds it adopted in almost the entire church, Catholic and Protestant. Words discountenancing it are seldom expressed by tongue or pen. The ministry, in nearly all instances, join hands with their congregations in using it, or keep silent as to their views. This stand the church officers readily take. As a consequence, the Christian world assumes that the church festival is altogether right. In a multitude of instances the pastor's full success depends upon his position with regard to it; for the few who look upon it with suspicion, or dare to oppose it, are pronounced "behind the times" and "narrow."

There are some who believe that, if this dictum concerning those who look with disfavor upon the festival be correct, the Bible is thereby proven to be likewise "behind the times" and "narrow." To substantiate this belief an attempt will be made to prove that the adoption of the church festival is a departure from God's ordained plan, and, therefore, contrary to his revealed will, wrong for Christians, and injurious to Christ's church.

This position will be defended by establishing the following propositions: (1) God forbids all departure from any plan given by him; (2) God has given only one plan for the support of his church; (3) The church festival is not that plan, but a departure from it, and hence, as a definite thing in the church, to be taken in its entirety, the church festival is discreditable.

I. GOD FORBIDS ALL DEPARTURE FROM ANY PLAN GIVEN BY HIM.

Before entering upon the direct discussion of this proposition some principles necessary to its clear and full understanding must be kept in mind.

The right or the wrong, the permissibility or the non-permissibility of the church festival, is not determinable on any save Bible grounds. Every plea urged on either side must be answered by the declarations of God's Word. The fact that the practice now in vogue of supplying church needs through the proceeds of festivals, bazaars, and the like, does not transgress the general principles of morality, is not in itself sufficient to establish the rightness of these schemes for Christians. The inherent rightness of all these is readily granted. Their essential sinfulness cannot be proven. Judged by the laws controlling man's conduct towards man and God in purely natural relations, they are often unimpeachable. As transactions in behalf of the secular charities of life, these schemes are, in many instances, altogether praiseworthy and advisable. For instance, it might be shown that a supper, lecture, or device of any given kind, in behalf of a poor fund or the building of a hospital is not only right and good, but worthy the patronage of all. This can easily be done on the principles of general morality. Yet this will not prove that the same things are either advisable or permissible in behalf of ecclesiastical needs, *because* the church is not an ordinary institution for secular purposes, but one formed and controlled by specific, divine regulations and laws for religious purposes. These specific principles determine the rightness, and hence the permissibility, of anything in church method or conduct.

That the peculiar rules of any organization or society determine the obedience or disobedience of its members, and the legality or illegality of their methods, schemes and conduct with respect to the body to which they belong, is, we believe, a principle recognized in the courts of all civilized countries. The Masons have certain rules and regulations which are obligatory upon them. Any man not a Mason might break or disregard any or all of these without wrong,

sin, or liability to punishment. Should a Mason do this, however, he would be censured and adequately punished by his local lodge, and the whole Masonic order, together with all right-thinking men, would approve his condemnation. His oath of allegiance to Masonry makes him amenable to all its laws and methods, which are distinct from those of ordinary life. The State of Virginia has certain laws peculiar to itself. All who live within the State are obligated to obey these upon pain of penalty for disobedience. Let a man move beyond Virginia's borders, and these laws would no longer bind him. In like manner church conduct, methods, and observances are determined by the specific laws laid down for the church by her divine Founder. The rightness or wrongness of anything connected with her advancement must be decided by the application of those specific laws which God has given for her guidance and control. The Christian's oath of membership, his oath of allegiance, makes him amenable to these laws, even as his church is bound by them.

One law of the church is that nothing wrong or sinful in itself is permissible for its adherents. Another is that nothing is allowable which brings reproach upon the church's faith, or retards the spiritual growth and advancement of Christians. A third is that obedience to God's commands is necessary and obligatory, even when he forbids what is sinless and harmless. Therefore, in discussing church festivals and their coterie of practices, to prove them sinless *per se* is not enough. It still remains to be seen whether or not they clash with any of the specific commands given by God to his people. Christians should stand by the laws that govern the Lord's people as such. Even should those laws not bind the consciences of men outside the church's bounds, they do bind the consciences of all her members. This prepares the way for a discussion of our first proposition.

That God forbids all departure from any plan given by him, is, or should be, a fundamental principle controlling all Christian conduct. God's having given one plan in itself excludes every other proposed for the same purpose. To do one way when he commands another is to *sin*—to be guilty of self-will and rebellion. In this connection, note that for God to only suggest one way, but not to go so far as pointedly to order it, makes us presumptuous in setting aside his suggestion and adopting another, however wise it may seem to us. Our wisdom can never equal God's advice. To ignore his counsel is to sin. Certainly, then, not to heed a plain instruction is a greater sin. The binding obligations of Jehovah's laws are stringent. They

know no compromise. When God orders, it is ours to do just **what** he orders; no more and no less. This holds good both when he says *do* and when he says *do not*.

On the very threshold of the discussion of this point we are warned that we are to go not by the exact "letter" in interpretation, but by the "*spirit*" of the scriptures. The inner meaning, the real substance, of the scripture statements is to be obeyed rather than the outward form. For instance, when our Lord says, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor," he does not mean that selling all we have and giving it to the needy will make us perfect, but that those who would be his real followers must hold all their possessions subject to Christ's demands upon them. This is only one of the many cases citable as to the difference between the letter and the spirit of the Bible. In every instance, God, in like manner, desires us to follow his meaning instead of his words. Especially is this true of the New Testament dispensation.

We grant this contention. It doubly reinforces our position. The Spirit of God, bear in mind, is the only revealer of the "*spirit*" of the scriptures. The inner or real meaning of any Bible statement is determined by the Bible itself, and not by any of the predilections of its readers. In the case cited to show the distinction between a live understanding of God's real meaning in his words and a dead literalism in construing them, that real meaning was discovered from the context and from the analogy of the faith. The circumstances attending our Lord's statements explained their intent. Thus in every case must the Bible be its own interpreter. In the present contention the "*spirit*" of scripture will be found to coincide with the law as stated.

But a few remarks upon this devotion to the "*spirit of the law*" are not inappropriate to the discussion. Acting on the spirit of the case cited, many *hold* their possessions subject to Christ's demands *until the demand comes*.

The phrase "*spirit of scripture*" in the plea urged, as in many others, wears a suspicious cast. Under a claim of great reverence and respect for God's Word, it is often employed to justify a multitude of departures from its requirements. Those who employ the expression thus do so to add to the worth of their "*broadness of view*," and to cast discredit upon the "*narrowness*" of those who prefer to follow submissively and faithfully the plain statements of the Bible, and whom these liberals would call *legalists* bound by iron fetters to the "*letter of the law*."

This suspicious character of the phrase is increased by its extreme vagueness. Like the fabled pavilion, it is, or can be, used to cover everything or nothing; ask for its meaning, and it becomes intangible at once.

No denial of a proper use of the phrase is made. We would not discredit the use of it to indicate the motive principle or substance of the law. Here the "letter" is Phariseeism; the "spirit" vital godliness. But we do object to its modern, evasive, "will-o'-the-wisp" use.

In brief, the "spirit of scripture" with regard to any plain and manifest statement of God's will concerning any course of human conduct is found in Isaiah viii. 20: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not *according to this word*, it is because there is no light in them." The only spirit of scripture worth considering is that which inculcates implicit and exact observance of all God's commands and instructions.

1. Consider Adam's sin. It was certainly not the mere eating of the fruit. On the general principles of morality there was nothing wrong *per se* in the fruit nor in the eating of it. It is easy to see that, apart from God's command not to eat, Adam could have partaken of the fruit sinlessly. The principle involved in these facts is that the right or wrong in church conduct is determined by reference to revelation. It proves our contention concerning the spirit of scripture. Adam's sin emerged in his *failure to observe the EXACT LETTER* of God's words.

2. Achan's sin was identical in kind. Jericho and its goods, its vessels, its silver and its gold, were consecrated, *i. e.*, set apart to God's use. All in the English version are said to be "accursed." By God's explicit order, whoever took them became thereby "accursed." Now this word is a translation of a Hebrew term elsewhere rendered in the Authorized Version "devoted." When a living being, animal or man, became "devoted" to God, it was in every instance sacrificed or otherwise put to death.

The record in the sixth and seventh chapters of Joshua shows that the command of God had been fully proclaimed that no soul in all Israel should, upon penalty of being thus "devoted" to destruction, take any of all the things mentioned. Achan rashly ventured to dare the prohibition and risk the punishment. God vindicated his authority by consigning Achan, his family, and all that he possessed, to stoning and fire. Since in other instances (*e. g.*, Ai, Josh. viii. 2) the spoil belonged to Israel, it is evident that God's plain instructions

determined Israel's moral relation to the spoil of war. Achan's sin was his *failure to observe the EXACT LETTER of God's command.*

These two cases show the "spirit" and the "letter" coinciding, and man's sin against both when God says, "Do not." What happens when he says, "Do"?

3. What was King Saul's sin? God commanded, "Go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." The words "utterly destroy" in this passage are a translation of the Hebrew term rendered in Joshua "accursed," and elsewhere "devoted." Accordingly, Saul's orders from Jehovah were to set apart to God by destruction the Amalekites and their property. This put the animals out of the power of Israel for sacrifice. Properly they could use only what was their own, not what was God's by his own devotion of it to himself. How could Israel devote to God in sacrifice what he had previously devoted without it? Saul and Israel should simply have executed the decree of utter destruction against Amalek. "But Saul and the people spared Agag," king of the Amalekites, "and the best of the sheep and of the oxen and of the fatlings and the lambs and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them; but everything that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly." Compare command and fulfillment!

Saul and Israel suffered severely at God's hand for that day's work. Before utterly condemning them, however, note their application of the "spirit of scripture" to God's orders. Agag preserved a lone captive is a proof of the destruction of his people. With them dead, and himself a sole survivor, would not life punish him more than death? Surely, then, his preservation alive is obedience to the spirit of the Lord's command. So Saul says, "Yea, I *have obeyed* the voice of the Lord, and *have gone the way which the Lord sent me*, and have *brought Agag*, the king of Amalek, and have utterly *destroyed the Amalekites.*" As to the saving of the animals for sacrifice, surely the spirit of the order was kept. God had devoted them to his use in their death. Why not let that death be in sacrifice? It is narrow literalism to hold that it must be in war's alarms and horrors. Where is the sin in Israel's sacrificing the best of the animals? Plainly, the sin lay in sparing for such sacrifice what was not theirs to spare. Consider God's answer: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and in sacrifice as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and

stubbornness is iniquity and idolatry. Because thou has rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." Israel was right in sacrificing unto Jehovah, but only in God's appointed way. Saul was right in punishing Agag, but only according to the Lord's instructions. *God desires exact obedience, and such obedience is the only "spirit of scripture" when God speaks.*

4. There is a case more striking, however, than that of Saul. It involves disobedience both to what God commands and to what he forbids. It is Uzzah's *error* and its punishment (see 2 Sam. vi. and 1 Chron. xiii). There are several important points in connection with Uzzah's death to be noted. First of all is the command of God concerning the transportation of the ark from one place to another. The ark was one of the pieces of the tabernacle furniture placed specially on the sons of Kohath of the tribe of Levi; none but these Kohathites were to bear it. They were specifically directed to bear it on their shoulders by means of staves run through the rings on the sides of the ark. Furthermore, even they were forbidden to touch it upon pain of death. (Cf. Num. iv. 14; vii. 9 *et al.*) Second, as learned from history by David and Israel, as well as by us, God had years before allowed the *Philistines* to place the ark upon a *new cart*. He had even given his divine approval to this means of transportation by miraculously returning the ark from its captivity to Israel thereby. Israel could, therefore, point to *divine precedent* in at least *one* instance for the use of a *new cart*. How natural the supposition that it *could be used again!* Third, note that David and all Israel had already set aside the law that the Kohathites should carry the ark on their shoulders by setting it on a new cart before Uzzah had any opportunity to watch it or care for it. This was only a breach of the *exact letter* of the Levitical laws; but by it the ark was endangered.

However, observe the good reasons for placing the ark on the *new cart*. Its newness is strongly suggestive of to-day's demand for newness, or "up-to-date-ness"—it suggests modern so-called *progressiveness* in church work and methods. Israel could safely say also that God had given no special reasons for its being carried by the Kohathites of Levi. Yet again, the cart was perfectly strong, and just as capable of bearing the ark's burden as the sons of Kohath, if not more so. David had consulted with all the rulers and leaders of Israel, civil and religious (1 Chron. xiii. 1-4), concerning this plan, and they had approved it. Therefore, the cart was, no doubt, beautifully made and ornamented. The purpose evidently was to

make the ark prominent before the eyes of the thronging multitudes. By thus bearing it they gave it special notice, and so honored it. Are we unjust to him in thinking, too, that he had in mind *the return of the symbol of Jehovah's presence from Philistia*? It was just the very time to signally place the ark, and on a new cart. That whole occasion was due to Israel's love for that sign of God's mercy. No one who knows David and his life can, for a moment, doubt the sincerity of these motives; and where, after all, was the *sin* or the *harm PER SE* in placing the ark on the cart?

Fourth, on account of Israel's failure to observe the *exact words* of God's law, the ark was imperilled. The oxen stumbling caused its revered burden to topple. Uzzah sees it about to crash to destruction. Love for the glory of Israel demands that it be saved. *With perfectly good intentions*, Uzzah stays the ark with his hand—and dies! Amazed, we ask, "Why?" "God smote him there for his error." Give heed to that word "error." In the original it is "rashness." He simply *made a mistake*. God had said, "Touch not the ark." It was a plain command; exact obedience was alone acceptable.

It is necessary now to distinguish between God's relations to his own laws and man's. God, if he has a right to make them, certainly possesses the right to set them aside. Evidently man can only obey them until God tells him otherwise. God ordained circumcision. When Christ came, God set it aside. Yet, so long as it lasted, Israel was bound to its observance. So God had the right to bring the ark from Philistia on a new cart himself; but this by no means justified Israel in departing from God's instructions as to how *they* should bear it. Neither did it, nor the danger in which the ark was, justify Uzzah in departing from another command of Jehovah. Therefore, the case of Uzzah proves that *no pretext whatsoever, not even a desire to especially honor God, nor love for the symbol of his presence, can justify any departure from his law plainly stated*. David's words over Uzzah's death are significant, "Because ye," *i. e.*, the sons of Kohath, "did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him *not after the due order*." It is God's to propose and make laws and methods for his church; man's to obey and adopt.

The New Testament binds these Old Testament principles upon Christians. The Holy Spirit says (Romans xv. 4), "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning," and (1 Corinthians x. 11), "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our instruction upon

whom the ends of the world are come." This is to be expected. Is it likely that the freeness and fullness of God's love and grace shown us in Christ would lessen or that they would increase our obligations to obey his words? Should a Christian ask for full command, an unrelenting law? Should not God's mere wish or will rather be a *law* to him? Therefore, if God in the Old and New Testaments gives a law, or plan, for conducting the finances of his church, we are under even greater obligations to obey than was Saul, or David, or Uzzah.

The punishments inflicted, in these instances selected for consideration, show that no pretext whatsoever—not even a claim of love and devotion to God's cause—can ever justify any departure from his plain commands. In each case, the thing done was in itself neither right nor wrong. There was no sin *per se* in Adam's eating the fruit; none in Achan's taking the spoil; none in Saul's reserving the sheep and oxen for sacrifice and sparing Agag alive; none in David's placing the ark on a new cart, and none in Uzzah's touching it. Apart from God's instructions to the contrary, it was altogether right to act as the parties involved did. Evidently it was disobedience and rebellion, however, to do one way when God commanded another.

A plan given by God then excludes every other proposed for the accomplishment of the same purpose. When God says, Do, we must do exactly as he says—no more and no less. A close study of these instances will reveal a further fact, viz., God's plans admit of no addition and no subtraction, as well as of no substitution on the part of man: they stand alone.

5. Now this is assailed as being only a human conclusion from a few incidents of Bible history. Our only rejoinder will be in the exact words of God himself: "And it shall be unto you for a fringe, that ye may look upon, and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them; and that ye *seek not after your own heart and your own eyes*, after which ye use to go a whoring." "Ye shall not *add* unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye *diminish aught* from it, that ye may keep the commandment of the Lord which I command you." (Num. xv. 39 and Deut. iv. 2.) "Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law which Moses my servant commanded thee, *turn not from it to the right hand or to the left.*" (Josh. i. 7.) "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. *Add thou not* unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and

thou be found a liar." (Prov. xxx. 6.) "They were defiled with their own works, and went a whoring with their own inventions." (Ps. cvi. 39.) "But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. xv. 9.) Surely no words of Holy Writ can be plainer than these just quoted. You will search in vain for any more unmistakable way of saying that God expects us to do with regard to all matters of service and work exactly what he tells us to do. Notwithstanding we are constrained to give two more quotations. One is spoken by God himself: "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." The other is from Christ our Lord, who is that same God: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." This joins the Old and New Testament together again in prohibition of adding to or subtracting from any plan of God. Therefore, if God gives a plan of church finance different from church festivals and their like, he forbids the latter by giving that plan, since they are either substitutes for, additions to, or subtractions from that plan.

Accordingly, it is not at all to the point to argue that in church festivals there is no sin and no harm. The first thing to determine is whether God has given any plan to his people by which to support the gospel cause. That plan found, festivals and all related schemes are immediately excluded.

II. GOD HAS GIVEN ONLY ONE PLAN FOR THE SUPPORT OF HIS CHURCH.

The justification of merchandise schemes for meeting the financial needs of the church involves a proof that God has given to the church no instructions as to how those needs are to be met, but, instead, has left this important matter to be decided as her members may desire. In respect to this particular branch of church conduct, men become God's confidential advisers, and set bounds and limitations which God has not set.

The doctrine of those who defend these merchandise methods is that any honest business scheme is permissible for the support of gospel work. The whole financial branch of Christianity is under the sole direction and control of the Christian body itself. God has given no orders at all in regard to the matter.

It is a biblical anomaly if God has left a matter so necessary to the church's life in such a chaotic condition. He has done so in no

single other instance. Now note this anomaly. He has said, "They which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Think for a moment what the support adequately of the gospel ministry alone in the lands of Christendom means! The Master has ordained that the church provide a sufficiency for her ministers in all ages, and in all lands. This one item in the church's financial needs is simply stupendous. The perfect God never works imperfectly. Yet, if he ordained so great a spiritual need as the gospel ministry, and so great a temporal need as its support, and then, leaving the getting of that support hap-hazard, gave no certain method of obtaining it, where is the perfection in so far of his work? But church buildings, home and foreign missions—all the ramifications of steady, aggressive Christian work—add incalculably to this financial need. All these must be supported. It would be very strange if God has not indicated how.

This anomaly is increased when certain facts, which all grant to be taught in the Bible, are considered. The scriptures indubitably assert: (1) That God ordained and makes effective the gospel plan of salvation; (2) That he committed to a body called the *church* the duty and privilege of making known this gospel to all men; (3) That over this church and its work he set officers such as were to preach the gospel, teach the church, and rule it according to *God-given laws*; (4) That he set for the church's spiritual growth and territorial expansion, worship, and places for worship, such as teaching, praise, prayer, thanksgiving and *offerings*; and (5) last of all, That he gave *orders* as to how the officership should teach and rule; how the gospel should be propagated, and how and with what he should be worshipped. Furthermore, these orders were given with great minuteness of detail. Consider that not only in revelation, but also in providence, God has shown it to be impossible to do any or all of this great work without financial support of some kind. Is it conceivable that, giving orders as to how to meet all other demands of his kingdom, he has given none as to how to meet this particular and imperative need? Not having left all these other needs of his church to the ignorance, prejudices, frailties, imperfections, and passions, and, therefore, imperfect wisdom of his people, is it not certain that he has not left this particular need to that wisdom, which is just as faulty and imperfect on financial methods as it is on everything else known to man? There is just as much need of

divine guidance in this part of church work as there is in any other.

Therefore, the presumption is all against the fundamental assumption of the devotees of merchandise schemes for supporting the gospel, viz., that God gives no orders in the Bible as to any particular way to gain the needed finances.

It can easily be shown that this is the real assertion of the festivalists. According to them, provided you cast in your contributions at the sanctuary, you may establish a fair or bazaar, give an oyster supper, have a private theatrical, or provide a lecture, musicale, or what not. If this is not a chaos of schemes and methods, it is difficult to comprehend what would be. If this is not saying that God has not given a plan for church support, but has left it to the Christian's pleasure to provide one, what is? Deeds can speak nothing more plainly than these deeds speak this.

Would the upholders of merchandise schemes declare that it would be right to withdraw all contributions at the time of church worship? If they disclaim any such view, then they must hold that God has given a plan. One or the other of these assertions must be true. Now, if God has revealed a plan, it is the Christian's duty to follow it. His plan is practically admitted in the proviso stated just above. He has considerable audacity who sets it aside for a plan of his own. Therefore, when asked to indicate the place where God declares church festivals and entertainments to be wrong, it is only necessary to show that he has instructed his church to use another plan, and the place is given. When this is done, who can dare in the face of the fates of Adam, Achan, Saul, and Uzzah to follow any other? The words of the prophet would be solemnly appropriate, "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

It shall now be our endeavor to show the plan of church financing which God has given to the Christian church. Here a challenge can safely be extended. From Genesis through Revelation one will look in vain for anything that appears like a festival or entertainment or business scheme of any sort for the support of God's work. There is not one instance of any such thing in all the Bible. The only thing that looks like it was the buying and selling in the temple in the days of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. It is useless to call direct attention now to our Saviour's stern rebukes in that case. The Bible furnishes nowhere an approval of anything like

a church festival. "Add *thou* not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."

Scripture furnishes, however, a definite, plain, unmistakable command of God concerning the support of his church: "As I *have given* ORDER to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as *God* hath prospered him." "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him *give*; not grudgingly, nor of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful *giver*." "*Thanks* be unto God for his unspeakable gift." These three passages state the *law of God to the Christian church touching church finances*.

A. These statements are made with reference to the funds raised for the poor saints at Jerusalem in the days of Paul.

When he first began his work in Antioch of Syria a great dearth became prevalent in Judea. "Then the disciples *every man according to his ability*, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea; which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." (Acts xi. 29, 30.) Afterwards there was a great council of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem representing the church at large. (Acts xv. 2-6.) This council did two very important things: (a) It set aside circumcision and the whole Mosaic law as binding upon Christians, and (b) laid it upon their consciences to remember the poor. Note Paul's words (Gal. ii. 9, 10): "When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. *Only they willed* that we should *remember the poor*; the same which I also was forward to do." Accordingly we find (Rom. xv. 25-28): "But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain *contribution* for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily, and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, *their duty is* also to *minister* unto them in carnal things." First Corinthians xvi. 1 ff. gives the words quoted above. We are told (2 Corinthians viii. 1, 2) of the grace of God bestowed on the churches in Macedonia, so that in abject poverty themselves they besought Paul and Silas to receive their "*gift*" and "*fellowship* of the *ministering* to the saints." Finally, in Acts xxiv. 17, Paul records, "Now after many years, I came to bring *alms* to my nation and *offerings*."

From the facts given in the passages quoted, we learn that the collection for the saints at Jerusalem was decided upon by the churches, in the first instance, of their own accord; that an assembly of the church at large approved of the plan as suggested, and took proper measures for its prosecution; that a superintending committee, consisting of Paul, Barnabas, and others, was appointed and put to work, caring amongst other duties for this cause. Here is, therefore, a pure case of church finance in the New Testament. It might be called "Sustentation of Needy Portions of the Church by the Stronger" (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14). We learn, further, that the obligation to contribute to this cause was a *moral duty*; and, last of all, that the whole procedure was authorized by inspired apostles, acting under the direction of the Holy Spirit. Hence what was done carries with it *the weight of God's authority*.

Now what did God authorize in getting the funds needed?

1. God's people were to raise the funds by *free gifts*, and no other means were suggested.

The method is called a "contribution" (Rom. xv. 26); a "collection," or "liberality"—in the margin, a "gift" (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 3); a "gift" and "fellowship of ministering" (2 Cor. viii. 4); a "bounty"—a matter "not as of covetousness" (2 Cor. ix. 5), and an "offering" (Acts xxiv. 17). It seems as if the Holy Spirit, to make his meaning unmistakable, used every term possible to emphasize the nature of this money as a *gift untrammelled in every way*. Yet, unsatisfied, as it were, he indicates that it be a *free-will* gift. "Let each one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him (1 Cor. xvi. 2); every man according as he purposeth in his heart; not grudgingly nor of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful (Gr. *hilarious*) giver."

2. The *standard of giving* was very plainly stated.

"According to ability" (Acts xi. 29); "as it has gone well with him" (Orig. 1 Cor. xvi. 2). If first there be a willing mind, the gift is accepted "according to that a man *hath*" (2 Cor. viii. 12). These free gifts were to be in keeping with a man's means and ability. God demands *all* that we can give: no more ("not according to that he *hath not*," 2 Cor. viii. 12), and no less. When Christians obey this rule, they will have nothing left over to invest in church festivals.

3. The *motives* from which, and the *purposes* for which, these free-will offerings were to be made were likewise plainly stated. The Holy Spirit deigns to reveal God's reasons for placing in his church the plan of free gifts.

It proves on the part of the Christian a sense of obligation for benefits received (Rom. xv. 27). It shows joy in Christ. The apostle commended the Macedonian saints for "abundance of joy" in their gifts (2 Cor. viii. 2). "Wherefore shew ye to them and before the churches the *proof of your love*" (2 Cor. viii. 24). It tests our appreciation of the cost of Christ's sacrifice for us, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. viii. 9). The plan is ordained to develop the Christian in keeping with all Christian graces, "Therefore, as ye abound in everything—in faith and utterance and knowledge and in all diligence and in your love to us—see that ye abound in *this grace also*" (2 Cor. viii. 7). (Compare 2 Cor. ix. 7, 8.) The plan causes others to render thanksgiving to our Lord (2 Cor. ix. 11). Paul assures us (2 Cor. ix. 13) that our obedience to this plan will cause men to glorify God, seeing in it an indubitable proof of the genuineness of our subjection to the gospel and submission to Christ.

In brief, he sums the whole motive and purpose up in the words, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." The gift is our Lord Jesus Christ. The "thanks" should be rendered "a free gift." Let "thanks"—proofs of a thankful spirit, *gifts* expressive of thankfulness—be rendered to God for the greatest of all benefits—the Saviour.

4. The *conditions* under which these gifts are to be made are plainly designated.

(a) They are to be given in *worship*. "*Honor the Lord* with thy substance, and with the first-fruits of all thine increase" (Prov. iii. 9). The free gifts are called a "fellowship" or communion of saints. So was the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. x. 16, the word rendered "communion" here being the same rendered "fellowship" in 2 Cor. viii. 4). These gifts were ordered for the "first day of the week." On that same day (Acts xx. 17) the disciples "broke bread" together, *i. e.*, partook of the Lord's Supper. If we worship God in the supper, what do we in our free-will offerings set for the same day and called by the same term as the supper? If they are not to be made as part of worship, why does God command them to be brought in the assemblies of the saints, and on his *holy* day? Is the Christian's Sabbath holy to God?

(b) The gifts are to be brought into God's treasury *systematically*.

Paul's order was, "Upon the first day of the week let each lay by

in store, . . . that there *be no gatherings* when I come." This word "gatherings" is identical with that rendered "collection" in verse 1. The apostle meant that the Corinthians were quietly, soberly, and steadily to give to the cause of Christ in order to avoid a hurried, excited, feverish, noisy rush of collection when he came for the money asked for the poor saints. God desires systematic, week-to-week giving of *all* our ability to prevent the church's ever being under a great strain for lack of funds. Surely the rush, noise, excitement and flurry of a church festival are not in keeping with this condition, nor with that of worship!

In this case of New Testament church finance, therefore, a law of free gifts is laid upon the church. That law is enforced and emphasized by the standard, the motives, the purposes, and the conditions of giving. Repeated over and over again, the law is always gifts, free gifts, gifts of love, of zeal, of fellowship, of worship—nothing but *pure gifts*.

B. The New Testament mentions one other instance of church finance—the support of the ministry: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel" (1 Cor. ix. 10). In Phil. iv. 14–18 we have an illustration of how this support was given with inspired approval: "Ye have done well that ye did *communicate* with my affliction. Now, ye Philipians know also that, in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning *giving* and *receiving* but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye *sent* once and again unto my necessity. Not because I desire a *gift*; but I desire *fruit* that may abound to your account. But I have all and abound. I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things sent from you, an odor of a sweet smell, a *sacrifice well-pleasing to God*." Here we still find a *law of gifts*; the *purpose*, to produce Christian "fruit," and the *conditions of giving*, in *worship* as a kind of sacrifice, and as a *communion* of saints. There are the same main features as in the case of the poor fund. So in the only instances of church finance in the New Testament God ordered free gifts.

C. We crown these facts with another. Christ commended the *gift* of the widow's mite. The *spirit* of all scripture is *give*. Christ gave himself. God gave his Son. Both give the Holy Spirit. The Spirit gives us life. We are to give our bodies to God. Christ is to be given our all. The New Testament knows nothing but *give*.

Hence the anomaly does not exist. God did perfect his work in giving a perfect law of church finance. That law is, *Worship God*

in free gifts systematically. According to the principles discovered, that law admits of no additions and no subtractions. It forever forbids church festivals and their coterie of practices.

III. THE CHURCH FESTIVAL IS NOT GOD'S PLAN, BUT A DEPARTURE FROM IT, AND AS A DEFINITE THING IN THE CHURCH, TO BE TAKEN IN ITS ENTIRETY, IS DISCREDITABLE.

A. In fairness some things should be said in favor of the festival.

1. The festival always comes forward with the face of an honest, business venture. In matters sold, enjoyment given, or entertainment provided, a full equivalent for the money invested is promised. No Christian body surely would ever hold a church fair, lecture, supper, or what not, without believing that they gave to the patron the worth of the fee charged. In numerous instances the Christian conscience has approved what was strictly honest as a matter of simple bargain and sale.

2. These honest, business ventures represent a labor of love and devotion to Christ on the part of those who provide them. The tears and prayers, the anxious hopes and fears of the best and purest Christians attend them. They are often laid at the Saviour's feet as tokens of gratitude and praise.

3. These schemes, so their advocates assert, often put into the church's coffers funds otherwise next to impossible to get. Many devout women are without ready money. This is variously caused. They are stayers-at-home. Their husbands, fathers, or brothers either cannot or will not give them money for Christian purposes. Others think they must use their small ready money in other ways. The calls of life are many. Necessities daily accumulate. It requires great stint to give in coin to the church. To both these classes the merchandise schemes seem to afford ready relief and ready funds for the church's great needs.

4. Results of these schemes may be alleged in their defence. Many a stately edifice stands a monument to a church fair's monetary value. Pulpits, pews, organs, books—all sorts of church furniture—are produced through ice-cream's power. Struggling, destitute congregations have weathered many a stormy gale through the marvellous financial fruitage of the oyster.

5. Churches favoring these schemes often seem to secure thereby great popularity. Their members multiply and much good Christian work is done in them. It is claimed that the good-will and sociability

often engendered among the members are marked. It is not said, however, how much of this is *spiritual* development.

In brief, the festival can say much in its own behalf. The answer is not far to seek. Many a villain is a polished gentleman in appearance. It is impossible to point out a single heresy in the church's history or error in her conduct that does not hold up "the good it has done." Herod adorned Jehovah's temple in marble and gold; an infidel can preach morality and beautify his falsehood with beneficence; and Satan often steps into the pulpit and proclaims subtle error in Christian garb. Hence, in spite of its fair appearance and beneficial deeds, the church festival may be evil and contrary to God's commands.

B. That the festival is contrary to God's commands can be shown in several ways.

1. The first charge against it is that it is a departure from the divine plan.

Undoubtedly, merchandise schemes are either an addition to the plan of free-will gifts or a substitute for it. Perhaps they are a *detraction* from it. Such methods are not "according to ability," for, if many of their patrons are to be believed when gifts are asked, they have far less to give than they expend in such things. The patrons are not buying to prove their love and cause thanksgiving to God, nor to show their submission to Christ and subjection to the gospel, for if they were, they would give without expectation of return for the money spent. There is no worship in such procedure, and no "fellowship of the ministering" of the saints. Nor will any one have the hardihood to claim that it is the plan of free gifts as laid down in the scriptures, Old and New. Which should hold, God's wise plan or human schemes?

2. The merchandise method is denounced by Christ himself. This denunciation was twice given—at the beginning and at the end of his ministry. When he said, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise," and, "It shall be called a house of prayer," He declared the *incongruity of merchandise methods with divine worship*.

The passover season in Jerusalem was essentially a time of worship. Jews and Gentiles came from all parts of the world to share in that worship. God commanded every devout Jew to "eat the passover." Before he could obey, sacrifice on God's altar was necessary. It was impossible for the many visitors from afar to bring with them the animals and products necessary to meet all the demands of the

feast. These had to be bought after arriving in Jerusalem. There was also the temple tax, to be paid in the "sacred coin" of the temple. Thus it became necessary for the pilgrims to exchange their various coins for the temple money. For the sake of the poor, unable to provide sheep and oxen, God ordered doves and pigeons for sacrifice. Amongst others, the temple authorities owned temple flocks and herds, and doves and pigeons. They possessed the sacred half shekel also. For convenience' sake, and to sell temple property, a market for all these things was provided in the temple enclosure for the sojourners at the feast. Stalls and butcher shops gave a plentiful supply of sheep and oxen, and venders of doves and pigeons had their stations and cages, and hawked their wares. Near the entrance to the court of the Jews the money-changers set their tables, and exchanged the temple coin for the ordinary money of the worshippers. A certain percentage of all went into the temple treasury. The proceeds of the sale of the temple property furnished enormous additional wealth. All this buying and selling, exchanging of money, and crying of wares was done *in the interest of the temple worship and the passover feast, or in the support of religion*. Nevertheless, Christ overturns the tables of the money-changers, drives out the traffickers in sheep, oxen, and doves, "them that *bought* and them that *sold*;" and purifies his Father's house. He commanded, "Make not this house a house of merchandise." To-day at church festivals and their ilk, *in the interests of worship and religion*, wares are bought and sold. This is religious merchandising, and is condemned by Christ.

An evasion of this is met by saying that Christ condemned the merchandise in the temple enclosure, not elsewhere. This proves only that church festivals, concerts, etc., are not legitimate in church buildings, but are entirely so elsewhere. That building, being set aside for purely religious purposes, could not rightly be used for purposes of merchandise sort.

The temple symbolized God's heavenly dwelling place, and hence signified God's dwelling place amongst men. The worship of the temple typified the worship rendered God in the heavens. For example, the entrance of the high priest once a year into the holy of holies typified the Saviour's entrance once for all into the heavenly holy of holies. The temple and its worship were, therefore, consecrated to God's and separated from secular use. The support of both was something likewise sacred—worship. The desecration was in the manner of supporting God's "house of prayer;" in its being hon-

ored (?) with a secularized, merchandised worship. "Our Lord here enounced the general principle that the church is a spiritual institution, designed for spiritual ends, to be conducted on spiritual principles, and to be surrounded by spiritual associations."

The church of Christ is more than the wood and bricks and stones and mortar of her material buildings; more than the building and the plat of ground surrounding it. Raze every church building to the ground and confiscate every foot of church property, and you have destroyed the church of the living God herself not one iota. The church on earth is the body of Christ's followers—the visible evidence of his invisible kingdom. Her edifices are sacred only by virtue of reflection from her sacredness. If a thing defiles and desecrates the place where the church worships, surely it defiles and desecrates her more. If dragging the church building into the midst of festivals, lectures, and musicales for money defiles it, to drag the church of Christ herself into them anywhere defiles her more. The Lord forbids making his glorious church a church of merchandise at all.

But some claim that these merchandise methods, when used outside of the church enclosure, are not enterprises of the church, but of the private parties who employ them. If this claim be well-grounded, the money accruing to these private members is theirs to give or not to give to the church, just as they please; just as the merchant's money is his. They can honestly spend it for their own individual, secular needs. However, these individuals call them *church* festivals, *church* concerts, etc. They induce men to buy by the plea that they are for the church, and thereby contract to turn every penny made into the church coffers. The newspapers are besought to publish them free of charge for the *church's sake*, which they would refuse to do for the individual's sake. The church is expected to give her auspices. All good church members are chided for not patronizing "the church's enterprises." The minister is always asked to announce these things along with notices of the *church's* work and worship; in brief, to "interrupt God's service to talk about concerts and suppers and festivals given by individuals to make money for their own use," if these things are not the church's work. Furthermore, after the profits from these schemes are all in hand, these individuals consider themselves in honor bound to turn over all to the church, just as the clerk does the proceeds of the sales of his employer's goods. They constitute themselves agents of the church, and, therefore, all that they make the church's own, not as

a *free gift* from them, but as their *debt* to her. The church is so brought into connection with all these schemes as to make her do nothing else than transact business for monetary gain, just like a merchant or any purely secular organization. There can be no doubt that the church festival is contrary to the general principle announced by Christ—that all the church's doings should be spiritual. Make not Christ's church a church of merchandise.

3. The church festival shows its departure from God's plan and its discreditable character in the limitations which its advocates continually have to place upon it. Its tendency is to all manner of excess. In what bounds can they be kept? The answer is unknown. Some say one thing and some another. If scripture has not by its *law* set the bound, shall man undertake the task? Are men at last to assume the dignity of confidential advisers of God? Is it not daring presumption to set a limit which God has not set, as well as to remove one that he has established? Only they who are tampering with God's law of church finance are at sea as to the allowable and unallowable in methods and schemes. The upholder of God's plan knows his position. Here is food for thought. To say the least, the fact is not favorable for the festivalist.

C. The church festival method is discreditable in that every plea urged in its defence sets aside some plain Bible statement.

1. It is urged that if we do not employ such means the church will perish for lack of modernity, and consequent popularity. To be successful the church must make a noise in the world.

Our Lord's instructions are explicit to the effect that we are to take heed not to make our gifts before men to be seen of them, upon pain of receiving "no reward of our Father" who is in heaven. "Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee." This can only mean not to make a noise in our gifts to man or God. If the festivals are *gifts*, what about their "noise"? They are widely published beforehand. They would otherwise be failures. The public are afterwards notified of the "success that crowned the 'labors' of the 'earnest Christians' who gave them." The "gifts" of the individuals who provide the festivals are "trumpeted" abroad. Our Lord's command is broken. Paul says, "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;" that is, with modesty and singleness of heart. Do not call in the world to help you give, and then watch you do it. Without announcement of your purpose as an inducement to purchase, sell your last coat, if need be, for its market worth. Then quietly, without observation, reverently present

it to Christ in his house, a token of gratitude and love. If popularity is to-day obtainable only by the trumpet method, then God forbids the church to be popular. Notoriety is too often confounded with popularity and multitudes with success.

2. Another plea is that the church or the givers are so poor as to make a festival necessary. Do not these pleaders forget that God ordered the plan of free-will *offerings* to churches "in great trial of affliction" and depth of poverty? (2 Cor. viii. 2.) Who knows the best finance for a poor church and a poor Christian, God or man? As to the poverty of the faithful women who give these entertainments, let them remember the *widow's mite*. Christ approved that mite: it spoke volumes of gratitude, love, and worship. Would his commendation have fallen so graciously had she kept "all her living" safe at home, taken some articles, gotten the neighbors to add others, noised her purpose abroad, made a good business venture, and brought the proceeds of such a course to cast into the Lord's treasury? The Lord desires our *mites*, not our departures from his plans. He accepts our gifts "according to that we *have*, not according to that we *have not*." He who cries poverty to justify ecclesiastical merchandising forgets the plan God gave to Christians deep in poverty, persecuted, and oppressed. God will not accept his plea.

3. A third plea is, the church needs money; if we rely upon free gifts, we shall never have enough to meet her needs; she will be in danger. Men will not give except through church festivals. Hence they are necessary.

Here is a perfect Pandora's box of evils and false logic. How much of the necessity *has the festival itself created?* Because of its danger, Uzzah touched the ark—and died for his "error." This plea bears bald unbelief on its face. God gives a plan to his church, and says of it, "He that soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully." "God is able to make all grace abound toward you, that ye, *always having all sufficiency in all things*, may abound to every good work, being enriched . . . to all bountifulness." "He that ministereth seed to the sower, both minister bread for your food and multiply your seed sown." (See 2 Cor. ix. 6-10, and compare Mal. iii. 10.) In these scriptures God gives his word to the effect, that if his people obey him in offerings, his church shall be supported, and they shall be blessed. This plea expresses unbelief in that Word, and in God's wisdom in the plan that he gives. The plea says plainly that the church is in danger because God's people are not doing their duty. God says that if they do, the church shall prosper. The pros-

pering is lacking; therefore, observance of the duty is lacking. This plea would perpetuate this neglect of duty, by making it easy for Christians not to give. It is nothing more nor less than a confession that in the hearts of God's people to-day there is not enough of gratitude, love, and thankfulness to Christ, who died for them, to open their purses and pour their thankful gifts into God's treasury—a confession that God cannot care for his church, and she must look to the world. This plea would make the church leave her rock in God's resources and the grateful gifts of worship of God's people, and become a street vender of wares. It robs her of her dignity as the bride of Christ, receiving the loving gifts of her followers, and, clothing her in the rags of beggary, sends her into the dirty marts of business to cry her tale of need. Some say, "It is a shame to make the church a beggar for men's unwilling gifts. It is nobler to let her make her money." If supporting her by the free-will offerings of her devoted children makes her a beggar, God makes her such. The devotee of the festival would take this bride of Christ, and, placing in her hands a bowl of oysters, a saucer of cream, and a piece of cake, make her urge, "Buy of me, because I need a new organ, or a belfry, or am poor." The maimed, placarded beggar stands on the street, and holds out his bunch of pencils to the passer-by, saying, "I am helpless; buy of me." To this position does the festival reduce the church. None of those who provide a festival would turn beggar, and thus sell fruits from a table on the streets for a living, because such is beneath the dignity of a full man. Yet they think to honor the church in making her do that very thing! "What a state our poor church must be in when she is forced to take to selling oysters and ice-cream for a living!" It is only as the church's neediness is urged that the festival is crowned with success.

4. Only one more plea can be noticed, *i. e.*, those who give the festival are really giving to God. This is the point of last refuge.

One reply is sufficient; many could be given. Giving is not the only thing required. The demand is for giving in a particular way. It is to be a gift direct; *not provided through the ability of others*. It is to be a gift of *worship*; a gift *proving* our trust in God; a gift along with other gifts—a communion in gifts. God sets before us a pure gift; not one contaminated by self-gratification—"as of bounty, and not as of *covetousness*." The gift of him who gives only when he expects a material return is despised by God. In his sight, a gift of money given only when the fun and excitement of a festival procure it, is no gift at all. Where also, in the rush, worry and ani-

mosities incident to merchandise methods of all sorts, are the worship and development of spirituality demanded by God in church finance?

The devoted members who resort to the church festival and its related schemes are generally those who love God and his cause, and give liberally themselves. What causes them to adopt such measures is the exhaustion of their own resources, and the still unmet needs of the church. Many do not faithfully give. The loyal thus fill up the want occasioned by this negligence of their brethren. Thereby a premium is put upon the coldness and indifference which cause that negligence. Men feel no call to give, because some devoted hearts will, they know, through some business venture, fill up their deficiency, and meet every crying need of Christ's church. True loyalty would forego such questionable methods, and stir up the pure love of the brethren by constant adherence to God's wise plan.

GEORGE W. LAWSON.

Park Place, Norfolk, Va.

HOMILETIC NOTES.

JACOB AT THE JABBOK.

"And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day."—GENESIS xxxii. 24.

THE Rubicon was not more eventful in the career of Cæsar than was the Jabbok in the life of Jacob. His consciousness of solitude was enhanced by the darkness of night, and the critical character of the issue which confronted him. It was at this time that God came to him, as he so often comes to us in our hours of darkness and loneliness. But he did not come as a protagonist in his contest with Esau. He came rather as an antagonist, opposing all further progress toward Canaan.

God's first reason for antagonizing Jacob was grounded in the nature of Canaan. It was God's country, not man's. He had promised it to the elect race, of which Jacob was the head. But it was to become theirs by the gracious gift of God, and not by conquest, purchase or cession. Jacob, however, did not realize this, and endeavored to buy his way into Canaan by appeasing, with his presents, the wrath of Esau. But God was not willing that he should get possession of the land in this way. This incident illustrates the way in which God deals with men who try to get salvation in some other way than by receiving it as a free, gracious gift.

The second reason for God's opposition to Jacob was the nature of Jacob himself. He was a supplanter. Such a man was unfit to be the head of the church on earth. It was necessary to change his nature. The change was made, and was forever commemorated by changing his name from Jacob to Israel. Jacob was unwilling for the change, and resisted to the last the effort of God to make him a new man. He never fully recovered from the effects of that struggle. Ever afterwards he was lame, and bore in his body the marks of the Lord.

This feature of the incident illustrates the necessity of regeneration, and the method of God in dealing with men to make them willing in the day of his power. He does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men; but when affliction becomes necessary to the furtherance of his merciful purposes concerning them, he does not shrink from laying it upon them. Our afflictions, like Jacob's, may be brought upon us by our own perverseness, and they may, too, like his, be the introduction to a new, a better and a happier life.

W. H. NEEL.

Memphis, Tenn.

THE WORLD ALREADY LOST.

"Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—ROMANS viii. 18.

THERE are two judgments—one at the beginning and one at the end of the world. The first racial, the second individual. The second vindicates the first.

The world is, therefore, condemned already. This needs great emphasis. The world does not believe it. The majority of the members of the church are not convinced of it.

Salvation is not from a future judgment alone, but from a past. Therefore, it is not a question of morals. The man already condemned to be executed cannot hope to escape by simply being good.

This doctrine of the world already lost is the only explanation of the zeal of the church. Without it missions are lifeless.

It reveals the true mission of the church, not to reform simply, but to rescue.

It gives the true philosophy of life. Why the babe suffers. The seeming injustice of many things. The devil, the god of this world, is not just or merciful. Sin and hell are not questions of justice, but of fact.

It opens to us the true interpretation of Christ's life and death. The "free gift" is otherwise meaningless. Christ implies Adam. Justification through Christ cannot be understood without the fall through Adam. The meaning of the New Testament stands or falls with the story of Genesis. Heaven is explained only through a lost Eden.

The highest hope of human righteousness, even if perfect, could only be Adam's condition before the fall. That was not heaven. There is, however, no reasonable reward hereafter for human righteousness. We do not expect a pension for obedience to civil laws. Our neighbor does not pay us for not stealing his horse. It is much more foolish to expect such a reward as heaven's glory on the ground of human righteousness, even if perfect.

Christ's righteousness is open to "all men." Whosoever will, of all the lost world, may escape from hell to heaven through him. He is able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto him. All are lost; all are offered salvation—a free gift.

EDWARD EVERETT SMITH.

Owensboro, Ky.

THE WAGES OF SIN, AND THE GIFT OF GOD.

"For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—ROMANS vi. 23.

THIS text is exceedingly familiar. Its frequent use has rendered it well-nigh commonplace. It is constantly quoted to clinch argument or enforce appeal. Its familiarity grows out of its importance. It is a marvellous combination of the warning and invitation of the gospel; a distinct expression of the goodness and severity of the perfect God. It enthrones both Justice and Love; abates none of the terrors of the law, but uses them to heighten the sweetness of the gospel. Its message is such that "he may run who reads, and he who runs *may* read."

There is in the text a striking contrast. It is as though two canvasses faced each other. One black-lined, gloomy; the other bright-hued, glowing, beautiful. Or, as though in one quarter of the heavens there hung a cloud, black, lightning-pierced, vocal with thunder, while opposite there glowed the brilliant sunrise of promise. Or it is as though two landscapes lay before us. In one, rayless and sunless, moss-hung and funereal, stretch the forests of cypress and yew. Voiceless are its obscure aisles. Its branches seem to writhe

under the smiting of a bitter wind of despair, while only the shadow of a raven's wing sweeps in living movement through its darkness. On the other hand, the landscape glows with flower and fruit. The air is vocal with melody, life beats with full stroke, and brightening vistas show glimpses of spreading fields and glorious harvests. Such, in the text, is the contrast between justice towards sin and grace towards the believer.

"The wages of sin," etc. Let us interview the inhabitants of this house of truth. There stalk forth man's two enemies, bound together by a bond that neither can break. The idea emphasized is the inevitable consequence of penalty upon guilt. Wages must be paid; the paymaster cannot avoid it. He must pay what the servant has earned. The words warn those who fail to realize the consequential relationship between guilt and punishment. "God is not mocked," and "the wages of sin is death."

"Death!" How shall we describe this enemy of mankind? The essential idea in spiritual death is privation, separation. As the man physically dead is separated from all things with which he had been in communion, so the man spiritually dead is separated from the things of love and peace. Spiritual death involves not only separation from God and all good, but a perception of the worth of all that has been lost. The future state is one of perfect knowledge, which to the saved is a cause of ineffable joy, to the lost a source of unspeakable misery. There is combined with this sense of the value of the things that are lost, a conviction of ill-desert, which constitutes the bitterness of the lot of him who is drawing the eternal wages of sin.

But the gloomy contents of this part of the message furnish a background against which the loving words that follow shine with a brighter glory. "The gift of God is eternal life." The first thought that here emerges is that of the entire graciousness of God in salvation. Death is wages, but eternal life is a gift. It cannot be bought. God is under no obligation to bestow it; but, as a king, he gives it.

"Eternal life!" It is the bright positive of which death is the gloomy negative. Everything that death is not, eternal life is. Death is infinite loneliness, eternal banishment, thirst unappeased. Life is constant companionship, rest undisturbed, living water. Death is to grope for the ghost of a lost happiness; life is to clasp the blessed reality. Eternal life is freedom from bondage, perfection in holiness, fulness of joy.

“Through Jesus Christ our Lord.” In these words both the method and condition of salvation is made known. The plan is wrought out by Christ, and its advantages are obtained through Christ. To accept Jesus is to enter the door, to reject him is to be thrust out, for “there is no other name given . . . whereby we must be saved.” Come to Jesus!

GEO. W. PATTERSON.

Montgomery, Ala.

CHRISTIAN VOCATION.

“I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.”—EPHESIANS iv. 1.

THIS epistle contains six chapters. The first three a discussion of doctrine; the last three of practice. The text contains the germinal thought (walking worthy), which the apostle amplifies in the following three chapters under six heads.

I. *Unity.* Eph. iii. 3: “The unity of the Spirit.” The Christian, in order to walk worthy of his high calling, must be united to every other Christian in the bond of peace. And this thought of unity engages the apostle’s attention from vs. 3–17. It is sevenfold: (1) “One body;” not two, but one in Christ, “and every one members one of another.” (2) “One Spirit,” and by him we are all regenerated and sanctified, and through him “we have access to a common Father.” (3) “One hope;” not many hopes, but one. All Christians have the same hope, springing out of the effectual calling of the Spirit. (4) “One Lord,” one divine head of the church. (5) “One faith” in one Lord uniting all believers. (6) “One baptism,” symbolizing the work of the one Spirit. (7) “One God and Father of all,” binding the family in perfect unity, as with a golden chain. Wonderful unity! The Christian must have it in order to walk worthy.

II. The second requisite to a worthy walk is found in chapter iii. 22: “Putting off the old man, putting on the new.” The doctrine of sanctification. The remnants of sin cling to us like dead leaves upon the oak, that are only pushed off by the swelling of new buds. Like garments of rags, we are to lay them off, and put on the seamless robe. The apostle mentions some of the rags we are to put off: Lying (vs. 25); anger (vs. 26); yielding to the devil (vs. 27); theft (vs. 28); foul tongue (vs. 29). So, to walk worthy, we must “die daily unto sin, and live unto God.”

III. We find the third requisite in chapter iii. 30: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." We grieve the Spirit when we trifle with sin, when we give place to the devil, when we cherish a spirit of the world; and no one can live the Christian life who grieves this divine person, from whom he draws all his grace and strength.

IV. A fourth requisite is "walking in love." (Eph. v. 2.) Love is not only the propelling power in service, but the restraining power from sin. It keeps us in the narrow path, thus enabling us to walk worthy.

V. Fifth requisite, "Walk in the light." (Eph. v. 8.) "Ye are the light of the world," says the apostle. No man can walk worthy who walks in the dark. Like Enoch, we must walk with God, and then we will walk in the light.

VI. The last requisite we will notice is found in Ephesians v. 15: "Walking in wisdom." It isn't enough to walk; but we must walk wisely; not loosely, but with fixed principles of action. Let us, by the grace of God, follow this divine programme, and then we will "walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called."

JOHN H. PATTON.

Marietta, Ga.

IX.

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

PALMER'S "THE THREEFOLD FELLOWSHIP AND ASSURANCE."

THE THREEFOLD FELLOWSHIP AND THE THREEFOLD ASSURANCE. *By B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, La.* Pp. 144. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Richmond, Va. 1902.

This is perhaps the last gift of Dr. Palmer to the church he loves, and which he has served so well for forty years. In 1861, when the Southern Presbyterian Church was organized, it was Dr. Palmer who was chosen to voice, in the sermon before organization, the protest of the South against tying the church, the bride of Christ, to the chariot wheels of Cæsar. He was chosen Moderator of that organization Assembly, and presided when the Southern Church was born and set forth her distinctive principles before the world. This is enough to show that he was a trusted leader then, though in his young manhood, and now, in his old age, he is a trusted leader still. There is no name in the Southern Church more honored than that of B. M. Palmer. Dr. Palmer is a man of convictions. He stands for something. He has a creed, and he believes it in no half-hearted, tentative way, as though looking for something better, but as the eternal truth that came from the lips of God.

This book is modestly styled "An Essay in Two Parts," by its author. Its purpose is to set forth the whole scheme of Calvinism from an *experimental* point of view. We have many books on Calvinism from a theoretical, a scriptural, a logical, an apologetical point of view, and all of them are valuable in their places; but, so far as I know, this last book of Dr. Palmer's is peculiar in that it approaches our system of doctrine from the experience of the true Christian. Calvinism, in this book, is not a creed apart written in books, but a creed incarnated in the life of a true follower of Christ. It is the life that must result from a true belief of the great doctrines of grace—a life of fellowship with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, which must result in a threefold assurance—an assurance of the understanding, which is a conviction that we have rightly understood the scheme of salvation contained in the scriptures; an assurance of faith, which is an assurance that this plan of salvation is no myth, but a reality; and an assurance of hope, which is a conviction that we, having trusted Christ, can never come into condemnation, but must inherit eternal life. Can I be sure that I have found out the plan of salvation for sinners as revealed in the scriptures? Can I be sure that this plan is a reality; that it is God's complete plan? Can I be sure that if I trust Christ my sins shall all be forgiven, and I shall be made a child of God forever? To all these

Questions Dr. Palmer virtually answers, "Yes, you may be sure! If you will only find out what Calvinism is, accept it as true, and put it into practice in your life, you may be sure from your own experience."

Dr. Palmer's thorough acquaintance with both theology and psychology, his familiarity with, and reverence for, the Bible as the word of God, his long experience in the pulpit and pastorate, and his marvellous felicity of expression, pre-eminently mark him as fitted to accomplish the task he has set himself in this book. He deals with our system of doctrine from the standpoint of a great preacher, who for years has rightly divided the word of truth to congregations of thinking men.

His method is simple but stately. He goes to the Bible for his doctrines, as the astronomer goes to the stars for his astronomical creed. He never thinks his Bible can err, any more than that astronomer can think that the stars will err. Like all true Calvinists, he begins at the beginning, with God. What does the Bible teach about God? Here he deduces the Trinity as lying at the foundation of the whole plan of salvation. God exists in three persons. It may be mystical and beyond reason, but it does not contradict reason, and it is clearly revealed. Having established the Trinity as the basis, he proceeds to show that this distinction is not a vague theological speculation, but an actual reality; and the Christian knows this, because he actually has fellowship with each of the three persons in the Trinity, in their several spheres in the outward work of grace.

In Chapter II., the fellowship with the Father is developed under four particulars: 1. The Father is the representative and administrator of law, to whom supreme allegiance is due. 2. There is fellowship with the Father in the sovereignty of his electing love. There is nothing finer in the book than the developing of this head. He gives the scriptural proof of election; states Christ's own testimony; then gives the Calvinistic definition of it; defends it from its maligners, and then sums up the matter thus: "Take it out of the scriptures, and out of the scheme of grace, and the last hope of our salvation is destroyed. It is the security given by the Father to the Son that he shall not lose the reward of his mediatorial work, and the final pledge that all who believe in Christ shall certainly be saved." Dr. Palmer's exposition of the language of Peter, "elect according to the foreknowledge of God" is, not that God foreknew that some would repent and believe, and on that ground elected them, as the Arminians vainly say, but that God foreknew that if left to themselves, no one of the children of men would ever repent and believe, and thus foreknowing this corruption and doom of mankind, God did of his sovereign purpose elect some men to everlasting life through faith in his Son. 3. The third particular in which we hold fellowship with the Father is in the grace and privilege of adoption. 4. In the supreme worship rendered through him to the Godhead.

The fellowship with the Son is developed under five heads: 1. As the original source of all divine revelation. 2. As the Author and Architect of grace in redemption. 3. As the Trustee and Head of the redeemed, to each of whom he is responsible for the application of this grace. 4. As the immediate object of our faith in the work of redemption. 5. As he is the portion of our inheritance. Here the life, character, offices and work of Christ come into view.

The fellowship with the Holy Ghost is shown under four particulars: 1. In the relation he sustains to holy scriptures. 2. As author of regeneration. 3. As the efficient agent in applying the purchased salvation to sinners. 4. His agency in witnessing, in sealing, and in the resurrection of the body. This chapter on the Spirit steers clear of mysticism, which has clouded and rendered useless many of the recent works on the Spirit. Dr. Palmer seeks only to set forth clearly what scripture teaches on the Spirit and his work.

Having thus laid strong and deep the foundations of the more doctrinal part of his book, Dr. Palmer proceeds to apply it to the doctrine of Christian assurance. "Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God," says Paul, and so says our author. Since God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, has done all this for our salvation, let us realize it; let us see the threefold assurance that should be ours! First, there is the assurance of the understanding, a perfect persuasion that we have God's mind in the gospel; that it is the truth, and that we rightly understand it. We know that we know it. The grounds of this assurance are given: 1. We receive it upon the authority of divine testimony. 2. The gospel is adapted to the faculties of the soul, so that it appeals to fundamental instincts. 3. The truths of the Bible are put to the test of experience by the Christian. 4. The direct illumination of the Holy Ghost.

Next, is the assurance of faith, which is an abiding conviction of the truth and reality of the things contained in the scripture, and a hearty reception of them. The grounds of this assurance: 1. Faith must be exercised, whether under law or grace. 2. Faith is the internal sense, through which religious truth is received so as to become the foundation of worship and duty. 3. This appropriating power of faith is seen pre-eminently in the sinner's acceptance of Christ as a personal Saviour. 4. The actualizing power of faith comes alone through the agency of the Holy Ghost.

Last, he deals with the assurance of hope, which is a conviction that we, as individuals, are accepted in Christ, and shall never come into condemnation, but shall have everlasting life. The grounds of this assurance are: 1. Hope is an elementary principle in our rational nature. 2. Since salvation is conditioned on coming to Christ, we must have evidence of our having accepted him. 3. Scripture testimonies adduced. 4. The fruits of the Spirit. 5. The witness of the Spirit.

It will thus be seen that Dr. Palmer traverses a wide range of topics in the developing of his theme. In fact, within the brief compass of one hundred and forty-four pages, he touches and illuminates, in his masterly way, every principal doctrine of the plan of salvation. It is needless to say that it rings true from the first word to the last. There is no shadow of doubt or pessimism in the book, but truth, certainty and triumphant faith. Dr. Palmer's own faith is serene and beautiful. With one foot on the door-step of heaven, he pauses for a moment to send back this message to the church he loves—a message which declares of the gospel: "I know that it is true, for I have tested it by experience. It has removed all difficulties between me and my God, and satisfied all the wants of my soul! O brethren, 'Come and see,' and you, too, shall hold fellowship with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and be assured in a threefold way that

the gospel is true and your soul safe for all eternity." We commend the book, without reserve, to the church at large, to ministers and people alike.

Some years after the civil war, Dr. Palmer was in Brooklyn, and preached for Dr. Van Dyke. A gentleman who was prominent on the Northern side listened entranced, as so many have done, to the sermon. When it was over he asked, "Who was the preacher to-day?" "Dr. Palmer," came the reply. "Who? Dr. Palmer, of New Orleans, the old arch-rebel!" "Yes, it is he." "Well," said the first speaker, "he preaches like an angel." We are reminded of this characteristic of his style many times as we read this last gift of his to the church.

W. McF. ALEXANDER.

New Orleans, La., April, 1902.

ELY'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL ECONOMY. *By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics and Political Science in the University of Wisconsin.* New and Revised Edition. Thirty-first Thousand. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Sye. 1901.

Our author's bibliography, consisting of a list of works to which reference has been made in his treatise, together with certain others believed to be helpful to the general reader, embraces more than two hundred names of economic writers, of whom more than half have published one or more treatises on economics within the last ten or twelve years.

This rapid multiplication of works treating either in a general or specific way of the science of Political Economy certifies a demand somewhat extensive and imperative, and the demand, equally with the corresponding supply, points to a growing interest, and indicates a general and special significance of economic studies.

Truly an inquiry dealing with the satisfaction of man's material wants and their wise adjustment, claims and, in some sort, evokes a perennial interest, and presents an ever-present significance: and yet, as a distinct science, appropriating a definite and peculiar field of investigation, Political Economy figures as little more than one hundred years of age. Two facts explain the seeming anomaly. It goes with the saying that ours is a scientific age; the methods of logical scrutiny and elucidation are mercilessly applied to every class of facts, including man's sentiments, desires, and aspirations, equally with the more rigid facts of the physical universe.

Men are now not only conscious of certain wants, but scientifically conscious of them; *i. e.*, they understand better the meaning of these wants and more intelligently aim at their adjustment and satisfaction. At the least accelerated movement in that direction figures as one of the signs of our time.

Closely related to this deepening consciousness of the meaning of economic experience is a second fact yet more obvious and significant: man's interest in his relations to his physical environment has been stimulated and intensified by the recent and marvellous phenomena of commercial expansion,

and the consequent and rapid ripening of industrial and social problems, domestic, national, and ecumenical.

Ours is said to be a materialistic age. So it may be; yet there are not wanting signs of a wholesome reaction, not only in the ranks of philosophical thinkers, but equally in the attitude of men of science; yea, of the captains of industry themselves, touching the great social problems of the nation and of the world. Witness, for example, the marked tendency towards idealism of our great universities, apparent not only in the writings of pure speculatist, but equally evident in the works of practical scientists such as Shaler of Harvard, the late Prof. LeConte of the University of California, and particularly in that remarkable little book of Darwin's successor, the late Prof. Romann of Oxford, his *Thoughts on Religion*. Equally significant of the growing conviction that the welfare of society demands the dominance of mind over matter are the princely gifts of the Princes of Industry, such as Carnegie and Rhodes, in furtherance of the cause of higher education.

At all events, if we wish to counteract the materialistic tendencies of our day, we are bound to meet false views touching the correlation of mind and matter with a true and lucid theory of man's relation to the physical universe. If the testimony of consciousness is reliable, matter, whatever in the last analysis its essential significance may be, is a reality by its anti-thetic properties contrasted with, yet vitally related to, mind. And thus there is a need that we correctly interpret the correlation of our physical want and our physical environment, so that we may use this present world as not abusing it. The subject of those wants is at once an individual and a social unit: hence arise the peculiar problems of Political Economy. We may equally repudiate the tenet of absolute individualism and absolute collectivism; and yet the social and industrial problems of our day still confront us with an imperative for at the least their approximate solution. Knowledge even of the compelling force or forces by means of which conflicting interests, social and industrial, may be certainly adjusted, is not enough: an intelligent appreciation of the actual conditions of the problems to be solved is needful that we may efficiently play our secondary and instrument part in the application and direction of moral and spiritual forces to their adequate solution. Let us ever remember that while the One Great Source of these forces, as of all force and energy, is superhuman, the channels through which they find application to the individual and society are human minds, and hearts, and hands. If such be the economic outlook of our day, surely every wise thinker and laborious investigator who may help to an intelligent appreciation of the problems of our economic life, indicate the true point of view from which we may scan and interpret the social, commercial, and industrial trends and tendencies of the day, merits a warm welcome and hearty thanks.

Among competent guides to learners in the school of economics Prof. Ely stands preëminent, by reason not only of his long experience as an economist in teaching and practical research and the formulated results of his investigations, but especially because of the qualities of the man himself as he shows himself to us in his writings, a man characterised at once by breadth of vision, keenness of analytic insight, and intense moral and religious sympathies.

Our apology for this slight tribute to the work of a scholar of international fame is the simple desire of attracting the attention of those who may feel the need for a concise, yet luminous compendium of the science of economics, to a work remarkable among the numerous and rapidly multiplying treatises on this subject in respect both to its conception and the manner of its realization. Our verdict is based upon a careful and somewhat critical reading of the *Introduction* in conjunction with an experience of several years with beginners in the study of economics, and the unsatisfactory search for a clear yet brief and comprehensive outline of the science suited to the average student and the time-limit of the ordinary college curriculum. Somehow we had never happened on Prof. Ely's *Introduction* until this revised edition was put in hand for review. We feel that we have found a prize, and that added interest will accrue to our class-room exercise in economics by the aid of this capital text-book. We are happy, too, in finding our judgment touching the merits of the book abundantly confirmed by the commendations of foremost scholars and educators of the day.

We cite as rather a notable coincidence two laudatory notices, one emanating from the new, the other from the old world. Says Prof. Bewne, of Boston University: "It is by far the best introduction to economic science which I have read." In almost identical terms Prof Emile de Laveleye, of the University of Leige, Belgium, writes: "The best elementary economic treatise that I have read. How clear and simple it is!" Were further evidence needed of the practical value of the book, it may be found in the fact that the representatives of religion unite with the devotees of science in crowning this economic gem. "Eight years ago the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church adopted it as part of the preachers' reading course. They have this year asked that the book be revised, but with the understanding that after revision it must be essentially the same book."

A brief indication of the salient features of the book discloses the secret of this consensus of opinion touching its peculiar merits.

The interest of the general reader is at once attracted by our author's charm of literary style and his felicitous method of handling the complex and intricate themes of an incomplete and rapidly growing science. Thoroughly scientific in his treatment of his subject, marked at once by logical precision, coherence, and comprehensiveness, he yet further charms us by lucidity of statement as well as by the vital interest with which even the commonplaces of economics are invested. The last mentioned feature is due in great measure to the fact that economics is regarded as a department of social science, and to the vigorous application of the historical method throughout the entire work—a trait that distinguishes the book from all other elementary treatises on economics, and that tends to awaken human interest and stimulates to further inquiry.

But while our author may be classed with the so-called "historical school" of economists, he successfully avoids the fond weakness of extremists of that school for bare facts and their meaningless manipulation, and shows full appreciation of the emphasis placed by "the new deductive school" on the part that the deductive method has to play in the adequate development of science. But probably the most valuable characteristic of the book consists

in its accentuation of the vital relations subsisting between economics on the one hand and sociology, ethics and religion on the other. It is a regulative conception with the author that economics is a social science, and that social interdependence is an essential phenomenon of economic life, and should determine our conceptions of both private and public economics, and of the importance of ethical considerations.

"There is no commoner mistake in economic thought or reasoning than the omission of this fundamental fact of social interdependence from the picture which man tries to form for himself of the conditions involving concrete economic problems. The economic life of a people, its regular systematic activity for the acquisition and employment of commodities and services for the satisfaction of its wants, embraces the activity of all its individual members and political units not merely for the satisfaction of the wants of individuals as such, but also of all its institutions, educational, religious, governmental."

One more virtue we shall note. Our author sticks to his text, vigorously confines himself to his predetermined scope, and avoids the not uncommon faults of excessive analysis and classification as well as wearisome reiteration and diffuseness.

The present treatise differs from the author's *Outlines*, published in 1893, as furnishing chiefly the historical and descriptive materials of the science, while the former attempts a more systematic sketch of theory. We are informed that the main purpose of the revised *Introduction* contemplates the removal of obvious defects, the bringing of statistical statements down to date, and the changing of theoretical exposition as far as the advance of thought requires. This *Introduction* to the study of economic science thus "aims to present what intelligent citizens ought to know in regard to political economy and to do so with scientific accuracy; to help those who wish practical guidance in the solution of puzzling economic questions coming to them in the various relations of life. All other considerations are subordinated to the needs of the general reader."

A brief analysis of this interesting treatise may help the prospective reader to an appreciation of its structure and contents, and indicate the completeness with which Prof. Ely has realized his purpose.

The book consists of seven parts, with an appendix.

In part first our author elucidates in seven chapters "The Growth and Characteristics of Industrial Society, and the Nature of Political Economy." Its significance as a social science is vindicated; the economic life of man is sketched; the two great factors in a national economy, land and man, are signalized; the evolution of economic civilization is traced, and the science is viewed from the twofold standpoint of production and transfers; the present status of economic society and of economic progress, and the general features of the economy of the modern nation are depicted.

Next, in a masterly way, are discussed the nature and scope of the science, the questions of methods and laws in political economy, the utilities and relations of the discipline.

Part second elucidates in four chapters the nature, motives, factors, and the organization of the factors of economic production.

Part third, in four chapters, discusses the transfer of goods, money, credit and banks, the regulation of industrial commerce.

Part fourth, in ten chapters, treats of distribution, and embraces the topics of rent, interest, and profit; wages and labor organizations; profit-sharing and coöperation; socialism; monopolies; remarks on social problems and remedies for social evils.

Part fifth deals briefly with consumption.

Part sixth, in two chapters, treats of public finance.

Part seventh treats the evolution of economic ideas in the ancient world, in the Middle Ages, and in modern times.

The appendix embraces suggestions touching the study of economics and courses of reading; questions and exercises; an extensive bibliography.

A carefully prepared index of seven pages completes the volume.

Clarksville, Tenn.

J. E. FOGARTIE.

KENT'S "THE JEWISH PEOPLE."

A HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE DURING THE BABYLONIAN, PERSIAN AND GREEK PERIODS. *By Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and History, Brown University.* With maps and chart. Fourth edition. 12mo, Pp. xx., 380. \$1.25. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901.

The popularity of this small volume is indicated by its reaching a fourth edition within two years. It is one of the Historical Series for Bible Students, under the general editorship of Professors Kent, of Brown University, and Sanders, of Yale University. The series is an effort to give a non-technical, but scholarly, guide to the study of the history, literature and teaching of the Old and New Testaments, and of the contemporary history and literature. The volumes already issued have well carried out this object. They are among the most readable books ever issued. They, unhappily, popularize some of the modern theories of the critics as to the recent authorship of some parts of the Bible, the double authorship of Isaiah, and such like teachings. Each volume is complete in itself.

The period in general, of about four centuries, beginning from 586 B. C., the date of the destruction of Jerusalem by the army of Nebuchadnezzar, the author of the volume before us justly characterizes as of the greatest importance. One of the grounds for his assertion, however, showing the trend of his mind and his attitude toward the advanced theories, is that this period witnessed the rise of more than half the literature of the Old Testament, while probably every book of that ancient library was either written then or else edited and revised. In his preface he remarks, touching the work of modern Biblical research, that it is well that we are learning to be content at times with a mere probability, or even with leaving a doubtful question open, and apologizes in advance for the fact that "probably" may seem a mannerism. This is not a fault with which conservatives usually charge advanced students. It has been our observation that probability is somewhat ruled out by the latter. They usually begin with probability, and desert that ground for actual assumption of truth. Few of the historico-critical school stop with "probable."

In this volume there are three parts, dealing severally with the Babylonian, the Persian, and the Greek periods of Jewish history. In each part the author first considers the historical sources and literature of the period, and following that, traces the history and more pregnant facts of the period. In the Babylonian period he places, properly, portions of Jeremiah's prophecy and the prophecy of Ezekiel. Here, too, he places Isaiah xiii. 2 to xiv. 23, with the statement that even a cursory reading of it furnishes conclusive evidence that its historical background is the Babylonian exile. Here, too, he locates Isaiah xl. to lv., with some further statement that the Messianic ideals of this section were very different from those of Isaiah Ben Amoz of two centuries before. Of Lamentations, he holds that no one can assert absolutely that there is not a basis for the tradition that Jeremiah was the author, but concludes that it belongs, as to authorship, to disciples of Jeremiah or Ezekiel.

In the Persian period, beginning B. C. 539, Ezra figures as the first writer. Of him there is this significant assertion: "Like his contemporaries, he unconsciously read the institutions and conditions of his own day into the earlier and more primitive periods, since he did not fully realize that Israel had enjoyed a progressive religious development extending through many centuries." These words, by the way, most aptly express the method of the modern reconstructors of the Bible. This "unconscious" coloring by a later writer of literature and facts which long antedated his time, is little better than that habit which the author attributes (p. 6) to the Bible writers of falsely assigning dates or quoting passages in a "harmless" custom which resulted in preserving many a priceless literary treasure from threatened oblivion! The dishonesty of the Bible is the first conclusion that the thinking mind will reach, if these notions of the modern historical and literary reconstructionists be true. The author here also asserts the anonymity of Malachi, here places the last few chapters of Isaiah, and, chiefly because of certain slave-trading mentioned in connection with Grecians (iii. 2-8), assigns Joel. Ruth and Jonah are put here, too, on the basis of Aramaisms detected in both.

In the Greek period, beginning B. C. 332, are placed the books of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, the latter part of Zechariah, Esther, Ecclesiastes and Daniel.

Among other appendices, is one on the books of reference upon Jewish history. In this will be found a tolerably full bibliography of the subject, chiefly Dutch, French and German, and altogether on the side of the reconstructionists.

The chapters on the literature of the several periods are, of course, but a small part of this volume, but they indicate the point of view of the author, so far as the biblical sources of the history are concerned. The other portions of the book, in their account of the life, customs, history of the people of Israel and of the nations around them, are full of thrilling interest, are finely written, and bring the events of an obscure age clearly and vividly before the reader. We could wish that such an attractive work were based upon sounder principles, so far as the latter touch the biblical narrative.

BALLARD'S "THE MIRACLES OF UNBELIEF."

THE MIRACLES OF UNBELIEF. *By Frank Ballard, M. A., B. Sc., F. R. M. S., etc., Minister of Wycliffe Church, Hull; Double Prizeman in Hebrew and New Testament Greek in the University of London; Author of "The Mission of Christianity," "Reasonable Orthodoxy," "Which Bible to Read," etc.* 8vo. Pp. 376. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1900.

The author is an evolutionist. He does not accept the principle of verbal inspiration. He does not see in the Old Testament anything concerning immortality and the resurrection. But for all this, he gives a clear-cut, strong argument for the religion of the Bible. The wonder is that he did not run into more mistakes. The book is an apologetic. Its distinctive principle is that Christianity is supernatural, and that it must be so. How he reconciles this principle and its co-ordinate one, that such a Christianity must rest ultimately upon a revelation which is only and all of God, with even a mild holding of evolution, and with any kind of inspiration but the plenary, we shall leave to himself.

The author specially emphasizes the fact that it is not so much naturalism as it is anti-naturalism that is set over against supernaturalism. "Naturalism," says he, "with all its dramatic pessimism, can give no rational account of the whence or the whither" of the world's physical suffering and moral evil. "It is therefore utterly disqualified, on scientific principles, from suggesting any fundamental cure." "Naturalism can render no reason whatever as to the source and existence of all these things, save that they developed themselves by chance, through a process of evolution which determined itself, out of ultimate atoms which caused themselves to be the 'manufactured articles' which science is compelled to own them. . . . With reference to . . . the yearning for blessed immortality, naturalism has nothing to hold out to the sore heart of man but the clammy hand of hopeless death." Against naturalism he charges the triple failure of intellectual insufficiency to solve the problems which relate to the past, to explain the realities of the present, and to do anything else than crush human aspiration in regard to the future.

In a practical way the author pleads for more familiarity on the part of ministers of religion with the fundamental principles of apologetics, and more frequent presentation of them from the pulpit. There is a fervor about the book which, despite the somewhat heavy nature of its contents and discussion, makes it most attractive to the reader.

RIGGS' "HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE."

A HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE DURING THE MACCABEAN AND ROMAN PERIODS (INCLUDING NEW TESTAMENT TIMES). *By James Stevenson Riggs, D. D., Professor of Biblical Criticism, Auburn Theological Seminary.* With maps and chart. 12mo. Pp. xxii., 320. \$1.25. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900.

The interbiblical period is at once the least popularly known and the most thrilling in all history. It is at the same time one of the most impor-

tant in its bearing upon subsequent times. This is true even as to secular history. It is much more true as to sacred history. This period witnessed the transfer of the seat of power from the East to the West, the lowering of the civilization of the one and the elevation of that of the other, the founding of those empires which have had the most potent influence in shaping the career of modern nations of all parts of the world, and, above all, the immediate preparation of the world for the coming of Christ. Between the East and the West lay this little Jewish people, out of whom should spring the Messiah, the Saviour of the world.

That part of the interbiblical period covered by Dr. Riggs' little volume was most significant. In it were brought to their fullness of development the Jewish sects which figured so largely in our Saviour's day, the literary form of the Bible which was most current in his day, the political changes which brought about the outward condition of the world in the days of the first apostolic efforts and earliest propagandism of the faith. All these are faithfully recorded in Professor Riggs' book. In Part I. he first tells of the sources of the history, and then describes the causes and occasion of the Maccabean uprising, the successful struggle for religious freedom, the contest for political freedom, the attainment of independence, the development of Judaism in Syria and Egypt, the internal divisions and the growth of parties, the revival of Hellenism, the fatal dissensions, and the coming of the Romans. In Part II., he tells of the last days of the Asmoneans, the appearance upon the scene of the Herodian family, the reign of Herod the Great, the inner life of the nation, and the final catastrophe. One chapter is devoted to a sketch of the Jews and Judaism in Palestine after the destruction of the Temple by Titus, and in the dispersion. A number of appendices add interest to the book, by giving various genealogies, outlines, etc. One of these is devoted to the question as to Maccabean Psalms. The author's conviction is that there is no clear and indisputable criterion for dating any of the Psalms in the Maccabean era. A very full index makes the book the more useful for reference. The whole is a volume of rare interest and profit, and the story will be found as thrilling as a romance.

"NEW PSALMS AND HYMNS."

THE NEW PSALMS AND HYMNS. Published by authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. A. D. 1901. Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Prices: Music Edition, 75 cents to \$2.50; Word Edition, 35 cents to \$1.50.

It gives us so much pleasure to see this Hymn-Book that we are little inclined to do aught but praise it. And praise it well deserves, for its outward attractiveness in cover and inner beauties of typography. It is printed in unusually clear type, of good size. the lines well spaced, the numbers large and distinct. The book lies open readily, as though made for use. As a collection of hymns, it embraces practically everything that is apt to be called for by ninety-nine hundredths of our people. In the forms of familiar hymns, the editors have sought, as far as possible, to give them as originally written. There are seven hundred and fifteen hymns, a number

vastly larger than will be actually used by the majority of churches, but not as great as that of many similar books of praise. The editors showed wisdom in limiting the number. In the selection of the tunes, care has been taken to give all the more substantial and practically approved, and to preserve the associations which have long existed between certain hymns and tunes. A small collection of chants, fifteen in number, has been added.

The indices are numerous and full. As has of late become the custom, and a happy custom it is, the Index of First Lines is put at the front of the book, where it ought to be. The Index of Tunes is also there. The Index of Scripture Texts and the Index of Subjects are unusually full, making it practicable for one to find, without trouble, suitable hymns to properly accompany any topic. An inappropriate hymn oftentimes seriously mars a happy sermon, whereas a suitable hymn deepens the impression made and strengthens the effect of the preacher's words. About one hundred Psalms are introduced in the collection.

We wonder a little at the title, "New Psalms and Hymns." The adjective "new" might well be applied to the collection, but not to the Psalms and Hymns themselves. We would prefer to think of the latter as old, long tried, and approved.

DIXON'S "THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS."

THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS. A Romance of the White Man's Burden. 1865-1900.

By Thomas Dixon, Jr. Illustrated by C. D. Williams. Small 8vo. Pp. xiv., 465. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 1902.

We wonder that the first part, and not the second, of the passage quoted upon the title page, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" was not selected to give a name to the story. For, after reading it, we find that the whole tale is designed to illustrate and enforce the principle uttered in a speech of Abraham Lincoln, "There is a physical difference between the white and black races, which I believe will forever forbid their living together on terms of social and political equality," and wrought out more sharply by the author, through the lips of one of the leading characters of the book, in the words, "In a democracy you cannot build a nation inside of a nation of two antagonistic races. Therefore the future American must be either an Anglo-Saxon or a mulatto." The story is designed to show that a black will always be a black, and that the Anglo-Saxon race cannot and will not tolerate him in power.

The story is cast largely in the mould of Harriet Beecher Stowe's famous *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. It brings together incidents of actual occurrence, and weaves them together as a most harrowing whole. Unlike its famous prototype, however, it does not take up the unusual, the rare, the abnormal; but the real, the common, the almost daily-experienced facts of the entire section over which the pall of black rule fell, and over which black passion has so foully wrought its nameless crimes. The tale is realistic to the last degree, thrilling, powerful. The unfortunate fact is that it will not be believed outside the region in which the events recorded have actually occurred. These facts are too harrowing to be accepted by those who have lived at a distance from them. The writer is strong and nervous in style, rising to heights of passion

and pathos, far from smooth, and lacking the ripeness which will come from longer experience in literature. He has the courage of his convictions, and if those who should read this book will only give it attention, and for themselves inquire into the evidence for the incidents recorded, the book will accomplish good.

To us the finest piece of work in the book is that part which is devoted to the relations of the typical advocate for social equality to a practical case of such brought to his own home. Here the writer surpasses himself in fine analysis and in the keenness of the satire of fact.

In bringing the story, in its historical aspects, down to the very verge of the writing, the author rather weakens the effect. History requires a perspective, to be properly written, and time and distance are needful to give this perspective. No history written the day after the event is apt to view the latter in all its true relations.

As a story, there is but little in the book. It was not the author's aim to make this the leading feature. The thread is just large and distinct enough to carry the facts. As a story, and in its style, it is inferior to "Red Rock," which deals with much the same period; but in its power it far surpasses Thomas Nelson Page's book.

Taken altogether, it is a strong and passionate statement of life in the South, as witnessed all over that section, and as containing within itself problems which outsiders can neither appreciate nor deal with. The conditions will be better understood by outsiders if they will read the book.

X.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

LIGHT FROM THE EAST; OR, THE WITNESS OF THE MONUMENTS. An Introduction to the Study of Biblical Archæology. *By the Rev. C. J. Ball, M. A. (Oxon.)*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1899.

In its mechanical execution, this quarto is a beautiful specimen of modern printing. Paper, press-work, typography and illustrations are perfect.

The book does not present the results of archæological study, but consistently carries out the purpose named in its sub-title. It prepares for the study, and presents the facts upon which the student must base his own conclusions or theories. For apologetic uses, therefore, the student must needs seek some other work. The field is so large, however, and so fruitful, that one does well to prepare for it as he may do with this guide.

THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Being the History of the Process Whereby the Word of God has Won the Right to be Understood. *By Henry S. Nash, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Episcopal School of Cambridge.* 12mo. Pp. 203. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1900.

The title of this book is almost a misnomer. It should be "A Plea for an Advanced Form of Criticism." The author's theory of criticism is one which discards the fundamental principle of infallibility. He pronounces "the dogma of infallibility" to be foreign to both reason and revelation. A large part of the book is devoted to such subjects as "How Criticism Became Necessary," "The Historical Spirit," and "The Inspiration of Criticism." As a history it is of little value.

OUTLINE OF A HISTORY OF PROTESTANT MISSIONS FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME. A Contribution to Modern Church History. *By Gustav Warneck, Professor and Doctor of Theology.* Authorized translation from the seventh German edition. Edited by George Robson, D. D. With portrait of the author and twelve maps. 8vo. Pp. 364. Cloth, \$2.00. Chicago and New York. Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

The editor, Dr. Robson, says of this work: "Of all existing histories of Protestant Missions, I have no hesitation in characterizing Dr. Warneck's as by far the best, not only in respect of the completeness and orderliness of its survey, but also in respect of insight into historical development and

enlightened sobriety of judgment." The author strives to avoid the extreme of overestimation on the one hand and hypercriticism, or undervaluation, on the other. He deals with missions from the historic, rather than the personal, standpoint. He studies results rather than means or measures.

THE CALL, QUALIFICATIONS, AND PREPARATION OF FOREIGN MISSIONARY CANDIDATES. Papers by Missionaries and Other Authorities. New York: The Volunteer Movement, 3 West Twenty-ninth street.

A collection of papers, each of which will be found helpful to those who are volunteering for the work of foreign missionaries. As a whole, they cover, without special unity, being by different authors, most of the questions that will arise in connection with the inquiry into one's duty and preparation for the work.

THE STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CENTURIES. *By Edward G. Selden, author of "In the Time of Paul."* 12mo. Pp. 319. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

It is of the civilization produced by the Christian faith, rather than of the faith itself, or of the church to which the sacred oracles are committed, that this book treats. The subject is traced through the apostolic period, the centuries of persecution, the fall of the Roman Empire, the middle ages, the Reformation period, and the modern era. The subject is well handled and popularly treated, giving a most interesting display of the wonderful manner in which the religion of Christ has wrought the happiest and most lasting benefits to men.

BIBLE STUDIES ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. *By Rev. John R. Herndon, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Johnson City, Tenn.* 16mo. Pp. 116. Richmond, Va.: Whittet & Shepperson, Printers. 1902.

An admirable little treatise, in three parts, or "Studies," answering the questions, What is Christian Baptism? Who are to be baptized? How are we to be baptized? The answers to these questions, covering the nature, the subjects, and the mode of baptism, are given chiefly in the words of Scripture. A proper analysis is made of each subject, and the word of God adduced for each subdivision. For instance, under the inquiry, What is Christian baptism? the author answers and proves that it is a sacrament; that it is ordained by Christ; that water is the element to be used; that this element is to be applied to the believer; that it is to be applied in the name of the Trinity; that it is a sign; that it is a seal of the new covenant; that it symbolizes the baptism by the Holy Ghost; that it is the initiatory rite of the Christian Church; that it does not symbolize death, burial and resurrection, and that it is not administered in order that sin may be remitted, but because sin has been remitted. The ground traversed is not new, nor the arguments and proofs unusual; but we know of few books as concise and clear, with as much soundness and good argument packed into as few pages.

MESSIAH'S SECOND ADVENT. A Study in Eschatology. *By Calvin Goodspeed, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in McMaster University, Toronto.* 12mo. Pp. 288. Toronto: William Briggs. 1900.

A book devoted to the post-millennial view of the second coming of Christ. It is in popular form, and will be useful as a compendium of the argument on this side.

THE RISE OF A SOUL. *By Rev. James I. Vance, Author of "The Young Man Four-Square," "Royal Manhood," etc.* 12mo. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Dr. Vance has a fancy for quartets. But he works them well. He is always bright and readable. His vigorous, clear style, his epigrammatic way of putting things, his intense earnestness, invariably secure for him interested readers. In following "the rise of a soul," the author shows that four great facts are encountered, namely, that the soul has a prospect and an opportunity, that it is hindered and obstructed, that there are divine helps within reach, and that by these one may succeed in climbing to a goal of abiding and eternal value. These four great facts are discussed under the heads of "Vision," "Shadows," "Ascent," and "Summit." Dr. Vance succeeds most happily in adapting his pulpit work to the more permanent literary form. He is rapidly gathering an unusually stimulating and suggestive series of books, which will widen his influence and success.

THE PRINCIPLES OF JESUS APPLIED TO SOME QUESTIONS OF TO-DAY. *By Robert E. Speer.* 12mo. Pp. 280. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

The writings of the young Secretary of Foreign Missions, no less than his captivating addresses, are doing much for thoughtful people. All Mr. Speer's utterances, whether written or spoken, are full of fervor, and stir the souls of those who follow him. This book takes for its fundamental principle the idea that as Jesus is the Light of the World, the source of all truth, the best solution of the problems of the day, and the best correction of the evils of the day, are to be found in the inquiry, "What does Christ approve?" The volume is so arranged, with questions and analyses, as to make it of practical value in class work, as well as for individual reading. The book contains fifty-four short chapters, showing the bearing of the principles of Jesus upon every-day affairs in all the religious, domestic, social, civic, and economic relations in which we stand.

A MIGHTY MEANS OF USEFULNESS. A Plea for Intercessory Prayer. *By Rev. James G. K. McClure, D. D., Author of "The Great Possibilities," etc.* 12mo. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

These "Studies in the Power and Serviceableness of Intercessory Prayer" are designed to check the tendency to minimize the great duty of intercessory prayer. Its subjects are: "The Mighty Ministry of Intercession," "The Talent of Intercession," "For Whom Christ Asks Intercession," "The Com-

forter Sought for Service," "Special Petitions for those Beloved," "Christian Workers Dependent upon Intercession," "The Best Requests for the Best People," and "Intercession for the Unsaved." These are presented in that practical, yet scholarly, manner which may be expected of one who has been so useful and so signally blessed as Dr. McClure in both the pastorate and the university presidency.

HOW TO GET ACQUAINTED WITH GOD. The Meaning of the Christian Science Movement. *By Theodore F. Seward.* 12mo. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1901.

A little volume which comes as near missing its aim as anything one ever encounters. The author's principal object seems to be to exploit the idea that it was only through a woman that a true interpretation of God could come. Christ he regards as a messenger from the "real universe," to restore the race to a condition of sanity, teaching that the spiritual is the only real universe; but Christ was not understood or interpreted until the last apostle, Eddy, appeared and told us what he meant, and cut out what she could not interpret. From Unitarianism to Eddyism has been the author's movement. This is sufficient to show how capable an instructor he is for others.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON SYSTEM. *By Edwin Wilbur Rice, D. D.* With a Classified List of the International Sunday-School Lessons for Thirty-three Years (1872-1904). Arranged According to the Order of their Sequence in the Bible, with the Date when Each Lesson was Studied. Prepared by Clarence Russell Williams, M. A. 16mo; cloth. Pp. 72. 25 cents. Philadelphia: The Union Press.

The description above is so complete that more need not be said. The booklet is an interesting record of thirty-two years' work. The International System is by no means perfect, but it has done a great work, and perhaps it is to it that we owe the effort now making to secure such a graded system as will better accomplish the end in Sunday-school study. Such a system is more and more demanded, and must soon be almost universally adopted.

AMERICAN LITERATURE. *By J. W. Abernethy, Ph. D., Principal of Berkeley Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.* 12mo. Pp. 510. \$1.10. New York: Maynard, Merrill & Co. 1902.

The author is a teacher of long experience, and thus familiar with the needs of teachers and classes. The work shows, also, large familiarity with the subject. By lists of biographical and critical material, he provides the reader with an abundant supply for study. Lists are given also in connection with each important author, to guide the student in critical study and outside reading. The historical feature is largely introduced to give the proper background for the study. The author devotes special attention to other's views and critical estimates of American authors. Recent contributions and Southern literature are given attention.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 60.—OCTOBER, 1902.

I.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FAITH.

EVERY intelligent reader of the Scriptures has observed how much they have to say about faith; how prominent a place they give it amongst the other graces of the Spirit. They say we are united to Christ by faith; that we are justified by faith; that we live by faith; that we walk by faith; that we are sanctified by faith; that we are saved by faith. They thus give to faith a prominence and ascribe to it an efficiency such as are asserted of no other grace in the long catalogue of the graces. As grand summaries of their teaching on this subject, they say, "According to your faith be it unto you;" "without faith it is impossible to please him;" "he that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."


There are many, however, who do not understand why it is that so much is thus said about this grace, and why there is ascribed to it so much importance in the plan of salvation. They think there is something strange about it; something arbitrary; something that needs explanation; something that very much needs explanation; something that is derogatory to religion in the view of the intelligent; for, as they suppose, the faith so much insisted on is, to some extent at least, a blind faith, an unintelligent faith, an unreasoning, and therefore an unreasonable, faith; and so a faith that inevitably brings about a conflict between itself and reason, and thus forces the intelligent into the dilemma of choosing in religion whether they will be controlled by knowledge or by ignorance; by reason or by mere credulity. There can be no doubt that there are many who

imagine that this is the issue with which they are confronted by what religious teachers usually inculcate on this subject. The writer once heard a distinguished lawyer say, in a public religious meeting, that a brother lawyer had expressed to him a wish that he could believe what Christians believe, and had asked him how he might do it; and that he had answered him, "You must just swallow it down."

But while many entertain this notion, the fact is that the Scriptures make no arbitrary demands in connection with faith, and teach nothing that brings about the slightest conflict between faith and reason.

They do not require us to believe anything that is contrary to reason. Reason is a revelation from God as truly as the Scriptures are, and since both these revelations come from the same divine source, they must be in harmony with each other; and, therefore, reason, rightly used, can never come into conflict with the Scriptures, rightly interpreted; nor can the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, ever come into conflict with reason, rightly used.

Not only is it true that the Scriptures never require us to believe anything contrary to reason, but it is also true that they never require us to believe anything without reason — without sufficient reason. We are required, indeed, to believe a number of things that are above reason; above the comprehension of our limited faculties; such as the doctrine of the creation of the universe out of nothing; the doctrine of the Trinity; the doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, and similar doctrines; but we are never required to believe anything without reason; without the best reason that can be given for believing anything. That reason is given us in the form of conclusive evidence that the Scriptures are an infallible revelation from God. In the history of the book as recorded in the annals of time, in which we can trace it back to its origin, in inspired prophets and apostles; in "the heavenliness of the matter"; in "the majesty of the style"; in "the scope of the whole, which is to give all glory to God"; in the unity of its teaching, although written by so many different authors, at so many d



ferent times, in so many different places, in so many different circumstances, with so many different qualifications and under so many different influences—the only instance of such perfect unity of teaching to be found in all literature; in “the full discovery it makes of the only way of man’s salvation”; in the efficacy of its doctrines as demonstrated by the mighty transforming and elevating moral influence they have brought to bear upon men, and institutions, and nations, wherever they have been sincerely received; in the absolute perfection of the moral law which it inculcates; in the results it would accomplish if its truths were universally accepted and its commands universally obeyed, since, as every candid person must admit, it would then make the race a perfect race and the world a perfect world;—in these, and in many other ways, God furnishes conclusive evidence that the book is a revelation from himself, written by “holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost”; “an infallible rule of faith and conduct”; and it is on this ground, and on this ground only, that he requires us to believe what it contains. Are we not thus required to believe for the very best reason that can possibly be given? And can such a faith as this bring about any conflict between itself and reason? Why, if there is anything on which the clearest reason most imperatively insists it is that such a faith as this shall be exercised. It may be well, then, to add just here, that notwithstanding all that has been said and written about “the great conflict between faith and reason,” there is in fact no such conflict, and never has been, and in the nature of the case cannot be. Reason and faith are in perfect harmony in the plan of salvation, faith doing only that on which reason imperatively insists, and reason doing only that which perfectly accords with all the requirements made of faith. Conflict occurs only when the divinely-appointed functions of one or the other are disregarded. When the Romanist, for instance, asserts that the bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper are completely changed in their substance in and by the act of priestly consecration; that nothing of the substance or essence of either remains; that their accidents, or sensible properties, however, continue the same; that their form, color, taste, odor, specific

gravity, chemical affinities and nutritive qualities remain unaltered; that the substance of Christ's body and blood are present without their properties, and the properties of bread and wine are present without their substance;—when the Romanist makes these assertions and insists that they shall be believed, reason rebels and refuses, because the assertions are absurd. They are contrary to the testimony of the senses, which affirm that the bread and wine still look, and feel, and taste, and smell like bread and wine. They are contrary to the testimony of science, for any chemical analysis to which these elements might be subjected, would show them to be still bread and wine; and they are contrary to fundamental rational intuitions of the mind, which distinctly assert that substances and their properties can never be so separated that a substance can be present without its properties, or properties be present without their substance. Thus a conflict is brought about between faith and reason. But it is only in such cases as these, where faith and reason are abused, and required to do what God has never enjoined.

The main object of this article, however, is to point out some reasons why the Scriptures have so much to say about faith, and why they attach so much more importance to it than they do to any other grace, giving it the first place in the plan of salvation.

1. Faith, in the broadest sense of the word, and as a controlling principle of human conduct, has the first place, not only in religion, but everywhere else.

It has the first place in the family. Suppose that the members of a family have no faith in each other; the husband no faith in the wife; the wife no faith in the husband; the parents no faith in the children; the children no faith in the parents; with what comfort, with what benefit of any kind, could the family relation then exist? If the husband had no faith in his wife, how could he love her even as Christ loves the church, as he is enjoined to do? If the wife had no faith in her husband, how could she reverence him, and be in subjection to him in the Lord, as the Lord requires? If the parents had no faith in each other, how could they agree together in a proper administration of the affairs of the household, and in training up their children

"in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"? And if the children had no faith in their parents, how could they receive such training at their hands with any spiritual benefit? In short, if the members of a family had no faith in each other, how could there be conjugal affection, and parental affection, and filial affection, and without such affection, how could there be that constant and faithful discharge of conjugal, and parental, and filial duties on which the welfare of the family is entirely dependent? How could there be any concert of effort to accomplish the numerous and important ends for which the family relation was divinely instituted? It is thus seen that faith has as conspicuous a place in the family as it has in religion.

But it has an equally conspicuous place in the business world. Suppose that business men had no faith in each other; merchants no faith in merchants; the merchants of one part of the country no faith in the merchants of other parts; sellers no faith in buyers; buyers no faith in sellers; employers no faith in employees; employees no faith in employers; lawyers no faith in clients; clients no faith in lawyers; physicians no faith in patients; patients no faith in physicians; teachers no faith in pupils; pupils no faith in teachers; man no faith in man, how much business could there be transacted? How many railroads could then be constructed? How many cities could then be built? How many fortunes could then be made? How much secular good could then be acquired and enjoyed? How much progress could then be made toward the highest forms of civilization? In such circumstances, how could there be any civilization at all worthy of the name? Destroy the faith of man in man, and then all those mighty energies of the race which are now so splendidly illustrating its annals with their wonderful achievements, would be as instantaneously and completely paralyzed as they will be in that day when "the trump of God shall sound and the voice of the Son of God" shall be heard, summoning them to the awful solemnities of the final judgment. Faith, thus, has as conspicuous place in the business world as it has in the scheme of redemption revealed in the Scriptures.

It has a place no less conspicuous in the civil sphere. Suppose

that the different members of civil society had no faith in each other; neighbor no faith in neighbor; citizen no faith in citizen; the rulers no faith in the people; the people no faith in the rulers; how, then, could men come together and form those plans on which the comfort and general welfare of society are so dependent? And if such plans could be formed, how could they be carried out? How could governments be organized; and if organized, how could they be successfully administered? How could laws be enacted; and if enacted, how could they be enforced? How could rulers be chosen; and if chosen, how could they efficiently discharge the functions of their respective offices? How could there be organization of any kind whatever, for any purpose whatever—social, civil, political or religious? Why, instead of organization and a well-ordered society, there would be nothing but confusion, conflict, chaos. Every man would be an Ishmaelite—his hand against every man and every man's hand against him. Society, in any desirable sense of the word, could not exist. It is plain, then, that faith has as prominent a place in the civil sphere as it has in the plan of salvation.

But it has a place equally prominent in what I may call the more purely intellectual provinces of life. Suppose we had no faith in historians, how much history could we learn? No faith in philosophers, how much philosophy could we learn? No faith in scientists, how much science could we learn? No faith in linguists, how much of the dead languages of the world could we learn? No faith in teachers of any sort, how much benefit could we derive from their instruction? The broad assertion may here be confidently made, that all our knowledge of every sort rests at bottom on faith, and on that alone. Why do we say, for instance, that we know that in past times there lived such military heroes as Alexander, Cæsar, Napoleon; such philosophers as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle; such orators as Pericles, Demosthenes, Cicero; such historians as Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy; such poets as Homer, Milton, Shakespeare? It is because we have faith in history. Why is it that we say that we know that in the fields of space above us there are certain worlds that have certain magnitudes, that move with certain velocities, that accom-

plish certain revolutions? It is because we have faith in astronomy. Why is it that we say we know that deep down in the earth's crust there are certain rocks that belong to one age of the world's history and certain other rocks that belong to other ages of its history? It is because we have faith in geology. Why is it that we say that we know that certain words derived from certain dead languages have a certain meaning? It is because we have faith in the science of etymology and philology. And so it is universally. All our knowledge of every kind rests at last on faith, and on that only. In confirmation of this fact, we may here be reminded that our knowledge of a material world external to ourselves rests on faith. Some philosophers have undertaken to prove that there is no such world. Amongst other things, they have said that our seeming knowledge of such a world comes to us through the avenues of our physical senses—the senses of vision, hearing, touch, taste and smell—but that, for different reasons, this apparent information is wholly unreliable. Why is it, then, that the great mass of men so confidently believe in the existence of such a world? It is only because they have faith in this testimony that a few would reject. Vision says that there is such a world, and so do all the other senses, and we are naturally so constituted that we cannot but believe the testimony thus given. Even those who theoretically deny that there is such a world, are constrained by the very constitution of their minds so to confide in the testimony of their senses as to its existence, that they always act—and are always obliged to act—as if their theories were discredited even by themselves. Do they not always act just as those do who believe there is such a world? Do they not go out into it just as others do; and move up and down in it, just as they do; and engage in its pursuits and seek its secular good, just as they do? Do they not write their books to prove that there is no such world, because in fact they secretly believe there is such a world, and that their books will go out into it, and be read in it by others just like themselves? Why else should they write them? Our knowledge, then, of the existence of an external material world is rooted ultimately in faith; in faith in the testimony of our senses. If we should

give up that faith, then, indeed, we should not know whether there is such a world or not, for we have no information in regard to it except what the senses give. But it is naturally impossible to give up that faith.

It may be added here that not only does our knowledge of an external material world rest on faith, but our knowledge of our own existence does also. A few philosophers have undertaken to show that nothing is certain, not even our own existence. Of course their argument is inherently absurd; for if nothing is certain, then there is one thing at least that is certain, and that is, that nothing is certain. But if the human mind can arrive at this certainty, why not at others? Augustine, in *The City of God*, Book XI., Chap. 26, long ago exploded this kind of agnosticism: "I am most certain that I am, and that I know and delight in this. In respect of these truths, I am not at all afraid of the arguments of academicians, who say, 'What if you are deceived?' For if I am deceived, I am; for he who is not, cannot be deceived; and if I am deceived, by this same token I am. And since I am, if I am deceived, how am I deceived in believing that I am; for it is certain I am, if I am deceived. Since, therefore, I, the person deceived, should be, even if I were deceived, certainly I am not deceived in this knowledge that I am. And, consequently, neither am I deceived in knowing that I know; for as I know that I am, so I know this also, that I know." But why is it that we have the profound and unalterable conviction that we have this knowledge and other kinds of knowledge of the utmost importance? It is because we have a natural, intuitive, irresistible and indestructible faith in the informations of our own mental faculties.

But enough has now been said to show that faith, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, and as a controlling principle of human conduct, has the first place, not only in religion, but everywhere else, and that it constitutes the foundation of all human knowledge. In view of this important fact, it is manifest that the great popular objection to religion, that it, to so great extent, appeals to faith and rests on faith, is destitute of force. Many imagine that, because religion has so much to say about

faith, and makes so much depend on it, it thereby discredits reason and depreciates knowledge, and so is unworthy of the consideration of the intelligent; and they often regard with amusement and pity the credulous dupes who allow themselves to be so much concerned about its teachings and to be put to such pains to secure its offered rewards. But we now see that reason itself inflexibly demands all the faith for which religion calls, and that, instead of its being a peculiarity of religion that it makes much of this mental exercise, equally as much is made of it everywhere else. If religion must go because faith is given so large a place in it, then every pursuit of life and every relation of life must go also, because faith has an equally large place in them. If religious knowledge must be rejected because it rests on faith, then must all other knowledge also be rejected, because it rests on exactly the same basis!

Of course it is true that faith, in the broad sense in which the word is used in the preceding remarks, differs from religious faith. They differ as to their origin. One originates in nature; the other in grace. They differ as to their objects. One has for its objects the truths of nature; the other the truths of revelation. They differ as to their ends. One is intended to secure secular ends; the other spiritual ends. And because they thus differ, it may be supposed that the foregoing argument is invalidated. As to the point essential to the argument, however, they are precisely alike. That point is that men, in all the secular relations of life, and as to all secular interests, act on faith—on faith in one another, and in the trustworthiness of their senses and of their mental faculties, and of the knowledge secured through them; and that, therefore, it is absurd to object to religion that in its sphere, and in regard to its objects and interests, it requires them to do the same thing.

2. Another reason why faith is given so important a place in religion is that there is so much in religion that cannot be understood, and, therefore, cannot be received through the understanding, if received, if at all, must be received through faith. It could be remarked at once, however, that this is not a peculiarity of religion. It is true of all subjects, even of those with

which we are most familiar. There is much about them all that we cannot understand. We cannot understand, for instance, how we ourselves exist; how our bodies and our souls are so united as to constitute our persons, and how they constantly act and react on each other. We cannot understand how an impression made on our senses is carried within and announced to the soul in its secret dwelling-place, and how the edicts of the soul come forth and execute themselves through the nerves and muscles and limbs of the body. We cannot understand in what that principle consists whence all our physical activities proceed—the principle we call life. No anatomist has ever discovered it, and held it up in his laboratory on the point of his scalpel, to the admiring gaze of his students. We cannot understand how our bodies are nourished and sustained; how food is received and digested, and taken into the circulation of the blood, and carried about over the body, and some deposited in one place to make bone, some in another to make muscle, some in another to make nerve, and some in another to make flesh. Some things about the wonderful process we can approximately understand; but, after we have gone as far as is possible for our limited faculties, there still remains a vast domain of profound mystery that utterly baffles all our attempts successfully to explore it. There are mysteries in nature as well as in revelation. There are insoluble problems connected with our own being as certainly as there are with God's being. Mr. Huxley, in a letter to the Dean of Wells in 1877, went so far as to say, "The mysteries of the church are child's play compared with the mysteries of nature. The doctrine of the Trinity is not more puzzling than the necessary antinomies of physical speculation." The fact is, that we cannot fully understand anything. We cannot fully understand that fundamental fact that underlies and makes possible all other facts—we cannot understand existence itself. Those who so much object to the mysteries of religion cannot explain how it is that they are able to stand up on their feet, and so to make use of their vocal organs as to express their objections. That is as much a mystery as the mysteries of religion at which their objections are aimed! In how sorry a light, then, do their objections appear!

But we have said that there is much in religion that cannot be understood, and that, therefore, it cannot be received through the understanding; and hence, if received at all, must be received through faith; and that this is one reason of the importance ascribed to this grace in the Scriptures. This statement should be made more definite. We may say, therefore, that we cannot understand how an infinite Being exists without ever having begun to exist; how he possesses infinite knowledge without ever having learned; how he possesses infinite power without ever having undergone any process of growth or development; how he possesses every excellence in infinite degree underived, unacquired. We cannot understand how, in the infinite amplitude of his divine nature, there are three Persons, each God; each equally God; "the same in substance and equal in power and glory;" and yet how, notwithstanding, there are not three Gods, but only one, "over all, blessed forever." We cannot understand how, by virtue of his omnipresence, God is, at every moment, in all the fullness of his infinite attributes, equally present at every point in the wide extent of his vast dominions. We cannot understand how, by the mere word of his power, he called into existence this world, and all the worlds we see in the fields of space above us, and how, just as easily, he could repeat the wondrous achievement; how, indeed, every moment throughout eternity, he could bring into existence a system of worlds as vast and glorious as this. We cannot understand how he so united the divine and human natures as to constitute the Person of Christ—a Person so wonderful that it was at the same time both divine and human; both infinite and finite; both God and man; both creator and creature; both immortal and mortal; both incapable of death and yet capable of the death of the cross; both the great God, ruling over all beings and all worlds, and yet at one time a little helpless babe, wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in the arms of his mother. We cannot understand how he so presided over the composition of the Scriptures, that, while they were written by fallible men, in fallible human speech, they are at the same time the infallible word of life, able to make us wise unto salvation and to guide our feet safely along the straight and

narrow path that leads to his kingdom. These and many other facts and truths connected with religion we cannot understand, and, therefore, cannot receive through the understanding. If we receive them at all, we must receive them through faith—through faith in the Scriptures, which come to us as a perfectly-attested revelation from God; that is, as has already been said, receive them for the very best reason that can possibly be given for receiving anything. Hence so much is made of this grace.

3. Still another reason why so much importance is given to faith in religion is found in the fact that it is the parental, the fountal grace; the source of all the other graces; the grace we must have before we can have any others. This fact is overlooked by those who object to the prominence given it in the Christian system. They think it is strange that this grace should be put first; they imagine there is something arbitrary about it. "Why not put love first; love to God, which prompts us to meet all our obligations to him; love to our fellow-men, which prompts us to meet all our obligations to them; 'the love that is the fulfilling of the law?' Or, why not put obedience to the law first, which manifests itself in the form of all kinds of good works? Why is it that you attach more importance to creed than you do to conduct; to what a man thinks than you do to what he does? Does not this fact show that your religion is, in this respect at least, somewhat whimsical and unpractical?" Those who thus object, however, fail to see the relation in which faith stands to the other graces of the Spirit. What is that relation? How are the other graces brought into existence? How, for instance, is the grace of love to God brought into existence? Why, we first believe what the Scriptures say about God; about his infinite excellence and glory; about his infinite knowledge, and wisdom, and righteousness, and goodness, and power; about the many and great temporal and spiritual blessings he has already bestowed on us, and the innumerable and still greater blessings he offers to bestow on us in the future; and sincerely believing what they thus say, our affections are excited, and begin to rise up, and to fix themselves on him; and thus the grace of love to him comes into existence; and it is plain it could not

come into existence in any other way. We are naturally so constituted that we must first believe that God is lovely before he can become to us an object of love. How does the grace of repentance come into existence? Why, we must first believe what the Scriptures say about our sins; about their number; their aggravations; their inexcusableness; their offensiveness to God; their heinousness in themselves; their destructiveness to the soul; and sincerely believing what they thus declare, we begin to regret that we have sinned, and to turn away from our iniquities with grief and hatred of them, and to seek after holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; and thus the grace of repentance comes into existence; and it seems to be equally plain that it could come into existence in no other way. We must believe what the Scriptures say about sin, before we can have for it the godly sorrow for which they call. How do the graces of consecration and zeal in Christ's service come into existence? We must first believe what God's word says about his service; about its origin, its nature, its importance, its obligations, its objects, its rewards; and sincerely believing that, we begin to be interested in it, and to be willing to devote to it all we are and all we have. The same is true of all the other graces. They all spring out of faith. The reason, then, that faith is put first in religion is that, in the nature of the case, it comes first. It is by no means an arbitrary arrangement, but results from the very constitution of the soul.

It is only stating the truth just mentioned in a slightly different way to say that faith has so much importance attached to it because it controls the affections of the soul. In order that we may be Christians, we must love God, his law, and his service. But our affections are determined by our faith. If we believe an object to be beautiful, we admire it; if we believe it to be dangerous, we fear it; and so if we believe it to be lovely, we love it. Our natures are such, as we are conscious, that it cannot be otherwise. In order, then, that we may have towards God, and his law and his service, the affections for which the Scriptures call, we first have the faith for which they call.

What is true in regard to our affections is equally true in

regard to our consciences. In order that we may be Christians, we must have good consciences; "consciences void of offence toward God and men." But our consciences are controlled by our faith. If we believe an act to be right, our consciences approve it; if we believe it to be wrong, our consciences condemn it. The act we believe to be right, may not in fact be right; but if we believe it to be right, our consciences cannot do otherwise than approve it. The act we believe to be wrong, may not in fact be wrong; but if we believe it to be wrong, our consciences cannot do otherwise than condemn it. This is a fact of universal experience. It is plain, then, that if we are to have the consciences that God's word requires, we must first have the faith it requires.

Thus faith controls both our affections and our consciences; and so, of course, controls our characters and lives. Is it strange, then, that the Scriptures have so much to say about it, and that they give it so much prominence and ascribe to it so much power?

It may be thought that what is here said about the importance of faith is inconsistent with what the Apostle Paul says in his first epistle to the Corinthians, "Now abideth faith, hope and love; but the greatest of these is love." There is one respect in which love is greater than faith; greater in value. It is, as we have seen, the fruit of faith. As, then, the fruit of a tree may, in some respects, be of more value than the tree, so love, the fruit of faith, may, in some respects, be of more value than faith. This fact, however, leaves faith untouched in its primary and essential importance. The fruit of the tree may, for some purposes, be of more value than the tree; yet the tree is of primary and essential importance to produce the fruit, and to give it its value. The supreme necessity of faith is seen in the fact that it stands in this causal relation to all the other graces of the Spirit.

4. A further reason for the importance ascribed to faith in religion is found in such passages in the Scriptures as Heb. xi. 1: "Faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen." There is difference of opinion, indeed, as to the precise meaning of these words; but a careful study of them,

in connection with the context, cannot leave much doubt that Professor Davidson, of Scotland, is right in his commentary when he says, "The apostle means, faith is the giving substance to things hoped for; it is the act or state of mind which makes things that are, as yet, but objects of hope, as substantial as if actually possessed;" and it is "the conviction of things not seen." In other words, the apostle means that faith gives such reality, in the view of the mind, to the things addressed to hope in the Scriptures, that they exert a controlling influence over the soul, and it is so profound a conviction of the truth and importance of the things not seen, that they determine the character and the life. Accordingly, in the subsequent part of the chapter, he gives a number of historical illustrations of this power of faith, by pointing out the great achievements which it has wrought. Faith gives reality to the commandments of God and secures obedience to them; therefore "by faith the elders" (the saints of former days), "obtained a good report"—from God and men. Faith gives reality to the declarations of God concerning the plan of salvation, and secures compliance with its terms; therefore, "by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he, being dead, yet speaketh." Faith gives reality to the warnings of God, and prompts to the use of the needful means, divinely provided, to escape the dangers to which they point; therefore "by faith, Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Faith gives reality to the promises of God, and induces the soul to rely on them, and to fulfil the conditions on which they are to be fulfilled; therefore, "by faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise, for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Faith

gives reality to the blessings and glories of God's eternal kingdom, and inspires the soul with courage and strength to do and to suffer anything that it may at last be found amongst those of whom the world is not worthy; therefore, by faith many suffered "trials of cruel mockings and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned; they were sawn asunder; were tempted; were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented; they wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth." Such is the power of faith! Such servants of the Lord can it make! Such battles can it fight! Such victories can it win! Such deeds of righteousness can it perform! Such purifying and uplifting and ennobling influences can it bring down upon men from the things that are "hoped for" and that are "not seen." Is it any wonder that the Scriptures have so much to say about it?

It is to be remembered, in this connection, that we may still more distinctly see the importance of this grace; that it not only thus so completely and so beneficially brings us under "the powers of the world to come"; but that it is the only grace in the long catalogue that can perform for us this necessary service. Since the chief blessings of religion are by us as yet unseen, and since they are remote in the future, and are only the subjects of promise to us, we cannot "walk by sight" in reference to them, but must "walk by faith." They can be brought to bear upon us in controlling and sanctifying power only by that faith in regard to them that gives them substance and reality in the view of the soul, and that consists in a profound conviction of their infinite importance and value. This grace, then, is exalted above all the other graces by the fact that it not only does this, but that it is the only grace that can do it.

5. The last reason there is space to mention why the Scriptures ascribe so much importance to faith is that it is the instrumental condition of salvation. In order that we may be saved, a number of things must be done for us that we cannot do for ourselves. Our sins must be pardoned. We cannot do that for ourselves. We must be made new creatures in Christ Jesus. We

cannot do that for ourselves. We must be adopted into God's family; kept through faith unto salvation; presented at last faultless before the presence of his glory. None of these things can we do for ourselves. They can be done for us only by our Saviour. But he will do them for us only when we receive him as our Saviour, and we can receive him as our Saviour only by faith in him, and in the offers of himself he makes to us.

Thus have some reasons been given why the word of God attaches so much importance to this grace; why it says, "According to your faith, be it unto you;" "without faith it is impossible to please him;" "he that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And it is now seen, it is hoped, that this teaching of the Scriptures (as might be shown in regard to every other), may be completely vindicated against every objection that is made against it; that conclusive reasons can be given for all that the Scriptures say about this grace, and for all the prominence and power they ascribe to it.

This discussion may be concluded with this practical remark: Since faith is so necessary in the plan of salvation, the great practical question for every one is, "Have I faith? Have I faith in God's word? Have I faith in all of its essential teachings? Have I that true faith that responds to each one of these teachings according to its character? Have I such faith in the warnings that I heed them; in the threatenings, that I fear them; in the invitations, that I accept them; in the promises, that I rely on them; in the commands, that I obey them? Especially, have I such a faith in the Lord Jesus Christ that I receive him as he is offered to me in his word, and rely on him alone for salvation?" These are the questions on which eternal destiny turns. Let it never be forgotten that he who is the King of the kingdom of heaven; who carries its keys at his girdle; who opens its doors and no man can shut them; who shuts its doors and no man can open them; let it never be forgotten that he hath said (and we now see some of the reasons why he has said it), "He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."

G. B. STRICKLER.

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.

II.

THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.¹

QUESTIONS which gather about the divine authority of the Scriptures are of perennial interest and importance. Upon the answers men give to these questions depend their acceptance or their rejection of the Christian religion.

All religion depends on revelation. Without some knowledge of God there could be no faith in God, no love for him, no obedience rendered to him. God must reveal himself in some way in order to be known. Men must at least believe that they have revelations from God, or they will practice no religion. These are elementary truths which will not be denied by the most skeptical. According to the belief of all theists, God reveals himself in the universe. This has been called cosmic revelation. It is general to all mankind, and forms the basis of what is called natural religion.

In our time there is no special call to defend this general or cosmic revelation. Now, only the atheist or the agnostic denies this cosmic revelation. All others admit that God speaks to men; that he reveals himself in the objects and events of the universe. In the opinion of many this revelation is so clear, so complete, so satisfactory, that man needs no other, and there is no other.

In opposition to this last averment, it is asserted by many

¹This article was originally prepared as a lecture, and was read before the Presbyterian Ministers' Alliance of Kansas City, Mo. The subject of the lecture was proposed by the Alliance. A request from one of the members of the Alliance to read and to express an opinion in regard to *The New Epoch of Faith*, by Dr. George A. Gordon, determined very largely the form of the discussion. About the same time *Immortality and the New Theodicy*, by the same author, and several books by the late Prof. John Fiske and others on evolution in its varied relations to modern religious thought, were read. These facts will serve to account for certain lines of thought and modes of expression drawn from these books, even where they are not directly quoted.

that there is another revelation from God. In a sense it is a part of the cosmic revelation.¹ But it is to be sharply distinguished from that revelation. It is a special revelation; in word rather than in act. It is supplemental, and has aptly been called a soteriological revelation. In it God is revealed in a special aspect; an aspect in which he is not revealed in the cosmic revelation: as a Redeemer, a Saviour of sinners. While these two revelations are to be carefully distinguished from each other, they are not antagonistic. Even in mode they are at times similar, for the soteriological revelation is at times in act as well as in word. Their chief difference is in the aspect in which God presents himself to men. In the cosmic revelation he is presented as creator, providential ruler; in the soteriological revelation he is presented in these aspects, it is true, but also and specially as the Saviour of men from their sins and the bestower of an eternal life of blessedness. This revelation is contained in a book called the Bible. It claims to be a special revelation making known to men directly from God certain facts and truths not revealed, and hence not discernible, in the cosmic revelation.

It is the object of apologetics to show that the Bible is a God-authorized book in the same direct and immediate way in which it is claimed that the universe is a God-authorized book. As the universe is a direct expression of the mind and will of God to men as to certain subjects, so the Bible, in all its statements concerning creation, God, sin and redemption, in all that constitutes it a soteriology, is a direct utterance of God. In this sense the Bible is a book of divine authority; it is a God-authorized book.

In this article it is not proposed to discuss the mode or modes in which God has revealed himself to men in the Bible, voice, theophany, prophecy, miracle; nor will the question as to the inerrancy of our copies and translations of the Scriptures be considered. These are interesting and important, but altogether subordinate, questions. The most conservative believer will admit that our copies and translations are imperfect; the critics, all of them except the most captious, admit that our copies and

¹ Inasmuch as inspiration, miracles and prophecy are parts of the cosmical development in its most general sense.

translations are substantially correct and fairly represent the autographs. If the autographs were God-authorized in the sense explained, then our Bibles are God-authorized in the same sense.

We are now concerned with the question of the attestation of the Bible as a God-authorized book; with the proofs by which its peculiar claims are sustained. At the outset of this discussion it is frankly admitted that this proof falls short of complete demonstration. It is not sufficient to compel intellectual assent. The acceptance or the rejection of the Bible as a God-authorized book is a matter of faith.¹ In this respect, as always in practical matters, the human mind moves along the line of least resistance; rests on what appears to it to be the best foundation. This remark applies to the reception or the rejection of the universe as a cosmic revelation of God. No man saw God speaking the universe into being, or otherwise producing it. No man now sees God guiding and controlling the universe. Notoriously and confessedly, all views respecting God and the universe, and the relations subsisting between them, are matters of faith. No view is sustained by demonstrative proof which compels the consent of the intellect. The atheist is a man of faith. He cannot prove his theory. He believes it. The agnostic and the scientific evolutionist are men of faith. They believe their theories; they cannot prove them to be certainly true. The credibility of any view of God and the universe is to be tested by the evidence which can be adduced to sustain it; by its reasonableness. A theory, a position, the answer to a question, is reasonable in proportion to the amount and reasonableness of the evidence which sustains it. This is true of the orthodox answer to the question, Is the Bible, in the sense defined, a God-authorized book? The orthodox answer is "yes." The orthodox give this answer, because to their minds it is the most reasonable answer. It has more evidence to sustain it, and less evidence against it, than any other.

It is impracticable, within the limits of this article, to present all the lines of evidence which sustain the orthodox answer, and to account for or remove such evidence as appears to overthrow

¹ Usually in this discussion the word *faith* is used to express that acceptance of statements which is based on *probable* evidence.

that answer. Much might be said of man's need of a God-authorized book; of a special, a soteriological revelation from God; of God's willingness and ability to give such a revelation. But these lines of remark will be passed by. After very brief mention of three of the great lines of evidence relied on to sustain the orthodox view as to the divine authority of the Scriptures, a section of the third line of evidence will be discussed with some fulness of detail.

One of the clearest and most convincing of all the evidences for the divine authority of the Scriptures is the testimony of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus is a fact duly attested according to the canons of historical criticism. When we apprehend him, his character and teachings, to say nothing of his alleged miraculous deeds, it is easy to construct an argument for the divine authority of the Bible. He vouches for this authority. He must have known the truth in regard to this supreme subject.

Another, and very convincing as well as popular, argument is afforded by the wonderful effects produced by the book on the minds and hearts of men. The Bible, in this respect, is by all odds the most remarkable book ever written. The difference between it and all other books is immense, if not immeasurable. Men of science sometimes ask, What has Christianity done for mankind? The answer is, Nothing apart from the book. Christianity without the book is nothing. The Bible might retort on the men of science and ask, What has science done for men without the book; for China, for Africa, for the aborigines of America? What did science do for the ancients? Mankind for thousands of years had the book of nature to observe and study. Plato, Aristotle, Julius Cæsar, Confucius, our Teutonic and Celtic ancestors, had eyes to see and minds to think. What did they learn? The Englishman, down to the time when the Bible in his own language was placed in his hands, remained a savage or a semi-savage, scarcely more enlightened than were his ancestors when they emerged from the gloom of the German forests. The human race made very little progress in the useful arts until the Bible came to it, bringing a knowledge of God as a Saviour. With scarcely an exception, all the great discoveries and inven-

tions which have given to men control over the great forces of nature, have been made within the domain of Christendom, by men who have had some knowledge of the soteriological revelation. Here is a series of facts, most significant and important in this discussion, to be reckoned with and accounted for.

A third line of argument is found in the structure of the Bible and the nature of its contents. In this respect the Bible is a unique book. It stands first among books, and has no second. It is in a class by itself. The unique nature of the contents of the Bible account for its marvellous effects. There is no other way to account for those effects.

Instead of discussing the contents of the Scriptures in a general way, it is now proposed to present the evidence for their divine authority based on a single view of their contents: to show that faith accepts the Bible as a God-authorized book, because *it contains the most reasonable account of God and the universe, and of the relations between the two; especially the most reasonable account of man's origin, condition, career and destiny.*

In order to prepare the way for this discussion, it will be well to call to mind the other views of these great subjects which claim the faith of mankind, and with which the biblical view is to be compared. Omitting dualism, which, so far as it rests on any evidence, may be considered under theism, we may reduce all other views to three:

1. *The Atheistic.* The atheist believes that there is no God. For him the universe is without reason or reasonableness, except as the imagination of man vainly conceives.

2. *The Pantheistic.* The pantheist believes that God is all, and that all is God. He regards the universe as the perpetual self-manifestation of an omnipresent energy, out of which all individual things and persons and events emerge, and into which they all return. He sees a certain orderliness in this eternal unfolding and infolding, but no designed goal, no ultimate catastrophe, no consummation; in other words, no teleology.

3. *The Theistic.* The theist believes that there is a God, an omnipresent energy, ever living, ever active. He sees in the

universe an orderly progression towards a preconceived and fore-ordained goal. As to the precise character of this goal theists are not agreed. Nor are they agreed as to their views respecting the relations of God to the universe, and his mode of working therein. In the light of modern speculation, and for our present purpose, theists may be reduced to two classes, biblical theists and evolutionary theists. The terms are chosen, not because they are ideally perfect by any means; but because, better than any others at hand, they indicate the two classes with which we are now concerned. It will be desirable to describe them somewhat in detail.

In this discussion we are not concerned with atheistic or materialistic evolutionists who, during the middle of the last century, posed as the only men in the land of truly scientific attainments. Materialism, whether evolutionary or not, is incredible, except temporarily to minds prone to superstition. Rational faith rejects it, because it subjects mind to matter. It subverts all our best conceptions of what is reasonable and worthy. It degrades deity and defies dust. If it can be demonstrated to be true, we must needs accept it; but, like all other theories of this sort, it is incapable of demonstration; and faith rejects it because it is unreasonable to regard matter, as we observe and define it, as the creator of mind; to find in dust the cause, or the antecedent, of the intellect of Aristotle, the genius of Shakespeare, the sublime moral heroism of Christ. If there is only one Being, that Being is mind. We are now dealing with those who find mind in the universe. Of these there are the two classes named above.

The biblical theist recognizes growth—evolution, if any one chooses so to call it—as one of the methods God employs in accomplishing his purposes. Some evolutionists accept many of the great facts and doctrines revealed in the Bible. They believe in Christ and follow him as they understand him. The real distinction between the two classes of theists is this: the evolutionary theist regards evolution as the sole method by which God works in the universe. Evolution, in one form or another, is the sole cosmic process. It is a process so comprehensive as to leave no room for such events as the biblical theist calls revelations

from God, whether prophecy or miracle; no room for such events as the creation, the fall of man, the incarnation of God's Son, the new birth. The evolutionary theist admits that in some sense God is personal; that, if cognized at all, he must be anthropologically conceived. God is mind, spirit. He is moral; he works for righteousness. He is immanent in the universe; but in no sense does he transcend the universe. He works by evolutionary processes only. Hence there are no breaks, no interventions, no contrivances, no miracles; no need, no room, for any such events or processes. The so-called "second causes" of the biblical theist are a delusion and a sham. Man's volitions, no less than the centripetal and centrifugal forces of nature, are direct expressions of God's will and power. Matter, whatever it is, is neither dead nor inert. In every atom of it, in all its combinations, minute and immense, matter quivers with energy, the energy of God. Says Prof. John Fiske, "The whole tendency of modern science is to impress upon us more forcefully the truth that the entire knowable universe is an immense unit, animated throughout all its parts by a single principle of life." (*Idea of God*, pp. 144, 145.) Again: "The universe is not a machine, but an organism, with an indwelling principle of life. It was not made, but it has grown." (*Ibid*, p. 131.)

Biblical theism, in contrast with all this, represents God as indeed immanent in the universe; but also before, above and beyond it. He transcends the universe. He made it. It is a machine, created by God, ruled by God. He rules it according to immutable laws which he has ordained. Through these laws and their resultants he reveals himself to men. This revelation is partial, and in a sense mediate. The forces and laws of nature conceal while they reveal God. In addition to this partial and mediate revelation, God, for special purposes, reveals himself directly to men. He speaks to men, telling them truths about himself and his purposes which they could not learn from the cosmic revelation. The biblical theist holds that God uses contrivances, but that he is not obliged to do so, save as he chooses to act in accordance with the order of things he has himself ordained. This use of contrivance is not derogatory to God's

wisdom and power. He does on a grand scale what he permits men to do on a small scale. As man, in the exercise of his wisdom and power, utilizes the forces of nature to accomplish his purposes, so God, in the exercise of his wisdom and power, utilizes these same forces to accomplish his purposes. A bird is a contrivance to realize the idea of flight. The Incarnation is a contrivance to realize the idea of redemption. Neither in man's contrivances, nor in God's, is there any annulling, suspension, or setting aside, of any force or of any law or method by which force acts. There is a utilization of forces to accomplish purpose. To the finite observer the first bird, the first man, were as truly miracles—that is to say, miracles of contrivance—as the incarnation is to us. Birds and men are no longer regarded as miracles, because we can, to some extent, trace the methods by which they are produced. So we have ceased to regard the reproduction of the Christ in men as miracles, because we can, to some extent, account for it. None the less is it a miracle. When traced back to the efficient agent in their production, the bird, the man and the Christian, owe their existence to the wisdom and power of a God who creates.

Mr. Herbert Spencer calls this biblical view of the universe the carpenter theory. So be it. The question is, Which is the more reasonable, the carpenter theory or the evolutionary theory? It is proposed, now, to show that of these two theories the biblical theory is the more reasonable. As faith, having option between atheism and theism, chooses theism; so faith, having option between these two kinds of theism, chooses biblical theism. In thus choosing, faith finds a foundation for its acceptance of, and reliance on, the Bible as a God-authorized book.

In order to justify this discussion, attention is called to the fact that evolutionary theism, in one form or another, is now the great opponent of biblical theism. It is the only antagonist in the field which we have to fear. Atheism, materialism, in their stark forms, have passed. Evolutionary theism is popular. It is most plausibly maintained by vast learning, by a pretentious array of facts, by men who are thoroughly honest and earnest. It is the house of refuge for all theists who renounce the Bible

as a God-authorized book, who reject the biblical teaching concerning man's sin and doom under the curse of God's law.

It has been admitted frankly that both biblical theism and evolutionary theism are beset with intellectual difficulties. Both have to deal with the infinite and the absolute; with the relations existing between the infinite and the absolute on the one hand, and the finite and the conditioned on the other. The human mind breaks down in all its attempts to compass these high themes. Yet the human mind, while it continually deals with the finite and the conditioned, must and does also postulate the infinite and the absolute. Hence both theories admit some eternal being; both call this being mind. Both theories are theoretically monistic; but biblical theism is practically dualistic. In order to avoid the manifest absurdity of two equal, eternal and absolute beings, waging equal and eternal warfare with each other, it refers matter and force, all finite wills, to God, who created and controls all according to the counsel of his own will; whose plans and purposes will ultimately be accomplished. But it accords a real efficiency to force and finite will. These are real, if secondary, causes. It thus accounts for the observed antagonisms between man's will and force; between man's will and God's. It thus accounts for the manifest use of contrivances on the part both of God and man. All known facts are in harmony with this view. The antagonisms referred to are matters of universal experience and opposition. The necessity for the use of contrivances by man for the accomplishment of his purposes is equally apparent.

Does God use contrivances? This question presents the core of the contention between the two theories. Biblical theism asserts, evolutionary theism denies, that the universe is a contrivance, or a set of contrivances, designed to accomplish a pre-conceived and preordained purpose. In maintaining the assertion of the biblical theist, it will be shown that his view presents at once a more reasonable teleology and a more reasonable theodicy than the view of his opponent. To prepare the way for our discussion of these two points, attention must first be called to the

fundamental error which underlies the evolutionary hypothesis. It is pantheistic in form and in essence.

In using this word to describe the evolutionary theory, there is no desire to throw discredit upon it. In this discussion there are no *a priori* objections to pantheism. The word is used only to make emphatic the truth that, according to this theory, God and the universe are in no sense objective to each other. God and the universe are one. God does not grow by means of communion or correspondence with the universe as an environment; the universe does not grow by means of communion, or correspondence, with God as an environment. God and the universe constitute an immense unit, an organism of which God is the sole animating principle, which changes its form continually, like the bits of glass in a self-moving kaleidoscope.

The great objection to this theory is that it transcends, if it does not contradict, all that we know of growth. Growth requires two factors: a living germ and an environment with which it is in communion or correspondence, each objective to the other. According to this monistic, pantheistic conception, there is only one factor. There is nothing objective to the unit, to the organism. It is an infinite baby in an infinite void. We do not have a God assimilating a universe, and so a growing God. We do not have a universe assimilating God, and so a growing universe. There is only a living organism, having no environment. On these conditions there can be no growth, as we understand that process.

It will be replied that by growth is meant evolution—a peculiar, special, unique unfolding; a cosmic process, a progression from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. This process does not require two factors. The reply is obvious; there is no evidence for this cosmic growth. Certainly no human being has observed it. It is at best only an inference from what has been observed. All the evidence to sustain this cosmic evolution consists of the observed facts of life and growth. If cosmic evolution does not conform to what we know about growth, growth of cells by means of environment to perfect organisms, then there is no evidence to sustain the doctrine of cosmic evolution. It

is preposterous to infer from one sort of growth a growth of an entirely different kind. At one time we are told that the evolution of the cosmos conforms to the evolution of the individual organisms with which we are familiar. When attention is called to the fact that all the evolution with which we are familiar, including the alleged differentiation of individuals from type and the emergence of new varieties and species, requires two factors, a living germ and an environment, we are told that cosmic evolution is altogether a different affair. It is an eternal process of unfolding, which requires no environment. So be it. Then there is no evidence whatever to sustain it.

This last statement will, of course, be denied by evolutionists. They tell us that there are many facts to sustain their theory, apart from the fact of the growth of cells to perfect organisms. They point to the facts which sustain the nebular hypothesis, and all that is involved in that famous speculation. It may be admitted, for argument's sake, though it has not been and cannot be proved, that the material universe was originally a vast expanse of homogeneous gaseous matter, out of which the stellar universe, as we see it, has emerged. The questions are as to the character of that primitive matter, and the process or processes by which it has become heterogeneous. The averments of the evolutionist are that the process is one of development only from within; of evolution only; that primitive matter was living matter; that the homogeneous has become heterogeneous by means of its own inherent, living energy, differentiating itself; that all which now appears was originally implicit in the gaseous mass. We are told that the kaleidoscope illustration does not illustrate. Originally there was no variety of color; only a latent power to produce colors; no variety of form, only a latent power to produce forms; no living germ cells, only a latent power to produce these.

The questions recur, Who knows all this? What is the evidence? Who has examined "star dust" with a microscope? All the matter we know is heterogeneous, and not homogeneous, in the mass. All the matter we know remains as it is, unless it is acted on from without, or unless it contains a living germ-cell,

with power to assimilate elements from environment.¹ Admit that a germ-cell is homogeneous under the microscope. So far as we know, it would remain homogeneous forever unless it were brought in contact with a heterogeneous environment, from which it could get heterogeneous elements. The only just and fair inference concerning the alleged primitive, homogeneous gaseous matter, even if we regard it as an immense living cell, is that it would have remained homogeneous and undeveloped unless wrought upon from without, as the biblical theist asserts; or unless it somehow came in contact with a heterogeneous environment objective to itself, which the theory distinctly denies. As thus stated, there is no evidence to sustain the evolutionary theory of the origin and development of the universe.

But let us suppose that the primitive matter was heterogeneous; that it contained all the known elements of matter in various proportions; that bedded in its huge mass was a living germ-cell, or cells, capable of assimilating those elements—in a word, let us suppose that the original matter was a huge egg, or a huge mass of finite eggs. Then we have a miracle of creation, a miracle of contrivance; and we are entitled to infer, nay, we are bound by all the laws of human thought to infer, a contriver, which brings us again to the position of the biblical theist. Our con-

¹This statement as to the changelessness of matter has regard, of course, to its essential elements, not to changes of form produced by heat or other forms of chemical action. The sun, compared with the earth, is a very hot body, but the men of science tell us that its constituent elements are the same as those of our earth. The laws of motion, heat and other forms of chemical action, operating on a mass of nebulous matter, might produce a great change of form in the mass. In a sense, the homogeneous might become heterogeneous. But, so far as we know, these forces could produce no heterogeneity in the constituent elements of the mass. They could create nothing; could turn no atom of oxygen into an atom of hydrogen; could transform no combination of mere atoms into a living germ-cell.

Besides, we are entitled to ask, Whence these wonderful forces of motion, heat and chemical action? The nebular hypothesis calls for a combination, a collocation, a set of conditions. In briefest terms it is this: a heated mass, surrounded by a cold space, or a cold somewhat capable of receiving the heat radiated from the mass—a wonderful set of forces acting in well-defined methods. Whence this marvellous collocation of wonders? At the start we have a contrivance, which the human mind, at its best, must needs refer to a contriving mind.

clusion, therefore, is a just one; there is no sufficient evidence to sustain the evolutionary theory as to the general development of the universe. All the known facts are against it. Acceptance of it by the human mind is an irrational belief, more irrational than the belief in ghosts and witches. The carpenter theory, as to its fundamental assumption, that the universe is a machine, that it has been made both as to its elements and form, is sustained by all the known facts. Growth, evolution, or the process of differentiation by means of growth under the guidance of his own wisdom and power, are methods God employs to build up his machine, to bring it to its perfection and goal. But no one is entitled to say that these are the only methods God employs. These methods do not account for the origin either of matter or mind; for the origin of atomic matter or matter in the mass; for matter organic or inorganic; for motion and its laws; for all the observed forms of chemical action. If there should come to men what purports to be a revelation from God asserting that he created, by the direct and immediate exertion of his wisdom and power, matter and finite minds, that he has guided and controlled the development of the universe and brought it to its present state, we have at the start the highest presumption that the revelation is what it claims to be. So far it is sustained by all the known facts, and the most reasonable conclusions based on the facts. Kant's word, in the light of the wonderful advance of knowledge since he uttered it, remains true: "It is useless for men to hope that some genius like Newton will some time arise, who will be able to make it comprehensible that even a blade of grass can be created under natural laws and without an ordering mind."

We are now prepared to compare the teleology of the two systems. Evolutionary theism has no place for teleology so far as subordinate ends are concerned. Its advocates confess this frankly. They tell us that an infinite God has no need of contrivances. He is able to accomplish his purposes without the aid of these devices of human weakness. Moreover, they tell us that our view concerning the so-called contrivances of God is a delusion. Eyes were not designed to realize the preconceived

idea of sight. A bird is not a contrivance to secure the preconceived idea of flight. These are antiquated notions. For example, Prof. John Fiske says, "It is not that the organism and its environment have been fitted to each other by an exercise of intelligence, but it is that the organism is necessarily fitted to the environment, because in the perennial slaughter that has gone on from the beginning only the fittest have survived. Or, as it has been otherwise expressed, the earth is suited to its inhabitants because it produces them, and only such as suit it live. . . . The demonstration of this point through the labors of a whole generation of naturalists has been one of the most notable achievements of modern science, and to the theistic argument of Paley and the Bridgewater Treatises it has dealt destruction." (*Idea of God*, p. 129.)

Those who keep up with current discussions need not to be told that this doctrine of "natural selection" and "the survival of the fittest," as a sufficient means of accounting for existing organisms, is now discredited by many men of science who enjoy a world-wide fame for learning, ability and fairness. It may be admitted that such organisms as now exist were not created as they now are. There have been changes in form, and in some instances in function. But the original organisms are to be ascribed to the creative mind of God.

On the Michigan prairies, unless it has been destroyed by the commercial spirit of our age, there is a rude figure of a hawk, formed by heaped up earth-mounds. Near by there is a similar figure of a man aiming his spear at the bird. It is conceivable that these figures were made by the movements of glaciers and the rush of waters. But no one who has learned of the mound-builders' work in the valley of the Mississippi will hesitate to ascribe the work to them. As soon as the possibility of human workmanship is admitted, we inevitably ascribe the construction of the figures to intelligent design. Must not the same ascription be made respecting the living man pointing his spear at the living bird? Where did these living forms come from? How were they made? They are veritable miracles of contrivance. Shall we say that they came from ancestors somewhat different

from themselves, and these from living germ-cells or chemical combinations? So be it. But the questions recur, Who made, how were they made—these living germ-cells, these chemical combinations with their miraculous powers of change and growth? Evolutionary theism has no answer. There is no reasonable answer, except that of the biblical theist. God created the atoms of matter; God imparted the wonderful life-principle; God contrived the chemical combinations, the living germ-cells; God's wisdom guided, his power controlled, the marvellous development which has brought out the living man and bird standing related to each other as we observe on the American prairies. Here, again, all the facts, and all the sane reasoning based on the facts, are on the side of the biblical theist and the statements of the book which he regards as a revelation from God.

It should be remarked just here that it is not claimed that this so-called argument from design by itself would give us the idea of an infinite and eternal God, an infinite person. The idea of some infinite and eternal being is arrived at along other lines; it is based on other considerations. The point at this stage of our discussion is that, inasmuch as both theories postulate an infinite and eternal Somewhat, ascribing to that Somewhat mental and moral attributes, the biblical view, which also ascribes intelligent purpose and the use of contrivances to that Somewhat, is the more reasonable and credible view. It is sustained by all the known facts; by all the most reasonable considerations.

Let us now compare the two theories as to teleology in its widest scope: the great purpose of God in creating the universe, especially as that purpose regards man and his destiny.

The biblical theist, looking at the rolling worlds, sees a wonderful adaptation of means to secure an end. At first he may conclude, with the ancient sage, only that by this wonderful contrivance God "stretcheth the north over empty space and hangeth the earth upon nothing." But his reflections will not permit him to stop at this conclusion. He is led to believe that God must have some further design, some great moral purpose, in the formation of this world and its inhabitants; that there must be some great drama in which man is to play a conspicuous part. He

opens his Bible, and he finds that it asserts the particulars of the drama; particulars which he could never have learned from the heavens above him, from the earth beneath him, nor from the soul within himself. The goal of the great drama is this: man, originally made in the image of God, having lost that image by his own folly and sin, is to be recreated and brought to holiness and perfection by a wonderful redemptive process; and then is to reign forever on earth as God's son and representative in a kingdom truly heavenly. The revelations of the book, although they go beyond the deductions of the reason, are in strict accord with those deductions. Here is a solid ground for faith.

The evolutionary theist begins with the bold and unwarranted assertion that his theory has no place for designs, great or small; his science has dealt destruction to the theistic argument based on design. Yet, as Professor Fiske says, "The teleological instinct in man cannot be suppressed or ignored. . . . There is in every earnest thinker a craving after final causes." (*Idea of God*, pp. 137, 138.) Hence Professor Fiske sets himself to find a final cause which will satisfy this craving. It is the perfection of the human race. "The glorious consummation towards which organic evolution is tending is the production of the highest and most perfect psychical life." (*Ibid*, p. 160.) "A stage of civilization will be reached in which human sympathy shall be all in all, and the Spirit of Christ shall reign supreme throughout the length and breadth of the earth." (*Ibid*, p. 163.)

It is frankly admitted that, if the assumptions of the evolutionists in regard to man's origin, early condition and method of progress be granted, there is some ground to expect a still further and very great improvement of the human race. But this improvement, if it should go on to perfection, will not be, on evolutionary principles, a preconceived and preordained end, a final cause, the conscious choice of an intelligent will. Like the production of an egg or a bird, it will be a necessitated end; necessitated not by the decree of an omniscient God, controlling all things according to the counsel of his own will, but necessitated by the eternal processes of mechanical, or, if any one prefers so to say, of vital forces. It will not be that the perfect race and

the earth have been fitted to each other by intelligence; it will be that the perfect race has come because the earth necessarily produced it in accordance with the principle that the fittest survive. Hence the objections urged by the evolutionist against contrivances in the sphere of subordinate ends apply *a fortiori* against the perfection of the race, regarded as a designed end. For surely the less ought to be easier than the greater; the greater ought to include the less. If it is absurd to assert that God designed human eyes, human beings and other organisms, it is even more absurd to say that he designed the perfection of the human race. In a word, there is no place for teleology anywhere in the scheme of the evolutionist. Hence it is confessedly at variance with the instincts and cravings of the human mind. On the contrary, the theory of the biblical theist is in strict accord with these instincts and fully satisfies these cravings. It is self-consistent, and offers a reasonable explanation of all the facts within and without man's own mind. Hence faith, choosing the path of least resistance, accepts biblical theism, and with it also the book which reveals this theism as a God-authorized book.

If the theory of the evolutionist is at variance with the instincts and cravings of the human mind, it is still more repulsive to the instincts and cravings of the human heart. Its teleology is, intellectually, absurd; morally, it is monstrous. As a theodicy, as a vindication of God's attributes, it is a ghastly failure, even when compared with the highest Calvinism. The evolutionist may care very little for this charge. His theory has, as we have seen, no proper teleology; he has no call to "justify the ways" of his gigantic and eternal organism. But as the human mind craves a teleology, so the human heart craves a theodicy. In this craving of the human heart, and the utter failure of evolutionary theism to meet it, we find a potent argument against the theory. Biblical theism may offer something not much better; it could scarcely offer anything worse.

Biblical theism seeks to preserve the goodness of God at the expense of his power. It asserts that God has great objects to accomplish. Among these, and the ultimate object so far as man is concerned, is the founding on earth of a heavenly kingdom in

which an innumerable company of men, conformed to the image of the incarnate Son of God, will be made perfectly blessed in the full enjoyment of God forever. God is unable to accomplish this object, except by means of beings having freedom of will; beings with ability to choose, if they please, a course antagonistic to God's will; beings capable of violating God's law, of incurring the penalty of law. So far, but only so far, God's power is limited. He cannot create beings in his own image, who at the same time are mere machines. He chooses to create beings in his own image; beings not yet confirmed in holiness; beings who have power and opportunity to choose the evil rather than the good. In so creating them God does them no injustice. He gives them a fair chance to choose good rather than the evil, and thus work out a glorious destiny for themselves. If they fail it is their own fault. God permitted this failure; if any one pleases so to say, he ordained it.

Of course the question recurs, Why should God seek an object so fraught with deadly peril to the human race? Since his power, in view of his purpose, is limited, why not forego his purpose? To these questions there is no answer. The opposing theory is equally dumb. But the known facts sustain the biblical theory. Man is free; he has power of choice. This is a fact testified to by the universal experience and observation of mankind. In the exercise of this freedom man continually puts himself in opposition to the forces and laws of the universe. He thus brings frightful penalties upon himself and frightful consequences upon those dependent on him. Whatever of evil comes to man is due to this opposition of his will to the will of God. These remarks apply to other intelligent, moral beings who have violated God's law. But the evil thus allowed and inflicted God overrules to secure great and beneficent ends. For example, a portion of the human race is ultimately to be completely delivered from all this evil and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoyment of God and the universe forever. The remainder of evil, and of evil beings, are left as an object-lesson warning all intelligent and moral beings in all the vast and eternal universe against wrong-doing in every form. It is again admitted that this scheme is not a complete

and an altogether satisfactory theodicy. Unanswerable questions may be asked. The contention is that it is a more reasonable and credible theodicy than that of the evolutionary theist. Let us see.

Here, for the sake of our comparison and argument, we must concede something to the evolutionist. We must admit his teleological claims, inconsistent as these claims are with his general view of God and the universe. And for this reason: if there is no preconceived and predestined end in the mind of God, or of God and the universe regarded as a living organism, then there is no place for morality nor for morals, and no call for a theodicy. But, as is alleged, if God works for righteousness, then righteousness is a predestined end for which he is working. If there is no such end, then the universe is non-moral. This conclusion the human mind rejects as absurd. Hence the evolutionary theist asserts an end. This end is the perfection of the human race. What precisely this perfection is to consist of we are not informed. Whether or not all evil, moral and physical, is to be eradicated, we are not told. Be this perfection what it may, on the principles of the evolutionist, it will be limited, both in numbers and duration. All speculation as to the precise limits as to numbers and duration must needs be vain. But some things are clear. We know that the race is now very far from being perfect. We know that the earth's resources are finite. We know that the race is very rapidly consuming these resources. It is, therefore, a fair inference that by the time the race reaches perfection these resources will be very much drawn upon. Hence we must conclude, unless the earth's resources are replenished *ab extra*, which the doctrine of evolution excludes, that the enjoyment of its perfection by the race will be comparatively brief, or that the numbers enjoying will be small; or, what is still more reasonable, that the numbers will be small and the duration brief.

This, then, is the outcome of the whole process which reason is asked to accept as the great goal of the universe, so far as man is concerned: for the sake of the perfection and enjoyment of comparatively a few persons for comparatively a short time, God has ruthlessly sacrificed countless millions of sentient beings,

who, for no fault of theirs, have no part nor lot in this goal, no chance to participate in its blessings. These teeming generations of wretches have been without sin or guilt. Whatever defects or faults they have manifested, whatever mistakes they have made, are to be attributed solely to God and his method of bringing them into existence. Neither they nor their ancestors had any opportunity or power to choose anything better for themselves or their posterity. They are like the coral insects in numbers, in office, and in destiny. They have toiled, suffered, died, in order to furnish a foundation on which may rest an island, peopled, indeed, with a perfect race, but destined, with its race, to be removed in the remorseless grind of evolution. It is at best only one of the myriad and fleeting changes of the kaleidoscope. What is this but election; but Calvinism gone mad; but supralapsarianism in its most extreme, most ghastly, most repulsive form? How unreasonable at every stage; how beggarly in its results! Why were these fortunate individuals chosen for their blessed destiny of perfection? For any good freely chosen by themselves? No. They are, indeed, better than their ancestors, fittest to survive; but evolutionary processes made them so. They have not, on their own motion, refused the evil and chosen the good. Whatever choice they have exercised has been the result of processes over which they exerted no control. The earth made them what they are. Why were their predecessors consigned to wretchedness, toil and death? Because they chose evil and refused good? No. They were slaughtered because the universe made it impossible for them to live.

How any man, who believes in a God who works for righteousness in any sense, can believe in this goal of humanity thus attained, passes the orthodox comprehension. It is frankly admitted, again, that biblical theism has its difficulties; but these difficulties are as a mole-hill to a mountain when placed alongside the difficulties, intellectual and moral, which beset this ghastly theory of evolution. Biblical theism asserts the perfect, the eternal, blessedness of a perfect race which no man can number. They were chosen to this high destiny, notwithstanding the fact that they, or their ancestors for them, had chosen the evil rather

than the good. Others were left to perish. But this was only on account of their sins. Their sufferings, however great or long-continued their sufferings may be, are strictly commensurate with their ill-desert. Evolutionary theism asserts that these innumerable multitudes—men, women, children, infants of days—are passed by, caused to suffer, for no sin, fault, imperfection or mistake of themselves or their ancestors. They are thus doomed to perish, many of them in most horrible fashion, many of them after long years of untold physical and mental anguish, in order that a few, in whom they could have no personal interest whatever, might be happy for a few short years.

Neither of these theories can be demonstrated. But faith must follow the line of least resistance; must rely on the most rational foundation. Faith chooses, it must if sane choose, biblical theism. Thus choosing, faith must also accept the only book which reveals this most rational view of God and the universe as a God-authorized book.

It must now be admitted that there is another and a better theodicy, founded on a better teleology, which some evolutionists assert. These evolutionists see very clearly the moral, if not the intellectual, difficulties involved in the scheme which thus far we have discussed and discarded. This discarded theory is too Calvinistic for them. They will have none of it. They frankly say that if they reject biblical theism, they must become atheists or adopt a more rational teleology, a more attractive theodicy; a goal of the universe more consonant with good morals, more agreeable to right reason, than this ghastly theory of Prof. John Fiske and others. This goal is the final, the eternal, the perfect blessedness of every individual of the human race. They do not define with precision at what line or point the human race began in the upward march of sentient life. But God knows; and each and every one brought to God's image will attain, in this or some other world, this perfect, this eternal blessedness.

This is universalism. The term is not used as a reproach. In this discussion there are no *a priori* objections to universalism. All admit that it is "a consummation devoutly to be wished." Instead of seeking evidence to overthrow it, we should all be glad

to find evidence to sustain it. The trouble is that there is no evidence to sustain it which can satisfy the unprejudiced mind. The truth is, that this last evolutionary hypothesis rests altogether on *a priori* considerations, not at all upon any known truths or observed facts. The argument employed to prove it is based upon assumptions concerning God which are unproved, and, on evolution principles, unprovable; assumptions which are not even plausibly sustained by any facts or statements outside of that book, the divine authority of which we are now considering. In briefest compass the argument may be thus stated:

God is infinitely wise, powerful and good. He has brought men into existence by evolutionary processes in countless generations and multitudes. He is morally bound to have regard for the welfare of each and all of these creatures brought to being in his own image. Hence their perfection and blessedness must be realized. This realization does not take place in this life. There will be, therefore, a future life in which this blessed destiny will be attained.

On this argument the following comments are offered:

In the first place, it is based on the goodness of God. But this assumption is not only unproved; on evolutionary principles it is unprovable; indeed, the contrary may not unfairly be inferred. According to these principles men have lived many thousands of years on the earth. Until a very recent period man has been almost totally ignorant of the great forces and laws of nature, a knowledge of which is so necessary to his welfare and happiness. So little has he known, so hard has it been for him to wrest a precarious existence, not to say comfort, from nature's strong box, that his occupation, for the most part, has been to kill his fellow-men and take possession of the little wealth they had created. This lamentable ignorance, be it observed, is due solely to the conditions under which man was produced. God alone is responsible for these conditions of ignorance, wretchedness and want, which have made war, rapine, enslavement of men, the normal condition of the race. The bitter arraignment of nature by the late John Stuart Mill is doubtless familiar to many of the readers of this discussion. On the principles of

the evolution hypothesis it seems to be just.¹ More recently Mr. Herbert Spencer, replying to some remarks of Mr. Balfour, says, "When he [Mr. Balfour] learns that millions upon millions of years passed, during which the earth was peopled only by inferior brutes, and even now three-fifths of its surface are occupied by an ocean basin, carpeted with low creatures which live in darkness, utterly useless to man, and only lately known to him; and when he learns that of the remaining two-fifths, vast Arctic and Antarctic regions and vast deserts are practically uninhabitable, while immense portions of the remainder, fever-breeding and swarming with insect pests, are unfit for comfortable existence, he does not recognize much adjustment to the wants of mankind. When he discovers that the human body is the habitat of thirty different species of parasites, which inflict in many cases great tortures; or, still worse, when he thinks of the numerous kinds of microbes, some producing ever-present diseases, and consequent mortality, and others producing frightful epidemics, like the plague and black death, carrying off hundreds of thousands or millions, he sees little ground for assuming that the order of nature is devised to suit our needs and satisfactions." (Quoted in the *Review of Reviews*, July, 1895, p. 88.)

Confessedly nature presents a benign aspect to men. If it were not so they could not exist. But, as Dr. George A. Gordon so well expresses it in his *New Epoch for Faith*, "Without man's mastery, what will nature do for him? She will supply him with air and water, both badly adulterated, in all likelihood, and with acorns and sour apples. She will roast him in summer and freeze him in winter. She will not hunt, or fish, or cook for him. She will not build even a log cabin to shelter his children. To watch by him in sickness, and to change his whole environment, that he may get well, is far from her thoughts. Only man can serve man." (P. 120.) From the point of view of the evolutionary theist, God makes the world habitable for man; barely so. God implants instincts, appetites in man which make him willing to undergo no little toil and suffering in order to perpetuate his own life and the life of his race. Hence, about all

¹ *Three Essays on Religion: Nature*, pp. 28-31.

the goodness of God which man experiences may be ascribed to a shrewd skill and purpose, which keeps him alive that he may suffer.

Some recent apologists for the present order of things, moved by the facts in the case, admit that human life, under present conditions, is ill-adapted to the accumulation of wealth, to the gratification of appetite, to the securing of fame; indeed, present conditions, they assert, are adverse to, or subversive of, these ends, but furnish the discipline by which a man may become more gentle, humble, patient, unselfish. It is true that the conditions under which men are now actually living furnish a discipline by which a man may make large attainments in the virtues specified. But these conditions are not as they are represented by the evolutionists. The actual conditions embrace an earnest belief on the part of many in a God-authorized book, bringing glad tidings of immediate divine help to men in their wretched natural condition. And it is a very potent fact that, outside the influences exerted by this book, and faith in it as of divine authority, men make but little advance in gentleness, patience, unselfishness, forgiveness and love. Left to his own counsels, man fails as much in his endeavor to attain a Christ-like character as he does in his endeavor to secure wealth, or pleasure, or fame; indeed, far more so. Until God directly reveals to man the way to godliness, and directly moves upon man to seek the great attainment, there be few indeed that find it. But this direct revelation by the Son of God, and this direct influence by the Spirit of God, are quite outside all evolutionary postulates and conclusions.

The truth is that under any supposition which denies the sinfulness of mankind and its just doom under the curse of God's violated law, which denies that the gospel as revealed in the Bible is a revelation from God of his love and mercy to a condemned race, the evolutionary theist, and all other theists, are compelled to surrender the doctrine of God's goodness. On their premises the dealings of God with men are not good; rather are they monstrous, not to be justified by any known law, not conformed to any known standard of right. If the universe is an organism,

if the biblical account of God and man is not true, then it is impossible to maintain the doctrine of God's goodness at the bar of man's reason and conscience, and the argument of our evolutionary universalist is seen to rest on a foundation of mist. The fact is, that our universalist borrows his ideas of God's goodness from the Bible, and then he kicks the Bible out of court as soon as it begins to contradict the conclusions he bases on that goodness. This is unreasonable. If the biblical testimony concerning man's destiny is false, we have no assurance that its testimony concerning man's origin and sin are true. But, as we have seen, if the biblical testimony concerning man's sin is false, then we have no assurance that its testimony concerning God's goodness is true; and with the failure of that testimony we have no proof whatever of God's goodness.

In the second place, even if we allow our universalist's assumption as to the goodness of God, his conclusion sacrifices the power, wisdom and justice of God to his goodness; and, since justice is an element of goodness, the conclusion is fatally at variance with the premises. Let us see. God, according to our universalist, proposes ultimately to bless all mankind, without exception. The method he pursues is a method which involves the *undeserved* sufferings of the race through countless ages. God proposes to take his children to paradise. He chooses for their pathway a red-hot stairway. Up that red-hot stairway they go, with burnt feet, and blistering hands, and throbbing brows, and aching hearts. Is there no other way open to the choice of an infinite God? If not, then surely he is immensely limited in wisdom and power. The infinite God is constrained to do evil that good may come. He is compelled to torture innocent beings, that he may bless them. He is unjust, in order to be good. Surely this is absurd.

It is no escape from this conclusion to say that all this suffering is disciplinary. If this common, popular doctrine were true, it would not vindicate either the moral or the other attributes of God. Are the infinite wisdom and power of God unequal to the task of training intelligent creatures, except by this hideous process of the red-hot stairway? But the doctrine that all suffering is disciplinary is not true. It fails utterly in the case of infants dying

in infancy, of whom there is a countless multitude. It fails in the case of countless others, who, so far as we know, are not improved, but rather made worse, by suffering. More than this, every moralist admits that there is moral evil in the universe. As men go up the red-hot stairway they curse God and destroy each other. Hence, moral as well as physical evil is essential to the process. But this cursing God, this everlasting killing of men by men, are not of man's free choice, as biblical theism asserts. Man did not choose this awful temper of mind, nor the circumstances in which it arises and finds expression. It is all of God, wrought out by the grind of evolution. Hence, our evolutionist makes God the author of moral evil, in order that he may deliver men from moral evil and its direful consequences. Here, again, his argument involves a manifest absurdity, and must, with its conclusion, be rejected.

In the third place, a future life is essential to this universalistic theory, because, quite notoriously, human blessedness is not realized in this life. But, outside of the Bible, there is no assurance given to men of a future life. Certainly there is no proof of the immortality of the human organism in any form. So far as science knows or can foresee, its destruction is complete at death. According to evolution, not even the race is immortal. As to the spirits of men, if there be any such apart from the material organism, unquestionably men generally have believed that these live after the death of the body. The origin and persistence of this belief are most interesting objects of study, into which we cannot now enter. It is enough now to remark that this belief, apart from the Biblical statements as to the future life, is to be traced very largely to the human conscience, which demands a future life as a state or condition in which the monstrous inequalities in the distribution of good and evil in this life may be adjusted. But the consistent evolutionist takes away this basis of belief in a future life by his denial of the alleged inequality, and, therefore, he can have no desire for, or belief in, a future life. For him such a belief is a mere superstition, fostered by priests and others for the sake of lording it over the consciences of men. Besides, on evolutionary principles, the sur-

vival of the spirits of men after the death of the physical organism would be a break in the alleged continuity of nature's processes, which is an impossibility. So inexorable is this law of continuity that God himself cannot transcend or counteract it. He has no power to act on the universe from outside of it. There is no disembodied God; there can be no disembodied finite spirit. The human spirit, whatever it is, is inseparably bound up with the bodily organism. In their ideas respecting a future life, our universalists again borrow from the Bible, and when the Bible testifies concerning the nature of the future life, and as to the conditions to be fulfilled by men in order to enjoy its blessedness, they repudiate its teaching. But this is unreasonable. Here the law maxim applies—*falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*. If the Bible teaching concerning the future life as to its blessedness and the conditions of its enjoyment lack divine authority, all its teachings on this subject lack divine authority. This leaves the universalist with no sure basis for his doctrine of immortality, and with this lack of basis for an essential feature of his theory, the whole scheme falls to the ground.

In the fourth place, and still more conclusively, this evolutionary universalism is contradicted by every known truth, by every ascertained fact bearing on the subject, outside of the truths and facts presented in the Bible. Election, selection, natural or divine, is one of the most prominent facts, or series of facts, within the observation of men. We observe everywhere that the many perish; that the few are saved. In plant life, in animal life, in human life, the many perish before coming to perfection, before completing the full round of existence. Multitudes are abortive born; multitudes die before reaching maturity. Only the elect few are blessed with anything like perfection. Universal salvation, universal blessedness, universal perfection, is contradicted at every point in the book of nature. So perfectly evident is this fact that evolutionists generally scout the doctrine of universal salvation, which we are now considering. Those who hold it base their faith on certain biblical statements concerning God and his feelings and purposes respecting man.

For example, Dr. George A. Gordon bases this doctrine on

the goodness of God as that goodness is manifested in the incarnation of his Son. Commenting on John iii. 16, Dr. Gordon says, "Here the purpose of God in the advent of Jesus Christ is the salvation of the world. The effectualness of this purpose is indeed conditioned upon belief; but, upon its own side, the divine intention is absolutely unlimited. Other texts there are which look towards restriction; whether they actually involve the limitation of God's moral interest or not, is for scientific exegesis to say. But the Christian thinker is independent of these witnesses. He assumes the reality of the incarnation; he takes that event at its word when it asserts that the divine purpose in Christ is inclusive of mankind. If there are texts against this truth, so much the worse for the texts. The believer in the universality of God's love in the advent of Jesus will allow nothing that contradicts that assumption to be a genuine part of the gospel of the incarnation." (*The New Epoch for Faith*, p. 267.)

It is evident to every candid mind that, according to his own account, Dr. Gordon's view as to God's intention to save all mankind is based on his own *a priori* conception of the meaning of the incarnation. He says, "Christ is God's witness that God is for the race." (*Ibid*, p. 276.) Unfortunately, when Dr. Gordon's witness is brought into court and cross-examined, he "goes back on" him. Dr. Gordon knows this, and in order to protect himself and his cause, proposes to reject all that part of the testimony which does not suit him. He says, "If it should be shown by pure exegesis that in the teachings of Jesus there are expressions that imply a restriction upon the grace of God, the consistent believers in the incarnation will not allow that these expressions are adequate reports of the sayings of the Lord. The fundamental position is that Christ must not be set at variance with himself; the universality of God's love in the incarnation must not be affirmed and denied in the same breath." (*Ibid*, pp. 276, 277.)

Certainly this last remark is eminently a proper one; Christ must not be set at variance with himself. The trouble is, that in view of any fair criticism, lower or higher, in the light of any fair exegesis, Jesus is seen not to be at variance with himself,

but only with Dr. Gordon's theory. His theory as to the universality of God's love, even as manifested in the incarnation, is a pure assumption, sustained by nothing outside of the Bible, and by very little in it. No word of Jesus can be adduced to show that he ever taught in any form the universal salvation of all the individuals of the human race. On the contrary, he taught in every way, with utmost emphasis, a restricted salvation. Whatever may be the full content of our Lord's teaching, some things appear in it with singular clearness and force. He taught that there is moral evil in the universe; that God is not the author of that evil. He taught that men are sinners, justly condemned under the law of God; that the race, as a race, is lost and ill-deserving. He thus accounts for their wretchedness, and vindicates God's justice and goodness in inflicting suffering upon them. Dr. Gordon calls attention to the remarkable fact that, while the modern ethical ideal is sternly at variance with the behavior of the universe towards man, it does not appear that Jesus, who is the author of that ethical ideal, felt that variance. Certainly he does not refer to it, or in any way intimate that he was aware of it. Apparently, it does not occur to Dr. Gordon that Jesus neither saw nor felt that variance, because he knew and appreciated, as the modern ethical idealists do not, the sin and consequent ill-desert of men. He knew that the universe is hostile to men, because men are hostile to God. Hence Jesus, according to his own account, comes to redeem men from their sin and ill-desert; to call them to repentance and faith; to raise them from death in sin to life in holiness. All this he will accomplish for those given to him by his Father. This, in brief, is the teaching of Jesus. It is self-consistent teaching. It is consistent with all that is revealed on these subjects in the cosmic revelation; but it is hopelessly at variance with Dr. Gordon's universalism.

There is one view of the Bible and its interpretation, pointed out by Dr. Gordon, which may afford some ground of hope that God may give another revelation, and that this revelation may present to man's spirit, burdened with insoluble problems, a grander and more attractive goal than that contained either in the cosmic revelation or in the Bible as we now have it. The

present biblical revelation now consists of two parts. The Old Testament is constructed so as to provide for the faith and conduct of those to whom it first came. It also contains hints, comparatively few, slight, easily overlooked, of a new and broader revelation. The reference here is not to the prophecies of a new dispensation, which are numerous and explicit enough, but to a new revelation, greatly widening our conceptions of the applications of the saving grace of God. These hints are like seeds in an apple. By and by the apple will disappear, and the seeds will produce a noble orchard. Unquestionably the Messianic realizations of the New Testament far exceed the Messianic hopes of the Old Testament saints, and in many respects were different from those hopes. The old sons of Israel expected much; but much more came, and in forms quite unexpected to them. So, it may be, the New Testament now contains in germ the promise of a grander goal than that which believers generally see in it. It is, of course, designed for men as they now are, and, therefore, contains its solemn warnings, as well as its encouragements; yet in it may be found a basis for a hope that God, in his own time, will clearly show that, in the new heavens and the new earth, he will bring to perfect blessedness all the erring sons and daughters of our lost race.

God forbid that any one should assert that this is impossible. This would be without warrant to limit God's wisdom, power and grace. Our present concern is to note that, if there be any plausibility in this view, it sustains our contention that the Bible is a God-authorized book. No mere man, no Hebrew prophet on his own motion, placed in the Old Testament those obscure seeds of truth out of which Christianity has sprung. No mere man placed in the New Testament those marvellous bits of statement, apparently at variance with the mass of the revelation, on which some found this larger hope of a still broader revelation of God's saving grace. If these are in the Bible, none but the omniscient God placed them there. Meanwhile, it becomes us to bear in mind that, even if this supposition as to the Bible be correct, we have a basis, not for faith, but for hope only. The Bible has been given to a race very imperfect as yet, and very

sinful. We must take it as it is. Its clear, unmistakable teachings must control our faith and our conduct. If all men are ultimately to be saved, the truth waits a new revelation from God to attest it. It is not attested now, either in the Bible or in the book of nature. As the Old Testament prophets were required to say to all Gentiles, You must believe in the Lord God of Israel, who is indeed the Lord of all, and worship him in the way he has appointed according to the law, or you cannot be saved; so the New Testament prophets and teachers are required to say to all sinners, You must repent of your sins, you must accept Jesus the Christ as your Saviour and Lord, or you cannot be saved. This solemn alternative is to be enforced by the assurance that when the Son of God shall be again revealed from heaven, he will render "vengeance to them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus, who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction, from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." (2 Thess. i. 8, 9.)

Our conclusion is that faith cannot accept evolutionary theism: Christian theism, Dr. Gordon calls it, in this last and most attractive form. Faith desires to do this; but faith must be reasonable. Without rational basis on which to rest, and from which to act, faith degenerates into superstition. Faith in universal salvation is superstition, because the thing believed has no good evidence to prove it. Its so-called foundation is a foundation of clouds. Its assumptions are not sustained by any known truth or fact outside the Bible. Its conclusions are contradicted by every known truth, by every observed fact of the cosmic revelation; by the repeated, explicit and emphatic testimony of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Faith moves, must move, along the line of least resistance. Faith rests, must rest, on the best foundation of proven truth and accepted fact. Hence faith rejects atheism, materialism in all its forms, pure pantheism, dualism, except as the biblical revelation is dualistic. Of the two forms of theism, biblical and evolutionary, faith rejects the latter and accepts the former, because, on the whole, biblical theism commends itself as the more reasonable theory. It explains all the facts but one—the presence

of moral evil in the dominions of an infinite God. No monotheistic theory can avoid this fact or explain it. It is the one insoluble mystery. Hence biblical theism is at no disadvantage here. Its weakness is the weakness of all monotheistic conceptions of the universe. The thinker, contemplating this insoluble mystery, may say, if he pleases, that there is no God, no Mind, in the universe. He may say, with the Persian dualist and his Manichaean successors, that there are two eternal beings, hostile to each other, waging eternal and equal war with each other. But reason says there is a God—one only living and true God; and faith, resting on this judgment of the reason, says, I will trust in this God as good, though I cannot explain the presence of moral evil in his dominions. Thus far both theories agree—evolutionary theism and biblical theism.

Faith now carefully examines these two theories and accepts biblical theism, because it is decidedly the most reasonable. Accepting this view of God and the universe, of man and his relations to God, the biblical theist has little difficulty in ascribing divine authority to the Bible. It is the only book which is original authority for this most rational account of God and the universe. It is the only book which gives any assurance to the reason and heart of man that God is good. It is the only book which gives any account of the awful sufferings of the human race which is at all satisfactory to the human conscience. The truth is, and it needs to be emphasized in our day, that if the biblical account of sin is not true, if the human race is not guilty and ill-deserving, it is impossible for a sane and logical mind, on any fair view of human history, to believe in a supreme and beneficent God. Still more clear is this impossibility on the evolution view of human history. But God is good. So say the highest, best, noblest instincts of men; so says the human conscience, having a sense of human responsibility and regardful of the way men have met that responsibility; so says the human reason when it fairly contemplates all the facts in the case. God is good. Hence the biblical doctrine of sin is true—must be true. And the Bible is the only book which gives to man any good hope of escape from sin and its frightful consequences. It is the only book which

reveals any salvation from sin worthy of consideration by enlightened reason. True, it is a limited salvation; but it is the only salvation. Outside of this book there is no salvation revealed in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, which can stand for a moment at the bar of human reason. It is the only book, the only authority known to man, that opens even the smallest door for hope that there may be for some future race, duly prepared for it, another revelation from God, opening up to man a grander, lovelier view of the ultimate purpose of God respecting moral evil, and of the destiny of his sentient creatures who have fallen under its awful curse.

Hence faith accepts the Bible as a book of divine authority. Faith needs such a book; rejoices to find it; is pleased to rest upon it, and to act in accordance with it. Faith, thus sustained by reason, hears with patient ear all the objections urged against this book and its central personage, the incarnate God; it listens to all the invitations of the sirens to leave this divine Saviour; but turns with devout heart to him and says, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

Lexington, Mo.

E. C. GORDON.

III.

THE NEW HEATHENISM.

WE are prone to think that we have left heathenism far behind us in the centuries of the past; or that it is banished from our shores to hide its shame in the remote and darkened corners of the earth; and one is almost stung into a feeling of resentment when the charge is made that there is a lively revival of heathenism at our very doors, here in enlightened America, in this blessed day of grace.

I beg you to notice that the word heathen cannot be restricted to those dull dwellers on the outlying heaths, who, with barbaric sullenness and stupidity, steadily refused the gospel. A heathen is not necessarily a savage, nor does heathenism historically involve an absence of culture. The fact is that much of what we call culture is heathen. All the classical writers were heathen. Longinus was a heathen, and his essay on the "Sublime" is superior to Burke's, or any Christian writer's. John Foster said in quaint phrase that "all the colleges in Christendom were engaged in teaching heathenism." Professor McGuffey, in his lecture on rhetoric before the students of the University of Virginia, remarked that all text-books on that subject were but dilutions of Aristotle, and Aristotle was a heathen. Heathenism can well be proud of its culture. I have known some very ignorant people who were very excellent Christians; and I have known some very elegant folk who were very fascinating heathen. Sometimes Christianity has arrayed against it all the power of skeptical culture, and it may fight its final and fiercest battle with unsanctified civilization.

The essence of the whole matter is this, the heathen are the godless, whether they be naked savages or college professors. I spoke of a revival of heathenism, and I desire to say that in our day godlessness has become rich, educated, elegant, even moral. Even vice has become refined; crime, scientific; and doubt has

grown learned. The new heathenism goes in good society, takes first place in commerce, promotes reforms, patronizes education and the arts, and turns up its nose at the churches. We should not fail to recognize it because it is well-dressed, polite, exquisite. As we study the marks of this new heathenism, I think we will be considering four tendencies in modern society which powerfully combat the efforts of evangelical Christianity to save the world.

I. COMMERCIALISM.

Money to-day has a mighty, almost a merciless, power. Too often those who have it are frozen with pride, and those who desire it are burning with hate. Between the lust of the rich and the greed of the poor, selfishness has entered upon a legalized career of injustice and fraud. The aged German Chancellor, Prince Hohenlohe, recently deceased, addressing a company of his learned countrymen, said that it seemed to him as if that ancient geological era had returned, when immense saurian monsters walked the earth, with their great passionate greed, as he saw the struggles and griefs of men and observed society, apparently bent on the destruction of its own members. Matthew Arnold, looking upon the vast drama of lust being enacted by our modern materialism, almost cursed this age with this cynical generalization: "The upper class is becoming materialized; the middle class is becoming vulgarized; and the lower class is becoming brutalized."

By way of palliation, it is said that the American people found themselves in possession of a vast domain, which had to be quickly wrested from the idleness of savagery and converted to the uses of civilization. Thus we became rich suddenly; and our money mastered us before we had time to learn how to manage it. As we went about the task of building up a continent, Puritan righteousness cooled into worldly covetousness, and Cavalier gallantry deployed into commercial sagacity. And so the Pilgrims have all become promoters, and the Cavaliers are capitalists. New England piety has gone out West to make a fortune, and the F. F. V. is now a railroad train. To-day we too readily define talent as the ability to get, and virtue as the power to hold.

No age ever more profoundly believed in that despicable French fallacy, that "nothing succeeds like success."

"It is success that colors all in life;
Success makes fools admired, makes villains honest;
All the proud virtue of this vaunting world
Fawns on success and power, howe'er acquired."

And so the age is marked by much injustice.

"Plate sin with gold, and the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;
Arm it in rags, a pigmy straw doth pierce it."

Too often do we see successful coarseness petted, and dishonest thrift admired, while Crime, with a purse in its bloody hand, maintains its place in good society.

This characterization of our times is to be applied only to those to whom it belongs; but I wish to observe that this commercial spirit has also entered the church. Whatever is in the world somehow gets into the church, whether we like it or not; and while theologically the church is not a part of the world, mathematically it is, and the two have a way of mixing up in spite of all protest. In our religious conventions pastors used to tell how many souls they had saved; now they tell about how many dollars they have raised. "The evangelist has become the finangelist." The reader may not agree with the remark, but it is worth considering, twenty-five years ago our denominations existed on a creedal basis; to-day they largely exist on a commercial basis. So much for the first mark of the new heathenism.

II. AESTHETICISM.

When a people get rich suddenly they wish to acquire culture quickly, so they do the cheap thing, and take on the vulgarities of æstheticism, instead of the more difficult refinements of true art. Elegant ladies and gentlemen, strong in the languor of luxury, lounge in dainty drawing-rooms, and cultivate an Attic indifference to virtue and a Roman contempt for the enthusiasms of robust manhood. They patronize a licentious drama with extravagant delight, indulge the coarsest pleasures veneered with the refinements of the most artistic vice, and then they pass Pity weeping on the streets, untouched and unmoved, their hearts frozen within them by the elegant unrealities of their godless

lives, totally disqualified for sympathy with plain suffering when they meet it in the unromantic garb of common, every-day life. The æsthetic emotion is never a true friend of charity, and your habitual pleasure-seeker is invariably cold-hearted. These same people revel in the stupidities and vulgarities of current fiction; they delight in the brilliant negations and beautiful perfidies of writers like Omar Khayyam, and then they wave away with their heathen hands the gospel of God's love and life. They repress spiritual curiosity, suppress spiritual surprise, and protest against the stir of the religious feeling. These men who rage like mad on 'Change, and these women who rave at the play, demand in church a solemn calm, a passionless unresponsiveness to the word of God. They seem to think that a little spiritual excitement would be the death of them.

I have one other charge against this class, and that is an animal, lustful love of music. We are ready to-day to worship stupidity with a voice in any register, and we almost regulate one's standing in the community by his skill at fiddling. We rave over long hair on a piano stool, and go into ecstasies over instrumental insanities with a foreign name attached. We pay saints one dollar a day to preach the gospel, and profligates five hundred dollars a night to sing to us. There is a good deal more culturine than culture in the land, and pantasote refinement and celluloid elegance are abundant.

All this might be comparatively harmless if it did not have a way of getting into our churches. There is grave danger of substituting æsthetic emotion for religious feeling in our public worship. We must train an eye to discern between animal magnetism and spiritual power in preaching; between mere theatricism of service and a worship in spirit and truth; and we must ever know that when our church music becomes æsthetic instead of spiritual, then it is heathen, and not Christian. Mr. Lowell says that the Puritans thrust Beauty out of the meeting-house and slammed the door in her face. In our efforts to get Beauty back into the church we have made a series of blunders. We have about tired of the silly ditties of the travelling evangelist. We are now in danger of importing the heathen music of the

world into our services to praise the glory of God. Æstheticism is never a friend of piety. We should cling to the truly spiritual in art, which we have in rich abundance. Whenever the music is listened to instead of participated in; whenever it becomes an entertainment instead of an inspiration; whenever it stops one from singing instead of cheering him on to praise—then that music is harmful and not helpful, it is heathen and not Christian. It is high time that Christian leaders should stand against this tide of æstheticism which is sweeping through the world; for now, as in the past, it means decadence and not growth; and it will rob any church that indulges it of all evangelical power.

III. OCCULTISM.

When people get rich suddenly they wish to become intellectual quickly, and they usually become superstitious rather than philosophical. There has been a ridiculous revival of occultism in this country in the last ten years. We are growing such a swift passion for necromancy that we may soon progress backwards to the days of witchcraft. Numbers of teachers, whose chief qualifications are long hair and soiled linen, profess an acquaintance with the mysteries of philosophy which would appall the real learning of the world. Hypnotists reveal the deep secrets of psychology on a month's tuition which have been hidden from the wisdom of the world for ages. And the amazing thing about it all is that thousands of people listen to the babble of these fellows who will not heed the oracles of God. A certain statistician has computed that there has been an increase of 300 per cent. in fools in this country in the last fifty years, and one is half inclined to believe the estimate. When a young lady graduate through the instructions of theosophy locates the soul of her departed lover in a poodle-dog, and seriously proposes to marry the canine, one sees to what lengths this movement has gone.

This tendency has also invaded our churches, and the religious life of the day is attended with freaks and oddities which would amaze our pious fathers. Evangelical Christianity is embarrassed by a refined mysticism developing into a ridiculous occultism.

Who has failed to note instances where faith-cure proposes to take the place of faith-character? Hypnotism is to become a substitute for grace, and the new psychology is to drive out the old gospel; spiritualistic mediums usurp the functions of the Holy Spirit, and fortune-tellers assume to be prophets. "Christian Science" is the great high priest of this order of affairs, with Buddhism and theosophy as its forerunners, and a dozen other little mysticisms marching as monks in the parade of its apostolate. One is hardly aware how widespread is this tendency who has failed to look over the vast number of books along this line that are being issued every year. The printing presses seem to be sick with nausea, and are vomiting up barrels of these books. It all comes of an untutored people, with liberty of utterance, attempting suddenly to live the philosophical life. It means shallowness. Occultism is always the friend of superstition, as it is always the enemy of faith. And yet we must confess that it is one of the distinct marks of the new heathenism.

IV. SOCIALISM.

The three tendencies above mentioned are aristocratic in their nature; they tend to organize people into exclusive coteries. The first is proud; the second, arrogant; the third, esoteric. And yet these movements are occurring in a democratic age. A reaction is unavoidable. These tendencies have inflamed the passions and embittered the spirits of many people, who, in order to resent that which is wrong, have permitted themselves to be led into an indiscriminate attack upon that which is right. This constitutes the fourth mark of the new heathenism, an unwise and passionate socialism.

I have not one word to say against the great body of the common people. They have always been poor and patient, and of themselves and by themselves have never done any wrong. Stung by the injustices of life, they have become half-conscious of their woes and half-intelligent about their rights, and in this condition they too easily become the prey of bold and bad leaders. Democracy's greatest danger is demagoguery. The trouble all comes when the man with the mouth gets hold of the man with

the hoe and makes a fool out of him. We used to wave the bloody shirt; now we wave the dirty shirt. As dangerous as these merciless money-devils, as offensive as these brocaded high priests of vulgarity and idiocy, are these apostles of dirt, who go about preaching the superiority of inferiority, and teaching the people that the only way to be happy is to despise the just dignities and decencies of life. I know a little poem of rare worth which speaks my thought.

"A man's a man," says Robert Burns,
 "For a' that and a' that,"
 But though the song be clear and strong,
 It lacks a note for a' that.
 The lout who'd shirk his daily work,
 Yet claim his wage and a' that,
 Or beg when he should earn his bread,
 Is not a man for a' that.

 If all who dine on homely fare
 Were true and brave for a' that,
 And none whose garb is hodden gray
 Was fool and knave and a' that;
 The vice and crime that shame in time
 Would fade and fail and a' that;
 The ploughman be as good as kings,
 And churls as earls and a' that.

 A man may own a large estate,
 Have palace, park and a' that,
 And not for birth, but honest worth,
 Be thrice a man for a' that;
 While Donald, herding on the muir,
 Who beats his wife and a' that,
 Be nothing but a rascal boor,
 No half a man for a' that.

 For a' that and a' that,
 'Tis heart and soul and a' that,
 That makes the king a gentleman,
 And not his crown and a' that;
 A man with man, if rich or poor,
 The best is he, for a' that,
 Who stands erect in self-respect,
 And acts the man for a' that.

This in broad lines is a description of the new heathenism. One who thinks the description feverish and overdrawn has but to look at life to find the facts worse than these words. The

conclusion I would draw from the whole matter is that we should stand squarely by our evangelical faith in these days of swift and passionate changes. There never was a time when there was more need for a sane, orderly, and practical presentation of the teachings of Jesus.

To complete this paper, I should say that there is nothing in the religion of our Lord against the acquisition of wealth. It is distinctly promised that "the meek shall inherit the earth"; and we all know that the Christian virtues are those which win material success. Our Lord simply commands us to consecrate our means. When money is master, man is a heathen.

And so there is room for the beautiful in the worship of our God. The church has the bell qualified with one vast tone like the sea, and the organ with its immense resourcefulness. We have no need for heathen art. The church, under the inspirations of praise, should never fail to lift loftier hymns than the world can write.

And so, again, in the search for the secrets of the unseen, light flashes all along the way from the word of God. Why should we stop to listen to the cackle of these blind neurotics when revelation offers visions of the beyond of which they have never dreamt?

And, finally, no scheme of social redemption is comparable to our Lord's law of love. Regeneration is the only true reform, and sanctification is the only certain cure for the ills of society. Humanity can get all it needs from the Christianity of Christ.

My one plea is that the old gospel is the only cure for the new heathenism. Let us beware how we neglect this gospel. When the Roman Consul Mummius was sacking Corinth he saw some of his soldiers carelessly handling a Greek statue. He warned them to have a care, remarking, "If you break it, you shall replace it." Think of a Roman rustic replacing an arm carved by Phidias! Have a care how you handle the gospel of Jesus! If you desert it for any of the shallow tendencies of the times, you have forsaken the power that is to save the world.

Nashville, Tenn.

J. O. RUST.

IV.

THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION.¹

It has become somewhat the fashion to speak in depreciatory terms of the denominational colleges. They are represented as incapable of doing the work of higher education, as behind the times, as out of sympathy with the so-called "new education," as obstructions in the way of higher attainments in learning and greater value in academic degrees. This tone of disparagement has been noted almost everywhere, but especially in the great gatherings of public teachers, and has become more or less popular. The public press, too ready to ally itself with anything that savors of a criticism of things ecclesiastical or denominational, has echoed and reinforced the effort to decry. Like many other fashions, this one will soon pass. The sober second thought of wise people will recognize and appreciate the facts, and will recoil from anything that appears to be a low estimate of that educational effort which for ages was all that the world possessed, which stimulated and developed our present secular institutions, and which must, from the very nature of things, continue to be a powerful factor in the higher training of the masses of the people.

It shall be the aim of this paper to set forth the facts, that they may speak for themselves. These will show that the day has not yet come when the denominational colleges may be safely retired or ignored; that they have done too much to lay the foundations of higher education and make it what it is to-day to yield readily to the thoughtless clamor against them. In the consideration of their relation to the higher education there will be no intended disparagement of the principles or methods

¹A paper read before the Southern Educational Association, Richmond, Va., December, 1900.

or results of the other institutions. These, whether founded by individual enterprise and philanthropy, or by civic or State organizations, have their work to do, which none others can do, and are indispensable. When they are alluded to in this discussion, it will be only to emphasize the importance of certain lines of work which, in the very nature of the case, they may not pursue, and with equal regard to the fact that there are lines of work which the secular institutions alone can accomplish, and from which the denominational institutions must scrupulously abstain.

The past of denominational education, with its history, its conditions, its marvellous results in maintaining education, its stimulation of men's minds, need not be traversed. No more need be said of it than this: that but for the faithfulness of the church to her trust, in an uninterrupted series, not of years, nor of decades, nor even of generations, but of centuries, the world would not have to-day that wide-spread knowledge, that intellectual ambition, that consciousness of the needs of mankind, that impulse that has formulated itself in public institutions of all grades, which make this closing week in the nineteenth the most brilliant in the educational history of the world. The debt which mankind owes to denominational effort can never be paid. For ages no other effort was made. Men may not lightly esteem that past which has given the glorious present. It will be sought now to show that they may not judge that it is only a past which denominational education may claim, but that the principles underlying its work are living yet and active yet. Practical inquiry among the secular institutions will reveal the fact that most of the leading men, and most of the leading ideas in them, have been imported from the denominational institutions. And why? Because principles are unchanging; because, while education may advance, change, expand, enlarge, there are certain stages or aspects of it, even up to the verge of professional training, which are as invariable as are the methods at a mother's knee or the influences of a father's life and will upon his growing son. What a mother and father have done in the past they will continue to do. In the same manner, what the denominational institutions have effected for growing youth they will still effect.

As to the number, sufficiency of equipment, and adequacy of means, the denominational institutions are a tremendous factor, the equal of the undenominational, in the higher education. Avoiding mere details and tables of figures, take simply the summary of them. According to the best statistics attainable, there are four hundred and eighteen institutions in the United States professing to do the work of the higher education. Of these, two hundred and eighty-one, or sixty-seven per cent., are denominational. One hundred and thirty-seven, or thirty-three per cent., are what may be called the secular institutions. Of the total number it may be granted that very many are unworthy of the name of college or university, and are doing evil to the cause rather than good; but it is no less a fact that there are fewer denominational institutions that have thus only a name to live, and only a pretence to their work, than there are such among the undenominational. Taking a productive endowment of one hundred thousand dollars each as a minimum for worthy work in the higher education, it will be found that of the secular schools which do not possess this amount the proportion is fifty-one per cent., and of the denominational schools which do not possess this amount the proportion is only thirty-eight per cent. There are, all told, one hundred and seventy-nine institutions of both classes whose endowment is one hundred thousand dollars and upwards. A careful investigation of the actual income of all the institutions shows that about the same number have an annual income of twenty thousand dollars and more. Of these one hundred and seventy-nine, one hundred and nine, or sixty-one per cent., are denominational. Of the one hundred and nine thousand students enrolled last year in these one hundred and seventy-nine colleges and universities, forty-three per cent. were in those called denominational; or, if we subtract the registration of the twelve most largely attended State universities, such as those of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and others, where professional students make up the bulk of the enrollment, and whose numbers reach nearly twenty-six thousand, a percentage of fifty-six will be found in the denominational colleges. Of the one hundred and fifty-four million dollars of productive

endowment of the one hundred and seventy-nine institutions named, thirty-six per cent., or, if we omit the endowment of the same twelve indicated above, forty-eight per cent. will be found in the denominational institutions.

From these statistics it will be seen at a glance that the day has not yet come when the denominational institutions may be safely dispensed with, or relegated to a lower plane of work, or assigned an insignificant place among the forces that make for the intellectual development of our land. On the contrary, their number, their students, and their endowments alike indicate that they are doing, and that they are capable of doing, a work immeasurable in its results and power. By their location, widely diffused in all parts of the land; by their number, far surpassing the number of the secular institutions; by their attendance, largely exceeding that of the others, and furnishing to those others a great proportion of their material for technical and professional training; by their accessibility to the masses of student material, by the economy of their administration and the comparative inexpensiveness of travelling and attending them, they offer, especially to the poorer classes of the intellectually ambitious, opportunities which can be found nowhere else. They are doing a large amount of genuine work, and on a smaller capital than the other class.

In respect to the primary end of their existence, as compared with the secular institutions, the denominational colleges and universities are an indispensable factor in the problem of higher education. Founded by the churches, their ultimate object is not merely intellectual development, but intellectual development as a means to an end, and that end the highest known, viz., the upbuilding of character in man. Character and manhood are the supreme need, as they should be the supreme end, of society. Man-making should be the end of all disciplinary and educational processes. More than the others, the denominational colleges seek, as the ultimate object of their work, that elevation of character of which a cultured mind is but a part. They endeavor to impart their education under such conditions as to make the all-round man. Founded as they are, they can legitimately do this work,

and they have done it, as witness the products everywhere. But the secular or general schools may not do this. Their aim is purely intellectual, with only so much of the moral training as comes from the intellectual apprehension of ethics, or under restraints which will secure the behaviour of the student that he may attend uninterruptedly to his intellectual duties. The undenominational institutions may try to have all their students face the right way, but the denominational can legitimately try to make them go that way. A study of the rolls of the alumni of the denominational institutions will reveal the fact that this great aim has been accomplished. The very lists themselves will thrill the heart of every patriot and of every lover of education. The highest and noblest and best in all that enters into human society, in culture, thought, philosophy, government, religion, and statecraft, has sprung from this rich and fruitful source. The very leaders themselves of the secular education have been drawn from the denominational schools. That the secular schools feel their lack in this respect as compared with their sister institutions, is indicated by the struggle which some of them are earnestly making to maintain, in some sort of connection with themselves, and yet necessarily apart from their regular work, classes for religious culture, as Young Men's Christian Associations, classes for Bible study and lectures, and the like. As Dr. Thornwell, the South's greatest advocate of State institutions, put it, "The great problem to be solved in this country is the introduction of religion, the whole religion of the Bible, into public institutions of learning. That problem must be solved, or the church will be driven to establish institutions of her own."

The powers usually governing the two classes of institutions indicate that the denominational schools must be here to stay. They are dominated by the Christian sentiment and the church authorities of the land. This sentiment is a constantly rising and prevailing one. It must hold its principles and work with a firmer, and ever firmer, grasp. Its changes are all progressive, or in the line of advancement. The secular institutions, on the contrary, are more or less influenced by political environment or the changes about them. It is well-nigh impossible to eliminate

the political element from the State institutions, and to secure for them that impartial support and freedom in opinion and work to which they are entitled. The temptation to small politicians to interfere, to meddle, to tinker, is too great to be resisted. It is a sad sight to witness how assiduously many university officials must needs wait upon legislatures and legislators to secure the universities' permanent interests and to guard against constantly proposed legislation which will affect them. And too frequently it is a fact that freedom of opinion on debated questions is qualified by the matter of tenure of office, and that teachers and opinions must reflect pot-house politics. All honor to those, and they are the overwhelming majority, whom we see rising above these influences and facing their duty, though it cost them their official heads.

As to the methods of higher education, the denominational colleges and universities are indispensable. While some of the institutions of this class give technical instruction, and offer the best training to specialists, and while some of the secular institutions embrace in their organization the best features of the curriculum, or other opportunities for general culture, it is nevertheless true that in the main the denominational institutions are engaged in giving general culture, or a liberal education, while the others, especially the great universities, are pressing more and more towards technical, special, and professional education. From the very nature of the case, the work of the latter must be, in the main, spectacular and pragmatic. It must be in such form as to show practical, tangible, measurable and ponderable results. It must have something to show, in order to satisfy the tax-payer from whom the appropriation comes. The masses do not appreciate general culture. They demand something they can see. The work of the denominational institutions is, as a rule, basal, fundamental, broad. To-day, were these abolished, the great bulk of the work of the general kind would be eliminated from the higher education. Can this be afforded? Can the drill and discipline of the essential features of the general culture course be dispensed with, if we would have vigorous minds and high thinking for the later development of the special course? Can there be any true

ability along special lines without that broad culture which will enable the student to grasp the truth in its manifold relations? Does special work, severed from liberal culture, develop the mind or enlarge its capacity? It is said that in the factory a single pin passes through the hands of sixteen men, each one of whom does his part upon it before it is ready for the market. How much of power can that man develop who tends one of these machines a lifetime, or what can he become in the way of breadth of thought? Specializing without adequate previous training, or the acquisition of a previous liberal education, is the curse of the day. It dwarfs the intellect, narrows the horizon, and, by a shortening of the radius of a man's activity and power, reduces him to a mere machine. The man of broad culture is the one who becomes the thinker of his age; the man of special culture becomes, perhaps, the actor. But the thinker is infinitely superior, even though he be only a theorist, a dreamer. Jacob's brethren once exclaimed, "Behold, this dreamer cometh," but the dreamer was Joseph, and in later years they felt and acknowledged his power. The thinker delves into the mines of truth and brings up their hidden treasures, while the actor in most cases stays upon the surface and merely handles what the other has brought forth. The typical denominational college affords this liberal culture. It is no wonder that from it come the finest specimens of specialists or technical students, who afterwards adorn the typical secular institutions. Carlyle has well said that "the college is only a key to a library." In the fashion of the day, and in the multiplied opportunities now afforded for special training, the great practical bulwark against the danger of losing sight of that general culture and broad thinking which make the best minds is the denominational college. The training along special lines, sometimes begun in the very kindergarten stage, the attempt to adapt studies and work to the supposed bent of the individual mind before that mind has had proper drill and culture, and liberal training, and discipline and practice, is mental murder. "Education along the line of least resistance" is a fashionable notion. It is none the less a travesty; nay, a crime. Against it the denominational colleges are the chief defence.

In this connection, it may be added that even the special training of the secular schools, if wisely effected, depends upon the previous work, practically up to maturity, accomplished in a liberal education. Specialization is, in its last and proper analysis, differentiation. The student first amasses a store of facts. Out of this he gathers certain ones that are somewhat related. From the latter he rises to the next step of the pyramid, and brings together those that are more closely allied. From these he reaches another and narrower plane, and at last arrives at the apex, the specialty. In the ascent each higher course rests upon the broader beneath it. These lower, broader courses are laid most largely to-day in our denominational schools.

In this connection, too, emphasis may again be laid upon the fact that from this difference of aim there comes a difference in the cost of an education, which is no insignificant element in the solution of the problem of higher education for the masses. Technical and special education is invariably more expensive than general education, and must be so. The drill must be more individual and specific, the apparatus for experimentation must be more costly, the location of the institutions must be at distant points, and in communities where living is most expensive, and for all these the student must pay. The result is that the cost of the training is far greater than that in general education. Thus it comes about that even in the free State institutions, as well as in the larger secular institutions, such as Harvard, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, and others, the sons of the rich are chiefly the ones who profit by their elaborate equipment for special work, except in those cases, and they are comparatively few, where scholarships are given and young men are practically sustained in their work. On the contrary, the denominational institutions are able to offer their general training at a very much lessened cost. They are located near to the sources from which they draw their material, lessening the cost of travel. From their usual environment, they offer less temptation to extravagance in tastes, dress, and living. In many other ways they invite a larger number of the sons of the poor to avail themselves of the advantages of the higher education. The larger university, the expensiveness of which is usually

in proportion to its endowment, is largely for the sons of the rich ; the church college for the sons of the poor. The church colleges are to-day actually giving, in the Christian spirit, more to higher education in free education than all others. It is a rare thing for any one of them to turn away from its doors any young man who is worthy and prepared.

As to the character, *personnel*, and equipment of their teachers, the denominational colleges must continue to have a large place in education. These institutions seldom offer as large pecuniary remuneration as the others, but they have a force from which it is worthy of note that the others are wont to draw whenever they can, in their search for the ablest teachers. The instructors in them are usually animated by a high and noble spirit. "Meat, medicine, and money" are not their object, nor yet the mere pleasure or ambition of the mind. As a rule, they are devoted to a cause, rather than to mere intellectual exercise. They are chosen for their character and religion, no less than for their intellectual power and equipment. They have the power which comes from an end beyond mere mental acquisition on their own part or mere educing of powers on their students' part. They recognize education as a means to an end, and that end not merely worldly, but moral and spiritual. That end being with them from both conviction and conscience an exalted one, its loftiness has a reflex effect upon themselves, and makes them more and more zealous in the effort to accomplish the work set before them, and the more industrious in preparing for it. With them duty is a greater stimulus than intellectual ambition. They thus become the best teachers in the world. There are scores of men to-day amongst the most eminent teachers who have been offered flattering inducements to leave the denominational colleges and take places in others, who have declined the enticing calls, and, for conscience' sake and their work's sake, have remained in the more poorly remunerative sphere. In the secular institutions, on the contrary, and especially in the State institutions, offices are held sometimes as the result of political favoritism, or are bestowed for purposes of policy. A case of the latter recently occurred, where it was notorious that the controlling board felt that it must

fill a vacant professorship from a certain quarter of the State which up to that time had not been represented in the faculty! In the same institution, and it is one of the best, another vacancy must needs be filled by none but a Baptist, because, forsooth, there was at that time a smaller representation in the faculty of that body than of other religious denominations.

In the denominational colleges alone certain studies can be legitimately pursued which are essential to the higher education of men, and without which a man is to-day really not a scholar of the highest type. Among these studies are ethics and sociology. True, there are ways of approaching these subjects in the secular colleges. But there is no true study of them apart from the sources and authority from which their principles spring, in the will of a divine Law-giver, and in the giving and adaptation of a divine revelation as a medium of bestowing the knowledge and authority. This source and this authority can be traced and studied and philosophized over nowhere else but in the institutions which recognize and appreciate them. Let it be carefully understood here that it is not of peculiar denominational propagandism that we are speaking, but of a totally different and more important thing, viz., the culture of youth on the basis of revealed religion.

And again, the study of that which above all else has made our English literature and our English civilization—the Bible, the word of God—can be properly pursued, or pursued at all, only in the denominational institutions. If studied at all in the secular schools it must be solely as literature and scrupulously apart from its religious features, except perhaps in their historical aspects. In the discussion of the use of the Bible in public institutions, the argument is largely on the side of those who oppose its introduction. The free-thinker or atheist has a right to protest against it in the institution which he sustains. But all believers, and they form the mass of the educators and of the educated people, regard something else besides literature and history as the chief subjects of that book, and as the secret of the wonderful part which that book has played in the life and work of mankind, and even in its literary results. The secret of its sway and power

is its spiritual relation to men. It comes from a divine source. It teaches the principle of a life imparted by supernatural gift. To study it without these facts in view is to study the bare facts of a science without regard to the philosophical principles by which they are related or out of which they grow. It is to attempt to know a system without knowing its reason or philosophy.

In view, then, of these facts it may safely be concluded that the day of the denominational college has not passed. These institutions are yet, and will continue to be, a force in the educational world. Their number, equipment, endowment, and attendance show them to be the equal in outward importance and promise of their sister institutions. Their primary aim is that which is the supreme end of society. Their government secures them freedom from injurious molestation. Their methods meet and fill the great want in mental discipline and intellectual development. Their opportunity, especially with the poor, is beyond measure. Their instructors are animated and inspired by the loftiest possible motives. They appeal to the highest instincts and sentiment in the human heart and mind, man's religious nature. The subjects which they teach in connection with the higher education, and which they alone can fully and legitimately teach, are vital in their nature and in their bearing upon true education. That they fall short of the accomplishment of all these ends and in the work to be done goes without saying, but so do the others as well in their specific end. With all their defects, and with all their shortcomings, and with all their need to know more and to do better, they are here to stay.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

Clarksville, Tenn.

V.

DOCTRINE AND LIFE.

ALMOST every one is familiar with the current statement, that "it makes no difference what a man believes, so his character or life is right." The principle inculcated sounds well, and embodies a sublime truth, for the supreme and ultimate thing, after all, is a well-rounded character, a lofty and noble life. To secure this end, all the energies of religious education and culture are devoted; and yet, upon this principle, the value of these agencies, as a means to an end, is discredited by instituting a choice between doctrine or creed and character or life, as if the two were in separate antagonism.

A writer (Ian Maclaren) whose genius is unexcelled, whose pathos and humor thrill and fascinate, and whose brilliancy sparkles with a singular charm, lays considerable stress upon this idea. In his little book, "Beside the Bonnie Brier Bush," interesting characters pass in review before the mind in Drumtochty, and one which is especially admirable is the doctor of the old school, a man who neither professes any religious creed nor gives expression to any religious convictions. The impression made upon the mind is that, after all, it is a matter of little significance what a man believes, so his character or life is right.

The impression which the author conveys is a very prevalent opinion at present, and upon the part of those who maintain it, both in the pulpit and in other places, there is an aggressive disposition to ignore and vilify the value of religious doctrine. But scarcely any engagement is more nauseating than to sit for an hour and listen to a discourse with much fancy and little reason; throbbing with sentiment, but unsupported by the backbone of argument; full of beautiful phrases, tropes and striking figures, but devoid of thought; and watch the man mop his brow, as he strenuously labors with his weapon of sentiment

and apostrophe to destroy all creeds, and yet, to persuade and inspire his hearers to lead pure and noble lives. The thing is absurd. He has defeated the very end which he endeavors to achieve either by destroying the value or prejudicing his hearers against the means which must serve to originate and support the pure and noble life. It reminds one of the ridiculous postulate and position of the positive philosopher, who climbs up to a given point in his fanciful scheme by a given principle, and then hurls it from him with the declaration that there is nothing in it.

It requires no great mental effort to perceive the fallacy of this maxim, and to recognize that doctrine or creed and character or life are in perfect accord, consistently and indissolubly joined together. The Apostle Paul joins the spirit of power and a sound mind together, and makes holiness in life to depend upon holy belief. The one is the instrumental cause of the other. Godliness is the offspring of an accurate faith, both in its commencement and continuance. There is a natural affinity between them. In the highest sphere of being they are one, and in man's nature they are as compatible and friendly. In the organic movements of the human body the nerves of perception and sensation, in a sense, are distinct, but they are mutually dependent; in the outer and inorganic world the rays of light and heat, in a sense, are distinct, but they are inextricably united, and both are indispensable alike to the most important functions of animal life and the development of organized existence. Likewise, doctrine and life, in a sense, are distinct; but their combined influence is absolutely necessary to quicken and sustain the inner man, and one without the other is pitiable helplessness. What is doctrine? In a word, it may be described as that clear, definite, mental perception, and precise, logical, scientific expression in words of those eternal, immutable and divine truths which are revealed to man, for which he hungers, with which he is satisfied, and without which he is restless and discontent. For a man to say, "I believe in life, but not in doctrine; in practice, but not in faith," is like saying, "I do not believe in substances, but in shadows." There is no shadow without substance; there is no life without a creed of some sort behind it. Every substance casts its shadow; every

belief leaves its definite impression upon the mind and heart. The enunciation of that definite impression, whether true or false, is doctrine or dogma, and there is about as much doctrine or dogma with the one as with the other. The only difference is, that sound Christian doctrine or dogma becomes almighty to a pure and noble life the moment real thinking begins, and real thinking begins the instant it gets within the thinking mind, the feeling heart, the acting will.

The greatest factor in the world, and in the individual, is what is believed,—the creed. That which is believed governs and regulates the entire life. The reason why there are two diametrically opposing political parties is because people believe differently, have different political doctrines, creeds, dogmas, about certain political principles, and they act according to their creed; for the same reason there are diversities, various grades and distinctions in man's social life, people have a different social creed and act in accordance; for the same reason some are Christians and some are not; some are in the church, giving it their loyal support, and some are not; each acts in accordance with his belief about it. It is not a matter or question of life, but it is a matter of belief; and the creed, most inevitably and perceptibly determines the social, political, moral, grade and kind of life and practice each constantly perfects. This fact has been demonstrated centuries ago, and there are exhibitions lying all along the shoreline of history, that if a man's beliefs are wrong, he will go wrong, and that his life will not continue substantially and permanently in the right if his creed is altogether wrong. Doctrine and life, creed and character, are inseparably one, and if there is any antagonism between them, and if man is abandoned to the choice between them, then all preaching, all moral teaching and culture, all "faith is vain."

The superficiality of Pope, who gave poetical wing to the text, is offset by the profundity of Robert Browning, who discussed faith and character in almost every phase, and who never suggests any antagonism between them.

"Belief or unbelief,
Bears upon life, determines its whole course."

The superficiality of the statement is offset with more marked emphasis by the character and life of men in all ages who gave all their credence to the deep and sublime truths of the word of God. In such men as Paul, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and others, the value and efficacy of strong religious dogma or doctrine appears in its matchless consequences. It is impossible to read their biographies and meditate upon their religious experience, and follow them through their incessantly varied and perplexing labors without bowing in meek admission of the necessary relation, and the effectually potent moral and spiritual fruit of sound and accurate religious doctrine. They are the strong and substantial men of their time; they are the resolute, fertile, revolutionizing, epoch-making characters; and they are such because they are doctrinal, dogmatic men. They believe all the deep and grand doctrines about God and man, however severe, inexplicable, humbling; they feed on them, and the stream which issues from their mind and heart deposits fertility far and wide, and extends through many generations.

Place in contrast with these men the advocates of religion without theology, and it is like constituting a comparison between the diamond and the sandstone; between the brawny giant of years and the pigmy of a day. One of this class is Goethe, upon whom an exaggerated estimate has unquestionably been placed, probably because of his apparently moral motive. His ethical indifference and license finds a large place in the admiration and affections of those who affirm that "it makes no difference what a man believes so his life is right." The pleasure-seeking Faust is intensely "religious" after this fashion. When asked if he believes in God, he makes answer that he has "no name to give him; it comes to feeling; there is nothing in a name but sound and smoke," which excludes the warm glow of heaven. With all the might and ingenuity of his method, Matthew Arnold endeavors to expurgate the Bible of all doctrine, defines God as "the power that makes for righteousness"; and though more ethical than Faust, still he is about as hazy and misty and as morally weak,—commending the French stage as conducive to morals and as an aid to religion, and hopefully expectant that the "ringlet religion

will triumph over Christian dogma." Indeed, it is no exaggeration to assert that accuracy and precision in any department, whether science, literature or religion, furnish a tone and power which laxness is incapacitated to originate and supply. Sound doctrine, an orthodox or accurate belief, furnishes the mind and heart and will with a firm foundation,—with a power for which they hunger and by which character can compactly form and surely develop, and with lines along which the life can move to express itself with no uncertain steps. All history honors Paul, or any other, who believes something, something which is inherently good; who allows it to saturate his whole being and regulate his whole life; who gets strength and comfort from it in every kind of an hour that shall come upon him to try him. Thus, Paul could say, "I know in whom I have believed;" and thus John affirms, "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; hereby we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Likewise the prophets and other apostles; they were so positive as to be above being assailed either by objections or doubts. The same thing characterizes the early leaders and lights of the church, such as Athanasius, and the practical preachers, such as Savonarola, and the all but innumerable host which carried the gospel to the Celtic and Gothic and Slavonic races,—the Columbas and Bonifaces, and the great preachers who revived the faith of the masses and threw off the moral miasma of deistic ethics,—the Wesleys and Whitefields—these men believed something potentially good; they believed it with all the mind which thinks and questions, with all the heart which lives and worships, with all the soul which feels and enjoys, with all the strength which achieves and wills. A careful and devout perusal of these lives recompenses by strengthening the feeble faith, by reinspiring the fading effort, by reinvigorating the trembling arm, aye, by giving forth an influence which falls like the dew of heaven upon the fainting soul.

The history of the formation and promulgation of religious doctrine shows that the consistent, faithful adherent to it has the satisfaction that his labor is not in vain nor his reward uncertain. The Apostle Paul kept the faith, unmoved, amid all conjecture and doubt, amid famines and perils, and in a moment of retro-

spection, near the close of his eventful life, viewed with extreme delight the fruits of his labors, rejoiced that he had performed that duty, and with all confidence expressed his hope of a great reward beyond. From Paul turn to Calvin and read his words expressive of confidence and overcoming energy, "We know, and are verily persuaded that what we preach is the eternal truth of God. It is our wish, and a very natural one, that our ministry might prove beneficial and salutary to the world; but the measure of success is for God to give, not for us to demand. If this is what we have deserved at the hands of men whom we have struggled to benefit, to be loaded with calumny and stung with ingratitude, that men should abandon success in despair, and hurry along with the current to utter destruction, then this is my voice (I utter words worthy of the Christian man, and let all who are willing to take their stand by this holy profession subscribe to the response), 'Ply your fagots.' But we warn you, that even in death we shall become conquerors; not simply because we shall find, even through the fagots, a sure passage to that upper and better life, but because our blood will germinate like precious seed, and propagate that eternal truth of God which is now so scornfully rejected by the world." No bigot to laxness can discourse with such mighty confidence, nor find, in the very nature of the case, such a stimulus and incentive to vigorously labor in the promulgation of his doctrines. Indeed, there is a singular vitality in sound religious doctrine which is invincible to the sword of the unbelieving tyrant and the laxness of the nominal member of Christian society. It is forever safe under the protection of its divine author; it forever lives, whatever may be the condition of its environments. The seed which the Egyptians buried with their mummies, notwithstanding it was enclosed in the sarcophagus and retained in the very bosom of death for thousands of years, still kept its germ of vitality; and when exhumed, under the action of the elements, unfolds itself as surely and as luxuriantly as if but yesterday it had dropped from the parent stalk. This is ever the case with sound doctrine, and this is ever the assurance which accompanies its advocate. It is to be hoped that many churches and ministers and laymen are ecclesiastical

mummies, in which the incorruptible seed of the kingdom, having been sown by faithful parents and instructors in years gone, and having been deprived of the essentials of development, may be brought forth, to display its power and to produce its kind. The doctrine of justification by faith, when brought by Luther out of the catacombs of Rome, was as vigorous and fruitful as when first preached by the great apostle to the Gentiles. And though entombed now in theosophy, in Christian science, in rationalism, in sentimentalism, in liberalism, in latitudinarianism, it has not perished, and under God it shall come forth to vindicate its power and yield its legitimate fruit. The doctrines of the trinity, the incarnation, the apostasy and redemption, alone, can meet the needs of the soul and produce the peaceable fruits of righteousness; and though despised and sore wounded, still, like the gashes of Milton's angel, their wounds will close by the healing, heavenly virtues of their own nature, and they will stand forth with even greater power than before. These doctrines are their own reward; and amid storms of every distressing and discouraging nature, Paul wavered never. "None of these things move me."

That it makes a difference what a man believes is all but intuitive. The perpetual presence of churches, the repeated religious gatherings and conferences, the ceaseless effort of evangelism, the prevailing differences and distinctions in the morals of men, all bear witness that life and doctrine, character and creed, are inseparably united, and that choice between them is impossible. "Belief or unbelief bears upon life, and determines its whole course." Sound doctrine is the Spirit's sharp sword, the preacher's sure weapon, character's true foundation, life's unfailing support. Apart from it—

"Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player,
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing."

R. L. BENN.

Cleveland, Tenn.

VI. GENERAL NOTES.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1902.

THE General Assembly which met at Jackson, Miss., in May, 1902, was one of unusual interest. The beauty of the little city, the cordiality of the reception extended to the commissioners, the hospitality of the people, the spirit of harmony and good-will which prevailed, notwithstanding several warm debates, and the many subjects of far-reaching importance which enlisted the attention of the body, all combined to clothe the sessions of this Assembly with more than ordinary interest. From the retiring moderator's sermon, with its earnest and able discussion of the great subject of Christian education, and the felicitous speeches of welcome by the Governor of the State and other prominent citizens, all through to the closing exercises, nothing occurred to seriously mar the pleasure and good feeling of the occasion. One or two severe and, we think, uncalled-for remarks were made, but, fortunately, they did not provoke the hot retort which usually follows, and there is reason to believe that no deep scars were left of the wounds inflicted. Most of the members, at least, who took active part in the proceedings, were willing to listen patiently to those who were of the contrary opinion and answer their objections in calm and sober discussion. As a consequence, the business of the Assembly was transacted in an orderly manner and with reasonable dispatch. The Rev. Dr. W. T. Hall, of South Carolina, was happily chosen moderator, and accomplished his responsible task with ease to himself and much satisfaction to the commissioners. He was courteous and firm, not easily confused, prompt in his decisions, and all of his rulings were accepted without appeal. No charge of unfairness was at any time preferred against him.

The first matter which created a breeze in the Assembly was the report of the Theological Seminary of Kentucky. The Rev. Dr. Walden, of Georgia, objected to the reading of the report when it was presented, on the ground that the last Assembly refused to approve the consolidation of the Northern and Southern seminaries

in Kentucky, and, therefore, it did not properly come under the supervision of the Assembly. The question was docketed, but was called up the next day when the Rev. Dr. Hemphill, of Kentucky, moved that the report be received, read, and referred to the Committee on Theological Seminaries. This motion precipitated an earnest debate, in which Drs. Walden and Hemphill were the principal participants. The former contended that our relation to this seminary was essentially different from that which we sustain to the other seminaries of the church. Since over this we could only exercise a joint control with the Northern Assembly, he questioned the wisdom of our assuming any responsibility for its conduct. The matter of control was attended with embarrassments and apprehensions; complications were likely to arise; and while he did not desire to undo the action of the last Assembly, and disclaimed any sectional prejudice or disposition to reflect upon the brethren who had been instrumental in securing the consolidation, he believed that the wise course would be to "leave the entire responsibility to the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri." Dr. Walden presented his argument with much ability and clearness, and it made a deep impression upon the Assembly. Dr. Hemphill made an elaborate and able reply. He gave a brief historical sketch of the educational movement in the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri during the last forty years; he expounded the articles of agreement by which the two Presbyterian seminaries in Kentucky had been consolidated; and he clearly explained the action of the last Assembly in receiving the report of this transaction and in assenting to what had been done. The Board of Directors had not asked for the "consent" or "approval" of the Assembly, but only for its "assent," which had been given. The "responsibility" referred to in the action of the Assembly as having been left to the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri was "not the responsibility of the management of the institution, but the responsibility of making the consolidation." The two Synods assumed that responsibility, and had entered into a well-considered compact with the Northern Synod of Kentucky for the future conduct of the seminary, in which all of our rights are carefully protected, and now the General Assembly is only asked to exercise such general control and oversight over the consolidated institution as it exercises over its other theological seminaries. Dr. Hemphill also discussed the question of the coöperation of our church with other religious bodies, and showed that that was one of our distinctive principles. The constitutionality of this question had been settled long ago,

and we are now in coöperation with the Northern Presbyterian and the Dutch Reformed churches in the theological seminary in Japan, and with the Northern Presbyterian church in the theological seminary in Brazil. He felt that the brethren in Kentucky and Missouri had been led into this movement by the Spirit of God, and that in bringing it to a successful issue they had only performed their bounden duty. Dr. Walden moved to refer the question to a committee of five, but his motion was laid upon the table. Drs. Leavell, Tenney, Woods, and Judge Beckner also took part in the debate, and when the matter came to a vote the report was received, read, and referred to the Committee on Theological Seminaries without a dissenting voice. After this debate the committee felt that its work would be easily accomplished. Several overtures were placed in their hands protesting against the action of the last Assembly or asking for the reversal of it; but when the committee brought in its report, declining to entertain these overtures, and dealing with the Kentucky Seminary as with the other institutions of like nature, the report was adopted without debate and with practical unanimity. The progress of the Kentucky Seminary will be watched with much interest in the church. The apprehensions of many are by no means removed, but the brethren in charge of the seminary enjoy the confidence of the church in a marked degree, and the feeling widely prevails that they will prove faithful to their trust. There is reason to believe that this institution will become, more and more, a power for the training of ministers of the gospel who shall combine true scholarship with soundness in the faith.

The next matter which elicited the interest of the Assembly was the teaching of the Confession of Faith on the subject of "Elect Infants." This question has been prominently before the church in one form or another for the last three years. The Assembly of 1900 passed a resolution touching the statement of the Confession, Chap. X., Sec. 3, "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated," etc., in which it declares that "the present language of the Confession cannot, by any fair interpretation, be construed to teach that any of those who die in infancy are lost," and ordered that this language be inserted as an explanatory foot-note in future editions of the Confession. Serious objection was taken to this action in various parts of the church, principally on the ground that the foot-note would be a virtual change in the constitution by the vote of a single Assembly, without the question having been submitted to the Presbyteries and a subsequent Assembly, as the book provides. The

Assembly of 1901 revoked the order to publish the explanatory foot-note, but refused to change the language adopted by the former Assembly, giving five reasons for their action. Several of these reasons, notably the fifth, were highly objectionable to a considerable element in the church, and eleven overtures were presented to the Assembly of 1902, expressing dissatisfaction with the attitude in which we were placed, and asking for some positive statement upon the subject by the Assembly. The Committee on Bills and Overtures suggested an action under three heads. The first was in these words:

"1. That the request to rescind the action of the last Assembly (*Minutes* 1901, page 59) in regard to the foot-note which was adopted by the Assembly of 1900, be respectfully declined, because the relief desired can be secured as effectively by other forms of action."

After considerable debate Dr. Hemphill offered a substitute for this recommendation which was adopted and became a part of the final action of the Assembly, although the official *Minutes* do not show it. The stated clerk is a remarkably accurate man, but in this we are confident that the *Minutes* are in error. The language of Dr. Hemphill's substitute was, "The Assembly does hereby rescind the fifth reason of the last Assembly for declining to amend the Confession, which is in terms following: 'Because while we have a well-grounded hope, founded on Scripture, that all infants dying in infancy are saved, yet the Confession of Faith goes as far as the Scriptures justify a positive creedal statement.'" There were many in the Assembly who did not think that this rescission of the fifth reason was necessary, but were willing to yield to the wishes of those who felt aggrieved by it. Quite a number voted against it, but it was carried by a large majority. This action, in direct opposition to the action of the Assembly of 1901, shows what a wide difference there may be in the constitution of successive Assemblies, and how far any one of them may come from expressing the real mind of the church.

The second recommendation of the committee was in these words:

"2. This Assembly is fully persuaded that the language employed in Chap. X., Sec. 3, of our Confession of Faith, touching infants dying in infancy, does not teach that there are any infants dying in infancy who are damned, but is only meant to show that those who die in infancy are saved in a different manner from adult persons, who are capable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word.

"Furthermore, we are persuaded that the Holy Scriptures, when fairly interpreted, amply warrant us in believing that all infants who die in infancy are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit."

This was adopted by the Assembly without any dissenting votes, as interpretative of the teaching of the Confession upon the subject of the salvation of infants dying in infancy, and perhaps is as nearly expressive of the general faith of the church as any statement which can be framed. Many would have been content with the negative declaration in the first paragraph, believing that to be consistent with the historic position of our church; but others contended for something positive, and, as after all the second paragraph is only a *persuasion*, to which all agree, it was permitted to pass.

The third recommendation of the committee proposed that an amendment to Chap. X., Sec. 3, of the Confession be sent down to the Presbyteries for their concurrence, in the following words: "All infants, dying in infancy, are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh where and when and how he pleaseth." This was the critical point in the report, and was earnestly pressed, especially by Dr. N. M. Woods, the chairman of the committee; but, after a long and able debate, it was finally stricken out. The vote on the motion to strike out stood: Yeas, 94; nays, 83; absent and not voting, 12. The debate, unfortunately, did not enter into the merits of the question, except in a very limited way. Some of the advocates of the change threatened the Assembly with a "Bible reading," in which a superabundance of proof would be presented to sustain their contention; but the "Bible reading," unfortunately, was never given. One would have imagined, from some of the talk indulged in, that many of the members of the Assembly were wholly unacquainted with the teaching of the Scriptures upon this subject, and that "new light" had broken forth from them which the advocates of revision were eager to dispense to their less enlightened brethren; but the "new light" was not forthcoming. An effort was actually made, therefore, to revise the Confession upon a point which affects our system of doctrine without the presentation of any serious argument from the Scriptures to show that the Confession in its present form is anti-scriptural. The Confession has been accepted for two hundred and fifty years by the church as expressive of its faith as to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures upon the subject of the salvation of infants dying in infancy. If a change is now deemed

desirable, the burden of proof surely lies upon the advocates of change to show wherein the Confession is inconsistent with scriptural teaching. The Confession does not positively affirm the salvation of all infants dying in infancy because the framers of it were unable to discover that doctrine unmistakably taught in the Scriptures; they therefore contented themselves with showing that such of the elect as infants dying in infancy, and other irresponsible persons who are not capable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are saved by Christ through the Spirit, without the hearing of the word. This is a wise provision of the Confession which permits two parties to live under it, those who are able to derive from the teaching of the Scriptures an assured conviction for themselves of the absolute certainty of the salvation of all infants, Christian and heathen, who die in infancy, and those who are unable to discover that the Scriptures make a positive revelation upon this subject. The position of practically all the great teachers of theology in our church, as Thornwell, Breckinridge, the Hodges, Shedd, Dabney, Warfield, and others, has been in harmony with the Confession. They have accepted the silence of the Confession, because they understood it to be consistent with the silence of the Scriptures. Strange to say, the greatest arguments which have ever been made in favor of the universal salvation of infants, like that, for instance, framed by Dr. Stuart Robinson, have come from men who were satisfied with the declaration of the Confession. It may be safely affirmed, therefore, that all men desire to have an assured conviction of the scriptural truthfulness of this doctrine, and will cordially welcome any "new light" upon the subject which the friends of revision will be kind enough to furnish.

True to the short-sighted policy of our Assembly, when any question of vital importance is before it, the speeches were limited to ten minutes' each, an exception being made in favor of Dr. Strickler, who was opposed to revision, and Dr. Woods, who favored revision, both of whom were allowed thirty minutes each. As a consequence, the merits of the question were hardly touched. Dr. Strickler was wise enough to see this, and made a forcible argument, in which he confined himself, in the main, to discussing the inexpediency of undertaking to revise the Confession of Faith. Several other brethren succeeded in interjecting a few remarks upon the subject, and then Dr. Woods closed the debate for the committee in a vigorous speech of thirty minutes, in which he earnestly besought the Assembly to send the proposed amendment down to the Presbyteries;

but, as we have already seen, when the matter came to a vote, this recommendation was stricken out.

As a whole, the debate was unsatisfactory, as such a debate must always be when a vital doctrine is the issue, and the Assembly, acting as if time were more valuable than truth, insists upon setting an arbitrary limit to discussion. One admirable custom of the Westminster Assembly was that discussion was free and untrammelled, and those wise framers of the Confession were willing to spend weeks and months upon the consideration of a point which our restless commissioners would fain dispose of in two or three hours of time, divided into superficial speeches of ten minutes each. The worst of it is that the plea is usually made in our Assembly that the commissioners are *thoroughly* acquainted (*sic*) with the question at issue; that all has been said which can be said, and that all are ready to vote. Any student moderately conversant with theology could not have failed to discover during the debate on "Elect Infants," in the last Assembly, that many of the commissioners possessed a limited and erroneous acquaintance with the reformed system of doctrine. Dr. Strickler recognized this, boldly referred to it in his address, and made it a strong point in his argument against an attempt at a revision of the Confession. If the discussion of this subject would lead to a revival of the study of systematic theology among the ministers and members of our church, it might be profitably prolonged for years to come. Honest and intelligent discussion of such subjects, conducted in the right spirit, are more to be desired and of greater profit to the church than the fear of outside criticism, which so frequently manifests itself in our church courts, and influences many to hasty legislation upon vital doctrines of the Scriptures.

Two judicial cases came before the Assembly, one a complaint of the Rev. Z. B. Graves against a judgment of the Synod of Louisiana, and the other an appeal of the Rev. E. T. Hoge against a judgment of the Synod of Virginia. The former had been suspended from the ministry on account of unsoundness of mind, and the latter because of habitual inefficiency. As no question of doctrine was involved in either case, they were easily disposed of, the Assembly affirming the judgment of the lower courts in both instances. The former case was settled by a compromise which is open to criticism, but was perhaps justifiable under the circumstances. Against the action of the Assembly in the latter case, Judge T. W. Coleman entered an able and vigorous protest, on the ground of irregularity in the proceedings, both in the Synod and in the Assembly, because

the record shows that the evidence in the case taken by the Presbytery was not transmitted to the higher courts, although the Book of Church Order specifically requires that this shall be done. Judge Coleman was manifestly right in his protest, which was admitted to record without answer, for the obvious reason that no sufficient answer could be given.

Touching the matter of Ecclesiastical Commissions, it was found that the proposed amendment to the Rules of Discipline, sent down to the Presbyteries by the Assembly of 1901, had failed to secure the approval of a sufficient number of Presbyteries to make it a part of our organic law. Many of the Presbyteries were not ready to act, and asked for a continuance of the *ad interim* committee. This was done, and the committee was enlarged by the addition of the following names: R. P. Farris, D. D., A. C. Hopkins, D. D., S. M. Smith, D. D., A. B. Curry, D. D., and the Rev. J. D. Leslie. It is to be hoped that this subject will receive the earnest consideration of the able committee which now has it in hand, and that some final conclusion will be reached which will be satisfactory to the church, and which will make the commission a more serviceable agency in the transaction of ecclesiastical business than it has been.

The reports of the Executive Committees were encouraging, and received earnest consideration by the Assembly. It is to be observed that several of the committees, notably those on Foreign Missions, Home Missions, Publication, and Ministerial Relief, suggested definite forward steps which look to the enlargement of their work, and that the Assembly enthusiastically adopted their suggestions. The periodic cry of Retrenchment and Reform was not heard, but the watch-word was Progress. The opinion seemed to prevail that our church has reached a point in her history where her work must either advance or recede, and this Assembly was determined that it should advance in all departments, and fearlessly adopted plans for future enlargement.

The working force of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions was strengthened by the election of the Rev. W. R. Dobyns, D. D., of St. Joseph, Mo., as Field Secretary. This was a happy choice, and it is the earnest desire of the church that Dr. Dobyns will consent to accept this responsible and useful office. The receipts of the treasury show a small increase over last year, and the committee was able to report that all obligations have been discharged. All of our foreign fields, however, need reinforcements, and, therefore, the Assembly asks the churches for an annual contribution

of two hundred thousand dollars to properly maintain and carry forward our work. It also heartily endorses the effort now being made to induce churches and individuals to undertake the support of individual missionaries.

Home Missions also occupied a large share of the attention of the Assembly. An able *ad interim* committee which has been considering the better organization of this department of the church's activities made an elaborate report, which was referred to the Standing Committee. When this matter came up later in the session for discussion, the plan appeared not to be sufficiently matured for adoption, and was referred back to the *ad interim* committee, with instructions to report to the next General Assembly. In the line of progress, Dr. Morris' committee was permitted to augment its force by the appointment of a General Evangelist, who will occupy much the same position in the department of Home Missions that the Field Secretary will occupy in the department of Foreign Missions. It should have been said above that a portion of the plan of coöperation suggested by the *ad interim* committee was sent down to the Presbyteries for their consideration and consent to its adoption. The Assembly asks fifty thousand dollars for this cause, and recommends the support of individual ministers by churches and ladies' societies.

The cause of Publication is of growing importance and interest to the Assembly. Under the efficient management of the Rev. Dr. Hazen, whose recent death is deeply deplored by the entire church, it has steadily prospered, and now appears to be on the eve of a great enlargement of efficiency and influence. It is much regretted by the committee that at this interesting juncture the beloved secretary should have been stricken down. The business of last year was much larger than in any previous year, and promises yet greater development. The department of Sunday-schools and Young People's Societies, under the wise and vigorous management of the Rev. Dr. Phillips, gives manifest signs of growth in power and efficiency, and altogether the cause of Publication appears to be in a very healthful condition.

The first annual report of the Executive Committee of Ministerial Relief was received with marked attention and interest. It showed that the work had been carefully organized, a manual prepared, and the importance of the cause repeatedly brought before the people. The receipts, in round numbers, were about twenty thousand dollars. Of this, five thousand dollars goes to the endowment fund, and fifteen thousand dollars to the annual support fund.

The Assembly has entered upon the task of accumulating an endowment fund for the support of our aged and infirm ministers and the widows and orphans of those who have passed away. The plan suggested by Mr. S. H. Hawes is simple and practical, and, if adopted by the churches, will certainly result in the accumulation of a large sum in a short time; but of course neither this nor any other plan will succeed unless earnestly followed by the people. The Assembly commends the plan to the churches, and asks for twenty thousand dollars to the support fund this year. This should be the minimum, for if the entire amount is placed in the hands of the committee, the average apportionment to the beneficiaries would not be over one hundred and twenty-five dollars each. The Assembly unanimously elected the Rev. I. S. McElroy, D. D., of Kentucky, as secretary, and thus placed the committee on the same basis as the other executive committees of the church. It is to be hoped that the reproach which has rested upon our church for years because of our neglect of our aged and worn-out ministers will soon be removed.

The Colored Work, under the efficient management of the self-denying secretary, the Rev. D. C. Lilly, D. D., is evidently progressing, notwithstanding the indifference with which the church treats it. It is pitiful to record the facts that the contributions to this cause last year were less than six thousand five hundred dollars; that only two churches within our bounds gave as much as one hundred dollars each; that only four Presbyteries gave over two hundred dollars each, while forty-eight Presbyteries gave less than one hundred dollars each. But notwithstanding this niggardly way in which the cause is supported, the secretary and the Executive Committee are doing a noble and, in many respects, a marvellous work. At Stillman Institute the students are trained in industrial pursuits, as well as in literature and theology, and are accorded the privilege of supporting themselves by their daily labor, while most of the money contributed by the churches is expended in the maintenance of ministers and churches. It is to be deeply regretted that our people are so slow to appreciate the importance of this work. There is, perhaps, no field of labor in which we are engaged, either at home or abroad, which promises as large visible returns for the means expended as this work among the colored people.

Nothing occasions greater concern in the church than the steady decrease in the number of candidates for the gospel ministry. The Committee on Education reported an increase in the annual contributions to the cause, and a consequent addition of thirteen and one-half

per cent. to the maximum amount heretofore promised to each student; but only one hundred and sixty-two candidates received aid during the year. We may be sure that there will be no marked increase in the number of candidates until there is a revival of spiritual religion among us, and until the church begins earnestly to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers into his harvest.

Near the close of the session the Assembly adopted a recommendation of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, sending down to the Presbyteries a proposed amendment of the Book of Church Order, the object of which is to eliminate the Latin thesis from the examination of candidates for the ministry, and substitute therefor a thesis in English upon some common head of divinity. We deplore the restlessness in our church which is perpetually seeking for some modification of our standards. This movement to abolish the Latin thesis, which was inaugurated by the Rev. W. L. Lingle, one of our clever and accomplished young ministers, of whom we expected better things, found ready support in the iconoclastic spirit of the chairman of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, and was rushed through at a depleted session of the Assembly, at which less than half of the members were present and voting. We fail to see the wisdom of this amendment, and we confidently hope that it will be overwhelmingly defeated by the Presbyteries. The advantage of the Latin thesis is that it tends to hold up our standard of a liberal classical education for our ministry. No honest man will consent to hand in to his Presbytery a Latin thesis entirely cribbed from Turretin and the *Catechismus Minor*, and we do not believe this is often done. We admit that this exercise is not always prepared with the care which its importance merits, but it is of immense benefit to any student of theology to become acquainted with the Latin terminology common to the great historical discussions of this subject. Ben Jonson characterized Shakespeare's classical attainments by saying that the great poet "knew small Latin and less Greek." It is our experience, in the examination of candidates for the ministry, that the student who is deficient in Latin is, in this respect at least, like Shakespeare, and we would complete the comparison by adding a superlative, and venture to describe such a man's classical education by saying that "he knows small Latin, less Greek, and least Hebrew"! The argument which would abolish the Latin thesis, on the plea that it is not well done, would play havoc with the study of Greek and Hebrew. We beg the iconoclasts in our church, whose tribe, we regret to say, seems

to be increasing, to pause before the whole temple of classical learning in our ministry is destroyed. Before leaving this subject we desire to say that, in our judgment, much that was said in the discussion of this matter in the Assembly was an unwarranted reflection upon the scholarship of our theological students. We are sure that during the past two years several candidates have presented Latin theses as parts of trial before East Hanover Presbytery which gave evidence of great care and diligence in their preparation, and were highly creditable to the authors' knowledge of the Latin language.

The committees on the Twentieth Century Fund and upon Christian Education made elaborate reports showing the encouraging progress which these important movements are making in the church. The interest in education, and whatever pertains to its advancement among us, is spreading, and our people seem to be determined to place our institutions upon a better basis. As our wealth increases, it is to be hoped that the spirit of liberality will advance *pari passu* with it, and that our schools, colleges, and seminaries will receive that hearty and generous support which is necessary for their maintenance and proper equipment. The great educational movement among us, represented by these two committees, is something that cannot be hurried, but is the work of years. Nevertheless, its progress and ultimate success depend upon the enthusiasm and energy with which the people enter into it. We therefore look with much satisfaction upon the wide-spread interest in this cause which manifests itself in the church.

The Assembly's Home and School, at Fredericksburg, Va., was found to be in good condition. Under the efficient management of Mr. S. W. Somerville, the superintendent, and through the self-denying labors of the Rev. H. H. Hawes, D. D., the agent, the institution has been admirably sustained and the outstanding indebtedness reduced to about six thousand dollars. The Assembly instructed the Executive Committee to apportion this sum equally among the Presbyteries, and ask them to make payment as speedily as possible in order that this beloved institution may be relieved from debt, and thus enabled the more satisfactorily to do its work. The Assembly also directed the Executive Committee to confer with the Executive Committee of Ministerial Relief as to the wisdom and propriety of uniting these two causes under the same management. It is not clear that anything will be gained by such an arrangement, but the matter will doubtless receive the earnest consideration of the two committees.

The Committee on Foreign Correspondence brought several matters of importance before the Assembly. One of these was the report of Rev. Dr. McNeilly, our special commissioner to the Synod of Mexico. It was a cheering message from the brethren in our sister republic; and now that the Presbyterian forces are united there, we may expect to hear even better things in the future. We had a report also from the western section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, and an admirable address from the Rev. G. D. Matthews, General Secretary. The eighth General Council of the Alliance will meet at Liverpool, England, either in June or July, 1904, and the committee nominated delegates to represent our church in that meeting. An effort was made not to appoint any persons who had ever been appointed before, which seemed to us an unnecessary limitation, inasmuch as a number of those who have been appointed to previous councils have been unable to attend, and there appears to have been *no sufficient* reason why they should have been excluded from the *privileges* of the next meeting if their brethren desired their presence. The Alliance is doubtless doing good in bringing about a better understanding between the various branches of the Presbyterian faith throughout the world, and is thus far a contribution to the commendable effort to bring together into a more homogeneous and strengthened association the tangled ends of modern Protestantism. As a further contribution to the same desirable consummation, we deeply regret that the overture from certain brethren of Nashville, Tenn., requesting the appointment of a committee to consider the advisability of organic union with the Reformed Church of America did not meet with a more favorable reception. The committee reported against the overture—that is, a majority did—on the ground that the matter should have come before the Assembly in “a more official manner,” and the recommendation of the majority was adopted. Perhaps the Nashville brethren acted without sufficient deliberation; but this question is not a new one in our church, and having come before the Assembly, there was no possible danger in our appointing the committee asked for to counsel with a similar committee from the Reformed Church. The spirit of exclusiveness which has long exercised too much control in our church is neither wise nor Christian, and for ourselves, we shall hail the day with joy when it shall entirely disappear from among us. We cannot persuade ourselves that our church is the only “remnant” left of orthodox Christianity.

The Assembly was deeply concerned about the spiritual condition

of the church as this was revealed in the report of the Committee on the Sabbath and in the narratives from the various Presbyteries. The narrative adopted by the Assembly takes a gloomy view of the state of religious life. We wonder if it presents a true picture of our condition, or if it is not somewhat the reflection of a bad habit we have fallen into of deploring the low state of piety among us. We have heard few narratives read during the last twenty years, whether coming from Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, or Assemblies, in which the minor tone of lament over the decline of spirituality did not predominate. Is it true that the former days were so much better than these, and the fathers so much more pious than their children? If the story of church historians is to be credited, they were not. The church has always been subject to seasons of spiritual depression, and that which we are now admittedly passing through is not worse than many that have preceded it. We have no disposition to make light of the situation, but neither do we believe in hoisting the white flag of a continual lament and keeping it conspicuously displayed in the presence of the enemy. The Assembly, in answer to some overture, ordered a day of fasting and prayer, which, the papers tell us, was honored in the breach rather than in the observance. The explanation of this may be found by some in the low spiritual life of the church. We prefer to find it, and we believe with better reason, in the fact that the people did not recognize the necessity for such a day. It is a grave mistake to resort to extreme measures when necessity does not require it. The Assembly acted with greater wisdom in adopting a Pastoral Letter on Religion in the Home. This admirable paper was prepared by a committee, consisting of Rev. Drs. G. L. Leyburn and F. M. Woods, and Ruling Elder H. H. Dean; it was ordered to be read in the churches, and the Executive Committee of Publication was directed to publish fifty thousand copies for distribution among the people. There is a tenderness and "sweet reasonableness" in this letter which we believe cannot fail to touch the hearts of parents who have grown neglectful of the family altar, and our united prayer should be that this message may be followed with the demonstration of the Spirit and power. Evil is many-sided, and ungodliness is constantly assuming new shapes. We find it difficult to maintain in the present day many cherished practices in vogue among our fathers. Family prayer is one of them, and its decline is deeply to be deplored. We should be persistent in our efforts to see it revived, just as we should never cease to fight for the proper observance of the Sabbath. Still, we insist that a certain growing laxity

in these matters does not necessarily imply, as some would have us believe, that spiritual life is dying, and that faith in Christ will soon cease to exist. Spiritual life in this respect, like ungodliness, manifests itself in new forms, and if out of the whole body of Christians a greater number are careless in family religion and Sabbath observance than formerly, it is also true that a greater number than formerly are engaged in active Christian work, there are more intelligent students of the Scriptures, there are more consecrated liberal givers, and there is a far more wide-spread interest than ever before in the evangelization of the world. Modern Christianity, while it has modified some of its old-time characteristics, yet has assumed many new phases which are obviously in the nature of a proper scriptural development, and it is certainly unwise and short-sighted in God's people in lamenting over our losses to forget our gains. We walk by faith, and not by sight, and, on the whole, the outlook is cheering.

RUSSELL CECIL.

Richmond, Va.

THE NORTHERN ASSEMBLY.

THE Assembly which met in Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, on the 15th of May, 1902, was a meeting of unusual historic importance.

It was noted for the prominence which it gave to the subject of Home Missions. This great cause was lifted into the place of preëminence by an elaborate celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the organization of this branch of the church's work. The occasion gave birth to several addresses of lofty and inspiring eloquence, and to some papers of permanent historical value. The review of the century's achievements in Home Missions necessarily pointed attention to the marvellous expansion of our national life. It showed how the church had ever before it the worthy task of keeping step with the hardy pioneers who followed the star of empire as westward it took its course. "The Winning of the West" is a thrilling story, filled with deeds of daring, and the pathos of patient suffering. Those who bore a worthy part in the conquest did not wear soft clothing, nor dwell in king's houses; they were toil-stained and weather-beaten, rugged heroes, filled fresh from nature's fountain with the great elemental forces of life. They were in advance of the deteriorating influence of a luxurious and pampered civilization. Among these worthies, standing in the very front rank, and

nobly baring their breasts to the brunt of the battle, were the home missionaries. With Bible and hymn-book, with horse and saddlebags for equipment, they were bravely flying the colors of the Great King, and claiming for him the virgin soil as fast as it was won.

The able speakers in the recent Assembly marshaled the facts of the hundred years' history with great skill; they set them in different relations, and turned on the light at different angles, and made the mighty host of events march before the audience in grand panoramic array. All that charm of diction and force of utterance could do was done to make them stir the heart and kindle the imagination. The occasion was a splendid success. The Assembly was fired with a fresh enthusiasm, and every member girded himself for a more strenuous part in this triumphing warfare. If we mistake not, the impetus imparted to Home Missions by this celebration will sweep across decades of future years.

A matter exciting more temporary interest, but perhaps of less permanent importance, was the revision of the Confession of Faith, and the adoption of a Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith. Without any disposition to belittle the work of the Assembly, in the matter of revising the Confession, we venture to say that never has there been a more striking illustration of *parturiunt montes*, etc. Do we in this statement disparage the work of the able committee? Far from it. Their consummate ability was demonstrated in securing that the mountain should be delivered of nothing more formidable than a mouse. In this we rejoice. All lovers of the old standards had been looking on the agitation with trembling hearts. For years the rumblings of the threatened catastrophe had been growing more alarming, and the fumes of sulphur were in the air. Lo, when the explosion is over, and the atmosphere cleared, we find that "since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning" of the reformation. The old Confession came through without the smell of fire on its garments. Every doctrine remains intact, and remains without any change in form of statement. The famous Chap. III., "Of God's Eternal Decrees," remains just as it came from the hands of the Westminster Assembly. Its relentless precision, its mathematical exactitude, the impassable boundary lines which it fixes, in dealing with the subject of election, are all there. Nothing, even to the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," has been added to or subtracted from any of the doctrinal statements that make up the Calvinism of the Confession. The actual work of revision was confined to three subordinate matters lying entirely

outside of the doctrinal system. All told, it does not compare in importance with the revision made by the Southern Church, a few years ago, of Sec. 4, Chap XXIV.

In addition to the work of actual revision, two Declaratory Statements were adopted, one touching the doctrine of God's eternal decree, and the other touching "elect infants dying in infancy." If these declaratory statements shall be adopted by the Presbyteries, and appended to Chaps. III. and X., they will be nothing more than official interpretations—they will not modify, but only explain. The standard of doctrine, the test of orthodoxy, will be the same after the adoption of the declaratory statements that it was before.

It remains to be noted that the Confession of Faith was enlarged by the addition of two chapters—one on the Holy Spirit, and the other on the Love of God and Missions. We shall not pronounce on the merits of these chapters further than to say that they contain nothing, perhaps, to which all evangelical churches would not assent. If one were disposed to be critical, he might take exception to the massing of all the broad universal statements of the gospel, and the keeping out of the way of all qualifying statements, as is done in the chapter on the Love of God and Missions. It is in vain for those who are flying the banner of Calvinism to try to escape from the charge of believing that God is discriminating in the exercise of his saving grace.

What interests us most in these two new chapters is the simple fact that they make a long creed longer. If we have followed intelligently the agitation for revision, there has been an insistent demand on the part of the most earnest agitators for a shorter creed. Some have taught that the Apostles' Creed would be sufficient; others that the Shorter Catechism would answer all practical purposes. "Let us have a short, workable creed, something that everybody can understand, and that busy people will have time to get acquainted with." It seems that the outcome of the agitation will be to fasten on the church the same old burden with six per cent. additional matter.

The Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith is a fine piece of work. It consists of sixteen articles, embracing all the fundamental doctrines of evangelical Christendom, together with the distinctive doctrines essential to the Calvinistic system. Its phraseology is borrowed very largely from the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms; but it was selected under the guidance of an irenic, rather than a polemic spirit, and for a conciliative, rather than a defensive purpose. The phraseology has been carefully winnowed of those

somewhat forbidding terms which were used by the Westminster divines to draw the boundary line between truth and opposing error. The Brief Statement gives us a fairly good map of the territory covered by the great doctrines of our faith, but around the frontiers of this territory no fortresses have been erected, nor loud-mouthed cannon placed. Nothing is suffered to appear suggestive of enemies to be repelled. It assumes that there are no enemies, and that the way to prevent hostility is to uncover no weapons of warfare.

It is a fine piece of work, but confessedly a compromise, which means, we suppose, that it is not as clear-cut as some would have preferred, nor as vague as others wished. It commits itself to a definite Calvinism, but it leaves the limits hazy. In Art. X., for example, it comes perilously near to expressing the doctrine of "common sufficient grace," and this may account for the refusal of Dr. De Witt to give that the sanction of his name.

It was not our purpose to indulge in unfriendly criticism of the work done by the able committee on revision. We do not see how they could have done better, and they are entitled to the gratitude of the lovers of truth for having done so well. If their work shall be approved by the Presbyteries, and shall serve to put a quietus on the doctrinal ferment in the church, we shall greatly rejoice. We shall indulge in no prophecies, but try to hope for the best.

The Northern Assembly is an impressive body, and its methods contrast most favorably, in some respects, with the Southern Assembly. There is very little discussion of subordinate matters, and ample time is given to all the causes of Christian beneficence. The Boards which have the administration of these causes in their hands are ably represented, and the Assembly accords them not merely a patient, but a sympathetic hearing. Few points of order are raised, no red tape is permitted to tangle and obstruct the business. Discussion and deliberation are the work of committees, and all matters worthy of attention are, by these, faithfully and fully considered. When they make their report, the house assumes that little, if any, more light can be thrown on the subject, and is impatient of debate. To one accustomed to the almost interminable wrangles over little technicalities of law, or points of order, which so often lock the wheels of progress in the business of the Southern Assembly, the more expeditious methods of the Northern Assembly are a matter of admiration and delight. The Assembly gave a good part of two days to the special celebration of Home Missions; it gave unlimited time to the other Boards for the presentation of the interests with

which they were entrusted; it accepted six invitations to receptions, social functions and excursions; it accorded a decent hearing to a long list of delegates from other churches; it wrestled with, and disposed of, the great matter of confessional revision; transacted without undue haste all the ordinary routine business, and could have finished up and adjourned on Saturday night, at the end of the ninth day. It held over till Monday because it had arranged for an excursion up the Hudson on Monday afternoon, and had to have an excuse for remaining over that long. As an interested, but impartial spectator of their proceedings, we had the conviction borne in on us that the Northern General Assembly represents as large an aggregate of brain power, of scholarship, of effective oratory, and of aggressive piety as can be brought together by any branch of Christ's church on the American continent.

Columbia, S. C.

R. C. REED.

VII.

PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

PULPIT MANNER AND FORM OF UTTERANCE.

WE are taught by the jeweler's art that the setting of a precious stone may very materially affect its lustre. An inferior jewel in a superb setting may shine to better advantage than a stone of the first water in a clumsy setting. Form, too, is of first importance in revealing the hidden light of the diamond. If the setting of a jewel and its form go far toward bringing to light its rare beauties, may it not be that pulpit manner and the form of pulpit utterance will have their weight in enforcing pulpit truths? There will perhaps be no two opinions as to the vast influence of pulpit utterance upon the lives of men. The pulpit is a patent civilizing agency, and a mighty factor in the world's christianization; and it has maintained itself in competition with the world's best life of every form, the intimation of Dr. Joseph Parker to the contrary notwithstanding. But it is scarcely to be doubted that much of pulpit manner and form of utterance have been hindrances rather than hand-maidens to the truth proclaimed. There may be differences of opinion as to the value of a distinct ministerial dress and ecclesiastical architecture, but all must agree that a helpful pulpit manner and clear form of pulpit utterance are greatly to be desired. It is certainly true that there is no intention upon the part of any of the admirable instructors in our theological seminaries to teach men to be unnatural in the pulpit, and to speak with distressing cloudiness, but such a result is too often attained. Beyond a doubt, there is no school for the teaching of young men who are preparing for the ministry to read indistinctly and unintelligibly, so that the audience is bewildered and wearied, but without such training this end is unhappily reached in some way. Careless and slovenly public reading of the Word of God is one of the grave faults to which ministers of the gospel are too much addicted. Much of the reverence for the holy Word is lost by its careless public reading. Thoughtful and earnest study should be given to the reading of the Scriptures in the pulpit, so that the people may be given the sense and "understand the reading." It is

distinct testimony to duty as a magnet that the people continue to come to many of our churches, week in and week out, notwithstanding what they hear and what they do not hear.

It is true that dress does not make the man, but a proper dressing sometimes helps to train the boy. And while manner and the form of speech are not of supreme importance, they are essential in helping to drive home the arrows of truth. Manner, pronunciation, accent, intonation, articulation, flexibility of voice and proper emphasis are not to be despised by him who would be most effective in public speech. Nor are these things beneath the notice and the careful study of the conscientious preacher of the gospel. Over nicety of pronunciation that leads one to say *eville* for evil, and a delicacy of feeling that substitutes *hades* for hell in the sacred text, are not to be commended. And yet carefulness of utterance is always becoming in the pulpit. One has no more right to rely entirely upon the inspiration of the moment for manner and the way of saying things than for the thought that is to be uttered. Whether a man writes or not, his discourse, to be effective, must be carefully prepared, and the style of its delivery must be thought out in advance. He must be impressed with the importance of manner and form. But it may be doubted whether profundity can be given to very common-place utterances by even the most careful manner of delivery. Yet common-places impressively delivered may carry the sympathy of an audience more quickly than deep things spoken in an indifferent or slovenly way. The clerical lecturer, who carried his audience to a high pitch of enthusiasm by this bit of description, "And his coat was buttoned, not with *one* of the buttons, but with *all* of the buttons," was a master of form and manner. The audience would conclude that a speaker who was so careful to describe his subject, even to the buttoning of the last button of his coat, could not be careless in the introduction of nobler themes, and so attention was fixed. And the impressive and careful manner of stating so trifling a circumstance augured well for the statement of weightier matters.

All men are not endowed by nature with the same quality and flexibility of voice, but all who have to address the public may, by care and attention, make themselves heard, and give what voice they have wide compass. One of the many charms of Mr. Spurgeon's rare preaching was said to be his bell-like voice, which rang out with clearness, and yet was soft and sweet. Without training and judicious use, even his splendid voice could not have been made to reach such throngs for so many years together. Alexander H. Stephens

was so careful in the use of his thin voice that he could be distinctly heard by thousands in the open air, and he could accommodate his voice to any auditorium. Dr. Talmage, with a voice somewhat like a fog-horn, could yet adapt it to an audience of any size, and was always heard, even if there was lacking the quality of sweetness. Extreme care and attention should be given to the voice, and to this end the throat should largely be spared artificial lubricants. Let nature do her choicest work for the throat, before art steps in to lend a hand and claim the fee. The spoiling of many a naturally fine voice by a continual clearing of the throat during speaking, growing originally out of embarrassment, and deepening into a fixed habit, is greatly to be deprecated. Many a splendid sermon has been murdered by this monstrosity in mannerism.

But it is my purpose to notice certain types of pulpit manner, and to offer a few suggestions touching effective pulpit ministrations. That we all have our treasure in earthen vessels goes without saying. Improvement in manner and form of utterance is possible to most preachers, and such improvement may lend potency to their glorious message.

The first type of manner in the pulpit to be noticed is what may be termed the cyclonic. This manner makes the pulpit end of the sanctuary a decided storm-center from beginning to end. The congregation views the gale at its height, for it is always at its height. There is no room for special emphasis, for the whole discourse is one prolonged emphasis. Every sentence is of most importance. The speaker's voice is pitched upon the high "C's," as he rides upon the storm. When the last peal of thunder is heard, and the last flash of lightning is seen, the preacher, in great exhaustion, feebly invokes the divine blessing upon the ecclesiastical hurricane, and the congregation is grateful for the great calm. Such a manner reminds me of a speech I heard by one of my school fellows when I was a small boy. With one vigorous bound, he landed in the center of the platform, and began in tones as stentorian as he could command, "I'm a roarer from the hard scrabble hills, come down to have my say on this or any other occasion. I can outrun, outjump, throw, or whallop any six foot eight of human natur'. Whoop." and so to the end. It was thrilling.

In the United States Senate I heard a great debate between Senator Conkling, of New York, and Senator Thurman, of Ohio. The New York Senator thus referred to his distinguished opponent, in deep and measured tones, "The Senator from Ohio, that generalis-

simo of the Democratic party, comes into the Senate Chamber with that breezy affluence of dash that has been growing upon him of late." This was happily descriptive of the senatorial cyclonic manner, even if it was a libel upon the venerable Senator from Ohio. I have heard a distinguished pulpit orator, whose manner was largely cyclonic, begin his discourse with great, and even painful, decorum. His right heel was properly placed, by rule, in the hollow of his left foot, and his shining broadcloth suit hung to a nicety, but suddenly, as if moved by a galvanic battery, he dashed down a long platform, and, with mouth stretched from ear to ear, bawled at the galleries in tones to wake the dead. The discourse was certainly moving from that time forth.

The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, that prince of platform speakers, and consummate master of pulpit manner and form, said that when he had nothing to say he "just hollered." It must be confessed that he was seldom in need of "hollering." But when I heard him preach a sermon on "Evolution" from the text, "God is love," in which he said that it would make no difference to him if his father was a monkey and hung by his tail on a tree in the forest, I thought he lost a magnificent opportunity to "holler." A slight cyclone in the pulpit, with nothing but wind, would have been more moving. The Rev. Dr. Cuyler, of Brooklyn, is a veritable cyclone in the pulpit, but his cyclonic manner is the result of a surcharged mind and heart, pouring forth a great message for the blessing of the people. A moral and spiritual cyclone in the pulpit, carrying upon its wings moving messages of truth and love, is not without its uses.

Of close kin to the cyclonic manner in movement, but with none of its virtues, is the nervous and jerky manner in the pulpit. Its apparent purpose is to attain perpetual motion. The victim has hands and arms, legs and feet, head and body in involuntary and wild movement. He resembles a wild beast pacing from side to side of his cage, and never able to stop. The congregation, in amazement, look on and wonder what he will do next. They are afraid that he will explode and vanish into air. The man given to this nervous and jerky manner has the habit of stretching his arms at full length above his head, with his fingers widely separated, as if trying to catch and hold his scattering ideas. This manner, too, leads to a vain repetition of meaningless words and phrases, that greatly weaken the discourse and tire the audience. In the course of a sermon delivered in the nervous and jerky way, I have heard the repetition of the words, "my friends," perhaps not less than fifty times. So

frequently were the words repeated that the audience lost the run of the sermon in their amused waiting for "my friends." One addicted to this grievous manner greatly needs to have the mastery of himself. He should compel himself to stand in one spot, without the movement of a muscle, save the muscles of the face, and preach to imaginary people for hours and days and weeks, until he has himself thoroughly in hand. He who does not master himself cannot hope to control an audience and do them good.

Then there is the monotonous and sleepy pulpit manner and speech. No doubt this manner was the invention of Satan to put the congregation to sleep, and so to destroy the force of the gospel message. To brethren afflicted with this manner, it would seem proper to recommend the text, "If a man will not work, neither should he eat." What right has God's messenger, with the greatest of all messages to deliver, to plod along in undertones for a third of his sermon, so that the congregation will have to be gifted with prophecy to know what he says? To see a great, strong man too indifferent or too lazy to open his mouth and let the glorious gospel be heard from his lips must make the angels weep and the devils laugh. Will we as preachers of the truth never learn that it is impolite to whisper in public? or can it be that we have concluded that not to be heard will be to the greater edification of the congregation? In this latter case, not to preach at all would be the proper course. But unhappily it is often thought to be impressive to speak in very low tones for ten or fifteen minutes of the discourse, until the preacher gets "warmed up," and then to "tear a passion to tatters" for a few moments, and descend again into inarticulate monotones. This is slovenly and unpardonable, and shows a lack of appreciation of the high honor put, by the Infinite, upon the gospel herald. The writer was worshipping one hot Sunday in July in a great church in Toronto, Canada. Tramping all day Saturday, and none too much sleep on Saturday night, together with the great heat, naturally induced drowsiness. The preacher was as sleepy in manner and tone as the writer was sleepy in fact. The awful struggle to keep awake was just about to be settled in favor of quiet slumber, when the preacher threw out a volume of sound from a splendid voice that filled every space of the great auditorium, and the writer, with other sleepy people, started up at the unusual disturbance from the pulpit. The minister then quietly remarked, "This emphasis is for the benefit of weary heads." The emphasis, with its result, was a clear condemnation of the sleepy manner of the preacher, rather than a

reflection upon the "weary heads." The best that can be said of the monotonous and sleepy manner is that at the close of a discourse so delivered there is a general awakening. But the compliment is doubtful.

Another type of pulpit manner and utterance is the ponderous and sepulchral, which drags its weary length along in sunshine and in shadow. It knows no change. With exactly the same measured solemnity, it is present in the funeral sermon and the thanksgiving discourse. The preacher announces the death of a valued member of the church and the wedding of a happy young couple in the same heavy style. You shiver at both alike, for a wedding so announced seems as sad as death. Such a manner and utterance frighten children and deepen the lines in the face of age. The gospel preached uniformly in that ponderous and sepulchral style is not apt to be an inspiration to better living. Such uniform and heavy solemnity is no mark of piety. There must at times be a joyous ring to the gospel message, for the preacher is bringing glad tidings to the children of men. The most wondrous of all preachers said, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed 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." This was a joyous message, and it is our heritage. A man can be solemn without being sepulchral; he can be serious without invoking the shadows of the dead. One of the very solemnest utterances the writer ever heard was a preacher's announcement of dinner that had been prepared by the good people for the members of an ecclesiastical court. The theme was naturally a joyous one, but the ponderous announcement was enough to take away the appetite. The call to the happy feast ran something on this order, "My friends, after the adjournment of this body, dinner will be spread on tables in the adjoining grove. Ropes will be stretched from tree to tree to prevent the crowding of the tables, but when all things are ready, announcement will be made, and you can come forward, and partake." When the gruesome tones died away, visions of gibbets, with dangling victims at the ends of ropes, were suggested to the shuddering audience, rather than fried chicken, with all its glorious accompaniments. The preacher's heart was all right, but his solemnity had mastered him.

Another style of pulpit manner and utterance to be mentioned is the light and flippant. It is to be feared that there is a modern tendency, even in the pulpit, to trifle with divine things. To what

extent wit and humor may be used in the pulpit, with the serious intent of enforcing divine truth, I am not prepared to say. Some would entirely exclude it; others would put it to what they believe to be legitimate use. Let each man be fully persuaded in his own mind on that point, but let all walk softly in the presence of the Infinite. Certainly there is no place for light and airy flippancy in the delivery of God's message to men. The work is serious, and calls for dignity and reverence upon the part of the messenger, if he expects a reverent response upon the part of the hearer. Buffoonery is out of place in the sacred desk, and a circus clown is not charged with the delivery of God's message. The pulpit is the preacher's throne, and the sceptre that he wields there should be a mighty one.

Now for a few suggestions, touching increased efficiency in pulpit ministrations. A prime consideration in all pulpit manner and form of utterance should be distinctness. The preacher should resolve to be heard, from the first word to the last, whether in prayer, reading or preaching. He should be determined that the people will not have to guess at what he says or what he means. This should be an especial aim in the reading of God's Word. It is possible that we attach too little importance to this part of the public worship, and it is astonishing how many men read the Scripture lessons carelessly and unimpressively. This fact may explain, in some measure, the vicious habit, in many congregations, of the people coming in and being seated during the reading of the Bible. The impression appears to be too common that this part of the service is not of enough importance to require the strict attention of all the people. Such an impression ought to be corrected by the minister. An impressive illustration of the proper reading of the Word is found in Nehemiah, eighth chapter, where Ezra and his coadjutors stood upon a pulpit of wood, and read the "law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." In the clear and discriminating reading, the sense may be gathered by the people, with very little other explanation. It does not require genius to be distinct, but even genius cannot be impressive without being clear.

Again I would observe that entrance into the pulpit should not be the signal for the use of artificial voice and manner. How forced, strained and unnatural is much pulpit manner and utterance! Why cannot the man who can talk, with effect, to a dozen friends in the parlor, talk with equal effect to a hundred or more people from the pulpit, adapting the voice to the changed conditions? Because he has been accustomed to think that the pulpit demands something

artificial and unnatural. The stage is not permitted to be natural, for audiences demand that it be artificial. The more artificial it is, the better it is liked. But what is not allowed on the stage is demanded of the pulpit. We as preachers should indeed "hold, as 'twere the mirror up to nature, suiting the action to the word, the word to the action." It should be forever remembered that the elocution of public speaking is not different from the elocution of private talking. If an incorrect and unintelligible method of pulpit utterance is natural, then assiduous effort should be made to correct nature, even if the patience of Demosthenes, in overcoming a defect of speech, be required.

A true and heart-involved earnestness is indispensable to the most effective pulpit manner and form of utterance. Whatever else the preacher of the gospel may lack, he must not be at fault here, if his pulpit ministrations are to tell. His is a high and noble purpose, and a burning earnestness in the fulfillment of that purpose should animate his speech. The purpose of the gospel to "open the eyes of men, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified," should fill his very soul. Then all pulpit manner and form of utterance will be his helpers in the proclamation of the truth.

Fort Worth, Texas.

CHARLES R. HYDE.

HOMILETIC NOTES.

LOVE LIKE THE SUN.

"Let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might."—JUDGES v. 31.

THESE are the closing words of the song of Deborah. What a matchless poem it is, and what a marvellous light it throws upon those dark days of the judges in Israel! The history of those times is scant. For a period of two hundred and fifty years we have little more than these stories recorded in the Book of Judges. The country was in a chaotic condition; the people were disunited, and often oppressed by surrounding nations; there was no central organized government, and, for the most part, apparently, "every man did that which was right in his own eyes." (Judges xxi. 25.)

From time to time a strong man would arise, organize an army, deliver the land from its oppressions, and, in large measure by per-

sonal prowess, maintain, for a few years, a semblance of government. One of those exploits, instigated by the Prophetess Deborah, and led by Barak, is described in the fourth and fifth chapters. In the fourth we have a prose account of the successful uprising of the people against the Canaanites, and in the fifth chapter the same event is celebrated in an elaborate and splendid poem. I will not pause to direct attention to the beauty and grandeur of this poem. It is a psalm of praise to the God of Israel, and a recognition of his guiding hand in all their previous history, and of his help in this wonderful deliverance from their enemies. The body of the poem is a picturesque description of the campaign, and of the death of Sisera, the Canaanite general, at the hands of Jael, the wife of Heber, and it closes with the prayer, "So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord; but let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might."

I am impressed with the designation of God's people here as "them that love him." It was early in the history of the church for this conception of the spiritual life to find such clear expression. It is true that the sum of the ten commandments had been revealed as consisting in supreme love to God and man, but apparently this had found little expression in the experience of the people. The struggle of God's people had been to preserve the authority of the law, and to save the church from a threatened deluge of idolatry which surrounded it, and the impression which we receive from the history of the times is that few could have attained to that attitude in spiritual experience which would have entitled them to a place among "them that love him." Nothing, however, is truer than that the experience of the justified is the same in all ages and climes. The faithful in Israel four thousand years ago were just as truly "them that love him" as the saints of God are to-day. The heart of warlike Deborah burned with the same fire of love to God as did that of Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany, "the beloved Persis," or any saint of modern times. The people of God may always be beautifully and truly described as "them that love him." The prayer of Deborah is, "Let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might."

I desire to call attention to some glorious truths suggested by this bold and splendid image. In what respects can those who love God be like the sun when he goeth forth in his might?

I. *In the possession of power.*

The sun going forth in his might is the most striking image in the natural world of power. It is not a symbol of infinite power; for

even the sun is a created object, limited in size and strength, and subject to the control of the almighty arm of God; but it is the best symbol which we have among natural objects of power. There is, therefore, much force in this image, that the church of God is like the sun when he goeth forth in his might.

The strength of the individual Christian and the strength of the whole body of believers is one and the same. It is the life of God in one and in all. In themselves they are weak, but in Christ Jesus they are strong. Without him they can do nothing, in him they can do all things.

There is one thing characteristic of the Christian, whether it appears in the individual or in the organized church, and that is power. The actual possession of it is altogether out of proportion to appearances. Israel in bondage in Egypt appeared to be helpless, but because God was in the midst of them they were possessed of tremendous power, and their exodus from Egypt was like the sun when he goeth forth in his might. The apostles of our Lord were few in number, and but "a feeble folk;" they were destitute of all the ordinary elements supposed to be necessary for the successful accomplishment of a great enterprise; but, at the bidding of the Master, they remained in Jerusalem "until endued with power from on high," and who can read their history, and contemplate the results of their labors without feeling the force of the image that their progress was like the sun when he goeth forth in his might? All of God's true people have this power. Power is characteristic of them. It is the power of love—the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto them. Nothing constrains like love, nothing inspires and energizes like love. Love is uncomplaining, love is self-sacrificing, love is bold and persistent, love is courageous, love is indefatigable, love is invincible. Show me a man who truly loves God, and I will show you a man of power—a man the strength of whose character is recognized by his fellows, and who stands for something good and useful in this world.

II. Again those who love God are like the sun in *the exercise of beneficent influence*.

1. Like the sun, *they give light to the world*. The sun's exercise of power is most beneficent as the centre of light. When he goeth forth in his might, darkness flees before him. Those who love God are "the light of the world." That is because they bring the knowledge of God to men. Of course, the true and original source of light is Christ himself. He is the true light that lighteth every man that

cometh into the world—the light of the knowledge of the glory of God shines in the face of Jesus Christ; but his disciples receive that light and transmit it to the world. The light that shines in him shines in them. The knowledge that they have of God they receive from him, and they represent him in the world. The lovers of God have always been the teachers of the world in divine knowledge. They have preserved alive the knowledge of God, and have taught it to men. Paul exhorts Christians to “be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; holding forth the word of life.” (Phil. ii. 15, 16.) The world is dependent upon the church for the light of knowledge—the most important and valuable of all knowledge—the knowledge of God. This is the purport of our Lord’s teaching, when he said, “Ye are the light of the world. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.” (Matt. v. 14–16.)

2. Lovers of God are like the sun in their *purifying influence* upon the world. When the sun goeth forth in his might, he not only enlightens the earth, but he purifies it. His bright, warm rays dispel the mists, and gloom, and dampness; they dry up the bogs and marshes; they drive away miasma, and remove many causes of disease. Nothing is more health-giving, invigorating, and purifying than sunshine.

If you wish to keep well and strong, let in the sunshine into your home, and live in the sunshine as much as possible. So the lovers of God bring the purifying, sanctifying sunshine of holy living into the world. This would be a dark and wicked world, indeed—a more troubled and dangerous place to live in than it is—if there were no lovers of God in it. They bring to it blessings untold. The Saviour not only said, “Ye are the light of the world,” but he also said, “Ye are the salt of the earth.” They are the preservative, curative influence, the element which prevents the earth from being entirely destroyed by the putrefying power of sin. The earth owes much, yea, more than tongue can tell, to the lovers of God in it.

3. They are also like the sun in bringing *comfort to the world*. This world would be desperately cold but for the warm rays of the sun, and nothing could live here. Suppose that the sun only emitted light, and no heat with it; what a different planet this would be! But it brings to us warmth and comfort. Suppose that in the religion of Christ there were only knowledge, and no love, how could

our souls live by it? But we not only know God, but we know his love for us; and we not only know him, but we also love him; and it is the love of God which brings warmth and comfort to the souls of men.

The lovers of God make known his love to the world. They are always talking about it, and rejoicing in it, and commending it to the sinful and the broken-hearted. As Christians, we should strive to bring comfort to the world. I take it that the only true and abiding comfort is to be found in the consciousness of God's love, and there is a very deep sense in which the lovers of God must exhibit his love to the world. As partakers of his nature, his people must reflect upon others his love for them. As the Lord Jesus lives in you, and goes about in you doing good, you carry comfort to the afflicted and the sorrowing.

4. Again, the lovers of God, like the sun, make the earth *fruitful*. The bright sunshine ripens the fruit until it falls to the ground; and then it beams down upon the seed in the rich soil, and makes it germinate and spring up and bear fruit. All through the whole history of the plant, from the time the little seed leaves the hand of the husbandman until the day the ripening grain yields it into his hand again, the sunshine warms and blesses its life. There would be no fruit in the earth without the sunshine.

So the people of God make the earth fruitful of good works. Unless the lovers of God do good in the world, who will do any? How absolutely is the world dependent upon them! In those parts of the world where the spirit of Christ has not penetrated, how little is done for the amelioration of human suffering, and for the elevation and purification of human character! Hospitals, asylums, and all eleemosynary institutions go hand in hand with the gospel. The lovers of God are like the sun, when he goeth forth in his might to bless the world. They bear healing and comfort, light and blessing on their wings. The most beneficent institution the world has ever known is the church of God. If the church and its work could be eliminated from the history of the world, precious little that is worthy of admiration and preservation would be left.

III. Again, those who love God are like the sun *in assured victory*.

When the sun goes forth in his might, there is only one hand in the universe that can arrest his course, and that is the hand of Almighty God. He rides triumphantly over all opposition. Winds and clouds, rocks, rivers, and plains, the great sandy desert, and even the vast expanse of the sea, and the loftiest mountain ranges that

skirt the shore, all are powerless to prevent his progress. The darkest caves of Erebus blush beneath his penetrating gaze, the highest peaks of the Himalayas glitter like burnished gold in his smile, and he hides his beaming face in the bosom of

“Old Ocean’s gray and melancholy waste”;

and yet none can stay his hand, or say unto him, “What doest thou?” What a conquering hero the sun is when he goeth forth in his might!

So it is with the mighty host of the people of God on earth. The lovers of God can never be suppressed. The church is invincible. “God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early.” (Psalm xli. 5.) The church cannot die while God lives and reigns. “For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.” (Zech. ii. 5.) The conquering Christ dwells in the midst of her; therefore is she like the sun when he goeth forth in his might.

How helpful and stimulating this is to all true lovers of God! They sometimes feel weak and discouraged. The odds against them are so great; the opposition is so fierce; men are so depraved and vicious; the progress of Christ’s cause appears to be so slow. But we are enlisted in God’s cause; we are doing God’s work. “We are co-workers together” with him, and confidently look for victory, not because of our own efforts, but because it is his work, and he is interested in it. “We are conquerors, and more than conquerors, through him that loved us.”

Nothing can separate us from the love of God, and nothing can destroy that love.

“Thy saints in all this glorious war
Shall conquer, though they die;
They see the triumph from afar
With faith’s discerning eye.”

Friend, do you count yourself as among “them that love God?” I should not like to think of myself, or of any of you, as among those that hate him. Paul described the heathen world as “haters of God.” There may be some excuse for the heathen, by reason of their ignorance and lack of opportunity; but how can any human being in the midst of Christian light and privilege be a “hater of God”? The lovers of God only have any claim upon him. They only have a right to wait for his blessing. Shall we count you among those that love him?

Richmond, Va.

RUSSELL CECIL.

PURE RELIGION.

“Pure religion.”—JAMES i. 27.

PURE religion! Pearl of greatest price, the richest gift of heaven, the most precious possession of mankind! For time and for eternity, thou art everything, bringing salvation, holiness and joy.

Religion is a word often used when spiritual matters are being spoken of; the whole Bible has been given to establish religion, to preserve religion, and to inculcate religion; yet the word “religion” occurs but five times in our authorized version of God’s Word. As the Constitution of the United States, the basis of the federal government, and the rule for its development, is all given for government, and is all about government, though the word “government” occurs but four times in that instrument, so the word “religion” seldom occurs in the Bible, though it is all given only to teach and promote religion, pure and undefiled.

What is the meaning of the word “religion,” so often heard, and so often used? One, burdened with his sins, crushed beneath his guilt, in an agony of woe, cries out, “O that I might get religion!” What does he mean? What is it that he wants? It is *pardon* that he seeks, forgiveness from his God. Another, who has no doubt that he is a child of the King, whose transgressions are removed forever, pressed by care, wearied and anxious, amid perplexities and difficulties, exclaims, “O that I might enjoy my religion more!” What does he mean by religion? Not pardon; it is *peace* for which he sighs, for the restoring of the joys of salvation, for songs amid the night of earth. And now we hear the voice of a third, “O that my brother would use his religion more!” What is here meant? Neither pardon nor peace, but *purity*, a holiness of word and deed, without which faith is dead, and religion but its shroud.

If so many meanings of the word “religion” are to be found in daily speech, we may well ask for a formal definition of the term. Turn to the old edition of Father Noah Webster, “Any system of faith and worship.” Two terms now given instead of one; and by “any system” we perceive that there are other religions beside the “pure religion.” And, indeed, there are many others, from the degraded worship of demons to the refined reasonings of vain philosophies—“any system of faith and worship.”

The best definition of religion which has ever been given is

probably the one presented by Prof. Robert Flint, of Scotland, in his second lecture on "Theism." Dr. Flint says, "Religion is man's belief in a being or beings mightier than himself, and inaccessible to his senses, but not indifferent to his sentiments and actions, with the feelings and practices which flow from such belief." This definition is worthy of being memorized. Religion is threefold: *belief, feelings, practices.*

Every man has some religion, not the pure religion, it may be; but if not, some other he must have to supply the void, to answer the demands of his intuition. His nature requires some form of religion as much as some form of speech. Take away his hearing, that he may not have a speech of sounds, and he will invent one of signs. Take away knowledge of the true God, he will invent a false deity as a substitute. With his lips he may deny that he has any belief, feelings, or practices in reference to superior and overruling powers, but it is not so; only the fool has said in his heart, "There is *no* God."

But religion, to be of any value, must be true, not false; it must be the pure religion from the living God. Here is a man just entering a bank to deposit the earnings of years. He would have them where he can check them out for the purchase of a home. They are all in a single thousand dollar bill. What cares, what labors, what hopes are held bound up in that one piece of paper! He hands it to the bank for deposit. It is subjected to the keenest scrutiny, a consultation is called, and then, without a word to the expectant owner, it is pushed beneath a descending stamp; it is handed back to him, with a deep brand across its face, "Counterfeit." What consternation! What sorrow! All is gone, and gone forever; for he knows that the man of whom he obtained this bill in exchange for all his coin is a worthless fellow, and can make no reparation. So with those who put all their toil and thought into a false religion. In the great day of judgment it is branded "counterfeit," and through all eternity there is no home for them of light and love. Satan has cheated them out of their souls, and there is no reparation.

It is not enough to be able to say, "I am no heathen; I do not worship a graven image." There are many false religions even in the fair lands of culture and refinement called Christian countries. But those who do not accept Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour, nor endeavor to render to him that service of love which is due him as the Lord of all, may be divided into two great classes. The first of these two classes look on God as too good and loving to

condemn any one, and they think that they will be happy in eternity, no matter how their earthly life is spent. They forget that God is also just. God is love, it is his everlasting crown; but he so loves the good, the holy, that all evil is abominable in his sight, and as supreme Governor, he must banish it forever, and he will. Those not ready to be separated from their sins must with them be cast into outer darkness. The second class of false religionists look on God as a tyrant. They consider that the wheels of his universe grind on and crush and cripple all who come within their grasp. They look up to heaven with a scowl of hate; and not seeing the truth that there is a door of salvation, they go doggedly onward, with set teeth and hearts of stone, joined to their idols.

Are these two classes really any better than the heathen? Having had the privilege of finding out the pure religion, are they not the more culpable for their lack of truth and righteousness? Is not their religion just as false as that of the pagan? It may not be quite so much debased, but a counterfeit of gold is just as much a counterfeit as is one of paper.

Let us then seek the pure religion, the faith, the power, the life that will survive the hour of death and judgment. Let those who have but a false religion forsake it for the true, seek justification; let those who possess the genuine religion desire still a more abundant life, seek sanctification. The first essential element of pure religion is belief; not the blind acceptance of the unproved, as too many imagine faith to be, but intelligent reliance on credible facts. To risk life on what is but tradition or unproved hypothesis is only foolish superstition. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." "Faith is the foundation of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen," for so may we translate Hebrews xi. 1. Found your trust on knowledge, then you act with certainty and alacrity. But many say, "It makes no difference what people believe, just so they do what is right." What a childish statement! All doing comes from believing, not merely in religion, but in everything. There is not a voluntary action of any sort that is not prompted by a belief. You believe the train is coming, you step off the track. You believe the food is palatable and nutritious, you eat of it. Only belief acts; unbelief always stands still. Belief must be in that which is true; believe the false, and you build a house on the sands; the greater your building, the greater will be the fall thereof.

True belief must include the will. You may die of hunger near a table full unless you partake. You may perish in a land of Bibles

unless you personally receive the merits of Christ your Saviour by a personal trusting in him. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "He that believeth not is condemned already."

The life-boat will never rescue us from the waves of death unless we allow ourselves to be lifted up and placed within its security. By faith we enter into life, are born again, and our life is hid with Christ in God. "By grace are ye saved through faith."

"Then," says one, "faith is all there is to our religion." By no means. "But are we not saved by faith alone? is not salvation the work of God?" Certainly. "Is not our salvation the end of our religion?" No, indeed. Let no one make this mistake; it will spoil your life's work. Your salvation is not the end of your religion; it is the beginning of it. Until saved, you have not the pure religion, only a false one; but being saved, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.

Faith is the head of our religion, but religion has also a heart. With our belief in God and his everlasting truth, feelings rise up within the soul that are no little part of our religious life. One with much religious knowledge and little love and sympathy is like a man deformed, the head well grown and fully developed, the body but that of a child. He must be but a monstrosity, a weakling, helpless and pitiable. Many are the feelings that form a part of pure religion; feelings that are a reflection of the sympathy and kindness in the heart of the blessed Master.

Submission, contentment and patience are a triad that are a rich and fertile soil in which may fully develop the complete and ripened Christlike character. Hope, joy and peace are like the sun's rays, ever full of light and warmth and energy of life. And love, breathing her fragrance of benevolence and cheer, is a pure atmosphere sweetening with her perfumes each consecrated garden of the Lord. Many are the feelings of pure religion, flowing from a belief in him who is always with us, even unto the end of the world.

But pure religion is not complete when formed alone of belief and feeling. Some people's religion seems to stop here. They have minds to know, they appear to have hearts to pity, but they have no hands to aid, no feet to go on mercy's errands, no tongue to tell the glad, good news of grace. Deformed, indeed, and as useless as they are sightly! Pure religion has practices of virtue and of goodness. It is not without works, a dead and useless faith. In fact, the word "religion," as used in the Bible, is restricted to the single meaning of an active piety, or well doing. It is so used by James, "Pure

religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Take care lest, having hands and feet, you let yourself be bound, and become as helpless as though maimed. There are many giants of evil abroad in the land; they meet you on every pathway; they are sent to bind you. Especially be on your guard against three of the mightiest, for well do I suppose that at one time or another have we all felt their power. Pride is a giant that often halts us, binds our hands or seals our lips; and Avarice has often chilled the kindly feelings of the heart like an Arctic blast; and Laziness, how many a time have we sat in idleness, or stood in foolish waiting, little dreaming that we were standing among sinners, or seated with the scornful. Shun these giants as you shun the blight of death; or better, slay them with the Word of God, the Spirit's sword. Much there is for you to do; for your neighbor even now perhaps lying wounded on your way; much to do for God, the extension of his kingdom, the glory of his name; much to do for yourself, "study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." Pure religion is to follow Jesus Christ.

Madison, Fla.

E. P. MICKEL.

FAITH AND SOME OF ITS CONSEQUENCES.

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."—ROMANS v. 1.

FAITH is the revealed channel of salvation. The man out of the church has heard the command to believe, coupled with the promise of salvation. The man in the church has believed. From one comes the inquiry, Why should I believe? Why should salvation be linked to so simple a thing as faith? From the other comes the question, To what extent shall I repose upon faith?

Faith has many analogies in nature, and is not something strange. Its elements are knowledge, belief, trust. Reading its meaning into the text, we are told that through a knowledge of, a belief in, and a trust reposed upon, the Lord Jesus Christ, being justified, we have peace with God. The text answers three questions:

1. *The object upon which faith terminates.* Faith itself does not save. It is not—

(a) Human goodness. The Christian is not a being who has resolved to change the habits of his life, and who claims heaven upon

his merits. A comparison of Christian character and non-Christian life by the worldly conformed is to misconceive the point of faith.

(b) The church. Salvation does not come through church membership.

(c) The Bible. Salvation is not conferred because one believes the Bible is God's Word. Not terminating upon human merit, nor the church, nor the Bible, faith does rest upon—

(d) The Lord Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, the risen Redeemer. Faith leads us to Christ, for whom we unite with the church to labor in his cause, from whom we accept the Bible as God's revelation, and in whom we reveal good works as an evidence of our salvation.

2. *The strength of faith.* Not pardon, but justification. "Through faith in the Lord Jesus, being justified." Justification is based upon complete satisfaction. "Do we then make void the law of God through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." (Romans iii. 31.) Faith bears witness to the immutability of the law. It cannot be disregarded; Christ honors it. In receiving Christ, faith likewise honors it. Faith honors the justice of God. Its language is not, I demand the abrogation of the law; it admits the justice of the penalty, and meets it through Christ. Faith honors the mercy of God. It acknowledges the soul's unworthiness, and its entire dependence upon unmerited favor in Christ. Faith honors the truth of God. It recognizes the soul's condition to be just as described, and trusts Jesus to deliver it from depravity. Every attribute of the Almighty is honored by faith in the reception of Christ. Justification inevitably follows.

3. *The result of faith.* Peace. "Through faith in Christ, being justified, we have peace." What is peace? Not freedom from the common lot of man. It is a change in relationship. Before justification, the wisdom and power of God were against the sinner; after justification, the wisdom of God is pledged to guide, and the power of God is pledged to defend. Divine peace conveys the idea of a guaranteed protection. (See John x. 27, 28; Rom. viii. 31-39.) From this subject, we learn—

FIRST. The worthlessness of any foundation except Christ. With law fully satisfied, there is safety. Without law fully honored, there can be no safety. Honesty of purpose, sincerity, good works fail to give satisfaction to a broken law.

SECONDLY. The security of the believer. Salvation is not offered over a disregarded and despised law, but a law honored and kept.

"All the attributes of the Most High unite in constructing the platform upon which the redeemed sinner stands. Justice stands sentinel with mercy in admitting the saint into the joys of heaven. How great the security to a soul, reposing upon all that enters into the character of the Most High, without a single attribute to arise and challenge its entrance into glory."

Petersburg, Va.

J. S. FOSTER.

THE IMMUTABILITY OF GOD.

"I am the Lord, I change not."—MALACHI iii. 6.

IN the study of the character of God, "unchangeable" is the word which puts final emphasis on his perfections. Without it, other defining words lose their lustre, the glory of his character is not guaranteed, praise is enfeebled by fear, and all material and spiritual foundations are "out of course."

A great and precious corollary from the immutability of God is *certainty in religion*.

Religion arises from the relation existing between the character of God and the creature. God being unchangeable, that relation is unchangeable. A changeable God could not impose fixed relations. But now the one revelation of "what duty God requires of man" suffices. Certainty in religion—how practically important! With uncertainty and fickleness everywhere, men want a religion lifted out of contingency, a God who will not disappoint them. Let the pulpit sound an uncertain gospel, defection will follow; let it ring with the gospel of immutable love, justice, holiness and power, and men will respond.

I. The sinner's hope is in an unchangeable God.

He wants to know that God's purpose to save is unchanged; that Calvary stands for all ages; that Jesus is always the friend of sinners, and will love him unto the end. If the ambassador does not know that God is changeless, with what authority, sincerity and assurance will he offer salvation? God may have withdrawn his offer, or may have forgotten it, or may be unable to fulfil it. Those who deny God's immutability must answer for the crushing load of uncertainty they put on the sinner, for if God is changeable, how may he know he can be saved?

But an *unchangeable* God makes a *like* offer of salvation, as sincere and full as when Christ died. His "blood shall never lose its power." Always with arms outstretched, pleading voice, he is "Jesus

Christ, *the same yesterday and to-day and forever*" to "save to the uttermost."

II. The Christian's comfort is in God's unchangeableness.

This doctrine untrue, assurance of salvation is gone; suffering is an insoluble mystery; heaven a perchance; iron is taken from the Christian's character, hope from his heart, praise from his lips. When shadows come and deepen, when pain pierces the soul, when crape hangs on the door, "to whom shall we go?"

To comfort us, God uses his strongest expressions, "God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we might have a strong consolation.*"

"His oath, his covenant, his blood,
Support me in the 'whelming flood."

Houston, Texas.

C. T. CALDWELL.

EZRA'S ACT OF FAITH.

"For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to keep us against the enemy in the way: because we had spoken," etc.—EZRA viii. 22.

WE often find some rich gem in the most unexpected place. The prayer of Jabez is only the more beautiful for its dull, dead setting (1 Chron. iv. 9, 10); and the character of Amos is the more striking because he was found among the herdmen of Tekoa. And this history of Ezra's faith is like a green spot amid the valley of dry bones of long dead Hebrew generations; like a sweet, fresh flower hidden in the shade of mouldering grave-stones.

Ezra had gathered a band of Jews to go to Jerusalem. In this multitude there were many old men, women and children. They were to carry a great treasure of gold and silver. It was the custom then, as now, for such a caravan to be accompanied by an armed escort, to protect them from bands of robbers. Will Ezra apply to the king for this convoy? He had told the king that his God was powerful to protect all those who sought him, and had Ezra come to him for a band of soldiers, he would have thought that either God was not as powerful as Ezra had represented him, or that Ezra did not have much faith in his willingness. Ezra, after having professed his faith in God, was ashamed to show unbelief in time of test. He

was not willing that the king should think lightly of his God. Here was anxiety for God's glory. What an impression this heterogenous host, marching through danger, trusting only in God, must have made on the heathen mind! For result see vs. 33-36.

Christians are often, unconsciously, the greatest enemies of religion because of their unbelief. Our actions belie our words, and our rule of faith and rule of practice do not agree. We are known and read of all men, and when the world knows our profession and sees a different practice, they are led to a contempt of religion, and God's cause is dishonored. Works are an evidence of a living faith, and it is the only evidence which will impress those who are without.

Apply this principle to our lives, and it will result in conduct which will cause the world to glorify our Father. In temptation we must show that we have a God who is able to deliver us. In time of trial and weakness, we must let the world see God's power manifest in us. For example, Daniel and the steward, and Elisha at Dothan. (2 Kings vi. 16.) In poverty we are to show the world that God is able to add all things unto us; and we are not to sorrow as those who have no hope, and who have no comfort beyond that which the world can give. We are to show our faith in our conflict with sin. The church will always excite the enmity of the world and of the evil against which it testifies. To avoid this, we seek the friendship of the world, and tolerate many evil practices, and imagine that we can gain strength by compromise. God is able to care for his own, and has promised to be to us a place of broad rivers and streams. The world may curse us, it can never touch us. We can accomplish our mission only by faithfully testifying against the evil, and demanding purity of life on the part of members.

The truth of the gospel is also subject to assault. The cry is for smooth things, and too often we are led to comply with this demand, forgetting that the gospel, and that alone, is the power of God unto salvation. There is so much said about the hardness and severity of the doctrines of the gospel that there is a tendency to preach almost anything except the doctrines of grace for fear of offending some over-delicate mind. Thus, although we profess to believe these doctrines, the world, seeing our practice of avoiding them, is led to think that we no longer believe them. Let us be ashamed to thus dishonor God's Word.

Ezra was more particular before the heathen king than he would have been before those who understood the use that God makes of means. And so before those who do not understand religion, and

before scoffers and revilers, we are to avoid even the appearance of evil or of unbelief.

More faith is what we need. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." One act of faith will accomplish more than all the tongues of men and of angels.

Trenton, Tenn.

T. M. HUNTER.

"YE THAT LOVE THE LORD, HATE EVIL."

"Ye that love the Lord, hate evil."—PSALM xcvii. 10.

I. INTRODUCTION. The hand of man is on the throttle of limitless power; he controls the energies of *love* and *hatred*. The former knows no barriers, the latter fears no foe. The outcast is still followed by affection, or hounded by anger. Not infrequently these two combine. It is like thunder and lightning, or fire and flood, a cyclonic blast that sweeps to its purpose. The Christian is in the trust. These elements are to him as the wings of the morning, and upon them he mounts up like an eagle, to perch amid the heights of glory. He is addressed as a *lover*, and commissioned an enemy.

II. EXPOSITION. We reverence a conscientious ruler, and come to esteem him for his works' sake. The tie of friendship is another matter. It is free and full, and the bond that binds is love. God ordained in Eden, Jesus graced at Cana the highest devotion, the wedlock of hearts. The verb אָהַב is used for the love of the King Jehovah (Josh. xxii. 5), for the best of friendships (1 Sam. xviii. 3), but especially for the love of wedlock (Cant. ii. 4). Christians constitute the church, the bride of the Lamb, and love, for he is our Lover.

עו is an active and passive evil. It is (Deut. i. 39) and does (Psa. xxiii. 4) wrong. Evil is corrupt and corrupting.

אָהַב seems to be based upon the primitive idea of ugliness, which includes knowledge and judgment and feeling. We hate what we investigate, believe, and feel to be sinful.

III. PROPOSITION. Lovers of Jehovah hate sin.

A. Because of their relationship with God.

1. A Father dishonored thereby. 2. An Elder Brother lived and died because of and in order to eradicate it. 3. Their own personal inheritance jeopardized, and their claim thereto sought.

B. Because a malignant gangrene.

1. Veiled the face of God and hushed the divine voice since the fall in Eden—separated man from his Maker. 2. Author of infidelity, creator of sorrow, cause of doom. 3. Not that it may, but has, already destroyed. Christian not prevented from death, but resurrected; lost, but now found.

C. Because of divine command.

1. God commander-in-chief. 2. Christians volunteers. 3. Ministers couriers, and the Bible the dispatch.

IV. APPLICATION. 1. Hating sin provides the repulsive energies. 2. Living right brings one within the magnetic circle.

V. CONCLUSION. Lovers of God and haters of evil have harnessed the laws of nature to the equipage of grace; sin and Satan will step aside, and make room for the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof.

Newport News, Va.

E. T. WELLFORD.

VIII.

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

DAVIS' "ELEMENTS OF ETHICS."

ELEMENTS OF ETHICS. *By Noah K. Davis, A. M., Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Virginia.* Τρέφονται πάντες οι ανθρώπειοι νόμοι υπό ἐνός τοῦ θείου· ἤραται γὰρ τοσοῦτον ὄχосον ἐθέλει καὶ ἐξαρχείει πᾶσι καὶ περιγένηται.—*Herakleitos.* Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, Boston, Chicago.

Dr. Davis is bringing forth fruit in old age, mature, refreshing, nourishing. He has already given us three works on Logic, one on Psychology, besides several minor productions. He is yet, we hope, to send forth his *chef-d'œuvre* in a treatise on Philosophy proper in both departments of Epistemology and Ontology. His scholarly culture, his admirable power of clear and forcible expression, and his ability to see and grasp truths beyond the reach of ordinary men, have combined to give him a place among the first writers and teachers of the South. He is an ornament to the University, whose breast glitters with stars.

This work on ethics is introduced by a brief but comprehensive statement of Dr. Davis' more important views on psychology and philosophy, with special reference to their relation to the subject to be discussed. From some of these views we dissent. We do not believe that consciousness, rather than thought, is the *essentia* of mind (page 7). This opinion forces Dr. Davis to the materialism of unconscious cerebration; if the brain, without the mind, can do the best work directing physical dexterities, surely it can also do the poorer, and there is no need of mind as a distinct power. We do not believe that self-perception is sensuous (page 1); the mind needs and has no sense organ for the apprehension of its own condition and activity. We do not believe that all intuitions are judgments (page 3), or that judgment is involved in the simplest act of the mind; because judgment is an act by which at least two things are compared, and these two things in their separateness must be first apprehended before they can be brought together in an act of comparison.

We do not believe that affections are a class of desires (pages 5, 6); their relation is antithetic—the one craves, the other gives; the one is poor and wants, the other is rich and bestows; as Dr. Davis says, all desires have future objects, but affections are not so limited. We do not believe that the objects of desire are simply objects of cognition (page 5); they are objects both of cognition and desire. We do not believe that desires and affections are in general opposition to each other (page 7); they are, as feelings or mental acts, antithetic in nature, but as to objects and interests they are not opposed to each other; that is, one can both love and desire the

same thing; indeed, love is an element of desire, as we desire those objects only for which we have an affection.

We do not believe that concentration of consciousness is the sole function of the will (page 9); nor can Dr. Davis consistently so teach; for he tells us that the will chooses between alternatives, forms an intention to act, and makes an effort to carry out its chosen intention, and these are not mere acts of concentration.

We do not believe that one cannot be conscious or cognizant of a negative; we can be cognizant of an absence (page 14), as when we put our hands into the pocket to get our purse we are disagreeably aware of its absence if a thief has taken it; we are equally conscious when we are forced to act, and when we are not forced to act, in the one case of the presence and in the other of the absence of the compelling power.

We do not believe that all causes are necessary, and not free (page 14); God, the angels, the devils, man, are all causes, and all are the free causes of all their acts; the will is a cause, and a free cause, of its choices and determinations. We do not believe that choice is not a change, nor an event, nor an effect (pages 14, 15); choice is an act of an agent, and as such is a change in his experience, an event of his mental life, an effect of his causal activity. We do not believe that the absolute freedom of the will, as a special power and act of the mind, from the determining influence of the other powers of the mind, is either a fact or is essential to man's freedom and responsibility (page 15). We do not believe that the will is any more free than the intellect and the sensibility; we do not believe that it is as free from the influence of these coördinate powers as they are free from it, because, as the last of the powers to act, it is more affected by them than they can be by it. We do not believe that the mind, the whole mind, intellect, sensibility, and will, is free, that the mind is a unit, and that the mind as will acts as an intellect and sensibility as well, according to its judgments, affections, and desires.

We do not believe in progressive sanctification after death, as Dr. Davis, following Kant, does, making it an argument for immortality (page 19); teaching that no man can attain moral perfection in this life, and that he will need eternity to attain it in the life to come; on the contrary, we believe that "the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness."

We do not believe that absolute creation is philosophically absurd, meaning that nothing becomes something (page 23); we believe that infinite power can, and did, create something from no preëxisting material. We do not believe that an individual is, as to its mere existence, independent of other things (page 24); if so, God is the only individual; we believe that an individual exists separate and distinct from other things. We do not believe that the general has no objective existence, but is wholly subjective (page 24); this is conceptualism; we believe that the general has an eternal existence in the mind of God, apart from the particular, a subjective existence in the mind of man, and an objective existence in every individual of its genus; the same is true of law (page 31).

We do not believe that the will controls its conditioning desires (pages

46, 47); as these desires not only condition the will, but are, as Dr. Davis says, antecedent to it, how is it possible for a conditioned consequent to control its conditioning antecedent? We do not believe that freedom is purely negative (page 51); it is not merely the absence of constraint, but is the possession of the positive power of self-originated action.

We do not believe that the destruction of a man's life is the destruction of his personality (page 55); for his personality survives death.

We do not believe that belief is a feeling, nor especially do we think it the assurance of physical certainty (page 119); belief is a conviction of the judgment, is intellectual, and neither physical nor a state of feeling. We do not believe that our affections are limited to others as their objects, that we cannot, and do not, love ourselves (page 146); as in acts of cognition the *ego* is both subject and object, so it may be the object of its own affection. We do not believe that love is limited to sentient objects (page 173); love, both as complacency and benevolence, can fix its affection on any creature which God has made; the hermit loves his lonely home, the patriot loves the institutions of his country, Dr. Davis loves philosophy. We do not believe that complacency is not an affection, a species of love; it is the fulness of love, of which benevolence is a part, an element; we exercise benevolent affection towards all, even our enemies and the ill-deserving, as well as the meritorious; we reserve complacent affection for the well-deserving.

We do not believe that the conception of Deity is in every human mind (page 197); the true conception of God is in comparatively few minds; and there are some minds, deaf-mutes and savages, that have no idea of a god until given to them by others. We do not believe that man is a body and mind; still less do we believe that these are coördinate (page 213); man is a mind, living in and using a body as his home and instrument during his life in this world, but capable of living, and actually living and acting, without a body in the world to come.

In addition to these details, in which we are at disagreement with Dr. Davis' teachings in his *Ethics*, on psychological and philosophical questions, there is a matter of great importance to which special attention is called: Dr. Davis' doctrine of human freedom and accountability. He believes that man is free and accountable, and with this we heartily concur. But he teaches that the cognitions, feelings, affections and desires are none of them free; that the volitions alone are free; that the volitions have three elements, choice, intention, and effort; that neither intention nor effort is free; that choice is both an act and a fact, and as a fact alone is free; that is, the act of choosing is necessary, but the fact, or kind of choice made, is not necessary and is free; that choice is not within the pale of causality, for all causes are necessary; that we have no consciousness of freedom, because it is a negation; that all the grounds upon which man's freedom has hitherto been based are but yielding sand and unsatisfactory; that choice is neither a change, nor an event, nor an effect, for if it were it would be caused and necessitated. These teachings are taken from his *Psychology* and his *Ethics*. There are other limitations on man's freedom presented in the chapter on Liberty in the work now under review. For the present we shall notice the doctrine as above given.

We observe that Dr. Davis' doctrine of freedom is a very narrow one, confined to one element of choice and denied to all other mental acts; that he has repudiated and declared unsound all former defences of freedom; that he puts freedom to the hazard of the fact of choice being neither a change nor an event; that, having asserted, in agreement with all philosophers, that cause is a universal category, he limits its universality by excepting choice from its sphere; that, teaching that man's will is undetermined by anything but itself, he holds that the will of God, in whose image man was made, is determined by his nature, lying back of his will (page 204); and that, denying man's freedom in belief, he nevertheless holds that man is responsible for his belief.

In opposition to Dr. Davis, we hold that the mind is a cause, free in its cognitions, its feelings, its affections, its desires, its volitions; that, as a spontaneous agent, all its acts are free; that the mind, as a unit, is wholly involved in all that it does; that the will, as the final step in the mental process, is the determined resultant of its cognition, feeling, affection, and desire; that otherwise the will would be neither rational nor moral.

Dr. Davis' presentation of the Scotist, Arminian theory of the will seems a concession of its weakness and a despairing effort to rescue it from ruin.

Dr. Davis is an intuitionist, and holds that right and obligation are primary ideas of the mind. Conscience he limits to the "pure reason discerning moral law." It is unfortunate that the technical terms of the philosophical sciences are not fixed in their meaning. The popular use of a word should be its technical meaning, unless there are weighty reasons to the contrary. Conscience is ordinarily understood as synonymous with the moral nature, including among its acts any cognition, feeling, affection, desire, or volition with reference to moral objects. Whenever this usage is departed from, as it frequently is by writers, it is confusing and sometimes misleading. For example, the answer to the disputed question as to the fallibility of conscience depends on the meaning assigned to it. With Dr. Davis' restriction of it to pure reason, or intuition, it is infallible; in the wider application to all moral acts, of course, it is not.

Dr. Davis divides the discussion of Ethics proper into Obligation, "a binding together" of men, and Organization, the "working together." The first he treats under the aspects of Rights, Liberty, Trespass, the Law, Sanctions, Right and Wrong, Justice, Duty and Virtue, Selfishness, Service, Charity, Welfare, and Deity; the second under the Man, the Family, the Community, the State, and the Church.

We shall go through the discussion, noting, as they come, those points which seem to call for criticism on moral grounds. We do not believe that only the imperfect are under obligation (page 19); every moral being is under obligation to be right and do right; God to himself, the angels and the spirits of the just made perfect to themselves, to their fellows, and to God; the perfect realize this obligation and meet it. It is asserted (page 20) that the existence of God "is hardly yet established as an unquestionable philosophical doctrine"; because the infinity of God and absolute creation are not proven (pages 20, 23); if this be true, as we think it is, then

we owe our assured belief in absolute creation and God's infinitude to his revelation in the Scriptures.

Dr. Davis bases ethics upon the fundamental conception of rights, not right; a relation between concrete beings, not an abstract principle. We object to this as metaphysically wrong. The concrete is not primary, but secondary; not the bed-rock foundation, but a superstructure; beyond and below rights is right, as the moral primitive. We object to it as ethically wrong; in the first place, because it makes duty relative, not absolute; an isolated being would not be a moral being, there would be no rights of others for him to respect, and there would be none to respect his rights; God, prior to creation, would have been a non-moral being, as Dr. Davis indeed seems to believe. It is ethically wrong, further, because it is egoistic; Dr. Davis defines a man's right as "a free use of his native powers in the gratification of his normal desires," thus making each one's personal interests the basis of duty. It is ethically wrong, again, because it is utilitarian; the radical distinction between intuitional and utilitarian ethics is that the former makes right absolute and independent of consequences, while the latter denies the right in itself and makes it depend upon results; the effect of conduct upon rights is a consequence of conduct, and not an element in the conduct itself, whereas conduct is right or not in itself apart from results. Finally, as interpreted by Dr. Davis, it is ethically wrong as being humanitarian; as it is man's rights, which he makes the basis of ethics, ignoring, except by a mere mention in a foot-note, the rights of inferior creatures (page 45), and introducing God only at the end, as an unnecessary addendum, to complete his system.

Dr. Davis makes the desires the fundamental psychological fact in ethics. This is unjustified by a correct psychology; for the desires are secondary, not primary: as Dr. Davis teaches that they are subsequent to and conditioned on the cognitions and feelings (page 6). It is inconsistent with his doctrine that the desires have no inherent moral character (page 113); that moral quality is confined to the volitions. It is manifestly utilitarian. Dr. Davis by implication acknowledges that the desires are not moral ultimates, when he prefixes the qualifying word "normal" to them, it is "the gratification of normal desires." What are normal desires? Normal means natural, or it may mean proper; the former sense Dr. Davis cannot allow as morally justified, except on the assumption that man is in his normal or unfallen state. He is, therefore, shut up to the latter meaning, and the questions arise, Which are the normally proper or correct desires, and what makes them normally correct? and this brings out the truth, that desires do not fundamentally condition and differentiate right action, but that an element different from and back of desires makes them right.

Dr. Davis also teaches that desires conflict, naturally, normally conflict; that is what he calls the giving desires, or affections, and the craving desires, or desires proper. This surely was not true in man's primeval, perfect state; and as man was then possessed of both affections and desires, it cannot be that they naturally antagonize or conflict with each other. Dr. Davis holds that they are morally antagonistic, and that the giving desires, or affections, have rightful moral supremacy (page 140). On the contrary,

many affections are wrong, and as many desires are right. The affections are of two opposite classes, the benevolent and the malevolent, and Dr. Davis makes the malevolent abnormal; so that he restricts moral supremacy to the benevolent affections. It is not true that the malevolent affections are always wrong; God exercises them, for he is "angry with the wicked every day"; he commends and commands them, "Be ye angry and sin not." All craving desires are not wrong; indeed, they are generally right; all natural craving desires have their legitimate exercise; some of them are to the highest degree commendable, craving desires for truth, for purity, for usefulness, for the good of men, for the glory of God. The benevolent affections are not always right; the general and needful injunction is, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world;" we frequently and easily inordinately love the gifts of God's providence.

The fact is that ethics bases itself, not in the volitions, nor in the desires, nor in the affections, nor in the feelings, but, like all other sciences, in the cognitions, which, as Dr. Davis teaches, condition all the other mental powers, being the primal and fundamental fact of man's nature. As a man knows, thinks, so he feels, loves, desires, wills. The cognitions themselves are in classes, primary, secondary, and ancillary. The ancillary are the cognitive powers of memory and expression, which do not add anything to the stock of human knowledge, but merely assist the other faculties. The secondary powers of cognition are the relative, comparative, discursive faculty, dealing with the natural relations, and the creative faculty, which is limited to the factitious, that which does not naturally exist, but must be created by human invention. Neither the ancillary nor the secondary powers of cognition are basal; this is the function of the primary, the intuitive powers of sense-perception, self-perception, and pure reason. Of these last, there are primary and secondary; the experiential faculties of sense and self-perception are conditioned upon the absolutely primitive pure reason, the faculty of primary ideas and first truths. No science finds its bed-rock foundation until it reaches a basis in some primary idea or first truth of the pure reason. So it is with ethics, whose ultimate principle is the idea of right and the principle of obligation to the right. Dr. Davis, as an intuitionist, recognizes these as the pure intuitions that pertain to ethics; and then strangely forgets and ignores them when he is laying the foundation of his science; substituting the different, secondary, utilitarian idea of rights for the right; and, wavering between volitions and affections, he puts the science on its psychological head and shoulders, instead of upon its feet, in the pure intuitions.

Rights are classed as three, each, however, comprehending the other two: the right of life, liberty, and property; all of which Dr. Davis reduces to the right of liberty (page 49). This sacrifices completeness to simplicity. There are other rights, not enumerated here, of equal, and even greater, importance, such as the right to knowledge, happiness, purity.

He discriminates at length between freedom and liberty. Freedom is antecedent to choice, essential to personality, absolute, appertains to choice, implies free will, is negative of any causality, contradicts necessity, is subject to morality, conditions proficiency, and is a primary condition of obliga-

tion. Liberty, on the other hand, is subsequent to choice, is accidental in personality, is merely functional, appertains to effort and beyond, is merely free-agency, is negative of preventive causality, consists with necessity, is subject to legality, conditions efficiency, and is a secondary condition of obligation. The important distinction is that freedom demands that the will be absolutely free from all determining influences from within or without, and that liberty is merely the power to carry out the choice of the will. Freedom is subjective, and is limited to attention or choice, to moving our voluntary muscles within a small space, and to moving things; it is further limited by mental inertia as involving effort. Freedom makes man independent of his fellows, and so far independent of God, and he might add, according to his doctrine, independent of himself except as a will (pages 52-55). It would seem that the limitations to the moving of our voluntary muscles and to changing the place of things are rather restrictions upon liberty of action than upon freedom of choice.

He divides the restrictions upon liberty into impersonal and personal, and the personal into the objective, external, muscular, and the subjective, internal, mental. These subjective restrictions are either persuasives or menaces used by others to induce us to act (pages 56, 57). Clearly these are limitations of freedom, as they influence choice. They also indeed affect liberty, but all influences upon choice affect action. They are, however, really neither limitations upon freedom nor restrictions upon liberty of a character to relieve one of responsibility for his choice and corresponding action. The lawyer persuades the juryman to his verdict, but it is the juryman's verdict. Mephistopheles induced Faust to sell his soul, but Faust was none the less responsible for the succeeding devilry he practiced. The terrors of the law may persuade men to repent, but repentance is their free act.

Dr. Davis (page 93, note) gives as the royal law, quoting from James ii. 8, Moses' maxim, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Lev. xix. 18; he presents as the Golden Rule of Christianity Christ's saying, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so also do ye unto them," Matt. vii. 12; and as the golden rule of philosophy, Kant's categorical imperative, "Act on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become universal law." He criticises Christ's Golden Rule, as being a rule, a guide or test of conduct, rather than a law; it seems to be both. Christ added to his utterance of it that it was "the law and the prophets," which Dr. Davis interprets as meaning, "By this ye may fulfil the law." The phrase, "the law and the prophets," was a familiar one in Jewish usage of that day, and means what we call the Old Testament, the Hebrew Scriptures, referring to its two principal divisions as made by the Jewish doctors. Christ evidently meant that his Golden Rule was the substance of the Old Testament teaching as to our duty to our fellow-men, and he doubtless had specially in mind the royal law of Moses, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These differ only in the one referring to internal affection, and the other to external action as the outcome of the heart.

Dr. Davis further criticises this Golden Rule as inadequate, because it provides for no duties to self, nor for benevolence, nor for legal justice; and, further, that it makes self-love the test and measure of obligation.

This last is the serious objection to both the Royal Law and the Golden Rule. It seems strange that Dr. Davis, as well as practically all others, has mistaken Christ's relation to the Golden Rule. It did not originate with him, nor did he give it as his law on social ethics; he expressly says that it is the teaching of "the law and the prophets"; that is, of the Old Testament. Moreover, he quotes Moses' Royal Law twice, Matt. xix. 18, 19, and xxii. 39, 40, and on both occasions connects it with the Old Testament. Neither the Golden Rule nor the Royal Law is the New Testament teaching on our duty to our fellows; Romans xii. 10, Paul says that we should be "in love of the brethren tenderly affectioned one to another; in honor preferring one another"; and Phil. ii. 3, "in lowliness of mind, each counting others better than himself." The Golden Rule and the Royal Law put others on a level with ourselves; these passages require us to put our neighbor above ourselves; as Shakespeare makes Wolsey bid Cromwell, "Love thyself last." Moreover, Christ superseded the Golden Rule and the Royal Law by his own new commandment, John xiii. 34, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another: even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another;" and he repeats it, John xv. 12, "This is my commandment: that ye love one another even as I have loved you." He removes the human, fallible standard of the Royal Law and the Golden Rule, our imperfect discharge of duty to ourselves, and puts in its place the perfect pattern of his own infinite love for us.

Dr. Davis' doctrine of moral sanctions is utilitarian (pages 95-106). In ethics, a sanction is "that which makes virtue morally obligatory, or which impels, binds, or furnishes a motive for man to seek it. In utilitarianism, the knowledge of the painful or pleasurable consequences of an act, or the pleasure or pain itself consequent upon it." These definitions are taken from the *Standard Dictionary*. The *Century Dictionary*, clearly utilitarian itself, defines: "A sanction is a source of obligatory powers or motives; that is, of pains and pleasures; which, according as they are connected with such or such modes of conduct, operate, and, indeed, are the only things which can operate, as motives." These definitions agree in making moral sanctions the motives to moral conduct. Dr. Davis teaches that sanctions are the "good and evil effects"; "all sanctions of the moral law, innate or enacted, natural or artificial, are essentially the same, depending for their efficacy on the same element; all rewards are pleasures, all punishments pain." He thus asserts that the sanctions, the motives, for morality are the resulting pleasurable or painful consequences of our acts. In accordance with this he bases the reasonableness of recompense and retribution upon the ground that welfare demands them. His doctrine is not only positively utilitarian, it is negatively so also; in the fact that there is no mention of a regard for right, for truth, for duty, for the majesty of the law, for the glory of God; to say nothing of the distinctively Christian motive, love for the Saviour. Dr. Davis confines himself to the lowest, most ignoble motives, and ignores those which elevate and dignify character. Moreover, he overlooks the fact that pleasure and pain are neither proportionally nor always at all attendant upon moral action. Many a good man fails to find pleasure in self-sacrificing virtue; and many an incarnate demon, with

seared, dead conscience, gloats in fiendish triumph over his accomplished villainy. Still more, he forgets that in all cases, and in these last-mentioned especially, virtue is for its own sake, and that the dead conscience, feeling no pain, attests the crowning infamy of vice.

In this connection we shall notice Dr. Davis' doctrine as to the justification of punishment by the State; alluded to in the chapter on Sanctions and more fully discussed in §136. He teaches that the warrant for the civil punishment of the criminal is not revenge, nor the vindication of law and right, but is chiefly the defence of rights, with the additional and subordinate purpose of the discipline or moral improvement of the offender. He avers that "vengeance is reserved expressly for a tribunal higher than the State, Deut. xxxii. 35; Rom. xii. 19." It is manifest that, if vengeance or the vindication of the right is God's motive for punishing sin, it cannot be either a wrong or a low motive; that, if it is the motive of the absolutely perfect Ruler, it is presumptively the proper motive for all subordinate rulers; that, being impersonal, it is definitely different from and above all personal passion or interest, all taint of selfishness, and is purely and absolutely moral. But Dr. Davis asserts that God claims this as a warrant for punishing peculiarly, exclusively, his own, and denies it to all his creatures, even to the State; is this true? The passages cited by Dr. Davis are misapplied by him. They do teach that the private individual cannot be properly intrusted with the punishment of a wrong done to him; and manifestly so, because the impersonal motive of the vindication of the right will in such a case inevitably be lost in the personal resentment of the injured. This is not true in the case of a father or of a civil governor, and we are expressly taught, Romans xiii. 4, that the civil ruler is "a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil." Of course, the truth is that, as Hegel teaches, punishment inflicted by law is not mainly a chastisement or correction, nor chiefly for the defence of rights, but is a just retribution, a vindication of the law, an assertion of the supreme majesty of the right. It is sufficiently manifest that it is no defence of the rights of a murdered man to execute his slayer; as his right to life has already been fatally and irrevocably invaded.

Dr. Davis asserts that pain is not an evil; that it is essential to welfare; that it cannot be an evil, because God is the author of it. What he doubtless means in these statements is true, that pain is not wrong, that it is just, that in a fallen world like ours it is essential. Nevertheless, pain is an evil, not to be found in a sinless world, but inseparably associated with the wrong. It is not an evil, taking the whole history of the world into consideration, but it is an evil to those suffering it, an evil sanctified to the good of the penitent. It is an evil of which God is the wise and just author; we are repeatedly told in the Scriptures that God is the author of evil; Isaiah xlv. 7, "I make peace and create evil," the evil of pain, not the evil of sin.

In the chapter on Right and Wrong, Dr. Davis compares rights and the right, and affirms that they are coextensive and differ only as the former is a substantive notion and the latter a qualifying. They are coextensive; that is, every violation of rights is also forbidden by the right; but the right is a substantive notion as truly as rights, differing in that one is

concrete and the other abstract. They are coextensive, but they are not cointensive: a right always refers to a claim, is personal and subjective, and is based on law; while the right has no reference to a claim, is impersonal and objective, and is the basis of law.

In §57, he declares that moral quality does not pertain to any fact of causation, because all causation is necessitated, and no necessary action can be moral. We have already seen the inconsistency of Dr. Davis in this, with his teaching that cause is a pure intuition, and that one characteristic of pure intuitions is their universality, admitting of no exceptions. We have also seen that, while every act is within the domain of causation, some are due to free and others to necessary causes.

He further declares that no physical action, no act of conscience as the moral intuition, no empirical intuition, no exercise of the logical faculty, no moral judgment, no presentation nor representation of thought, no representation of mediate perception, memory, or the imagination, no feeling, and no desire, has any moral quality in itself. The ground for these sweeping statements is that all these acts are within the sphere of causation, are necessitated, and therefore have no moral character. The fallacy underlying these astounding negations lies in the major premise, as already noted, that all causes are necessary. These consequences of his doctrine, which he accepts and affirms, are logically drawn, and show to the common sense and common conscience of men that the premise on which they are based must be untrue; not even the desires, nor the acts of the conscience, nor the moral judgments, to say nothing of the feelings, affections, and other cognitions, are allowed to have any moral quality in themselves.

The axe, reeking with the blood of its slaughtered innocents, is not yet sated; for in §58, Dr. Davis avers that the choice as an act, and the effort to realize the choice, are also necessitated and have in themselves no moral color. All this logically results from the philosophy of his psychology; he bravely advances the consequences of his theory.

Is there anything left that is moral? Yes, there is still a narrow neck of land, on which the right may place the sole of her foot; it is choice becoming intention; this alone is free, not caused nor necessitated, but truly moral. We are relieved that Dr. Davis does not throw himself into the arms of Mandeville, and declare that all morality is a delusion. Of course, he is right in declaring that choice as intention is free, not necessitated, and is moral; and wrong in affirming that it is not caused. Choice is an act, intention is an act; and an uncaused act is a palpably unthinkable absurdity.

We are not without hope of convincing Dr. Davis himself that he is trying to hold an untenable position; a position not essential to his Scotist, Arminian theory; and one where he is alone, having deserted his free-will colleagues. Choice or intention is surely an act, and as such must have an agent that causes it; Pelagian, Scotist, Arminian, must agree with Augustinian, Thomist, Calvinist, that this is so. This is not the issue in the case between these contestants; unquestionably the mind itself, as a will, is the cause of the act of choice or intention. But is the mind as a will itself caused to act in choice or intention? This is the issue. On this point

there are three radical opinions: the necessitarian determinist affirming that the mind as a will is caused to act by a power objective and different from itself; the fatalist by fate, the theist by God, the evolutionist by heredity and environment; the libertarian determinist, denying that the mind as a will is caused to act by any extrinsic, objective power, asserts that the mind as a will is caused or determined to act by itself as an intellect and a sensibility; and the indeterminist, denying that the mind as a will is caused to act by any power, extrinsic or intrinsic, objective or subjective, holds that the mind as a will is an original, undetermined, itself the determining, cause of choice or intention. Thus all three agree to the universality of the principle of causality, and differ only as to its application. Necessitarianism and indeterminism, extremes, meet in denying freedom to the mind in its cognitions, feelings, affections, and desires; they differ only as to the will; the former denying, and the latter affirming, its freedom. The libertarian determinists are at variance with the necessitarians *in toto* as to man's moral freedom, having no tenet in common; they agree with the indeterminists that the will is free from all extrinsic determination, and differ from them in asserting that the mind is free in all its acts, its cognitions, feelings, affections, desires, and volitions, free from all causal influence outside of itself.

Dr. Davis' position as to the non-morality of every human act, physical and mental, except the one act of choice or intention, is so extreme that he is not contented to leave it without a serious modification. There was a saving phrase in his negations, just referred to, which might easily be overlooked by all except the most careful reader. He denies that any of these acts has *in itself* moral character; and he complements his doctrine by asserting, in §60, that choice or intention imputes its moral quality directly to the cognitions and indirectly to the feelings and desires, and to man's external acts; that is, no act of conscience, no moral judgment, no affection or desire, is right or wrong in itself; it becomes so purely by reason of the act of the will in intention imputing moral quality to it. On this we remark, first, that it is not consistent with "the psychological order," to which Dr. Davis refers on page 98. He correctly teaches that this order is first cognition, then feeling, then desire, and, last of all, volition. He argues (page 98) that the feelings, as subsequent to and dependent on moral judgments, must get their moral character from those judgments; if this be true, how can intention, an element of the final act of volition, give moral color to the cognitions, feelings, and desires, to which it is subsequent and on which it is dependent?

Again, Dr. Davis is misled by the ambiguity of the word intention: he uses it, as a psychological term, to denote one of the elements of volition, making it synonymous with choice. He then applies it, without noticing the change, and, indeed, on the assumption that there is no change, to its more common ethical meaning as "one of the decisive elements in determining the moral character of an act." Take a concrete case, the killing of Abel by Cain; it was Cain's intention to kill Abel. This is the psychological use of the word: and the killing was done with an evil intention, that is, from the prompting of a sinful feeling of hatred and envy. It is manifest

that it was not the psychological act of intention on Cain's part which made the killing wrong; but that it was the wicked feeling which made the psychological act sinful. The psychological, volitional intention would have been the same had it been formed upon Abel's making a deadly and unprovoked attack upon him; but the ethical intention, or feeling, or desire, or motive, would have given it an opposite moral character. The intention to do an act, and the intention with which it is done, are quite different. We see that Dr. Davis has the morality located just where it does not primarily belong; the volitional act of intention is in itself morally colorless, and takes its ethical character from the antecedent moral judgment, feeling, affection, or desire which has caused it.

The primitive, fundamental moral act is cognitive, because cognition conditions and colors all the rest; as a man thinks, believes, so he feels and so he wills. Every mental act is free, and when it concerns moral issues, is ethical. An act need not be deliberately voluntary in order to be free and ethical. On the contrary, our most spontaneous, impulsive acts are free and ethical, and are indeed the surest index to our character; what we spontaneously do is the genuine outcome of our nature. Deliberative choice is a comparatively rare experience, reserved for occasions of special importance; and were our responsibility limited to it, our conduct, even on moral issues, would only exceptionally be ethical.

In the chapter on Duty and Virtue, he defines duty as that which is morally due to another; intending to discuss the question more fully further on, we merely remark here that this denies, and is meant to deny, that we owe any duty to ourselves. He asserts that in any concrete experience only one course is or can be right; suppose that Dr. Davis was at the northeast corner of a square, and wished to go to the diagonal corner, which would be the only right course for him to take, along the north side west, or along the east side south? He does not limit the statement to acts that involve morality; indeed, he seems to teach that every act is ethical. Virtue, he holds, "implies a contrary inclination, overcome by will" (page 139); if so, then as one more and more habitually does right until he finally has no inclination to do wrong, he becomes less and less virtuous, and finally ceases to be virtuous at all in the overcoming of an evil disposition; if so, then the spirits of the just made perfect, the angels and God, are not virtuous. This last he admits, and says that God and the angels are holy, but not virtuous. The grain of truth in these strange averments is that there is special virtue in mastering temptation and overcoming our evil inclinations. Justice, in its wide sense, he holds to be the sum of all virtues (page 141); and fortitude, prudence, and temperance as its subordinate cardinal virtues. This is Plato's teaching; while Paul made love the chief, and faith and hope its subordinates. He holds that vice is the subjection of the soul to the appetites and appetences, which he calls the passions (page 142); this is a common and bad form of vice, but not its only form; vile affections are vicious, and the unprofitable servant, the negative character, the man who simply did nothing but hide his talent, was declared a wicked, merely because he was a slothful, servant.

In the chapter on Selfishness, Dr. Davis says that the *alter ego* is the

self objectified, and that there is in reality no such thing; that self, considered as object, is a fiction. This is an interesting discovery, if true; but surely self considered as object is as real as the subject self; self is both the subject and object of cognition; know thyself is not a fictitious maxim. Founded upon this denial of the reality of an objectified self, he asserts that self-love is a contradiction in terms, and that, though contradictory in terms, it nevertheless exists as selfishness, is always selfishness, and always wrong. He further affirms that duty to self is self-contradictory, absurd, selfish; that we owe no duty to ourselves. He still further teaches that the so-called duties to self, such as temperance, pursuit of truth, economy, are all, when proper and virtuous, not at all for the benefit of self, but solely for the sake of others; though, as a matter of fact, self may incidentally share the benefits. This is extreme Buddhistic altruism. If self-love under all conditions and to every degree is wrong, then the Royal Law and the Golden Rule have not only an imperfect, inadequate standard, but a positively sinful, vicious one. If we owe no duties to ourselves, then a solitary hermit would be dutiless, as Dr. Davis indeed teaches. All this is not only contrary to the common convictions of men, but is clearly untrue, and is justified by no reason but mere opinion and assertion. On the contrary, the truth is, we are nowhere taught in the perfect code of revelation that it is selfish and sinful to love ourselves to the least degree, but an intelligent self-interest is repeatedly appealed to in the Scriptures, as we are exhorted to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. We are taught to deny ourselves for Christ's sake, and to crucify our affections and lusts that we may better serve God and our fellowmen; we are to love God supremely, and in honor we are to esteem others better than ourselves; but we are also told, both in the Old and the New Testaments, that our love for ourselves is a proper and high standard by which to regulate our love for others.

In the succeeding chapter on Service, Dr. Davis refers to Kant's teaching that man is never to be a means; that both ourselves and others are always to be regarded as ends; and gives his own view, that self is always by us to be treated as mere means, and never as ends; and that others are never to be used as means, except with their knowledge and consent, and for rightful ends. We do not agree with either of these eminent teachers, but hold that neither self, nor other men, are to be considered supreme ultimate ends, but always as subordinate to God, who is the only supreme final object of all service; that both self and others may be subordinate ends, and may be used as means for rightful ends; and that the knowledge and consent of others is not always necessary to make it proper to use them as means for rightful ends, as the punishment of a criminal without his consent is a proper means of vindicating justice, of deterring the vicious, and of defending the rights of the innocent.

In the chapter on Charity, he declares it to be the proper ethical end of all endeavor; here putting himself in line with Paul. Love is the basal ethical virtue, rather than justice; because love includes justice and transcends it. He properly teaches that love is superior to mere duty for duty's sake; the weakness of the high Shaftesbury-Kantian school of ethics. Kant is censurable for directly discarding the element of personal affection;

for the truest duty and right is permeated with love, so that we should say the highest principle is loving duty for duty's sake. In this chapter Dr. Davis asserts that only imperfect persons are under law; that "the holy angels and the Deity are under no obligation to do what they do"; the imperfect are conscious of obligation, the perfect of holiness. Except as a mere play upon words this is not true; no moral being can ever be absolved from the law of love and right; God is under infinite obligation to himself and to his creatures to be infinitely loving and just. It is not a weakness, but a perfection, to be under moral obligation to the right. In this connection he misinterprets Romans vi. 15, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace"; asserting that it means that the believer is under the constraint of love, not of law. While it is true that the believer is animated by a loving rather than a legal spirit, Paul is not referring to that distinction, but to the antinomianism, which held the believer to be absolved from a compliance with the demands of the law, and which was ready to sin, because not under the law, but under grace. We are not under the law as offering life for perfect obedience to its requirements, but we are under an even higher obligation of gratitude to render a loving service in a spiritual compliance with the law. Dr. Davis' interpretation does not fit his own doctrine, that the imperfect person is under obligation to law, and that only the perfect are absolved; for the believer, to whom Paul wrote, was an imperfect person.

In treating of Welfare, he declares it to be "the sum total of obligation." What is welfare? It is not mere pleasure, which belongs to the feelings alone; is not a universal end, for we sometimes desire what brings pain; has no moral quality; is only a subordinate object of desire; and is included in welfare. Happiness is not welfare, but is the consequent of welfare. Welfare is "the gratification of normal desire"; and consists "in seeking disinterestedly to promote the welfare of others"; these are his two definitions. They are not the same; the first makes welfare a gratification of desire; that is, a consequence of realized desire, which is a feeling and is commonly called happiness; distinguished from happiness in general, as that special kind which comes from the fulfilment of a special kind of desires, the normal desires. The other definition makes welfare an act, an effort, a seeking, which is volition. The first definition is egoistic, for gratification of desire is a subjective feeling of the person having the normal desire. The other is altruistic as well as egoistic; the seeking is egoistic, but the thing sought is the welfare of others, that is, the gratification of their normal desires. Both definitions are utilitarian; as both make the sum total of obligation to be the gratification of desire, or happiness; the one is egoistic, the other altruistic utilitarianism. Nevertheless, in a note (page 194), Dr. Davis says, "An action proving useful does not make it right, which reverses the order of production, but can only logically show it to be right. The utility is *causa cognoscendi*, not *causa essendi*, of rightness. An action that conforms to the law is right, regardless of consequences"—apples of gold in a framework of lead; the light of Goshen in the midst of Egyptian darkness; why was Dr. Davis not true to this throughout his discussion? At the close of the chapter, after criticising

the theories of others, he says that "the present treatise teaches that the aim and end of life is the harmonious and complete development of the man" [utilitarian, egoistic perfectionism], "each one devoting his constant and total activity to the welfare of his fellows" [altruistic utilitarianism]; the consequences, not the aim or end, of which will be perfect obedience to the law and the *unsought* happiness of himself and others. He had before said that the sum total of obligation is to *seek* the gratification of the normal desires of others; that is, their highest happiness.

The last chapter of the first part of the book, on Obligation, discusses the Deity, ignored by positivism and agnosticism, but a postulate of ethics as the final court of appeal, and scientific as complementing, rounding out the scheme of ethics, and as accounting for the unity of man and law. No position taken by Dr. Davis is a more serious error than his location of God in his system; he makes him the capstone of the column, instead of the foundation. God is the capstone, but he is more, he is the foundation also. He closes, completes, complements the discussion with God. This is well; but he should have begun the treatment with God, conducted it throughout upon the basis of God's moral supremacy, his authorship of the right, the Person to whom obligation is primarily due, and the Giver of Law. This makes his system prevalently humanistic; man is at the maximum, God is at the minimum; it is man's rights which are the basis of ethics, not God's right.

This is the stranger, when we observe that in this chapter Dr. Davis rightly teaches that God's nature is the ultimate ground of obligation. If this be true, as it is true, then perforce the nature of God, as the absolutely right, should have been made the starting point, the foundation of the system.

In his argument for the truth that God's will is not fundamental, he gives credit to an alleged reason, which is untrue, as inconceivable and indeed blasphemous. It is a reason generally urged; nevertheless to us it is a sacrilegious suggestion; he says, "Should God capriciously command lying, murder, theft;" such a thing is not thinkable concerning God; we would far sooner say, should light become darkness, should white become black, should truth become error, should virtue become vice; and the suggestion of its possibility is infinitely dishonoring to the thrice holy God. This is not the reason why God's will is not the ultimate ground of obligation; the reason is not ethical, but psychological; God's will is not the ultimate ground, because God's will is not psychologically ultimate, beyond it as conditioning it is his intelligence, is his infinitely holy nature. So Dr. Davis asserts in the succeeding paragraph; declaring, inconsistently with his theory of the autonomy of the will, that God's "original eternal, essential nature determines his will."

True to his utilitarian instinct, Dr. Davis gives as the reason why we should discharge our obligations to God, that "our conduct affects the welfare and happiness of our Father." He asserts that "God is no egoist, but an altruist; he did not make us, nor does he rule us for his own glory, but for our beatitude." This is both unphilosophical and unscriptural. Unphilosophical, in that God, as an infinite being, cannot have a finite

ground as the ultimate and sufficient end of his being and action; his purpose must be as infinite as himself, and, therefore, must be himself. It is also unscriptural; as Paul assures the Ephesians, in the first chapter of his epistle, that God's purpose towards man is higher than man's beatitude (vs. 4); God chose us "that we should be holy," not simply happy; and that the ultimate end of God's grace towards man is (vs. 6) "to the praise of the glory of his grace," (vs. 12) to the end "that we should be to the praise of his glory," (vs. 14) "unto the praise of his glory." Dr. Davis is so extreme an altruist that not only man must not be, even subordinately, an end to himself, but even the infinite God must not consider himself as an end of his action. It is needless to add that God's supreme egoism is an infinite altruism; that in doing all things for his own glory, he makes all things work together for the good of those who love him.

The remaining eighty pages constitute the second part of the treatise, and discuss ethics under the conception of Organization, the working together of men. In the chapter on Man, he holds that a solitary being would be absolutely non-moral; if true, this would divest God of all moral character prior to creation. It is based upon the misconception that a being owes nothing to the right, and nothing to himself. He further asserts that a man in society, destitute of affection, would be an immoral, hypocritical monster, and yet might be a good neighbor and citizen; this is not apparent.

In the discussion of the Family, Dr. Davis asserts the lawful supremacy of the husband outside the home, and of the wife inside. This is not consonant with the biblical injunction that the wife should submit to her husband in all things (Eph. v. 24). He holds that divorce is lawful for crime; this is doubtful, although the view of conservative and orthodox men; the writer believes that Christ did not justify absolute divorce for any cause, and that separation alone is allowed for crime. The prohibition of divorce by South Carolina is Christian and wise. Dr. Davis teaches that the family property is common to both the parents and to all the children; that the wife and husband should not hold separate estates; that the husband and father is simply the trustee for the family; and that the property should be used and devised in accordance with the judgment of the family council.

The chapter on the Community contains a brief discussion of the vexed question, whether a lie is ever justifiable, teaching the negative, and, while holding that not every deception is a lie, affirms that the presumption is against the rightness of deception. These statements seem to convey the truth on this important issue.

Dr. Davis holds to the dual nature of the State: political for the protection of the rights of its citizens, and economical to attend to the general interests of the whole Commonwealth. The publicists differ chiefly as to the latter function. Of course, the anarchist denies that there is any *raison d'être* for the State, political or economic; but it is generally held that the political function is indisputable, and that the only question is as to the economic; opinions varying from a denial *in toto* to the extreme of socialism, which contends that all the general interests of the community should be conducted by the State. The tendency of the times seems to be

towards a paternal socialism; though the most judicious thinkers doubt its expediency. We have already criticised Dr. Davis' views on the purpose of legal punishment, which purpose we hold to be chiefly vindicatory.

Dr. Davis teaches that the State is an exception to his law of altruism; it is exclusively egoistic and has no altruistic obligations; "the sole purpose of the State is the welfare of its constituents; it is in no sense a philanthropic institution; no government has a right to do charity outside its own jurisdiction, or to legislate for or to govern an alien people." Charity "belongs exclusively to voluntary institutions organized for the purpose." This condemns our war for the liberation of Cuba, and our legislating for and governing Porto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, and the Philippines. We naturally ask, How is it that the individual man, if he considers his own interest at all, is selfish and wicked; while a combination of men constituting a State is exclusively egoistic, and is not allowed the least altruistic beneficence? Contributions by municipalities to relieve famine in other sections, by Congress for the sufferers from the eruption of Mont Pelee, are not morally justified. He rightly contends that no war of conquest is just, and that the wronged State may rightly strike the first blow, if necessary, in its own defence.

The final chapter considers the Church. In his introduction to *Obligation*, Dr. Davis discards the Scriptures as authority in the science of ethics, and throughout the discussion to this point he has treated all questions from the standpoint of natural reason. Here, however, he discriminates between natural religion, which is based on reason alone, and revealed, which adds to and corrects reason by revelation, the basal authority. It is the church as organized Christianity; the scriptural organism of the scriptural religion, which is made an integral element of his scientific ethics. On page 37 it was unscientific to do this; on page 287 it is essential to a complete ethics to introduce revealed Christianity.

Dr. Davis is clearly right in his "sober, second thought." If the Bible is a revelation of truth from God; if it contains a divinely inspired and perfect system of ethics; if the reason of man is fallible, both imperfect and positively erroneous; then it is manifest that ethics, limited to the teachings of this natural reason, must be uncertain, unreliable, and more or less involved in error; while a system, intelligently and loyally based upon God's perfect teachings, must present a doctrine to which we "do well to take heed as unto a lamp shining in a dark place." Christianity not only expands and completes ethics, it founds, pervades, begins and ends it.

Dr. Davis defines a local church as composed of "a pastor, deacons and lay members," which fits the constitution of a congregational church, such as the Baptist, to which he belongs, but does not that of any other. He is compelled, however, to ignore the congregational idea in considering the general Church, "an organic union, constituting synods, conferences, councils," as the independent theory does not admit an organic union of the local churches into a body politic, or ecclesiastic.

He makes Christ the atoning Saviour, the King, the Son of God; teaches that Christianity should dominate all duties; repudiates the union of Church and State, as they differ in purpose, function, membership; local

limits, and propagandism; and declares the Church Catholic to be the most powerful institution ever known, and to be vigorous and ever growing.

As we make a general survey of Dr. Davis' entire discussion of ethics, we enter our dissent from his position, because (1) it is humanistic, as dealing primarily and chiefly with man's relations to man, ignoring his relations to his other fellow-creatures, and making God a mere complement to his system; (2) it is utilitarian, as making rights, not right, the basal truth, and as teaching that welfare, the gratification of normal desires, is the sum total of human obligation; (3) it is extremely altruistic, asserting that all love for self is selfish and wrong, and that we owe no duties directly to ourselves; (4) it is rationalistic, as rejecting the Scriptures as of authority in ethics, and basing the science on human reason alone; (5) it is Arminian, or Scotist, as holding that man is free only as his will is free from the determination of his intellect and sensibility, that the will alone is free, that the choice element of the will alone is free, and that all other powers of the mind are necessitated; and (6) it is non-Christian, as positively repudiating the authority of the Scriptures in ethics, and as bringing Christianity in merely to supplement the discussion.

Washington and Lee University.

JAS. A. QUARLES.

LADD'S "PHILOSOPHY OF CONDUCT."

PHILOSOPHY OF CONDUCT: A Treatise of the Facts, Principles, and Ideals of Ethics. *By George Trumbull Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University.* Cloth, 6x9 inches. 663 pp. Price, \$3.50. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1902.

To the serious student ethics must ever remain the crown of philosophy. Psychology, epistemology and metaphysics are of interest chiefly as they furnish a firm basis for ethics and throw light upon the problems of the practical life. Righteous conduct and the development of virtuous character are the chief concern in our present mundane existence. And hence ethics, which proposes to investigate the criterion, the sanctions, and the rational end of conduct and of character, as Kant long ago remarked, has always had a charm and interest for men. The student of philosophy is especially eager to read a new book on ethics; and hence it is with peculiar pleasure that I shall set forth the claims of this new work on ethics. To one but slightly acquainted with the books that have appeared within the past decade, it is apparent that the advocates of the "cerebral" psychology and of the ethics of biological evolution have had the field and exploited their doctrines. They have considered ethical problems as involving no higher laws than physical and biological. Professor Ladd's treatise of the facts, principles and ideals of ethics is a work to be profoundly thankful for by those who believe ethics is more than a mere descriptive science, and who have grown utterly sick at hearing so much chatter about naturalism and its attendant determinism. Professor Ladd's ethics is not controversial, and the distinctly critical portion is remarkably small when we consider the many opportunities that arise for it. But while not controversial in style, one feels that a great work has been done for a sound

idealism, and one arises from reading the book with the feeling that much has been said, and said in a masculine and scientific manner, that will go far towards establishing the principles of a more vigorous ethics than we have had of late. It strikes one, in reading Professor Ladd's treatise, that he is not deeply read in the history of ethics, but the book is all the more remarkable for this very fact. His present treatise is in an unusual degree the product of his own reflective thinking upon a mass of material drawn from many quarters. There is no one better fitted by past study and reflection for writing an acceptable ethics. He has approached the study of ethics through the doorway of psychology and metaphysics. In philosophy his authorship began in 1887, when he published the masterly work on psychology, considered from the experimental and physiological standpoint. This was followed, in 1894, by his *Psychology, Descriptive and Explanatory*. Then, turning to the more metaphysical aspect of philosophical study, the author published his *Philosophy of Mind*, which was followed, in 1897, by an essay on epistemology (*Philosophy of Knowledge*.) In 1899 appeared his metaphysics, with the title, *A Theory of Reality*. All these works seem to be a kind of propædeutic to the present work on the facts and ideals of ethics. It is built upon the facts and conclusions established in the other works, and this explains why there is such a copiousness of reference to the author's own works.

Turning more specifically to the book, we remark, in the first place, the very satisfactory method of treatment. Ethics can never be adequately treated so long as it is regarded solely as a descriptive science. Ethics inevitably involves the ideal. In three preliminary chapters the author discusses the sphere and problem of ethics, methods and divisions of ethics, and the conception of the good. There are generally held to be three main methods of treating ethics: the psychological, the "data of ethics" so called, *i. e.*, the historical, and the metaphysical. Professor Ladd insists upon the importance of studying ethics with due regard to the facts and principles of psychology. Moreover, the need of interpretation of the facts is imperative in any fair treatment of ethical problems. The conclusion is that an adequate treatment of the philosophy of conduct demands a combination of all three of the methods. After the three introductory chapters the book is divided into three parts: *The Moral Self*, *The Virtuous Life*, and *The Nature of the Right*. In the first part (pp. 59-207) the author gives an analysis of the moral consciousness for the purpose of ascertaining the equipment of the soul for the life of conduct. "Ethics, considered psychologically, will then have to consider the possibility and the actual nature of (1) ethical feelings, (2) ethical cognition, and (3) ethical volition or choice as a moral affair. . . . The psychological (whether or not it be also rational) primacy—the first position in the order of actual development—must be given to the feelings, where our problem is that of tracing the sources and the unfolding of the moral life of man, whether of the individual or of the race" (pp. 60, 61). After a careful analysis of the moral consciousness, the author proceeds to consider the feeling of obligation and other ethical feelings, the ethical judgment, moral freedom, and the moral self. In regard to the feeling of obligation the author says: "It appears,

then, that the student of ethics must assume, as the necessary presupposition of the origin and development of the moral life, the existence in man's consciousness of the germinal feeling of obligation. In its earliest manifestations this feeling is vague and obscure, as is the case with all emotional excitements; and like all other forms of feeling, it is mixed with emotional excitements of a different order and kind" (p. 79). And elsewhere he says, "All views which do not find the feeling of oughtness, as uniquely human among the most original data of ethics, have already been adjudged unsatisfactory. This feeling cannot be regarded as the outcome or expression of any purely cosmic process. It cannot be explained as the resultant solely of the working of social influences upon the mind of the individual" (p. 614). The chapter on Moral Freedom is a delightfully interesting and withal a profound discussion of the problem. And speaking of the so-called "free-will" discussions, the author says, "No student of ethics need hesitate boldly to call in question the somewhat too overbearing temper and self-confident tone of this current determinism. . . . There is absolutely nothing in the most recent discoveries, either of psychological or of physical science, which compels one to regard the deterministic solution as the only valid and scientific answer to the problem" (pp. 138, 139). This first part is chiefly concerned with the facts of ethics. Obedient to the general method of all his philosophical writings, Professor Ladd begins his treatise with the facts of ethical life. He amasses these facts from the sciences, especially from ethnology, anthropology and psychology. While controverting many of the conclusions of evolutionary ethics and "cerebral" psychology, the author makes generous acknowledgment of the materials contributed by them to the science of ethics. He asserts, for instance, in the light of all the modern research, and over against many of the modern theories of ethics, the agency and regnancy of the free self, and refers man's final freedom to the freedom of the personal God.

In Part II. (pp. 211-453), which might be called the interpretative, the author considers the virtues. He gives us a new and original classification of the virtues. It is utterly impossible, and moreover absurd, to attempt to reduce all the virtues to one all-comprehensive virtue. For "such a method inevitably results in several theoretical and practical evils: (1) the misinterpretation of the terms used by men generally to express the different virtues; (2) a narrowing of the conception of the morally most worthy manhood, either by leaving out of it certain virtuous traits, or by underestimating the value of certain aspects of the ideal of manliness; (3) a loss of roundness and harmony to the idea of the good man, which results from making him 'over-good' on some sides ('too good for this world,' as the somewhat misleading, yet expressive, popular phrase would say); and (4) an excessive abstractness,—the completion of the task of describing the total virtuous life in terms that cannot be translated into the concrete lineaments and full-blooded structure of a living organism" (p. 216). The unity of the virtues is found in the unity of the moral self—"the total human being, feeling, intellect and will." The virtues are classified into the virtues of the will, courage, temperance, etc.; virtues of the judgment (or intellectual virtues), wisdom, justness, etc.; virtues of feeling, kindness, sympathy, etc.

Part III. (pp. 457-656) is the more metaphysical portion of the work. Here the different schools of ethics are critically examined. The chapter on *Utilitarianism in Ethics* is especially fine as an acute piece of analysis and criticism. In this last part the author shows the absolute need for a metaphysics of morals. Other chapters are: *Legalism in Ethics*, *Idealism in Ethics*, *The Ethical Sciences*, *Morality and Religion*, *The Ground of Morality and the World-Ground*, *The Ultimate Moral Ideal*.

A general criticism of the book applies equally to all the recent works of the school to which Professor Ladd belongs: the ideal towards which we strive, the *summum bonum*, is left undefined and unanalyzed. It is true the author says we must act so as to most perfectly realize our fullest selfhood. But moral goodness, or the virtuous life, is a very complex conception. Just how we are to get the needed harmony in developing our myriad-sided self, it is perhaps impossible to know. There are certain minor faults one might instance, certain undignified slurs, that one wishes were not there; but the book is so excellent in many ways that one can easily forgive these minor blemishes. The author has often remarked that we need to get away from much of our modern sentimental ethics, and incorporate some of the rigor of Kantian ethics. One is struck, and moreover charmed, with the vigor of the system. The author thinks that "the ethical spirit is low and nerveless just now" in the church. The present work is a reaction against this present low standard of morals.

Hanover College.

FRAZER HOOD.

WAITE'S "HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION."

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION TO THE YEAR TWO HUNDRED. *By Charles B. Waite.* Fifth edition. 1900.

This is a most dangerous book for the uninformed. As it has been in circulation for more than twenty years, and has reached its fifth edition, it has probably been instrumental in turning many away from the belief of the truth, and served to confirm many doubters in infidelity. It seems to have been little noticed by those who are supposed to be "set for the defence of the gospel" (Phil. i. 17), while it seems to have attracted the notice of a large number of readers. The author, in his preface, announces, in quite a triumphant strain, that no serious attempt at refutation has been made. "In conclusion," says he, "we again call attention to the fact that none of the main propositions of this work have been in the slightest degree impeached; much less overthrown." The notice which drew my attention to the book, and led me to examine it, was in a very popular weekly, which lies on the study-tables of a large number of the reading ministers of the English-speaking world, and enters the homes of many of their educated hearers; and that notice stated the position of the book, which is entirely incompatible with the truth of Christianity—and, indeed, gave the gist of its argument—without a word of dissent or an intimation that there was any answer which could be made to it.

One might, ordinarily, hesitate before drawing attention to a book of the

kind, which it might be best to let die unnoticed; yet when he sees that it has been noticed in such a way, and that it is not proceeding to die, as one might hope it would, but is assuming new life and vigor for its deadly work, and when, moreover, it requires no skill in the reviewer to refute it, because he has only to stand by and point out certain events of providence which have already refuted it, his duty, it would seem, is to speak, and bid as many as he can reach look on and see how God has answered the accuser.

The notice referred to was in *The Literary Digest*, which described the author as "said to be a man of learning, who has spent many years in an exhaustive non-partisan study of the history of the early Christian church," and, moreover, speaks of him as a "judge." The conclusion of many readers would naturally be that here is an entirely disinterested and judicially fair view of the great subject.

The author's great object is to prove the late date, and consequent unreliableness, of the gospels. In the endeavor to prove this late date of the gospels, he broaches the theory that there were earlier gospels than ours which were "suppressed" by church authority, our present gospels being put in their place.

All who are informed on this subject know that in the second and the following centuries pretended gospels were published, generally by sects of heretics who tried by means of them to form a support for their peculiar views. Indeed, the publication of apocryphal gospels continues even to our own day, one purporting to be the report of Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius on the trial of our Lord having been extensively advertised only a few years ago, and sent abroad over our country to deceive the ignorant and fill the pockets of the man who pretended to have discovered it. The publication of such frauds began as early as the second century; but at no time was any one of them accepted as true by the church in general, though the deception was successful in certain localities—as is the case with the recent one just mentioned.

The author of this book bases his theory upon three writings which he claims were the original gospels, and which he avers were "suppressed," that the four gospels of the "New Testament might be put in their place, namely," *The Gospel of Paul*, *The Gospel According to Peter*, and *The Logia, or Oracles*, attributed to Matthew, which he thinks was the germ of *The Gospel According to the Hebrews*.

The author is so possessed with his theory of the "suppression" of earlier, and the substitution of later, gospels that, in his preface, he makes a considerable journey down through the centuries to find, in the fifth, what he considers a very striking instance. On page vii., Preface, he says:

"The fact is, there were various instances of the displacement of older gospels, and the substitution of the canonical in their stead. Even as late as the fifth century Theodoret found it necessary to suppress the gospel of Tatian, and substitute in its place the four gospels. 'I found, myself,' says Theodoret (A. D. 430), 'upwards of two hundred such held in honor among your churches, and collecting them all together, I had them put aside, and instead introduced the gospels of the four evangelists.'"

This was, for the author's purpose, a most unfortunate selection. This

book, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, here represented as an *older gospel*, which was "suppressed" that the canonical gospels (of later origin in the author's opinion) might be put in its place, has been discovered, and instead of sustaining this "suppression" theory, demonstrates the priority of our gospels.

"Judge" Waite, the author of this so-called *History of Christianity to the Year Two Hundred*, read, many years ago—and made his text-book—a work published in England at the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, entitled *Supernatural Religion*, a book which sadly misled many educated Englishmen, and has contributed to the making of an American a false guide for many uninformed readers. His book is evidently an echo of *Supernatural Religion*. The author of the latter work combined with a one-sided and superficial knowledge of patristic literature the set purpose to "down" Christianity by destroying confidence in the New Testament.

When, a quarter of a century ago, interest among scholars was awakening about *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, which was said to be a harmony of our four gospels, and on which Ephraim, the Syrian, wrote a commentary, he ventured to say that "no one seems to have seen *Tatian's Diatessaron*, probably for the simple reason that there was no such work."¹

After it had become very evident that there *was* such a work, he said in an edition of *Supernatural Religion*, published in 1879, "It is obvious that there is no evidence of any value connecting Tatian's gospel with those in our canon."²

Let us look for a moment at an event which showed the utter falsity of this. There had been for more than a century in the Vatican library an Arabic manuscript, which had been brought from the East, numbered XIV. At the instance of Prof. Theodor Zahn, who had some knowledge of it, it was translated into Latin and published in 1888. It proved to be the long lost *Diatessaron of Tatian*, and was seen to be no "suppressed" gospel at all, but a *harmony of our four gospels*, so woven together as to give a continuous account of the life and the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ. To the Tübingen School, of whose theory of the late origin of the gospels *Supernatural Religion* was an English presentation, it was like the stone from David's sling to the forehead of Goliath. The contention of this German rationalistic school that the gospels were not all written till 170 A. D. has vanished as completely as a pricked bubble. No self-respecting, well-informed scholar would now uphold it. Even such a leader among the former followers of Baur, the founder of the Tübingen School, as Adolf Harnack, of Berlin University, has said,³ "The presuppositions of the Baur School can now be fairly said to have been entirely discarded," and adds, what is very significant as bearing on the present case, "Yet there is left in biblical criticism, as an inheritance from that age, an undefined suspicion [captiousness!] of a kind practiced by a trickster lawyer, or, at least, a petty fault-finding method, which still clings to all manner of minor details, and from these argues against the clear and decisive facts in the case."

¹ Our author echoes: "We have come to the conclusion that it is extremely doubtful whether Tatian, the Syrian, ever wrote a Gospel."—Page 497.

² "The fact that Theodoret felt obliged to suppress it is inconsistent with the theory that it was a harmony of the four Gospels"—page 326—another echo.

³ *Die Chronologie der Altchristen Litteratur*, Introd., page 8 and following.

The *Diatessaron of Tatian* is so purely a harmony of the four gospels, without a shred of any of the many apocryphal gospels, that I have known it to be used in daily reading at family prayers as a "Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Four Evangelists." The differences in the forms of expression from those to which the hearers have been accustomed in reading our authorized version—differences due to translation from Greek into Syriac, and from Syriac into Arabic, and from Arabic into English, as well as some variations of text—enhance the interest without destroying the impressiveness of the narrative. The inevitable mistakes of copyists through seventeen hundred and fifty years are a matter of course, but are surprisingly few considering all the circumstances of the case. No one hearing this harmony read doubts that it was made up out of the very words of our four gospels, that of John being more largely drawn on than any other. What becomes of the theory of our author that the *Diatessaron*—the through four—is an *older gospel*, "suppressed" to give place to ours? *A shoe cannot be older than the leather of which it is made.*

Considering his object, it is not very strange that, in a fifth edition of the book, published in 1900, the discovery of the *Diatessaron* is not even mentioned, though it was published and in the hands of scholars in 1888. The same significant silence is maintained also about the discovery of *The Apology of Aristides*, in 1889, and that of *the new Syriac Gospels*, or *Lewis Palimpsest*, in 1892.

But what of the author's three "suppressed" gospels of the first century? Other discoveries have cleared up this whole matter, just as that of the *Diatessaron* wrecked the whole fabric which the Tübingen School of criticism had built up; but it may be safely affirmed that there will never be a discovery of the *Gospel of Paul*, since it never existed, except in so far as the *Gospel of Luke*, the companion of Paul's travels and imprisonments, is the *Gospel of Paul*, and that has never been lost. The author's contention here is too puerile to need refutation.

As to *The Gospel According to the Hebrews*, which the author thinks is a sort of second edition of the *Logia*, or *Oracles*, attributed to Matthew by Papias, the twenty-three fragments of it preserved in ancient authors show that is made up of statements of *our four gospels*, with fanciful and heretical additions,¹ so that it is a valuable witness for our gospels. The illustration of the leather and the shoe is applicable here too. Materials must be older than the articles manufactured out of them.

The Gospel of Peter, the author thinks, was another first century gospel which was "suppressed," while the Gospel of Mark took its place in the second century. Unfortunately for this theory, a considerable part of *The Gospel of Peter* was discovered at Akhmin, in Egypt, a few years ago, and, as a result, another iridescent bubble bursts. It is found to be dependent on our four gospels, as an inspection of it makes quite evident, with some remarkable heretical additions. These additions to, and charges in, the gospel narrative, are such that we are not surprised that Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, forbade its use by the church of Rhossus. The question as to which

¹ See Dr. Bernhard Weiss' Introduction, Vol. I., page 80; Vol. II., page 232 and following, and especially the fragments themselves.

were the original writings in this case is no longer a subject for guessing. The discovery of the *Gospel According to Peter* has made it plain. We have the testimony of such a scholar as Dr. Sanday, of Oxford, for instance, to this effect:

"The apocryphal *Gospel of Peter* is based on our gospels." (See his Bampton Lectures, and especially page 301, note.) He gives a number of instances in which terms peculiar to our four gospels are used in this *Gospel According to Peter*, besides other evidences of its dependence on them; and, referring to the heretical changes and additions in this so-called gospel, says of the author of it, "It is very plain when he begins to walk by himself." Referring to these eccentric features of the forgery, he says, "In all these ways, the contrast between the apocryphal gospel and the canonical gospels is marked. The latter are really 'a garden enclosed.' Intrusive elements seem to be carefully kept out of them. They preserve the type of language, as it can be abundantly shown that they preserve the type of idea, which was appropriate just to the three years of our Lord's public ministry, and no more."

The evidence might be given in detail, but this can hardly be deemed necessary. The writer of the introduction to the recovered fragment of the *Gospel According to Peter* in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Vol. IX.), though evidently a "liberal," does not even raise the question as to the originality of our gospels. His only question is as to whether the forged writing does, or does not, draw its materials from other sources besides our gospels. His conclusion is that, "Whether the author used any *other* sources than the canonical gospels is a matter still in doubt." He has found no clear evidence that any writings other than, and in addition to, our gospels were used.

But the fragment of this so-called gospel discovered at Akhmin, if space could be allowed to introduce it here, would itself furnish the most convincing proof the reader could ask of the fact that it drew its materials from all four of the canonical gospels. While it would be clearly seen, at the first glance, that it drew upon the three synoptics, a closer examination would show an undoubted dependence on John also.

Thus it may be seen that the *Gospel of Peter*, so far from coming into competition with the four gospels as furnishing original accounts of Christ, becomes a valuable witness for the previous existence of our gospels, and of their origin in the apostolic age. The very weapon which our author has chosen for the discrediting of our gospels has blasted his own pet theory. He has been hoisted by his own petard, and the cause of the gospels has gained a new witness of no inconsiderable importance. Not arguments of men, but events of God's providence, have thus again furnished irrefragable testimony for his Word.

The man who has lived without the assurance of God's guidance and protection has walked his path very blindly, and also very unhappily, bearing the burdens of life unconscious of help and support, and going on to the unknown to-morrow without assurance against its possible disasters. But the full belief in the superintending providence which extends to trifles as small as the falling of a hair of the head, and includes the assurance of the co-operation of all circumstances for final good to ourselves, gives us the assurance also that all shall work together for the church of God, against

which, we have the promise, that the gates of hell shall never prevail. As we see continually how even comparatively trivial circumstances have brought us great good, or saved us from great evil, and thus have evidence of an all-wise guidance and the work of an all-powerful hand, for ourselves, so we are encouraged to believe that, for the church, there is a guidance and protection as efficacious as that of the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night. And in this, too, we often see great results turn on apparently trifling circumstances.

Now that steamships are constantly crossing the ocean, no one pays any regard to the calculations of the great English physicist and mathematician of the early part of the last century by which he proved conclusively, to his own satisfaction, that no vessel could be constructed to carry enough coal to propel it across the Atlantic. His arguments no longer need to be refuted by counter argument. They have long ago been refuted by events. The case of the author of *Supernatural Religion*, and his American follower, the author whose book we have been considering, is precisely the same. These books have been answered by events of God's providence. We can only stand by and reverently say, "This work was wrought of our God." (Neh. vi. 16.)

Bethesda, Md.

PARKE P. FLOURNOY.

IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHRIST'S AUCTOR. A Manual of Christian Evidences. *By Warren A. Candler, D. D., LL. D.* Fourth edition. 12mo, pp. vi., 255. \$1.25. Nashville: Barbee & Smith, Agents. 1901.

In this work Bishop Candler disclaims originality, asserting that most of what he writes can be found in the apologetic literature of our own and other lands. One cannot help but feel the author's vigor, however, in the handling of the great theme. The special feature which marks this work, differentiating it from most others of its department, is the stress laid upon the testimony of Jesus. He believes, with Principal Cairns, that "the key of the position is the person of Christ," so that if the life, character and work of Christ can be accepted "as fact and not delusion," Christianity cannot be gainsaid. The larger part of the volume is the study of the evidences of Christianity from this viewpoint. As such it is strong and invincible, and as clear as it is vigorous.

THE DICTUM OF REASON ON MAN'S IMMORTALITY; or, Divine Voices Outside of the Bible. *By Rev. David Gregg, D. D., Pastor of Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.* New York: E. B. Treat & Co. 1902. Pp. 73. 50 cents.

Two sermons, full of the force and eloquence characteristic of the author, containing a discussion, in popular pulpit form, of the testimony for the soul's immortality which is found outside of the Bible. Dr. Gregg first asserts and proves the right of reason to be heard upon this subject, and on all subjects pertaining to religion, and then examines carefully the grounds of faith in immortality which reason presents.

BROADER BIBLE STUDY. Illustrated by Diagrams. The Pentateuch. *By Rev. Alexander Patterson, Author of "The Greater Life and Work of Christ."* 12mo, pp. 236. 75 cents net. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co. 1902.

The word "broader," as used by the author, means the giving of such a view of the Bible as will leave its whole scope impressed upon the mind. In the pursuit of this aim he studies the Bible in its historical aspects, rather than canonical form, and uses diagrams which appeal to the eye. In all, however, he regards the Bible as first of all spiritual in its aim, and this fact is kept in sight from beginning to end. The Pentateuch is the subject

of study in this volume, and the facts recorded are carefully studied in their relation to each other and to the development of the spiritual aim of the Word of God. The book is specially commended to those who desire to draw this class of lessons from the record.

WORLD-WIDE EVANGELIZATION THE URGENT BUSINESS OF THE CHURCH. Addresses Delivered Before the Fourth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, Toronto, February 26–March 2, 1902. 8vo, pp. xiv, 691. \$1.50. New York: The Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 3 W. Twenty-ninth Street. 1902.

Next to attendance upon the great Convention, whose full report is given in this large volume, is the privilege of reading the addresses delivered there. These are all embodied in this book. Added to the body of the book is a classified list of the illustrative matter of the volume, together with a useful index, which makes the material gathered from so many sources useful and ready of access. As the report of what was perhaps the most notable gathering for missionary purposes since the great Ecumenical Conference in New York, this volume will be of great value to all practical students of missions.

PRESBYTERIAN HOME MISSIONS. An Account of the Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. *By Sherman H. Doyle, D. D., Ph. D.* 12mo, pp. xiv., 318. \$1.00 net. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1902.

So far as we know, this is the first separate, well-filled book devoted to the great theme of Home Missions. As such, we welcome it. It will elevate and strengthen the work for which it pleads, and whose methods and results it sets forth. After a "Foreword" by Dr. Henry Collin Minton, it describes, in its several chapters, the Home Board, the work among the Indians, the Alaskans, the Mormons, the Mountaineers, the Mexicans, the Foreigners, the Islanders, and in the Great West. Its author does not show a thorough knowledge of some features and facts of the mountain people, and needs to correct some mistakes in that chapter. The book, as a whole, is a most interesting, instructive, and stimulating one.

TWENTIETH CENTURY ADDRESSES. 12mo, pp. 275. \$1.00 net. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1902.

The addresses gathered together and given permanent form in this small volume were delivered before the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church, in celebration of its first meeting in the new century, in May, 1901. The speakers were Drs. Willis G. Craig, Henry C. McCook, Henry Collin Minton, George T. Purves, Marcus A. Brownson, Samuel J. Niccolls, and Mr. Robert E. Speer. Included in the volume are also an Introduction by Dr. W. H. Roberts, and the Moderator's Sermon by Dr. Charles A. Dickey. The themes presented are a Review of the Nineteenth Century, the Progressive Development of the Presbyterian Church, the Divine Purpose Develope!

in the Progress of Time, the Problems of the Twentieth Century, the Speedy Bringing of the World to Christ, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the Duty and Opportunities of the Presbyterian Church in the Twentieth Century.

CHRISTENDOM ANNO DOMINI MDCCCCI. A Presentation of Christian Conditions and Activities in Every Country of the World at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century, by More Than Sixty Competent Contributors. *Edited by the Rev. William D. Grant, Ph. D.* Two volumes. New York: William D. Grant, 27 Rose Street. 1901.

In two volumes, embracing about eleven hundred pages, with many pages of illustrations, the editor gives us an immense amount of information concerning the religious status in the opening year of the new century. The first volume gives thirty-one separate papers on the people and religions of the different countries of the world, and with special account of the conditions of Christianity in them. The countries are presented in alphabetical order. In the second volume he presents thirty papers discussing the various forces and forms of Christianity. Among the writers furnishing the papers collected in these volumes are President John H. Barrows, Dr. George T. Purves, Dr. W. C. Gray, all of whom have so recently passed away, as well as many of equal note who are yet living.

THE RISE OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AMERICA. *By Sanford H. Cobb.* New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902.

THE HAND OF GOD IN AMERICAN HISTORY. *By Robert Ellis Thompson, S. T. D.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1902.

These two books may well be read together. They discuss the development of those principles which have become distinctive of the American people, and especially the religious side of our national life. Mr. Cobb shows that it was not to the Pilgrim Fathers only, nor to Roger Williams, nor to the Catholics under Lord Baltimore, that the honor of enunciating or enforcing the doctrine of religious liberty must be paid, but that it was an idea which gradually developed from feeble beginnings in Plymouth to its full declaration in the Constitution. Dr. Thompson's treatise follows the later history of our country, coming down to the recent war with Spain. His work is along more spiritual lines. His maintenance is that the biblical idea of a chosen people is practically projected into our day, and that America is one of God's chosen peoples. Discussing recent events and political questions, it is natural that Dr. Thompson should express views from which many of his readers will depart. These, however, do not lessen the general value of the work.

EXTEMPORE PRAYER: Its Principles, Preparation, and Practice. *By the Rev. Marshall P. Talling, Ph. D.* 12mo, pp. 302. \$1.25. Chicago, New York and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

The author pleads for more care on the part of those who do not use formal liturgies or books of prayer in fitting themselves for this part of the

public worship of God. He inveighs sharply against set forms of prayer, and against carelessness as well on the part of those who reject forms. He urges attention to the voice, the manner, the language, and the structure of prayers, and makes many happy suggestions. A number of specimen prayers, gathered from many different sources, are given.

THE STORY OF THE TOKEN, as Belonging to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. *By Robert Shiells, F. S. A. Scot.* Second edition. 16mo. pp. xxi.. 196. \$1.00 net. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work. 1902.

Mr. Shiells won for himself, by the first edition of this book, a Fellowship in the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. He is a ruling elder in the church of Neenah, Wisconsin. His Scotch birth and associations, quickened by keen antiquarian tastes, have caused him to gather the finest store of the old "communion tokens" known in America. His book is a study of the history of the token, as used in the sacrament. It is illustrated with a large number of valuable plates. The unique custom of using tokens has almost passed away, but there gather about it many tender associations and thoughts, and all who treasure the memory of these will delight in the pages of this bright and learned little book. To the student of history it comes as a remarkably able and painstaking study of an interesting ecclesiastical custom.

WHAT IS RELIGION? AND OTHER NEW ARTICLES AND LETTERS. *By Lyof N. Tolstoi.* Translated by V. Tchertkoff and A. C. Fifield. 12mo. pp. 177. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1902.

An answer to the inquiry, What is religion? by Count Tolstoi, may be readily forecast by all who know his reputation and views. A Protestant, a reformer, a socialist, an iconoclast by temperament, his attitude towards the faith as held by the vast majority of Christians of every name is such that practically all look upon him as representing only himself. The fundamental principle which he sets forth in this book, and for which he pleads for recognition, is the equality of men. He charges all religions with having concealed and distorted this essential feature because it has been advantageous to them to do so. Because the Christian faith teaches this principle with special clearness, he thinks that special effort has been made to distort and conceal the teachings of Christ on the subject. To those who are familiar with the writer, it is enough to say that the book is Tolstoian from beginning to end.

THE CLAYBORNES. A Romance of the Civil War. *By William Sage.* With illustrations. 12mo, pp. 404. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1902.

A very pleasant, but not very strong or striking, picture of scenes and events of the civil war. The story is chiefly that of a young Southerner

who was in the United States army when the strife began, and who refused to leave the army and go with his State. The story is greatly marred by a profusion of profanity on its pages.

JEZEBEL. *By Lafayette McLaws.* Illustrated. 12mo. \$1.50. Boston: Lothrop Publishing Company. 1902.

BELSHAZZAR. *By William Stearns Davis.* Illustrated. 12mo. \$1.50. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 1902.

THE GATE OF THE KISS. A Romance in the Days of Hezekiah, King of Judah. *By John W. Harding.* Illustrated by George Varian. 12mo, pp. 404. \$1.50. Boston: Lothrop Publishing Company. 1902.

The prevailing craze for the historical novel is finding a fruitful field, as these three books indicate, in the remote ages of biblical history. Not many of this class of works, however, will survive the year in which they appear. Few of the writers are able to project themselves into the time and temper of such distant times and peoples, and the effort to do this becomes ludicrous to the thoughtful student or reader. The three books before us signally illustrate this fact. The effort to idealize a Jezebel, and win for her, not merely tolerance, but sympathy and admiration, even though made as skillfully as by Miss McLaws' pen, must inevitably fail. Mr. Davis' *Belshazzar* is perhaps better as a picture of ancient Babylon, restored by recent archeological investigation and study, than as a tale. As such, it is a little better than the ordinary run of such novels. For *The Gate of the Kiss* there is no reason, unless it be the exploitation of the author's use of words. As a story, it is poor; as a picture of ancient life, it has little merit; as a means of cultivating a love for the pure and the good, it is a failure. Its baldness and suggestiveness are such that the book should be kept out of the hands of the young. It is the story of the ensnaring of a sweet singer of Israel by a courtesan of Babylon, to the undoing of both.

UNCLE SAM'S BIBLE; or, Bible Teachings About Politics. *By James B. Converse,* author of "*The Bible and Land,*" and formerly Editor of the *Christian Patriot,* and the *Christian Observer.* 12mo, pp. 230. Chicago: The Schults Publishing Company. 1899.

The author states in the preface that this book is a looking at political questions from the standpoint of righteousness or conformity to God's will. The general theme of the book is the relation of the Bible to political issues and reforms. The form of discussion adopted is the conversational. Twenty-eight theses are presented and discussed.

In the introductory part of the volume the author, after stating the need of righteousness, maintains that righteousness is conformity to God's law; that the Bible is the best means of learning God's law; that Christ is the teacher of it, and that expediency cannot teach it, and that it is our duty to study that law. Among the general principles which he lays down and

argues are that the sole duty of civil government is to do justice to all; that the powers of government are from God; that the people are the God-appointed judges to decide what is righteous; that women, as a part of the people, have a share in judging; that the labor question is religious; that all have a right to work, that none should live without work, etc. Some of the reforms which righteousness requires are, equal taxation to pay all the expenses of civil government, the repeal of unnecessary taxes, free trade, honest money, remonetization of silver, the abolition of interest, the single tax, the enforcement of Sunday laws, the public ownership of natural monopolies, the destruction of trusts, the abolition of the liquor traffic. As one may readily see, the author has laid out for himself a large "contract" in the discussion of these questions. Very many of his positions will not be accepted by many who follow his statement of them, but their earnest presentation in this book will quicken interest and promote study of these great problems.

PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE, AND OTHER ESSAYS. *By J. H. Muirhead, M. A.* 12mo, pp. 274. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. \$1.50.

A collection of papers and addresses on subjects connected with logic and ethics, with a few of a more general character, such as "Robert Louis Stevenson's Philosophy of Life," "Modern Methods of Temperance," etc.

THE TRUST—ITS BOOK. Being a Presentation of the Several Aspects of the Latest Form of Industrial Evolution. *By Charles R. Flint, James J. Hill, James H. Bridge, S. C. T. Dodd, and Francis B. Thurber.* With Numerous Expressions of Representative Opinions, and a Bibliography. Edited by James H. Bridge. 12mo, pp. 255. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 1902.

To those who desire to study the subject of trusts from the standpoint of those favoring them, this collection of papers will be the very thing they wish. The discussions are not complete, however. They deal rather with certain general principles which are not controverted by many than with those questions which are the real ones in this practical problem of modern life, viz., the conditions under which industrial combinations may be properly permitted, and the limits and rights which should be recognized.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY AND CIVICS IN THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL. *By Henry E. Bourne, B. A., B. D.* 12mo, pp. 385. \$1.50. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1902.

The subjects considered in this volume are the meaning of history, the foundation of historical scholarship, the facts of most worth, the source method, the methods of teaching practiced in the schools of Germany, France and the United States, suggested courses for the study of the history of all periods, etc. The book is intended as a guide to the teacher of history, to enable him to direct his classes to the more important features of each

period, and to suggest to him such reading as will best furnish him for his work. To the latter end a somewhat complete bibliography is attached to each chapter.

FINLAND AS IT IS. *By Harry De Windt, F. R. G. S.* Illustrated. 12mo. pp. 316. \$3.00. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902.

The recent complete and forcible absorption of Finland by Russia has brought more prominently to view than ever before the country, customs, cities, and people of this interesting land. This volume gives a complete survey of all these. It is written in a happy vein, warm and sympathetic.

THE BIBLE IN STORY. *By W. F. McCauley, D. D.* 8vo, pp. 375. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company. 1902.

The author's effort here is to show the reasonableness and importance of faith in Christ by the study of the various periods of Bible history, and of the books and characters of the Bible. The conversation is used as the literary form in which the story is told.

PROBLEMS OF THE TOWN CHURCH. *By George A. Miller.* 12mo. \$1.00. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1901.

A discussion of the needs of the town church and the methods of meeting them, and written from the experience and counsel of over five hundred pastors of such churches. Very few questions or problems that arise in such pastorates will be found omitted here. The book gives many practical suggestions and helps.

WINDOWS FOR SERMONS. *By Louis Albert Banks, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 433. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1902.

A collection of illustrations, drawn from very many sources, and chiefly from the author's reading of books and papers and observation of current movements and events. Dr. Banks is well known as a popular illustrative preacher. His illustrations are sometimes sharper than they are accurate, and, as with many such preachers, sometimes must needs be dragged in by the scruff of the neck to do unwilling service. An index aids the student to make ready use of the contents of this volume.

MUSINGS BY CAMP-FIRE AND WAYSIDE. *By W. C. Gray, late Editor of "The Interior."* 8vo, pp. 350. Illustrated from photographs taken by Dr. Gray. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

The silence of the sweet voice that sung these poems from the woods gives them now a richer and fuller meaning than ever. Those who followed Dr. Gray's "Camp-Fire Musings" for so many years through the columns of his ever bright paper, will welcome this addition to their store.

THE METHODIST YEAR-BOOK, 1902. *Stephen V. R. Ford, Editor.* Pp. 198.
New York: Eaton & Mains. 1902.

As usual, this *Year-Book* is full of information concerning the great Methodist body. Statistics, lists of meetings, descriptions of work, comparisons of the results of different periods, etc., make up a wonderful array of facts for the encouragement of that people in their work. In a chapter entitled "Retrospective," some attention is paid to the initial year of the century, and special mention is made of the untimely death of that great Methodist, President McKinley. In a chapter entitled "Fellow-Laborers," many co-ordinate branches of work, such as the Y. M. C. A., American Sabbath Union, temperance organizations, are described and their results declared.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review.

(CHANGE OF TITLE.)

CLUBBING RATE.

The PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW will in future be issued as the PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW. The price will remain as hitherto—\$3 a year. Arrangements have been made with the publishers, by which subscribers to the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY may have both publications at a club rate of \$4, strictly in advance.

This amount must accompany the order, and be sent to

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
1001 Main Street, Richmond, Va.



THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 61.—JANUARY, 1903.

I.

MODERN ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE newest and freshest of studies to-day is the science of archaeology; and this is true, even though the statement may seem to contradict the very word itself, as archaeology means the science and study of the most ancient things. In Palestine, Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and other countries contiguous to the Holy Land, and frequently referred to in the Old Testament, the spade of the archaeologist has been busy for many years digging up the buried records of peoples and empires that have long since passed away. These records afford an opportunity to test the trustworthiness of the Scripture record which students and critics have not been slow to utilize. The discoveries in this sphere of scientific investigation have been more confirmatory than was even hoped, of the antiquity and historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament. It is too soon to gather in all the results of archaeological science and study; we can now only point to what is going on, and to a few discoveries of great value that have been made. We give here only a general and popular estimate of the apologetic value of these discoveries. For accurate and scientific treatment of this subject the reader is referred to the many valuable and elaborate treatises in book form that are constantly issuing from the press.

The beginnings of literature in the East are now being brought to light for the first time. A race of people known as the Semites migrated in the far distant past from their Arabian desert home northward, to the lands that we know as Babylonia

and Assyria, being at once driven by famine and drawn by trade into these more productive regions. They found a home in the fertile plains of Shinar or Sumer, the garden-spot of Southern Babylonia. The type of civilization which they found here, known as Accadian, exerted a large and lasting influence upon the new-comers. The Babylonian and Assyrian Semites adopted what is known as the cuneiform mode of writing, so called because of the arrow-like, or wedge-shaped, form of characters used. The Babylonian and Assyrian are but different dialects of the same language, which belongs, as do the Arabic and Hebrew, to the Semitic family of languages. Assyrian and Babylonian literature is very extensive, and is considerably more ancient than that of the Hebrews. This "elder sister of the Hebrew," as the Assyrian is called, has, through the discovery of its long-buried literature, thrown a flood of light upon the study of Hebrew history and literature. The time was when all Babylonian and Assyrian elements in the Old Testament language and literature were supposed to date from the time of the Babylonian and Assyrian captivity; and a late date (exilic or post-exilic) was therefore assigned to all Hebrew literature containing such elements. But since the discovery of this large body of ancient Assyrian literature, it has become evident that there was abundant opportunity for contact between Hebrew and Assyrian sources of literature in times antedating, by many centuries, the period of the captivity. These archaeological discoveries go to show that the age of Abraham was one of great literary activity and productiveness. Indeed, for many centuries before Abraham lived records were made by kings, priests, and scholars of what they considered the most important events. They wrote on soft brick tablets, which, when hardened, preserved intact for centuries, some of them even to this day, the characters written upon them. Some of these tablets are known to date from the age of Sargon, about 3800 B. C. How far back of this the beginnings of literature may yet be carried is a question the answer to which waits upon the discoveries of future archaeologists.

Bible students who are fortunate enough to own the latest editions of the Oxford and other Bibles containing illustrations

are familiar with the accounts given of the Rosetta and Moabite stones and the Siloam inscription. The *Rosetta Stone* was discovered in 1799 among the ruins of a fort near the Rosetta mouth of the River Nile, in Egypt. It is a slab of black basalt, upon which is found an inscription written in three different characters—the hieroglyphics of the priests, the ordinary language of the Egyptians used at that time (about 200 B. C.), and the Greek language. Previous to this discovery it was impossible to decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphics, or to interpret the Egyptian language; but this stone furnished the key for interpreting both the language and the hieroglyphics of Egypt by means of the Greek version of the inscription accompanying them. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this discovery to the science of Egyptian archæology and history. The *Moabite Stone* was found at Dibhan, in the land of Moab, in 1868. This stone has an inscription upon it that was written about 890 B. C. by Mesha, king of Moab, to celebrate his victory over Israel, in the days of Ahab, and the restoration of cities and other works which he undertook, as he there says, at the command of his god Kemosh. It would be interesting to study both the agreements and discrepancies between this inscription and the narrative in the Old Testament, but space here and now does not permit. The *Siloam Inscription* was found in 1880 on the inside of the conduit or tunnel that leads from a fountain or spring outside the city of Jerusalem to the pool of Siloam within the city. The tunnel was cut in the solid rock under the wall, probably in the age of Hezekiah, about 700 B. C. This inscription states that the excavators of the tunnel began at the ends and worked toward each other, and as they approached, each body of workers could hear the other speaking for some time before they had made connection.

Among the earliest and most interesting finds in oriental archæology are the Assyrian and Babylonian accounts of the creation of the world, the fall of man, the deluge, and the institution of the Sabbath. As the home of the human race was in this part of the world, and as it was from this section, embracing Ur of the Chaldees, that Abraham came forth on his long migration

westward, we should expect to find some confirmation of the biblical narrative among the literary remains of these ancient empires. The parallelism between the Babylonian account of the creation and that of Genesis is very striking, showing a common origin, whichever may claim priority, and yet the differences are no less striking than the resemblances. "The polytheism which underlies the one, with the thinly veiled materialism which overlies it," says A. H. Sayce, the archæologist, "is not more profoundly contrasted with the devout monotheism of the other than is the absolute want of mythological details in Genesis with the cosmological myths embodied in the cuneiform poem. We pass, as it were, from the *Iliad* to sober history. Where the Assyrian or Babylonian poet saw the action of deified forces of nature, the Hebrew writer sees only the will of one supreme God." A garden of Eden, with its fruit trees, its tempter, and serpent biting the heel, and in turn being crushed as the enemy of God and man, the Kerubim guarding the sacred gates when man had forfeited by sin his rights to the garden, are all in Babylonian story, suggesting its connection with the Scripture narrative. Not a few German theologians of distinguished ability, and some few English scholars, have maintained that the Sabbath was distinctly a Jewish institution of Mosaic origin, and that the Sabbath law came, therefore, to an end with the old dispensation, and is, hence, not binding upon Christians. This position could never have been maintained if these writers had possessed the knowledge which is now brought to light by the discovery of the ancient literary monuments of Babylonia. "The Sabbath rest was a Babylonian as well as a Hebrew institution," says the same writer quoted above. "Its origin went back to pre-Semitic days, and the very name 'Sabbath,' by which it was known in Hebrew, was of Babylonian origin. In the cuneiform tablets the *Sabattu* is described as a day of rest for the soul. The word was derived by the Assyrian scribes from the two Sumerian or pre-Semitic words, *sa* and *bat*, which meant respectively 'heart' and 'ceasing.' The Sabbath was also known even in Accadian times as *dies nefastus*, a day on which certain work was forbidden to be done, and an old list of Babylonian festivals and fast days tells us that

on the seventh, fourteenth, nineteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth days of each month the Sabbath rest had to be observed. The rest enjoined on the Sabbath was as complete as it was among the Jews in the period after the Babylonish exile."

The oldest of the Chaldean tablets that bear on the Old Testament are those describing the flood: the date commonly assigned to them is about 2350 B. C. The Babylonian narrative agrees with Genesis in representing this great catastrophe as a punishment sent upon mankind for sin, the ark (or ship) is built in response to prophetic warning, and in obedience to a divine command, the general details in the preparation of the ark are similar, the sending forth of birds, building an altar, the rainbow, the use of the number seven, and many other points present such striking resemblances as make it as certain as anything of this kind can be that the two accounts had a common origin, or else that the later was derived from the earlier. Until recent excavations were made, critics were in the habit of discounting as untrustworthy, if not altogether fictitious, the narratives found in the tenth and fourteenth chapters of Genesis. Archæology, however, has rescued both of these chapters from the doom to which the critics had assigned them, and placed them among the most genuine and trustworthy records of ancient history. Mr. Sayce and other archæologists have taken up the statements of these two chapters in detail, and have made out a strong and satisfactory argument, based on the cuneiform records, in favor of their general trustworthiness as history.

Perhaps the greatest triumph of biblical archæology over hostile criticism is connected with the name of Belshazzar, as found in the Book of Daniel. Critics charged that the name of Belshazzar was nowhere else known, and that all other authorities represented the last king of Babylon as being not of royal descent, but a usurper; and, moreover, he was not killed when Cyrus captured Babylon, as the Book of Daniel represents Belshazzar to have been. The Book of Daniel, the critics insisted, by thus representing the last king of Babylon as being a son (or grandson) of Nebuchadnezzar, as bearing the otherwise and elsewhere unknown name of Belshazzar, and as having been killed in the

downfall of the city, forfeited all right to be received as a trustworthy historical document, they contending that it was a fictitious narrative written in the age of the Maccabees, about 150 B. C. But some four or five decades ago the world was startled by the discovery in ancient "Ur of the Chaldees" of several long-buried cylinders bearing the name of Belshazzar as the son and co-regent with his father, who, though a usurper himself, married, it seems, the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, which made his son to be a grandson of Nebuchadnezzar through his mother, and it is a well-known fact of Hebrew etymology that the word *ab* means either father or grandfather. Nor is Belshazzar the only one long buried, who, at the call of modern archæology, has come up out of the dust in his grave-clothes to laugh to scorn the claims and arguments of hostile critics, who have ever been too fond of discrediting the truthfulness and accuracy of the biblical writers.

By the aid of modern archæology what had been considered prehistoric times have become historic. We find that, many centuries before the age of Abraham, highly civilized and cultured peoples occupied various portions of the eastern hemisphere. The children of Israel are now seen to have been one of the small tribes of antiquity, and their land, viewed in the light of archæology, owes its chief significance and importance to the fact that it was the hostile ground between the two great rival powers located respectively on the Euphrates and the Nile. The historian who has been so long dependent upon the literature of the Old Testament for his facts concerning the countries, peoples, and times covered by these sacred books is now the possessor of a rich and continually increasing store-house of information that is being rapidly brought to light by archæologists. There has been published, up to date, as a result of these archæological discoveries, more than six times as much literature as is found in the entire Old Testament, and yet not one-fourth of that which has been excavated has been published. In 1872 the library of Assurbanipal, the last great king of Assyria (668-626 B. C.), was unearthed in ancient Nineveh, and was found to contain thirty thousand tablets and cylinders. These literary records were found to be arranged according to topics, just like our

modern libraries. Those coming to consult the library had every facility for ready reference. In 1878 archæologists discovered at Bosrah, in lower Babylonia, the records of the career of Gudca, the great ruler of Gadash, who lived about 2800 B. C., several centuries before Abraham. At Nippur also, in the same part of Babylonia, thousand of tablets have been recently dug up, many of them belonging to the temple library there, and while this article is being prepared, the newspapers announce fresh discoveries of greatest interest and value among the ruins of this ancient city. New light has been thrown on Abraham and his age. This venerated Hebrew name has been found on several Assyrian tablets. "The father of the faithful," who migrated southward and westward from his Chaldean home, and founded the Hebrew race, lived originally in the capital of his nation. The records now in our possession show that books and libraries abounded everywhere about him. Works on grammar, astronomy, mathematics, jurisprudence, poetry, history, art, science, and philosophy were accessible to the students and readers of that day, and there seem to have been many who used these libraries. Abraham's intellectual opportunities and training seem to have been scarcely less than those enjoyed by Moses in Egypt, or Saul, the learned disciple of Gamaliel, and the educated Roman citizen.

But still fresher and more valuable, if anything, than these discoveries in Babylonia are others in the land of Egypt, where the children of Israel are represented in the Bible as having spent four hundred years. Until recently, there was no confirmation of the main details of the Scripture narrative, and it was, therefore, as a matter of course, set aside by a certain class of critics as untrustworthy in all points that it suited their literary hypothesis to call in question. Recent excavations in Egypt have opened up literary monuments that already vindicate in part, and promise ere long to vindicate in whole and fully, the historic trustworthiness of the Hebrew narratives with regard to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt. It was in 1887 that at Tel-el-Amarna, in Egypt, a large store-house of most valuable clay tablets was found. Many of them are letters or reports addressed to the king of Egypt by vassal or tributary kings in Canaan. They are

written in cuneiform characters, and are supposed, many of them at least, to have been written in the fifteenth century before Christ, during the age of Moses. One of the most curious of these tablets is from one Ebed-Tob, king of Salem (ancient Jerusalem), which bears a striking resemblance in some respects to what is said in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis concerning Melchizedek, the priest-king of Salem, whom the critics, before this discovery, had been much inclined to regard as a mythical character. These tablets prove that the people of Canaan, before its occupation by the children of Israel, had a large body of native literature, and possessed an intimate knowledge of Babylonian literature and customs, although at that time tributary to and dependent upon Egypt. Quite recently the name of Israel has been found for the first time among the hieroglyphic records of Egypt. The Pharaohs of the Oppression and of the Exodus have been both identified. One of the very latest discoveries is that of one of the treasure cities built by the children of Israel in Egypt (Pithom), the excavators even finding the section in the wall above which the bricks used were without straw.

The late discoveries by archaeologists of the remains of the Pharaohs of the Oppression and of the Exodus have proved of the greatest possible interest and value to Old Testament students. The mummy of Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, is preserved in the Museum of Gizeh, as also that of his father, Seti I., who doubtless began the oppression. The Pharaoh of the Exodus was Meneptah II. One of his inscriptions alludes to the children of Israel as being "without seed," confirming (as is supposed by some) the wholesale destruction of the male infants. Many inscriptions tell us of the sudden death of his eldest son, and heir to the throne, which accords perfectly with the Scripture account of the death of the firstborn in Egypt at the time of the Exodus: "From the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maidservant that is behind the mill." We learn from the Books of 1 Kings (xiv. 25) and 1 Chronicles (xii. 2-4) that Shishak I., king of Egypt, captured Jerusalem and the fenced cities of Judah in the fifth year of Rehoboam, who succeeded Solomon. This king had supplanted

the Pharaoh whose daughter Solomon had married. On the southern wall of the court of the great temple of Amun at Karnak, in Egypt, Shishak had inscribed a remarkable description of this conquest, confirming in every way the allusions in Kings and Chronicles, and adding information not found in the Hebrew Scriptures. He had his own figure cut on the rock in heroic size, representing him as holding in his hand a rope that was tied around the necks of the twenty-seven petty captive kings, whom he brought into subjection on this trip, they being represented in diminutive size in contrast with his own heroic figure.

It was about the middle of the last century that archæologists succeeded in translating an inscription that had been long known to exist at Behistun, in the Lagros Mountains of Persia. It was placed there about 515 B. C. by order of Darius Hystaspes, and was entered in three languages. As the Rosetta Stone, with its three languages, had unlocked the Egyptian language and hieroglyphics, so this inscription, when, after much guess-work, it was finally correctly read, proved to be the key to unlock the vast libraries of ancient Persia and other surrounding countries using the cuneiform characters. This poured a flood of light on the Books of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. Up to this time, the Book of Esther had been looked upon by many as a literary romance of no real historic value; but it now appears, in the light of archæological discoveries, that its descriptions of Ahasuerus and the palace at Susa, no matter when the book was composed, correspond accurately with the capricious character of Xerxes, and the royal palace that has been found buried in the ruins of Susa.

Archæology presents some of these ancient heathen kings in an entirely new light. Take, for instance, the literary records of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Some of the prayers of this king are truly remarkable, heathen and polytheist though he was. When he ascended the throne he addressed the following prayer to his god:

“O eternal Ruler! Lord of the universe!
Grant that the life of the king whom thou lovest,
Whose name thou hast called, exalting him to the throne,
May flourish as seems good to thee.

Guide him in the path of righteousness.
 I am the ruler who obeys thee, the creature of thy hands.
 It is thou who hast created me,
 Thou who hast entrusted to me the sovereignty over mankind.
 According to thy mercy, O Lord, which thou hast bestowed upon all,
 Cause me to love thy supreme rule.
 Implant the fear of thy divinity in my heart.
 Grant to me whatsoever may seem good before thee,
 Since it is thou that dost control my life."

It is doubtful if Solomon in all his wisdom has much surpassed this prayer—or David, indeed, or any other psalmist or prophet. We are not in the habit of thinking that the heathen kings who are described in the Old Testament as the enemies of God and man were accustomed to pray such prayers as this; and yet this prayer was addressed to the great god Marduk, and not to Jehovah, whom Nebuchadnezzar and his contemporaries regarded simply as Israel's God. Nebuchadnezzar was one of the most pious of the many heathen kings whom the Old Testament mentions. These kings, doubtless, were all as religious in their way as were the kings of Israel and Judah, and perhaps as true to their gods and their ideas of devotion. Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions are almost invariably closed with a prayer, and some of the noblest of these prayers, as to diction and elevation of thought, are offered at the dedication of temples which he had either built or restored. Thus—

"O great Lord, upon entering joyfully into this thy glorious temple,
 Look with favor upon thy precious handiwork.
 Mercy toward me be thy command;
 Through thy righteous order may I have abundance of strength.
 Long life and a firm throne grant me.
 May my rule last forever!
 With a righteous sceptre of blissful rulership,
 With a legitimate staff, bringing salvation to mankind adorn my sovereignty forever.
 With strong weapons for the fray protect my soldiers,
 Then, O Shamash, by oracle and dream, answer me correctly.
 By thy supreme command which is immutable,
 May my weapons advance, strike, and overthrow the weapons of the enemies."

King Cyrus was also, according to lately discovered records, a more than ordinarily religious ruler. The clay cylinders which

bear his name tell the story not only of his valorous deeds, but also how he was blessed by the gods in reward for piety and devotion. They show that he regarded himself as the man of destiny. One of the inscriptions reads thus, "He [Merodach, his god] sought for, he found him, yea, he sought out an upright prince, after his own heart, *whom he took by his hand*, Cyrus, king of the city of Anshan; *he called his name*; to the sovereignty of the whole world *he called him by name*. Merodach, the great lord, the guardian of his people, beheld with joy the blessed deeds and his upright heart; like a friend and helper *he marched at his side*." Cyrus was a polytheist, and had no disposition to degrade and dethrone the gods of the peoples whom he conquered. Moreover, his uniform policy as a conqueror was to restore exiled and captive peoples to their own lands. (See Ezra i. 2.) One of his inscriptions reads, "All of their peoples I gathered together and restored to their own dwelling places." Compare with these inscriptions the statements found in the forty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, *whose right hand I have holden*, to subdue nations before him. . . . *I will go before thee*, and make the crooked places straight. . . . I the Lord, which *call thee by thy name*, am the God of Israel. For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." The parallelisms here found are certainly remarkable. Are they accidental, or was there some connection between these writings?

Among the sacred relics of the orient which archæology has brought to light are found many penitential psalms uttered by these worshippers of false gods. This is a specimen:

"I, thy servant, full of sighs, call upon thee;
 The fervent prayer of him who has sinned do thou accept.
 If thou lookest upon a man, that man lives.
 Besides thee, there is no guiding deity.
 I implore thee to look upon me and hear my sighs.
 The sin that I have committed I know not.
 Known or unknown god, my sins are many; great are my transgressions.

The Lord has looked upon me in the rage of his heart.
 A god has visited me in his wrath, and brought me into pain.

I seek for help, but no one takes my hand.

I weep, but no one approaches me.

I call aloud, but no one hears me.

Full of woe, I grovel in the dust without looking up.

To my merciful God I turn, speaking with sighs.

O Lord, look upon me; accept my lament.

O Lord, do not cast aside thy servant overflowing with tears: take him
by the hand.

The sin I have committed change to mercy.

The wrong I have done, may the wind carry off.

Tear asunder my many transgressions as a garment.

My god, my sins are seven times seven: forgive me my sins.

My goddess, my sins are seven times seven: forgive me my sins.

Known or unknown god, my sins are seven times seven, forgive me
my sins.

Known or unknown goddess, my sins are seven times seven, forgive
me my sins.

Forgive me my sins, and I will humble myself before thee.

May thy heart be glad (pacified) as the heart of a mother who has
given birth; as that of a father who has begotten a child.

Instead of food, I eat bitter tears;

Instead of date-wine, I drink the waters of misery.

For my drink I have bitter waters.

Instead of clothes, I am enveloped in sin.

O my god, who art angry with me, accept my prayer.

O Lord, in mercy and compassion look upon me;

O thou who guidest the span of life against the encroachments of
death, hear my prayer.

May my sins be forgiven, may my transgressions be blotted out.

May the bond be loosened and the chain broken.

May the seven winds carry off my sighs.

Let me tear away my iniquity, and let the birds carry it to heaven.

Let the fishes take off my misfortune, and the stream bear it far away.

May the beasts of the field take it away from me.

The flowing waters, may they wash me clean.

Let me be pure like the sheen of gold.

As a ring of precious stone, may I be precious before thee.

Remove my iniquity, save my soul.

Thy temple court will I watch, thy image will I set up."

Until archaeology began to yield up its secrets, we certainly have not been accustomed to think of the heathen as uttering such devout and tender psalms of penitence as these. It is not strange that a race of people who worshipped the divine being in such prayers as the above could send forth an Abraham to bless the world, and become the father of the faithful.

Here is another impressive utterance of one of their sacred poets. It reminds one of the Psalms of Scripture:

"Powerful one, self-created, beautiful to behold, whose fulness has not been brought forth,

Merciful one, begetter of everything, who among living things occupies a lofty seat,

Father, merciful one and restorer, whose weapon maintains the life of the whole world;

Lord, thy divinity, like the distant heaven and wide ocean, is full of fear.

Father, begetter of the gods and of men, establishing dwellings, and granting gifts,

Calling to sovereignty, giving the sceptre, who decreest destinies for distant days;

Strong chief, whose wide heart embraces in mercy all that exists,

No god reaches to thy fulness.

In heaven who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted.

On earth who is exalted? Thou alone art exalted.

Thy strong command is proclaimed in heaven, and the Igigi prostrate themselves.

Thy strong command is proclaimed on earth, and the Annunaki kiss the ground.

Thy strong command on high, like a storm in the darkness, passes along, and nourishment streams forth.

When thy strong command is established on the earth, vegetation sprouts forth.

Thy strong command stretches over meadows and heights, and life is increased.

Thy strong command produces right, and proclaims justice to mankind.

Thy strong command through the distant heavens and the wide earth extends to whatever there is.

Thy strong command, who can grasp it? Who can rival it?

Lord, in heaven is thy sovereignty, on earth is thy sovereignty.

Among the gods, thy brothers, there is none like thee.

O king of kings, who has no judge superior to him, whose divinity is not surpassed by any other." (*Boscawen.*)

This is but one of many different renderings given of these ancient prayers and hymns. Translators are by no means agreed as to the exact ideas meant to be conveyed by the words found on the ancient tablets. But no one can read these psalms of the ancient poets and worshippers of the gods without having his respect for the heathen and their religions greatly increased.

A hundred years ago it was customary for the higher critics to write in depreciation of the Old Testament, because its statements were unverified from other sources. The following may be given as a fair sample of the way they wrote:

“The fourteenth chapter of Genesis was the invention of some enthusiastic Jew for the purpose of lauding the military ability of Abraham, and to explain the origin of the tithe system and of Melchizedek. And as to the Hittites, there is no extra-biblical evidence that such a people ever existed at all, and certainly not in or near Palestine. They are simply one of the mythical people with allusions to which the Old Testament is filled, and are introduced by the imaginative and ambitious historian merely to magnify the vast administrative ability of David and Solomon in commanding and using foreign peoples in their armies and in their service. Moreover, to further illustrate the historical untrustworthiness of the Old Testament record, take one name mentioned in Isaiah (xx. 1), that of Sargon, who is called king of Assyria. This name is not found in any other literature as the king of Assyria. It is manifestly absurd to say that such a name is anything but a myth, or a scribal error.” (See Price’s *Monuments and the Old Testament*.) In very much this style the critics wrote until archæology began making its revelations. But now, as we have seen, the allied kings who captured Lot and were later routed by Abraham, and others, have been identified by archæologists, and new light has been thrown on Melchizedek, which not only confirms his historic verity, but explains a hitherto unaccountable fact, how that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seemed to know certain facts about this priest-king of Salem, that are not even hinted at in the Old Testament records, but which facts were generally known, as shown by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. Hittite monuments have been unearthed, showing this race to have been one of the most powerful tribes located north of Palestine, and fully corroborating all that is said of them in the Old Testament. Sargon’s name and records have not only been brought to light by archæologists, but the ruins of his ancient palace have been unearthed, and it is now thought to have been the most magnificent palace the world has ever seen, covering an area of more than twenty-five acres. He reigned 722–705 B. C. Less extensive, but still of magnificent proportions, is the palace recently uncovered belonging to his son Sennacherib, who was king 705–681 B. C. And yet more beautiful, perhaps, was another palace that has been found belonging to another king of

Assyria, Assurnatsirpal, who reigned in 884–860 B. C., and was a contemporary of Omri, king of Israel. “There is no part of the Old Testament upon which the monuments have thrown more light than upon the tenth chapter of Genesis. It shows us that the names which are here arranged ethnographically present the chief settlements of the descendants of the sons of Noah. Out of this formerly mysterious list of proper names the inscriptions verify the accuracy of more than thirty, by indicating both places and peoples. The inscriptions both of Egypt and of Mesopotamia also corroborate in many particulars the statements of this chapter. In a word, this table is a limited bird’s-eye view of ancient nations, a word-map of ancient geography.”

We have given here only a brief survey of what has been accomplished by modern archæology, and many other equally important discoveries have not been even mentioned. One needs to read the daily associated press dispatches to keep up with the most recent discoveries in archæology, and to read ponderous volumes to learn how many important and interesting records have already been brought to light. The facts which we have presented, however, will suffice to make good the statement made in the beginning of this article, when we declared that the value and importance of recent archæological discoveries, in their bearing on the literature of the Old Testament, cannot easily be overestimated. The legal, historical, prophetic, and poetical portions of the Old Testament canon are all receiving a new light in which they will be reread with interest. Not all our traditional views regarding the Old Testament are being corroborated; but that the general historical trustworthiness of these ancient Scriptures is being constantly and powerfully confirmed is a fact so evident that even hostile critics are forced to acknowledge it. Shall we not say that a narrative which has threaded its delicate way so safely and successfully through the long centuries of man’s history, and whose historical trustworthiness is so well attested, and so powerfully confirmed, is a most worthy vehicle for the transmission of that moral and spiritual truth which it was the great purpose of divine Inspiration to reveal and record?

WILBUR F. TILLET.

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

II.

IS BAPTISM INITIATORY?

BEFORE this question can be answered intelligently, it is necessary to ask another, What is meant by initiatory? As applicable to the case in hand, Webster defines initiatory thus, "Tending or serving to initiate; introducing by instruction, or by the use and application of symbols or ceremonies." This, properly understood, may be said of the ordinance of baptism, so that there would be no objection to the use of the word in this sense. But there is another sense which is put upon it by Baptists, and others, which has been perhaps unconsciously adopted even by pedobaptists, so that it has come to be practically the universal idea which comes into the mind when the word is used. The conception which is thus introduced is foreign to the true nature of the ordinance; in fact, never was true of any of the sealing ordinances, either of the Old Testament or the New. The idea is that baptism is the door of admission into the church, and is just as necessary to admission as going through the door of a house is necessary to entrance into the house. Is this true? No, it is not. The church is not a house, and has no door. The idea contained in the word is too materialistic. The designation of baptism as the door of admission was no doubt originally merely an inaccurate use of figurative language, but it has become so common that it is forgotten that it is figurative, and that it never was anything but a bungling application of the figure at best. The idea developed out of that language is, that baptism is absolutely necessary to entrance into the church. But this is essentially a ritualistic conception, and its truth may be boldly challenged. It exalts the symbol into a reality, confounds shadow with substance. It is a species of sacramentalism, and is essentially unevangelical, and only fit for a Romanist or a high-church Episcopalian. Pedobaptists should by all means abandon the use of a term which springs out of the abuse of a figure, and which

now carries with it an essentially ritualistic conception. It is to little purpose to explain that this is a modern conception, which did not originally attach to the word "initiatory." The answer is, that whatever may have been the meaning, it is now so inextricably involved in ritualism that its use should be entirely abandoned. We can substitute a word which is more correct in itself, and which sounds so much like it that its substitution will not be difficult for pedobaptists, while it will in time perhaps prove an unconscious corrective (if nothing more) to Baptists, just as "initiatory" has unconsciously involved in ritualistic ideas those who warmly repudiate ritualism when it clearly appears as such. Let the word "initial" be used in connection with baptism instead of "initiatory."

Those who hold that baptism is initiatory—and there can be no doubt that not only Baptists, but some Presbyterians have this idea—must be prepared to show that baptism is a *sine qua non* of church membership, in such a sense that church membership does not obtain until the ordinance has been performed. Can such a proposition be sustained by scriptural proof? It may be confidently asserted that it cannot; on the other hand, it can be shown that church membership invariably precedes the application of the initial sign and seal.

A study of the signs and seals of the covenant, from Abraham down, goes to establish this view of the matter. Abraham received the promise which made him the father of the church before the sign of the promise was given to him, or even mentioned. The exercise of faith which was counted to him for righteousness was his acceptance of the promise in the form in which it was given in Genesis xv.; but it was on the occasion of the promise of the seventeenth chapter that the sign of circumcision was given. Paul draws an argument from this in Romans iv. very different from that conception of baptism which makes it the door of the church. The blessing was pronounced upon Abraham while still in a state of uncircumcision, and he argues from this that the promise may and does apply to Gentiles as well as Jews, telling us distinctly that "the sign of circumcision was given as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in

uncircumcision." The time which elapsed between the giving of the promise of chapter xv. and that of chapter xvii. must have been considerable, for Sarah got tired of waiting for it, and allowed her faith to waver. Ishmael was born, and was circumcised the same day that Abraham was, and yet he was not the child of promise—that is, not of the true invisible church—a circumstance which is fatal to ritualistic conceptions of this initial ordinance. There is no reason to doubt that Ishmael's external standing, however, as a child of Abraham, was recognized in the giving of the seal, and that he lost this external church connection by his own bad behavior, by which he exhibited his profane spirit, and his contempt for the promise and its seal. Isaac, the child of promise, was afterwards born, and circumcised, according to the command, on the eighth day, as a son of Abraham. He was a true spiritual child of Abraham, but it is impossible to show that his circumcision, as a sign of the covenant, indicated anything more or different from the rite as performed upon Ishmael. It did not signify a present regeneration in the one case any more than in the other. It was the sign of a spiritual promise, it is true, but it was a race badge which in both cases alike indicated that they were members of the Abrahamic race to whom the promise had been given. It could not indicate what particular sons of Abraham would follow in the steps of his faith, much less did it presuppose faith in any of them as individuals. The sign was not initiatory, for the reason that Abraham's sons were born such, and the sign only indicated this fact in relation to the covenant. The sign, being a seal of God's promise, did indicate that some of Abraham's children would be spiritually minded children, but as regards individuals it was dumb; it gave assurance of neither obedience nor faith, much less did it presuppose either.

When we come to the exodus from Egypt, and the establishment of the Jewish national church, we find that the distinctive sign which marked Israel as God's people was the institution of the passover. But this did not constitute them his church, they were already such; and he had before this distinctly indicated as much by the renewal of the Abrahamic covenant in Exodus vi.

(Ex. vi. 1-8). Thus the passover, which was the initial seal of the church in the second stage of its development, was not initiatory.

- When we come to Sinai, and the sealing of the Sinai covenant, or the covenant of the law, this was applied to Israel as already God's people. They had already been constituted the national church at the time of the Exodus, and this new covenant, in which the people themselves took part, merely completed the formal organization of the national church.

The seal of the Sinai covenant furnishes the prototype for baptism. The people were sprinkled with blood and water (*cf.* Heb. ix.) upon their profession of allegiance to Jehovah as the God of their salvation, and after they had made a solemn promise of obedience. The ceremonial was the seal of a compact which had solemnly been entered into with God. But the agreement was the essential matter. The seal was only attached, so to speak, to a document already drawn up and subscribed. That document embraced the whole law, moral and ceremonial. The agreement was with Israel as a people, and the whole people, as gathered in public assembly, were sprinkled, in ratification of the compact. (Ex. xxiv. 8.)

Now the people being assembled as a people, there is no reason to doubt that they were assembled according to families, just as they went out of Egypt. The family constitution of the church had been particularly emphasized by the sign and seal of the passover. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that the children were included in the sealing ceremonial of Sinai, as they had been included in the foregoing seals. This was the first case of ritual baptism, for the word is applied to it in Hebrews ix. If any one doubts that infant baptism occurred at this time, let him take note of the fact that it was expressly provided for in the law of ritual baptisms with the water of purification. These baptisms had reference to the birth of the child, and signified just what infant baptism signifies to-day. Instead of indicating their regeneration, it indicated that they were born in sin and needed regeneration.

Now, it will puzzle the Baptists to explain why the children

were included in a covenant which required the subscription of the people, or a profession of obedience. How did this differ from a profession of faith? The people must necessarily have faith in order to make this profession of allegiance to the true God. If, then, there had been a change in the constitution of the church, why did it not occur just at this point, where the element of profession was introduced? Did the people profess obedience on behalf of their children? No, how could they? But they could and did acknowledge that their children, as well as themselves, owed allegiance to Jehovah as their God, and, like Abraham, they obligated themselves to instruct those children in the knowledge of the true God and their relation and duty to him.

Now, to return, baptism as first practiced on Mount Sinai, although a sign and seal of the covenant of the law, was not initiatory.

The baptisms with the water of purification, which evidently grew out of the original sprinkling on Sinai, were analogous with it, both in form and meaning. It was called the water of purification or separation. It was a water of purification in that its application was intended to remove ceremonial defilement; it was the water of separation in that it removed the cause of separation by removing the defilement which shut out from God's presence and worship. It, therefore, would naturally carry both the ideas of justification and of sanctification which were contained in the Sinai ceremonial. As a representation of the justification which comes through atonement, the water of purification had the ashes of the sin-offering, which was used instead of the blood of the sacrifice on Sinai. This was a necessary variation of the symbol, in order that it might be always ready for use. The water in each case meant the same—the cleansing of the Spirit. The meaning is indicated in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27, where we learn that purification meant heart-purity or regeneration (or spiritual renovation), and that it symbolized the agency of the Holy Spirit. Purification or cleansing was the underlying idea of all the ritual uses of water. As one of those baptisms was a self-washing, we find the word "washing" applied to baptism in general, as in the phrase, "washing of regeneration," which again

indicates that regeneration is the underlying truth contained in the symbol; not necessarily the fact of regeneration, but the need of regeneration.

We come now to John's baptism, which was a forerunner of Christian baptism. It cannot be shown that it differed either in idea or in application from the baptisms which preceded it. John gave no explanation of his baptism, except that it was a baptism of repentance, and none was needed. Just as in the purifications of the Mosaic ritual, it conveyed the idea of confessed impurity and need of cleansing; in other words, of sinfulness and of repentance, and need of regeneration or sanctification. It bespoke anew the obligation of obedience to God, and implied a renewal of allegiance to him. John's baptism, of course, stood for his preaching. The phrase "baptism which John preached" expresses this idea. But his preaching had reference to the coming Saviour; therefore, allegiance to God, which was now professed anew, was to be exhibited by faith in him who was about to appear. He was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire—was thus to give the real cleansing which water baptism signified. He was able to do this, because he was "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and his work was thus a fulfilment of all the Mosaic ritual in its two grand divisions: First, the sacrifices; second, the ritual sprinklings, which signified the accompaniments of justification, regeneration and sanctification.

John's baptism was not initiatory, for he was an Old Testament prophet, and did not inaugurate the Christian dispensation.

When he baptized most of his disciples, his testimony was not yet complete, because the Saviour had not yet appeared. But when the Saviour did appear, and John's disciples accepted his testimony, as they professed themselves ready to do, they were Christians—made such by faith in the personal Saviour. John's baptism was, therefore, an advance upon the ritual baptisms of the law, in that repentance towards God was expected to develop into faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, who was immediately to appear. His profession of obedience was expected to become

an "obedience of faith." Since, then, John's baptism was prospective, it was in no sense initiatory.

Now it is for Baptists to explain how baptism got to be initiatory. They take their pattern from John, but the fact is that the bulk of John's professed followers did not become Christians; his baptism, therefore, was not initiatory, in such cases, for the simple reason that it did not initiate. The faithful ones, however, did constitute the charter members of the Christian church, and as far as the record goes, never received anything but John's baptism. The initiation of these was not by their baptism, but by their faith, which developed subsequently to their baptism. It is impossible to show that they needed any other baptism, since their faith in Christ was prospectively symbolized by John's baptism.

It is for Baptists also to show that little children were not included in John's baptism, together with their parents. Why should they not have been? The parents' faith was as much prospective as their own must be. The slight difference in time when the faith would be developed is of no moment.

It is for Baptists to show that there were no children in "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region around about Jordan," who came to John for baptism. Was the fact of its being a profession of repentance any barrier? Was this any more than the profession of obedience on Sinai?

Now, if there were children in the families of those who proved themselves to be true disciples of John, and such children received baptism together with their parents, is there any reason why they also should not have become full communicants of the church, upon a profession of their personal faith, without rebaptism? If the parents became full-fledged members of the Christian church, with nothing but John's baptism, it is difficult to see why John's baptism would not also be good enough for those children who came to years of discretion and exercised faith after the Christian dispensation was fully inaugurated. Is there anything in the record which militates against such an idea? If so, what? On the other hand, the record is favorable to this view. The Lord's Supper, instituted in the upper room and given only

to the apostles, was the introductory seal of the New Testament dispensation. Did the church then consist merely of the apostles? Were not the hundred and twenty in Acts i. clearly recognized by the apostles as members of the church of which they were the leaders? Did not they give this recognition in the very fact of moderating the meeting for church business? And yet there is no mention of their having received the supper at that time. They were, therefore, members without any distinctive seal of the new dispensation. The Lord's Supper, therefore, although the initial seal of the New Testament dispensation, was not introduced as an initiatory seal. Baptism was not such for the reason that the hundred and twenty could not have received an ordinance which was only to become established on the day of Pentecost, after the Spirit's baptism had been received, the very baptism John had promised from Christ. The two dispensations are so continuous that there is no well-defined line separating the two. There is nothing recorded as to the organization of the distinctively Christian church, unless the meeting of the hundred and twenty was such. If that was the organization it took place without baptism, which is fatal to Baptist theories. If the meeting of the hundred and twenty was not the organization, then it was organized, if at all, when the Lord's Supper was instituted; but it was not full-fledged and duly launched until the day of Pentecost. It goes without saying that the giving of a distinctively Christian ordinance like the Lord's Supper implied the existence of the Christian church, even if we do have difficulty in putting our finger upon it. Most certainly, then, baptism was not initiatory at the time of the organization. The supposition that all John's disciples had an opportunity of becoming members of the Christian church without rebaptism is supported by the record concerning Apollos, in Acts xviii. Apollos, who was well instructed in the Old Testament Scriptures, got to be a Christian preacher while "knowing only the baptism of John." After hearing him, and perceiving that his knowledge was not as clear as it should be, Priscilla and Aquila expounded to him the way of God more perfectly. He was kindly received by the brethren, who encouraged him, and "wrote to the disciples to receive him."

Not a word said of his baptism. He was a faithful disciple of John, and so a natural disciple of Jesus, and may represent the whole class, infants as well as adults, who became Christians by simple development of faith without other than John's baptism.

But how about the Ephesian disciples of John mentioned in Acts xix., who were rebaptized? They offer no difficulty, but rather go to prove the rule. The record shows that they were ignorant of the Holy Spirit, therefore their knowledge of Jesus must have been very defective, and their faith, if they had any, very unintelligent. The difficulty was not with their baptism, but with their faith; and as their faith was judged to be insufficient, they were rebaptized as new converts, whereas otherwise they would not have been. Paul did not ask them whether they had received Christian baptism, but whether they had received the Holy Ghost when they believed, showing that it was expected that all believers would receive this spiritual baptism whether in Jerusalem or elsewhere. This was the essential baptism, that which water baptism signified. Paul must have known that they had not received the Christian baptism, and yet he asks, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" Their answer betrays their ignorance of the ordinance of baptism as well as of the faith of Jesus. They answer (literally): If there is a Holy Ghost, we did not at all hear of it; that is, we heard no direct mention of the Holy Ghost in connection with our baptism. Paul answers, in effect: Ah! what then did your baptism mean—into what sort of a creed were ye inducted by this symbol? When they reply, "Into John's baptism," he proceeds to supplement their defective idea of John's teaching by telling them that John required faith in Jesus whom he heralded. Since he did tell the people that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Ghost, they certainly had not gotten into the full merits of John's teaching, which when complete implied faith in Jesus, and carried with it the very doctrine which they professed to have heard nothing about. They were evidently not intelligent disciples of John, and had received a symbol which they did not know the meaning of, and so their profession was adjudged to be null and void, and they were baptized *de novo*.

The incident goes to show that John's disciples needed no additional water baptism, but only the Spirit baptism, which constituted the opening of the new dispensation. That baptism, which was manifested on the day of Pentecost by the tongues of fire and the gift of tongues, must have been something more than simple regeneration. It must have been a quickening of believers, both in grace and knowledge of the truth, so that they were able to testify for Christ. It imparted sanctification and gifts for service in addition to regeneration. There is no reason why the New Testament symbol of baptism should not include the idea of sanctification as well as of regeneration. In this sense it is still a prospective symbol, even as applied to adults who make an open profession before baptism; and in this view of the case there is no reason why it should be initiatory in the sense of a necessary antecedent of membership.

We find the first mention of distinctively Christian baptism in the commission which constitutes the marching orders of the New Testament church. Christ said, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations"; (literally, disciple the nations.) The nations were to be made disciples; that is, Christianized. Is there not here a hint of the organic nature of society, as composed of families, like the nation of Israel? He adds, "Baptizing them [the nations] into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you." Baptism was to be given as a badge of discipleship, which discipleship was not to be regarded as perfected by recognition and reception into the church. The church was to be a school of instruction in all the paths of righteousness. Baptism, then, the external badge of discipleship, may well be symbolic of continued sanctification, and there is no reason to construe the great commission as changing either the meaning or scope of baptism, much less of inaugurating a radical change in the constitution of the church. The participial form of the clause having reference to baptism, would rather indicate that it was a well-known ordinance. It cannot be successfully held that the fact of its being "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" was a radical change. Have

we not just learned from Paul's own teaching that John's baptism contained a specific reference to Christ and the Spirit, as well as the general idea of God and his salvation?

What is there to indicate a change in the constitution of the church? Does not the reference to the "nations" as the parties to be Christianized rather indicate that the King and Head of the church still takes into account the organic nature of society? Why should not the family constitution of society be as efficient an instrument of the propagation of the gospel now as it was in the development of Israel in the knowledge of the true God? Is there any doubt that human nature is the same to-day as it was in the early ages, and is there any reason, in the nature of the case, why a heritage of truth should not be as valuable now as it ever was in the history of the world? Do we not see it exemplified to-day in the various walks of life? Why, then, should not the child of to-day, who is a member of a godly household, receive the sign of the same covenant, which bespeaks, as of old, his priceless heritage in the knowledge of the true God and his salvation? It indicates that he stands upon a vantage ground with reference to the truth which cannot be successfully questioned. It does not mean that he is conceived to be a Christian at his birth, but that he is unquestionably placed in a better position for becoming one. His baptism is a constant reminder, not of the fact of salvation, but of the need of salvation; not of the fact of an accomplished regeneration, but of the need of a change of heart, through the Spirit's influences.

We knock out the last prop of the Baptist theory by denying that baptism is initiatory, even in the case of adults who are baptized upon profession of their faith. It is not baptism, but profession, which gives admission in this case. It is the fact of discipleship, just as in the case of John's disciples. Baptism indicates in symbol what has already been professed by word of mouth. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Those who unite with the church on profession of faith really claim that they have been already saved by the regeneration of the Spirit, and have at least the beginnings of sanctification. If their pro-

fession appears genuine, no branch of the church can properly deny admission to such, and if they take action upon their application officially, such official action constitutes their admission into the church. In the Presbyterian Church it is the vote of the session. The baptism which follows is the sign of their profession, and becomes a public acknowledgment of the new relation. Even in such case baptism cannot properly be considered initiatory, in the Baptist sense, because it is subsequent to admission, in a correct understanding of the matter. It is merely a seal of the righteousness of the faith which they have already been adjudged to possess.

A DISTINCTIVELY BAPTIST THEORY.

Another consideration which should lead Presbyterians and other pedobaptists to abandon the use of "initiatory" in connection with baptism is, that Baptists evidently regard it as involving the tacit admission that faith must necessarily exist before church membership and baptism; consequently, they regard the practice of infant baptism, on the part of Presbyterians and others, as inconsistent; and even claim that they are largely abandoning the practice. If the latter contention is true to any extent, it must arise from the fact that upon the doctrine that baptism gives admission into the church infant baptism can scarcely be explained or defended. It is the circumstance of birth which gives the infant his right and standing, and not baptism. If birth does not give their right to baptism, it cannot be consistently defended. But if birth does give the right, then membership precedes the baptism, and the baptism cannot be initiatory. It is readily seen, therefore, that the theory that baptism is a *sine qua non* of church membership is inconsistent with Presbyterian doctrine and practice. The Baptist boldly charges that Presbyterians are inconsistent; and we thoughtlessly give color to the charge by speaking of baptism as initiatory, *i. e.*, necessary to initiation into the church. Again, they charge that the practice of infant baptism grew out of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and from this it appears that they assume that evangelical Christians all accept the doctrine that regeneration must necessarily precede

membership. We repudiate this assumption, deny the historical accuracy of the statement that infant baptism grew out of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and retort upon them their charge of ritualism, telling them that they are the ones who make baptism ritualistic by exalting it into an essential of church membership. Our reply to them should be, "Physician, heal thyself."

In order to present the issue with sharpness, we quote from a printed address of Dr. Norman Fox, delivered to the students of Drew Theological Seminary.¹ He says: "Baptists declared that as the bread of the church supper could have no spiritual effect save in the intelligent reception thereof, and thus should not be given to the mere infant, the baptism of an unconscious subject was in like manner unreasonable. They affirmed that one was christened—made a Christian—only by faith; that baptism was merely the symbol of a new birth which *had already taken place* [italics ours], and, therefore, should be administered only on an intelligent profession of faith. As a uniform is put on a man, not to make him a soldier, but because he is already a soldier; as a coronation ceremony will not make one a king, but can merely declare him a king, so the Baptists asserted that baptism does not make a man a Christian, and should be given only as a token that one *has already entered the new life*" (page 10). It seems never to occur to this champion of Baptist doctrine to tell us how they arrived at the conclusion that baptism must always indicate that the new birth has already taken place. Why the symbol should always be retrospective, and never prospective, he does not undertake to show. While freely admitting that "baptism does not make a man a Christian," and repudiating the charge of baptismal regeneration, we turn against the Baptist his own logic by saying that, although they do not teach that baptism makes a man a Christian, they do teach that baptism makes a man a church member; in the language of Dr. Fox's own illustration, "He is already a soldier," but not a member of Christ's army. Now we hold that this is an anomaly that cannot exist; that, on the other hand, the moment he is discovered to be a soldier, by those

¹*The Unfolding of Baptist Doctrine*, American Baptist Publication Society, 1420 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

appointed to pass upon this question, he becomes *ipso facto* a member of Christ's army. This applies to the class who apply from without on profession. But the church is not merely an army; it is a training school in which the most effective teachers are the parents, and their departments are their own families. The children are to be prepared for the army, but are not recognized as soldiers until they declare their loyalty to the King. On the Baptist theory, a man may be a professing Christian without being a church member; for it sometimes happens in actual practice that after their profession has been accepted the party refuses to undergo baptism by immersion. Not only do Baptists, then, make a symbol a *sine qua non* of church standing, but a particular form of water baptism; and this idea, that a particular form of a ceremony is the door of the church, excludes the great body of Christians, whom they are willing enough to admit are Christians, but not members of Christ's church.

Speaking of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, Dr. Fox says, "To them it is not baptism, but 'profession' which is the door of the visible church." If this were intended to apply to adults, we might accept it as a fact, but he means it to apply to children who come to years of discretion and make profession, for he adds, "They treat infant baptism as an absolute nullity" (page 12). Dr. Fox can see no justification for infant baptism, except in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. "To the Roman Catholic," he says, "baptism means something; it is that in which regeneration takes place. It means something to the Baptist; it is a token that regeneration has already taken place. To the evangelical pedobaptist, it means neither of these; it means practically nothing at all." Thus, according to him, it must mean baptismal regeneration or nothing. He is so sure of this remarkable logic that he contends that Presbyterians are coming to see it, and are, as a result, abandoning the practice. They are slowly coming to see (he thinks, what he claims to be a fact) that "the practice of infant baptism is an *outcome of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration*, in which alone it can find its warrant [page 13], and consequently they are fast abandoning it." Presbyterians (he thinks), "though slow, are logical, and are steadily

progressing towards the Baptist position, that since regeneration is not wrought in baptism, the rite can properly be given only as a token that the subject is already regenerate." Nevertheless, in theory they are still "high church," as may be seen from their manuals for infant baptism, and Baptists and others have only to keep their ears open, when witnessing an infant baptism, "to hear the preacher preach baptismal regeneration" (page 12). Now taken by themselves such statements would appear to be a willful slander of Presbyterian doctrine. They appear to be made, however, upon the strength of certain unguarded or inconsistent statements of writers on infant baptism; but at best they seem disingenuous, and unworthy of a man with any pretensions to a knowledge of church history, or the history of doctrine. Is it justifiable to say that Presbyterians have ever held to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration? We think not; but the statement is not surprising from a man who has the assurance to claim for Baptists all the credit for the spiritual enlightenment of the sixteenth century Reformation. The doctrine that salvation comes by faith alone, he tells us (page 7) was a fundamental Baptist principle; and he means a distinctive Baptist principle; in other words, he arrogates to his church the credit for the rediscovery, in the sixteenth century, of that grand old doctrine, which was the battle-cry of the Reformation—Salvation by Faith Alone. As he does not attempt to offer any proof of this startling claim, it does not deserve a refutation; but as regards the assertion that "infant baptism is an outcome of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration," history teaches just the reverse, for the first clear mention of the subject, in the early fathers, is in connection with a tendency to discourage what had already been the established practice. Tertullian, we are told, did not dispute the doctrine, or practice, but having exaggerated or misconceived its ritual importance and meaning, he encouraged parents to delay the baptism of their children, under the impression that on account of subsequent waywardness its effects might be lost. Thus the first ritualistic ideas in this connection had just the opposite effect of discouraging the ordinance, which the Tertullian quotation shows to have been the established practice of the church. Origen also

treats of it as an established practice received from the apostles.

Nevertheless, Presbyterians have need for all the clearness and consistency they can muster on this subject. Unfortunately, in the effort to explain the doctrine of infant baptism, and justify it, writers have fallen into many inconsistent statements; but in the historical argument with Baptists, who, like Dr. Fox, appear to draw their history from their own imaginations, we appeal to the fact that the earliest traces of the ordinance in church history indicate that it came down from the first century. It is one thing to possess a divine institution and another thing to be able to explain it. As regards the latter the church has often failed; but as an established institution, it still stands amid the blunderings of human weakness.

ANOTHER BAPTIST OBJECTION AVOIDED.

A definite rejection of the theory that baptism is initiatory, together with the accompanying idea that it implies a present regeneration, enables us to meet another Baptist objection, which otherwise can hardly be answered satisfactorily.

Dr. Fox claims that "the drawing of a line between the church and the world, between the converted and the unconverted, was an unfolding of Baptist doctrine." "When the Baptists," he says, "by giving baptism only to believers, made the church a body separate from the community at large, they presented a theory of the church radically different from that not only of the Romanists, but of the Lutherans and the Reformed also, a theory novel, nay, revolutionary" (page 17). Here again is a seemingly historical statement which is really nothing more than bad Baptist logic. He begins his argument by saying, "In the Jewish nation every son was circumcised, and *thus* [italics ours] the religious and civic corporations were made one." This shows that Dr. Fox's idea of the Jewish constitution is derived from his previous conception of the rite of circumcision; but that interpretation is incorrect, and the conclusion drawn from it shallow and false. It never was true that the civic and religious corporations of Israel were one, not even under the brief period of the

theocracy. This contention of the Baptists has long ago been refuted.¹ The same conclusion is drawn from the Romanist theory and practice as of the Jewish constitution. He says, "Though in the Roman Catholic theory the church is composed of regenerate persons, the belief that all are regenerated who are baptized, and the consequent giving of baptism to all who are born into the community, makes church members of all the people, so that, as in the Jewish commonwealth, the church comprises the whole population, and there is no outward distinction between the church and the world." Without stopping to show from church history that the purely imaginary condition which his logic again presents to him never had any reality, we are at present interested in the similar statement he makes regarding the Presbyterian position. "The Westminster Confession," he says, "makes the church consist, not of the converted alone, but of believers, 'together with their children.' Though the child of the saint grow up a worldling, even an atheist, he is in the church all the same. I suppose that Col. Robert G. Ingersol, baptized in infancy into the Presbyterian Church, died a member thereof in good and regular standing. . . . An unconverted person in a Baptist Church is there in violation of Baptist theory, but the Westminster doctrine is that the church may properly contain *confessed unbelievers*" (page 15). (Italics ours.)

Now is this our theory? If it is, we are willing to give the Baptist credit for a more correct statement than in the case of the Jew and the Romanist. Is it true that Presbyterians retain upon even their non-communicant roll "professed unbelievers"; if it is, then it must be admitted that their practice, and perhaps their theory, is at fault. But the statement is not based upon historical fact as to Presbyterian doctrine and practice. On page 16 we read, "But the child baptized and brought into the church by dedication is not thereby regenerated, and so this theory makes the *confessedly ungodly* to be church members *with all rights as such.*" (Italics ours.) The last clause is so notoriously untrue that the writer must be understood as simply drawing his own logical

¹ Cf. Dr. N. L. Rice on Infant Baptism.

deduction, without attempting to state fairly the Presbyterian practice; and yet since he at first appears to do this, the statement is, to say the least, recklessly misleading. Everybody knows that in Presbyterian doctrine and practice only confessed believers have a right to the Lord's Supper.

But is there any ground for the statement that "confessed unbelievers" are recognized? Would that it could be said that there is not; but here inconsistencies of statement and indefiniteness of theory alike rise to embarrass us. What is needed is to sweep away the inconsistencies, formulate more clearly the doctrine of child membership by birth, and the positive institution will stand impregnable to every assault. If the charge that "professed unbelievers" are recognized as members is not untrue, the church should by all means put herself in a position in which she can boldly deny such a charge; and she should make her doctrine so plain that it will be no longer open to misrepresentation. It is hoped that the practice is more correct than the theory in this matter.

To show that Presbyterians are open to criticism in this matter we have only to consider the words of a writer of high repute, whose name need not be mentioned. In an argument against the judicial prosecution of non-communicating members, he makes the point that it could not change their status, for the reason that, according to Protestant ideas of discipline, even the highest exercise of such discipline, excommunication, does not dissolve "the vinculum by which the person in baptism is related to the church and the covenant of grace." This is apparently deduced from the idea that "in Protestant churches it never amounts to *anathema*." We need not tarry to analyze this logic, and deny that such is the Protestant idea of excommunication. It is enough to say that it sounds more like the doctrine of a Romanist than a Presbyterian. How comes it that baptism is a vinculum which can never be broken? Does it give an "indelible character"? Is not that Romanism? Or does baptism seal the promise of salvation to the individual? Is that theory any better? Baptism is not a door to give admission into the church, neither is it a chain whose irrefragable links bind the world to the church.

But that this is the idea of our author is plain from his own language, for according to him the class of baptized non-communicants, "though in the church by external union, in the spirit and temper of their minds belong to the world; like Esau, neither understanding nor prizing their birthright." "*Of the world and in the church* [italics his], this expresses precisely their status and determines the mode in which the church should deal with them." Now is this just, as spoken of the class of whom the covenant gives assurance that many of them shall walk in the steps of Abraham's faith? Is it just to class with the world or with professed unbelievers those children of the covenant, who, by reason of an untrained intelligence and will, are not able to decide for themselves where they stand doctrinally and spiritually? And yet this is the only class who really have any right to be held upon the roll of baptized non-communicants. Many of them are Christians long before they have the understanding and the courage to declare themselves as such. If upon coming to sufficient years they declare their unbelief, this fact is abundant reason for dropping their names from the roll. Nay, if after having come to years of intelligence and discretion they fail to declare that loyalty which the King and Head of the church requires, this should be construed as an evidence of disloyalty, so that a failure to make profession of faith naturally becomes a profession of unbelief. They should be dealt with accordingly; no process is required for the action which declares them self-exeinded. The church is a training school for the young, not for adult non-professors (on the inside). If the young do not learn, it is not the fault of the school, and, in the nature of the case, tuition cannot last indefinitely. If the children of the church do not prepare themselves for Christ's army, they cannot be held in the position of ever learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. A clear recognition of this fact would avoid the serious objection we have been considering. It is a logical corollary of the truth that baptism is not initiatory. If baptism is not responsible for bringing a person into the church, neither can it be held logically responsible for keeping him in. Let us away with the ritualistic conception that baptism is an irrefragable

vinculum, and remember that it is a symbol of truth and nothing more.

It is very clear to the writer that none should be allowed on the non-communicant roll who have passed their teens; and it may be that seventeen would be a just age limit, giving a sufficient number of years of grace. In advance of a definite determination of an age limit, the principle may be conserved by defining the membership of the church as embracing all Christians who have made profession of faith in some branch of the church of Christ, together with the children of such believers, provided the latter have not forfeited their birthright by the neglect of infant baptism, or by their own failure to make profession of faith.

LUTHER LINK.

Washington, Mo.

III. CONSCIOUS SINS.

THE Scriptures teach God's power and willingness to save from sin those that trust him, and at the same time they teach that man in this life, by reason of his corrupted nature, corrupt environments, and liability to the assaults of the devil, will not be perfectly kept from sin. A solution of this apparent inconsistency is supposed by some to be found in the distinction between conscious and unconscious sins.

In order to discuss the subject, it is necessary to analyze and classify varieties of views as to the extent of the Holy Spirit's keeping.

The theory that sinless perfection is attainable in this life, as taught by Pelagians, Socinians, and Roman Catholics, is not under discussion. But a doctrine that is recognized by theologians, commentators, and encyclopedists as a modified form of perfectionism was held by Wesley, and, with some variations, is held by the Friends and the Oberlin School. The former taught that by the grace of God a Christian could be kept from all conscious sins, but that this state could be lost by decline of faith. (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia on Methodism.*) And that "the highest perfection which man can attain unto does not exclude ignorance and error, and a thousand infirmities." (*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia on Perfectionism.*) Close akin to this is the doctrine now widely taught by many of the most spiritually minded men of the time, Murray, Meyer, McNeil of Australia, the Keswick School and others, whose writings in the main are safe and helpful.

These writers hold, as I understand, (1) that God promises to keep from all sin the soul that is entirely committed unto his Holy Spirit; (2) that he will enable such as seek it to entirely commit themselves; (3) that there will yet remain a corrupt

nature and unconscious sins, which are sins, but these will be revealed and overcome gradually.¹

We hold with the Presbyterian and the majority of evangelical churches, (1) that God promises to keep from sin the soul that is committed to his Holy Spirit, exactly in proportion as it is committed; (2) that he will enable such as seek it to commit themselves, but this committing is progressive, according as he, in infinite wisdom, sees fit to enable each one to commit himself, and the perfect committing is not reached in this life; (3) that the sins which remain are both conscious and unconscious.

The upholders of either view have erred in hasty judgments of the other side. The charge of teaching sinless perfectionism has been rashly flung at the one class of writers, while the others have been charged with failing to teach God's provision for the

¹ Murray writes glowingly about the bright side, and says little about the sins that remain, but in passages like the following we may see his view:

"No believer can say either, 'I have no sin in me,' or 'I have in time past never sinned.' If we say we have no sin at present, or that we have not sinned in the past, we deceive ourselves. But no confession, though we *have sin* in the present, is demanded that we are *doing sin* in the present too (*italics his*); the confession of actual sinning refers to the past. It may, as appears from 1 John ii. 2, be in the present also; but it is expected not to be. And so we see how the deepest confession of sin in the past (as Paul's of his having been a persecutor), and the deepest consciousness of having still a vile and corrupt nature in the present, may be consistent with humble but joyful praise to him who keeps from stumbling." *Abide in Christ*, p. 188. *Cf. same*, p. 191. Also, *Spirit of Christ*, p. 30. "In thy heart there may be much involuntary sin, with which thou feelest thyself powerless. . . . But in regard to the voluntary actions say, day by day, to thy Lord Jesus, that everything thou knowest to be pleasing to him thou wilt do."

Rev. John McNeil, of Australia, in *The Spirit Filled Life*, pp. 59, 60, says: "He (Jesus) puts a power within the child that trusts him—that power is himself, by which a believer is kept from defiling his garments by any known sin, so that they do not need washing. . . . 'What is it to have a clean heart?' 'What is it to be cleansed from all unrighteousness?' . . . It is—in the words of another—to be 'saved from *all known conscious sins*.'" (*Italics his.*)

"Paul asserted that so far as his consciousness went he was without fault. . . . As far as he could see, every department of his being was filled with Christ." This view differs from the Wesleyan, in that the sins which remain are held to be sins, and not merely human infirmities.

defeat and expulsion of sin, thus leaving the Christian to fight in his own strength. The Confession of Faith (Chap. XIII., 1) plainly teaches that Christ, by his Word and Spirit, imparts to each believer a power that sanctifies him in this life.

The charge of teaching that the Christian in this life is doomed to constant defeat, that he is a Prometheus on the rock of sin, if it may be justly laid to some sects and some writers, does not apply to the Presbyterian system. The Confession (Chap. XIII.) says: ". . . The dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified, . . . the regenerate part doth overcome."

When it is said, in arguing this question, that it is impossible in this life to overcome all conscious sin, objection is taken to this word as applied to God. The objection would be admissible only by a narrow view of the meaning of the word "impossible." As here used the word means only that God, in the present order of things, does not provide for fallen man to attain unto such a state, and thus it does not express a limitation of God's power any more than to say that water cannot freeze under a summer sun. By overruling his own laws God could do the one as well as the other. Nor does this moral inability lessen man's obligation. We owe perfect obedience. God, while providing for the victory over sin, in his infinite wisdom provides that the committing, and hence the keeping, should be progressive. A willingness to recognize God's prerogative of elective grace can scarcely lay us open to criticism from those who honor him.

That the possibility of perfection in this life is taught in the Scriptures we cheerfully admit. But distinction in the use of terms is a first principle in sound exegesis. Absolute sinless perfection is required of men, and God were not God should he command less than "Be perfect." The possibility of fulfilling this command is to be considered below. In Scripture, record is made of perfect men—Noah, Job, Hezekiah, David, Zechariah. But that this perfection simply means "uprightness" is clear, both from the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek terms, and from the lives of these men. The facility with which some able writers

glide over the distinction between perfection by imputation and perfection by impartation is surprising.¹

In 1 Cor. ii. 6; Phil. iii. 15, and Heb. x. 1, 10, 14, the former appears in boldest relief, as the portion of every truly regenerate soul. If any Christian has not attained unto this state of perfection, by all means let him get down on his knees and pray God to save him. (*Cf.* Confession of Faith, Chap. XI., 1.) Again, perfection may mean entirety. To borrow an illustration from Rev. C. C. Hersman, D. D., the human body is perfect when it has all the members—one head, one body, two hands, two feet, all in place, though no member may be perfect in itself. Still another class of texts may be misunderstood—those which teach us to “be perfecting.” Thus Eph. v. 18 should probably be read, “Be ye filling,” and 2 Cor. x. 5 teaches the possibility of bringing every thought into captivity, *i. e.*, one by one. The Scripture does teach perfectionism in these senses, and this fact is misused, not only by the advocates of “sinless perfection” theories, but by Wesleyans, and by the class of writers now particularly under consideration.

Let us consider the arguments for this view. Does a command always imply ability to execute? *Non sequitur*. Command is based on duty, not on ability. God commands all to cease from evil. Now, while they have the natural ability, such as are not touched by the Holy Spirit do not have the moral ability, yet the command is not thereby nullified, neither is it removed. Apply the principle to Matt. v. 48, and it teaches that it is possible to be perfect, without even unconscious sins or Wesleyan imperfections. But the passages which, upon the basis of this principle, are supposed to teach the possibility of being free from conscious sin, are in many cases misunderstood. The command to die unto sin (Rom. vi. 10, 11; viii. 13; Col. iii. 5, and even Rom. vi. 6 is so quoted) can be fulfilled, but that this does not involve the keeping from all conscious sin is seen in the fact that this death is predicted of every regenerate person (*cf.* also Eph. ii. 5), and that

¹ Murray in *Holy in Christ* heads Chapter II. with 1 Cor. i. 2, Phil. i. 1, iv. 21, all of which refer to imputed holiness; but the chapter drawn from them is all about imparted holiness.

this death is followed by a gradual mortification of the members. (Col. iii. 5.) Furthermore, to apply to these passages a distinction between conscious and unconscious sins is without warrant. Such a meaning can be put on these passages only by understanding that unconscious sins are not sins. The interpretation of the standards is sufficient and sound. In one act allegiance to Satan is thrown off, but evil yet remains, to be gradually removed.

A second argument is that the Presbyterian view limits, while this view allows full meaning to God's promises of keeping from sin by his Holy Spirit. "All things are possible to him that believeth." Yea, verily, but these friends would not say that this gives authority, as the face meaning implies, to any one who thinks he can do so, to raise the dead. We must go deeper than the face meaning. Let us examine some of the passages supposed to be limited. Gal. v. 16, 18; Phil. ii. 13, and similar passages, teach that God works through us. This teaches the possibility of committing, but not of perfectly committing, ourselves to the inworking of the Holy Spirit. Let Rom. vii. 25; viii. 37 stand for another class—the victory passages. But is victory not victory except in case of annihilation? Shall the Lord himself not claim victory over the devil, because, forsooth, the enemy still lives to wage hopeless, but uncompromising warfare? When the poor sinner, by grace divine, breaks the fetters and denies allegiance to Satan, the enemy still continues to make attacks, and does him no little harm, yet he can raise the pæan of victory, and daily sing a glad hallelujah to the conquering grace of God. The "blameless" passages naturally divide into two classes. Some refer to blamelessness in the sight of men, which does not require freedom from all sins known to the individual conscience. Such are Luke i. 6; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10; Titus i. 6, 7; Phil. ii. 15; iii. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 10. The other blameless passages are such as 1 Thess. iii. 13; v. 23; 2 Peter iii. 14; Jude 24. Inasmuch as these refer to judicial standing in the day of judgment, if to be blameless meant to live free from all conscious sin, then the mass of Christians, to say the least, would be blamed in that day! But we are assured that we shall appear faultless and blameless by reason of the grace that keeps us from apostatizing, and cleanses us from every stain.

A few particular passages need mention. Heb. vii. 25, as the context shows, refers to Christ's priestly work, not to the work of the Spirit in our hearts. If in the *locus classicus* (1 John iii. 9) sin means conscious sins, none will escape. The sin which the regenerate soul cannot commit is, not a particular sin, but an estate of sin, and the meaning is that he that is born of God cannot come again into bondage to Satan.¹

Thus from an examination of these and similar passages, we see that the promises supposed to be limited by the Presbyterian view are really misinterpreted. But this charge of limiting is a boomerang. Either unconscious sins are not sins, a doctrine which these writers disclaim, or they are sins. Now see where we stand. God promises to keep from sin him that is committed to the keeping of his Holy Spirit. I, by God's grace, entirely commit myself, but, *mirabile dictu*, the keeping is not perfect, for unconscious sins remain! Is not this more derogatory to God than to say that God has not promised to enable us to be entirely committed, but that, in so far as one is committed, in so far is he kept from sin, both conscious and unconscious?

Did Paul and others claim to be kept from conscious sins? On this point much strength is laid on Rom. vii. 14 *ff.*, and the shout of victory in verse 25 is supposed to show that this is a past experience. But that the last clause of verse 25 sums up the conclusion is evident from the *ἀπό οὖν* as well as from its position, and this conclusion is, "So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." Thus, though conqueror, the saint yet retains a sinful nature that frequently betrays him into sin. One of the holiest men of the age, A. J. Gordon, says (*In Christ*, page 94), "In the seventh of Romans we see the battle progress between these two; we watch the advance and retreat of the forces of each. Now we hear the groan of the wounded, 'O wretched man that I am,' and now, clear and strong, above the conflict, we catch the shout of assured victory, 'I thank God through Jesus Christ.' But it is a victory yet delayed; for the battle closes with both antagonists still alive and hostile."

¹ Cf. also Westcott, "A character, 'a prevailing habit,' and not primarily an act."

Granted that Paul had a "third stage" in his experience, when he was filled with the Spirit, this does not necessarily involve the thought that he was free from all conscious sins. Thank God that the precious truths taught in the first part of the eighth chapter of Romans are not reserved for those free from conscious sins. We have known sins, yet we know that we have the Spirit, for he that hath "not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." And only in the stage-light of a preconceived idea can Paul's charge to imitate him (Phil. iv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 16, etc.) give color to the belief that he was free from conscious sins. At best it could but prove that he was better than others, and that it does not mean more is evident from the fact that the expression is applied to "us" in Phil. iii. 17, and 2 Thess. iii. 7-9, to "ye" in 1 Thess. i. 7, *i. e.*, all the Thessalonian church, and to Peter and all the elders in 1 Peter v. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 12. Surely it is not claimed that all these were free from conscious sins. That Paul claimed a holy life in 1 Thess. ii. 10; 2 Cor. i. 12, etc., is plain, but to say that such passages mean that Paul and his companions also were free from conscious sins puts a strain on his language that it was not intended to bear. When appeal is made to the plain statement of 1 Cor. iv. 4, we cheerfully recognize that the correct reading is, "Know nothing against myself," and were it not for the context, and, in consistency with other Scriptures, this would settle the question. As it is, Hodge is probably correct in saying that this passage merely denies the charge of fault in respect to "ministerial fidelity." The claim of perfection in Phil. iii. 15 refers, as has been said, to perfection by imputation. Paul's "clear conscience" may refer sometimes to his standing in the eyes of men, and elsewhere it refers to declarative, not inherent holiness. Thus Heb. ix. 14, x. 2 speak of the conscience clear by reason of the atoning blood of Jesus. Paul claimed peace of soul. True, and so may we. Paul's peace was not inconsistent with constant fighting of the enemy even to the end. (See Eph. vi. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7.) In the thickest of the fight, sweet assurance comes with the thought that Christ is all and in all, working almightily through us.

An argument is drawn from the supposed "fatal effects" of

the Presbyterian view on spiritual attainments. When pressed, a holder of this view will usually confess that he has not attained to the state where he has no conscious sins, and will often say that he knows no case, except perhaps Paul, in which it can positively be asserted that this state was reached, but that such a hope is stimulating. Which is more stimulating, the pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp, a rainbow-end, or a hope that sees actual fulfilment every day, and that is encouraged to look forward to a certain and perfect fulfilment as soon as a definite point is reached? It is said that the Presbyterian view teaches hopelessness, and thus leads to contented inactivity. The system that inculcates the strongest sense of the heinousness of every sin, both conscious and unconscious, that teaches to expect constant victory over sin and progressive expulsion of every sin, one by one, is said to be less stimulating than the belief that at one leap the Christian may be freed from all conscious sins, but that real, though unconscious sins, will still remain to be removed gradually. Is, then, the consciousness of these remaining sins less stimulating than unconsciousness would be? That many of those who hold and teach this view are peculiarly holy is true, but so there are others noted for holiness with whom we differ on even the radical points, *e. g.*, Thomas á Kempis, the Wesleys, Darby, Finney. If there be fatal effects, let us look for them in the lives of Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Rutherford, Bunyan, Baxter, Doddridge, Brainerd, John Newton, McCheyne, and hosts of men noted for a deep sense of conscious sinfulness.

In the arguments above considered, I do not find any sufficient proof of the doctrine, and, on the other hand, there is strong proof against it. There is no clear record of any one who was free from all conscious sins. Surely if in all the Scriptures there is no clear instance, it is vain to look for one elsewhere. The Scriptures teach that all men have sins until death. The petition for forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer cannot be referred to past sins, for faith says they have long ago been forgiven. Why, then, should we continue to pray for them? In Phil. iii. 12, following, there are two perfects, and as the perfect that Paul attained unto was that which was imputed to him, then the other must refer to his

own life and conduct. And he says that he has not attained unto this perfection, but is following after it. John, in the first chapter of his first epistle, says that we, Christians and sinners, all have sin, and have constant need of the purifying blood of Jesus. To limit this to the idea of unconscious and past sins is to take an unwarrantable liberty with inspired writings. James says that "in many things we all stumble" [R. V.]. This cannot be referred merely to the corrupt church of the dispersion. What right have we to claim for modern Christianity a higher morality than existed in those churches? Are there not among us adulterers and adulteresses in the sense that James used the terms? And men with unclean hands and impure hearts? But the expression includes James himself. Had he not attained unto the higher life? Such passages, as interpreted by the deepest thinkers, so far as I know, teach that all Christians sin.

The internal weaknesses of this theory are fatal to it. If it is possible to be entirely committed, then consistency would require us to believe that we could be kept from all sin, both conscious and unconscious. We have a dilemma with three horns: Either absolute perfection is possible, or we cannot in this life be perfectly committed, or when we fulfill the conditions, God does not perfectly carry out his promise. By a process of exclusion we find the second horn alone to be tenable. To say that there can be entire absence of heat without absolute cold is an absurdity. All the objections that bear against the Presbyterian view, bear equally against this view. Unconscious sins are still left, and when we remember that Saul's persecution of the church was a sin of ignorance, we see that nothing is accomplished by this attempted compromise. The two classes described in Romans viii. 1, *ff.*, Gal. v. 16, *ff.*, cannot refer to "carnal" Christians and those who live the higher life, for "they that are in the flesh cannot please God," and "they that have not the Spirit of Christ are none of his."

The apparent good effects of this doctrine are more than counterbalanced by the evil results. Suppose I say: For five months I have not consciously sinned. Now what do you think of me? Of course you think I am either a fool or a knave. To make such

a statement evinces the most deplorable blindness and self-satisfaction. On the other hand, when one has committed himself, as he thinks, entirely to the keeping of the Holy Spirit, and the expected state of freedom from conscious sins is not reached, the natural result is to doubt the Word from which he got such a hope, or at any rate to feel that there is a mistake somewhere, and thus to give up in despair. If the promises of Scripture that we shall be kept from sin, are interpreted to refer to conscious sin, the unconscious sins are not sins. To say that the conclusion does not follow the premises, may show that the writer's conscience is alive to dangers ahead, but logic is unaccommodating. The leaders may claim to believe that unconscious sins are real sins, but consistency will force either them or their followers to think amen to Wesley's statement, "I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins if you please; I do not." [See A. H. Strong's *Theology*, p. 489.] We follow good leadership in saying there may be sins of ignorance which are not sins, *i. e.*, "When the ignorance was of that kind which does not imply a perversion of the moral nature." But while making this distinction, Dr. Thornwell fully sustains our position that involuntary sins may be as heinous, yes, and more so, than sins of knowledge. Paul did not make light of his persecuting the church, even though he himself says he did it ignorantly (1 Timothy i. 13). The tendency of this theory is to make a distinction and obscure the enormity of sins committed under the shadow of a darkened conscience. These writers exalt an event in the Christian course that throws regeneration in the shade. The regenerated, but carnal Christian, is little better off than the unconverted. He is an anomaly in the universe—not a sinner, and yet not a saint. He is but the foetus of a saint yet to be born. *The Spirit Filled Life*, by Rev. John McNeil, of Australia, has an introduction by Murray, and was widely spread by John R. Mott in his tour round the world. On page 34 we read: "Our modern method is largely responsible for the large percentage of backsliding that one meets with in the church to-day. Many of these backsliders were soundly converted to God, but unfor-

tunately for them, no Peter or John, or Ananias or Paul, met them in the beginning of their Pilgrimage, to compel their attention to the 'one thing needful' for the people of the Pilgrimage; so they started out ill-provided, and after a longer or shorter time they became thoroughly dispirited: and then asking 'Is this all that is in it?' they threw their profession overboard; and one can scarcely wonder at it! Prevention is better than cure. Let our young converts be fully instructed and fully equipped with the glorious Fullness provided for them by a gracious Father, and we will hear less about backsliding." Is this the fruit by which we are to judge the tree?

Did David Brainerd have any conscious sins? or Robert MeCheyne? or Rutherford? or the majority of the holiest saints in all ages? The testimony will not be doubtful. Yes, ask the godly believers of this doctrine: Are you not conscious at this very time of not living as close to God as you should? Does your mind ever consciously wander in worship? Do you always, in speaking the name of God, feel the full sense of awe and reverence due to his name? Let each one hear the testimony of his own conscience.

Dropping the false and hurtful addenda, we gladly unite in proclaiming God's power and willingness to save us from our sins if we commit ourselves to the guidance and power of his Holy Spirit. The principle stated in the outset is similarly put by Bede: "*In quantum in eo manet, in tantum non peccat.*" This principle is practically applied to the Christian life in three stages: First, when in genuine conversion a soul is surrendered to his keeping, that soul is thereafter kept from apostasy. Romans viii. 1, ff., 1 John iii. 9, Jude 24, all teach this clearly, as well as 2 Timothy i. 12, and such passages. When the soul has been secured from apostasy, it is yet far from being fully sanctified. But the Holy Spirit will take that soul, and in so far as it is committed to him, will work in and through that soul, making it like unto the perfect model. This is the second application. We cannot say that there are now no fightings and no falling into sin, but we do say that we are no longer fighting in our own strength a war of constant defeat. The enemy has been con-

quered, and what remains now to be done is to repel each assault, and by the grace of the Holy Spirit gradually to drive him from the field, until even his last great assault is made, and death itself is overcome. This process is what Paul refers to in 2 Corinthians iii. 18, "But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord" (R. V.). The committing itself is to be done not in human strength, but by the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer. As Frances Ridley Havergal says, we must "commit the committing." This does not insure perfect committing, for this committing, too, is liable to human imperfections. But if we are pliable God will enable us to commit ourselves, and the more entire the committing, the more complete will be the keeping. In this way the soul may come, and should come, and often does come to such a state of union with Christ that comparatively grievous sins and rebellion against God's will are overcome, and the soul dwells in such peace and security from sin, that it is perfect in the sense that Noah, Job, and David were perfect, and can further say with assurance, I know that Christ will keep me from such sins because I have committed them to him; yet there remains the indwelling sin, and particular sins will be frequent, both consciously and unconsciously. Though all sin will not be removed at once, yet any sin of which the soul is conscious may be overcome by trusting the Spirit to remove it. But as the soul becomes more and more freed from sin, it is more and more filled with hatred of sin, and reaches out with longing towards higher and yet higher advances in the spiritual life. Looking back with rejoicing to see from what depths it has come, and looking onward and upward to the peaks that rise yet higher and higher, and fixing the eye on heavenly glory beyond, with joy and peace and assurance, the soul presses on till it leaves this sin-encumbered nature and rises up, perfected forever in the image of Christ. And this is the third application of the principle. For when we are told, "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh," not only do we learn that surrender to Christ means certain victory, that the more we are committed to the keeping of Christ the more he is committed to keep

us, but the principle stated by the Apostle embraces also this third grand truth, that when, in his grace, the time comes that we can entirely commit ourselves to him, then we shall be absolutely freed from sin forever. Then "that which is in part shall be done away, for that which is perfect will be come" (1 Cor. xiii. 10). Then, and not till then, we shall be "just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23). God's wisdom and grace are wonderfully displayed in providing such a simple yet all-comprehensive plan of sanctification.

HUGH W. WHITE.

Hsüchoufu, China.

IV.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD AND THE LIBERTY OF MAN.

I. God is the Great Maker of this world, the Creator of all things that are, out of nothing, by the almighty word of his power, and all beings and things very good. (Gen. i. 1-31.) "The God that made the world and all things therein, he being Lord of heaven and earth . . . giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation" (Acts xvii. 24-26, R. V.). And as to this created and sustained world, God is neither ignorant, nor unconcerned, nor out of relation. God has a plan, purpose, will, decrees, to execute or carry out in the making and preserving, the governing and saving, of the world and its people; doing nothing at random or without meaning, having a wise and good purpose in everything he does, the Lord is absolute and sovereign, not arbitrary or capricious.

The laws of life natural and life spiritual are fixed, and nothing has been left to chance or to fate, everything being wisely adjusted and preordered of God. God is before all, over all, for all, and through all things, and by him all things exist and continue. His direction and control of all things (each according to the nature and powers given it of God), therefore, is complete. And while, as related to each other, the several parts of the divine plan may condition one another; yet, as related to the divine purpose, the whole plan, with all its component parts, is unconditioned. The plan ever was in view; no part of it is an after thought; the plan being from eternity and its execution unfolded in time unto eternity; all the parts of this plan being wisely adjusted to one another, as means and ends, antecedents and consequents, conditions and results, in the complex framework of the whole. All things are clear to God from the begin-

ning, nothing is hid from his all-seeing eye, good and evil alike are open before him. Sin was not in God, nor did it come from his will or decree in a productive or efficient way, but only by permission as impreventable, yet even there bounded and controlled for wise and holy ends, inscrutable to us, but withal real. God is the Great and Good Designer of the world, but sin is an unnatural factor in the plan of the ages, and proceeds from beings other than God. The best that can take place and the worst that can come to pass are all provided for in the wise and holy, good and just, will of God.

II. The most fitting thing that can take place with regard to the world, undoubtedly, is the fulfilment of God's good and righteous will: because he knows and does always and everywhere what is most promotive of the creature's good and of his own glory. "The will of the Lord be done!" Yea, "thy will, O God, be done in earth as it is in heaven!" is our fervent and oft-repeated prayer. Let God's holy purposes be fully accomplished in time and in eternity. (Acts xxi. 14, and Matt. vi. 10.)

1. God is good. God's will or decrees as to the saved or elect are God's love in contemplation and action. (Rom. viii. 28-39; ix. 11, 15, 16; Eph. i. 3-14.) This is the election of grace in Christ by the Spirit.

2. God is just. God's will as to the lost or non-elect is God's righteousness (law) declared and upheld at all hazards. The unrighteous being left in their sin, are treated just as their sin deserves and God's law demands. (Rom. i. 18, 19; ii. 1-16; ix. 19-22; Heb. x. 26-31; Matt. xxii. 11-14.) This is preterition unto death for sin.

3. The purpose of God will be accomplished. The delay of man is not the defeat of God. Man proposes, but God disposes. God's plan may be rejected or ignored, but his purposes in execution who can thwart? God's holy will may be known and obeyed, and blessing follow, who then can condemn? The will of the Lord shall withal be done in God's good time, though it have to deal with a race of beings in total spiritual inertia, induced by man's self-will in the fall. The sovereign plan of purpose of God is two-fold—

(1) Predestination unto life eternal, or election, which aims—

a. To rescue and restore the sinful and fallen, the ruined and outcast, to their original beauty and worth; to save them from their sins and the issues. Rom. ix. 23, "That he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared (predestinated) unto glory." Jer. xviii. 2-6, A potter fashioning vessels of honor. Matt. i. 21, "He shall save his people from their sins."

b. To provide the successive steps in this divine restoration to newness and abundance of life, to fullness of knowledge and favor and blessedness with God. Rom. viii. 30, "Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified," etc. In God's will provision is made by predestination for the redeemed by the Saviour to enjoy—

(*a*) Spiritual vocation. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, God "hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest." (John vi. 44, 45; 2 Peter i. 2-11.) (This of course involves regeneration.)

(*b*) Justification. Rom. viii. 30, "Whom he called, them he also justified." Rom. iii. 24, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. v. 1, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Eph. i. 6.)

(*c*) Adoption, the high privilege of induction into God's own holy family and participation in its privileges. Eph. i. 5, "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children." Gal. iv. 4-6, "God sent forth his Son . . . that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

(*d*) Sanctification, or separation unto God in Christ-like conformity. The development of a God-given holy character in Christian service by the Holy Spirit's progressive work in us,

manifest in the good work of a holy life. Rom. viii. 29, God "predestinated us to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Eph. i. 4, "He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." Eph. ii. 10, "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." (2 Cor. iii. 18.)

(e) Providence, guaranteeing the coöperation of all things for our good, however adverse some may seem. Rom. viii. 28. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose." Even the times of evil are to be "shortened for the elect's sake" (Matt. xxiv. 22).

(f) Glorification. Rom. viii. 30, "Whom he did predestinate . . . them he also glorified." Ensuring a recovered kingdom with Christ as Sovereign. Matt. xxv. 34, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared (or predestinated) for you from the foundation of the world."

c. To glorify God's sovereign grace. Eph. i. 5, 6, "Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed on us in the beloved." Election thus keeps men pressing on heavenward, and in this phase of the will of God is the hope of humanity.

(2) Foreordination unto everlasting woe (the second death), or, reprobation and preterition of others for their sin, which seeks—

a. To maintain the penal sanction of God's moral government that sin must be punished. God is not the author of sin, nor did he make others to sin, nor did he decree to make any creature to damn it. God had naught to do with man's first sin in the way of causation, neither has he had aught to do with causing any sin of any man since Adam's original originating sin. Man himself though a dependent, is yet a real and distinct causer. Not God, therefore, but man is responsible for human sin, in its most refined as well as in its most heathenish forms, in its minute as well as in its mammoth phases; man's very disability of any good ac-

companying salvation being his own sin, by reason of racial and federal relation to the first man, Adam, and but a part of the penalty of original sin: for which God holds man responsible as well as for actual sins resulting therefrom, sin in either case entailing guilt, and guilt penalty.

God hates sin, and God must punish sin, or else moral government come to naught. Sin is an abnormal element in God's plan, and contrary to his order; and is impreventable by him as proceeding from responsible second though dependent causers in the exercise of their own free-agency; and hence the penal imperative must be inflicted to the fullest extent upon the finally impenitent and unbelieving.

The ground of God's passing by any is their sin. Being left in their sin, they are treated as their iniquity merits. Who that believes in the sanctity of righteous law, or in the righteousness of punishing sin, would have it otherwise? "Certainly God is sovereign in the salvation of sinners, and has just liberty to determine how many he will save from their sin and how many he will leave to their self-will in sin."

Why God was pleased to choose some to life in Christ by the Spirit, and to pass by others for their sin, rather than exert his grace towards all men, all being guilty sinners, we are not told in Scripture; but it would seem just to infer from the facts of the salvation of some from sin and of the damnation of others for sin, that the salvation of all the human family was from the standpoint of consistency with all the moral perfections of God a moral impossibility; or else it would be otherwise than as revealed in the Word of God and as realized in the experience of men.

God is partial in no sense of the term to any, partiality meaning a preference of one before another without good and sufficient reasons, or an overlooking of just and true claims, which God could not do, and of course does not. (Rom. ii. 11.)

"If any of the human family could claim anything at the hand of God, there would be cause of complaint, that some were passed by in his purpose of mercy; but when all equally (for their sin) deserve hell, if he see fit to save some for a display of his mercy, and leave others to the fate they themselves choose for

a display of his justice, though the former have great ground for gratitude, the others have no cause for complaint. Lam. iii. 39. 'Wherefore doth the living man complain, a man for the punishment of his sins?' God in infinite mercy has offered pardon to the rebels of Adam's race, through his Son. His language is, 'Whosoever will, let him come.' But all refuse; and if left to themselves, every individual of mankind will reject the offer, and everlastingly perish. Christ would have died in vain, and there could be no trophies of his mercy."

God's discriminations are wise and just, even if their reasons be unknown to men; it concerns us to use the means of grace he affords, and bring not his wrath upon us by disobedience. God has no pleasure in the condemnation and death of the wicked, they are self-condemned to death by their own sin. God is true to his word. His law must be kept inviolate. So let the wicked be warned, and turn from their evil way and live, is the dictate of Holy Scripture as well as of common sense. (Isa. lv. 5, 6.)

b. To set forth the power and magnify the justice of the Lord God. Rom. ix. 17-25, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory upon vessels of mercy, which he afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he also called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Gentiles?" (Ps. lxxvi. 10; Rev. xvi. 5, 7.) To this end was the purpose of God formed, and for this is it to be carried out. And such as are not saved to the praise of his glorious grace are to be condemned finally to the praise of his glorious justice. In God's will, wisdom and truth, love and justice, power and glory, meet together in perfect harmony. And they that will not be monuments of grace shall be monuments of wrath. God comes before man, his glory before man's good; and they that will not take the good he graciously offers them shall taste the bitterest gall

and undergo the deserved torments of hell fire. It is turn or burn. (Rev. xx. 11-15; xxi. 8; xxii. 11.)

(3) In either case the will of God is accomplished, whether by predestination unto life or by preterition unto death; whether by efficient decree or by permissive decree; whether by divine agency put forth, or by divine agency being withheld; whether by determination to effect good, or by ordination to permit evil; whether in election being the predestination of some human beings, without regard to their own merit, but to Christ's merit, to salvation, to the glorification of God's sovereign grace, or in reprobation being the foreordination of other human beings, on account of their sin, and for no other reason, to damnation, to the glorification of God's retributive justice: his purpose to save some affecting not in the slightest degree the light in which he stands to the rest, or the relation in which they stand to him. And as God provides for the salvation of the mature, so also of the immature and incapable, by Christ, through the Holy Spirit working when and where and how he pleaseth. (Matt. xviii. 14, etc.)

III. While God is sovereign in being, decree and action, his sovereignty is a sovereignty of righteous grace and glory, and in nowise interferes with the exercise of the free-agency of man as a second causer having individual responsibility. Holy Writ and human experience both bear plain witness that there is no conflict between God's predestination or foreordination and man's free-agency, or liberty of choice and action, and that the one interferes not in the least degree with the other.

1. The testimony of the Scriptures:

(1) Gen. xlv. 4-8: "I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt: now therefore be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither (free-agency): for God did send me before you to preserve life (divine sovereignty). So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Joseph was sold by the free-agency of his envious brethren into slavery for evil; but God designed it for the good of Joseph and his brethren.

(2) Exodus ix. 16: God says to Pharaoh, "In very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to shew in thee my power; and

that my name may be declared throughout all the earth. (Divine sovereignty.) As yet exaltest thou thyself against my people, that thou wilt not let them go?" (Free-agency.) Pharaoh had his way, but the will of the Lord was done in him. So likewise it was in the cases of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and Cyrus, king of Persia and conqueror of Babylon, who carried out the purposes of their hearts with little thought or intention of accomplishing any but their own selfish purposes and desires, and yet the will of the Lord God was fulfilled in them.

(3) Mark xiv. 21: "The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him (divine sovereignty): but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed." (Free-agency.) Cf., Matt. xxvii. 4: "I (Judas) have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." The Saviour's death was decreed of God, and yet Judas in his betrayal of his Master unto death acted freely and of his own accord.

(4) Matt. xxvi. 53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? (Christ's free-agency.) But how then shall the Scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (God's sovereignty.) Jesus was perfectly free and capable of calling angelic legions to his aid had he seen fit. And underneath all his action, whatever it was, freely determined upon by himself, was God's decree, "It must be," as it turned out to be. No compulsion of Jesus, and yet the will of God he did in everything.

(5) Acts ii. 23: "Him (Jesus of Nazareth), being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God (divine sovereignty), ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." (Free-agency.)

(6) Acts xiii. 48: "As many as were ordained to eternal life (divine sovereignty) believed." (Free-agency.)

(7) Eph. i. 4: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world (divine sovereignty), that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." (Free-agency.) Eph. i. 11: "In whom (Christ) we have obtained an inheritance (free-agency), being predestinated according to the purpose of

him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." (Divine sovereignty.) Eph. ii. 10: "We are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works (free-agency), which God before ordained that we should walk in them." (Divine sovereignty.)

2. The witness of human experience:

These conjunctions repeat themselves daily in every individual life of the race. If man sins in mind, heart, conscience, will, or in body, either by action or inaction; or whether he does the will of God in thought, feeling, volition, judgment, with soul and body; in either case he is conscious of no compulsion, but is unfettered in his activity, free to will according to nature, with nothing compelling him thereunto or hindering him therefrom. In a word, no man is an automaton; every man in his sphere is a responsible free agent, whether exercising his free-agency in good works unto life or using it in evil-doing unto death, unto righteousness or unto unrighteousness, unto faith or unto unbelief, unto repentance or unto impenitence, unto salvation or unto damnation, unto the benefits of redemption or unto the miseries and losses of the damned. Free-agency and moral responsibility demand only freedom in willing, and not the ability to will the contrary. Man's moral self-determinations, however, are always certainly in accord with his moral dispositions and states. Inherited sinfulness and consequent guilt have brought upon man a disability to know, love, choose, will, or do the good and right attendant upon salvation and holiness. Yet even for this disability man is accountable in view of federal relationship with Adam, as already noted.

There are two kinds of freedom not to be confounded, however. The one is the freedom of deliberate election between opposing alternatives, of going in either of two directions, the freedom of contrary choice (*i. e.*, of determining otherwise); the other is the freedom of a fixed and determined spontaneity. Man in innocence had a holy ability, yet with mutability. Man in sin has no ability to will the spiritually good, but a self-determined fixity and freeness in evil. Man in grace has freedom with a mixed ability to will that which is good and to will that which

is evil (though the dominion of the latter is broken). Man in glory is confirmed in holiness, with an immutable freedom to will and do the good, and the good only. Or, as the sainted Girardeau expressed it, "Man in innocence possessed the freedom of deliberate election between the opposite alternatives of sin and holiness. He may have chosen either. He was not determined by a fixed moral spontaneity either to holiness or to sin. Man in his fallen and unregenerate condition does not possess the freedom of deliberate election between the opposing alternatives of holiness and sin. By his first fatal act of transgression he determined his spiritual condition as one of fixed spontaneity in the single direction of sin. He is spontaneously free to choose sin, but he is not, without grace, free deliberately to elect holiness. Here, then, is a case of spontaneous freedom, but not of the freedom of deliberate choice between conflicting alternatives. Man as a saint in glory has not the freedom of deliberate election between the alternatives of holiness and sin; he is determined by a fixed spontaneity in the direction of holiness. He is spontaneously free in the choice of holiness, but he is not free deliberately to elect sin."

God's sovereignty in election is not inconsistent with the liberty (free-agency) of man in innocence, after the fall into sin, after his regeneration, or in glory. This is plain. In the beginning man's will was mutable, and his sin was avoidable. In unregeneracy free-agency in spiritual lines is God-given. After regeneration by determining grace there ensues an efficacious providence unto salvation. In glory it is the determining grace of God that secures confirmation in holiness beyond contingency, which is but an added element beyond his restoration to a normal state according to the original ideal of God. Neither is the divine decree of reprobation incongruous with the moral liberty of the non-elect sinner. While it is true that there is on God's part an irresistible production of holiness in the elect by reason of the decree of election, yet, on the other hand, God's decree of reprobation in nowise causes the sins of the reprobate. Rather is man's sin—the first, last and all sin—the occasion of divine reprobation of the guilty. How then any inconsistency with the sinner's

free-agency? Further, reprobation coincides with the wills of the non-elect which did not, and do not, choose holiness, but sin; which have issued in an inability to obey and an inclination to disobey God. Reprobation did not originate, but punishes sin in man, and is no more inconsistent with the sinner's search for salvation than is his own evil will. "To say they do not will to be damned is only to say they are not willing to experience the retributive results of their own self-elected conduct. Of course, no criminal is willing to be hanged. But if he was willing to commit the crime for which he is hanged, his hanging is of his own getting. The sentence of the judge is not inconsistent with his free-agency when he perpetrated the deed. God gives no man the will to sin, but he justly inflicts the doom of self-elected sin. Nor can his sentence of reprobation be, in any sense, regarded as the cause of that doom. It inflicts what the sinner has freely chosen."

God's decrees, instead of destroying, establish his creatures' right of willing; instead of precluding man's free-agency, are its everlasting warrant.

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them as we will."

And this fact daily confronts man in his experience over and again. The Lord is ruler over us all, and his wise counsels are ever being carried into execution *pari passu* with the exercise of the free-agency of man for good or evil. All through life, in every individual's history, these two doctrines as facts run side by side with each other, the one (divine sovereignty) being necessary to the other (human liberty). We are perfectly aware of our free-agency always, though of God's counsels we only know as he sees fit to reveal them to us in his holy Word and unfailling providence. All beings, acts or events are under his supreme control; in him we glory and rest in perfect peace, whose hearts upon him and his counsels are stayed. Though the wicked may flourish, it is only for a season; punishment is sure. Though the righteous suffer much tribulation, they shall enter into the blessedness of the Lord and the inheritance prepared for them from the beginning. Glory be to God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in the highest! Because we accept the Bible as the word

of the Lord, we believe both in God's sovereignty and in man's free-agency. Despair of self leads to hope in God. Never man became a Christian by compulsion, and never was a man made to sin, but chose to sin freely, however tempted by Satan.

IV. The doctrine or fact of the divine decrees in nowise discourages, but the rather encourages to the utmost, the use of means to secure salvation, and the making of the most strenuous exertions to be saved: for God's plan or purposes include the existence and employment of all the proper means and agencies divine and human by which they are to be carried into effect.

God has ends to be subserved, and he has ordained the end and the means in connection with each other. The end is not decreed to be attained without the means, nor the means appointed but in conjunction with the end: the means and the end being inseparably joined together. Hence we have furnished us the strongest motives to "seek the Lord in the time of our merciful visitation" with all earnestness. God chose some to salvation as the end, and to faith, penitence, righteousness, and holiness as the means, without regard to any natural goodness foreseen in them; their own righteousnesses being but as filthy rags in his sight (all being sinful and guilty), only the Lord Jesus Christ's finished and imputed righteousness and his Holy Spirit's imparted and inwrought righteousness availing for the salvation of sinners.

God carries out his design or decrees by the use of means—means of righteous grace and sacred privilege; and man must conform to God's conditions by grace if he is to be saved. The certainty of an event does not do away with the necessity of using the means appointed to bring it to pass. And knowing this, and that foreordination or predestination does not destroy free agency, man is to use all the God-appointed means, and in that way secure the predicted and predetermined end.

We realize no difficulty whatever between the divine will and human use of means: for the same thing is daily observed in every business, work, department, and branch of life. Plans involve means, whether much or little; the accomplishment of those plans involves the employment of the means in order to the ends in view. (*Cf.* 2 Kings iii. 16-20; xix. 32-34; Acts xxiii. 1-11.) So the soul that does not (by the Spirit) use God's appointed means of

grace (the church, with the ministry of the Word, the sacraments, and prayer) need not expect to be saved, for salvation comes only by the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. x. 17.) While God has mercy upon whom he will have mercy, he will in nowise cast out any that come unto him by Jesus, the God-provided way of approach.

V. The relation of God's decrees to his foreknowledge is that of cause to effect. Because God preordained all things soever that come to pass, in harmony with the laws of his own nature and the laws of human nature as intelligent and free, by the exertion or withholding of his power, therefore not only are these events certain of occurrence, but as such they are most surely fore-known of him. As some one has put it:

"We believe that some will certainly be saved. We also believe that some will certainly be lost. If some be saved and some be lost, then we believe that the some in either case is capable of definite expression in mathematical terms; and if a mathematically definite number of persons are saved on the one hand and lost on the other hand, there will be no more than that definitely saved and no more than that number definitely lost, neither any less saved nor any less lost, so that this certain number can neither be increased nor diminished: and God being omniscient must from the beginning know that number, the multitude that no man can number."

There is an inseparable connection between God's foreknowledge and God's decrees, the latter being neither dependent upon the former nor identical therewith; his foreknowledge being rather dependent upon his decrees, though perfectly distinct from them; for were his purposes unsettled, or undecided, he could not know the event certainly; but his purposes being fixed and definite, his knowledge of the event is also certain.

VI. Truly, then, this doctrine of the sovereignty of God in perfect harmony with the exercise of free agency by man is full of comfort to God's people as well as full of instruction to the world. It is the sinner's only hope. It is the Christian's only stay in prayer. It is the fount of encouragement to the ministry of God as they go about his work of bringing the world to Christ.

May the will of the Lord be done, as in heaven so in earth, for it alone is the hope of earth and the joy of heaven! May he work in us both to will and to work on the ground of his good pleasure! The divine plan of the ages o'erspans all, and is full of wisdom and truth, justice and grace, promise and warning. God's purpose in election encourages to faith and love and hope; while his purpose in preterition is monitory and should deter from unbelief and disobedience and despair. To the believer there is strength and blessing in the fact of God's decrees and man's free-will; good reason for constant praise of God and for persistent endeavor in Christian service. To the unbeliever the doctrine is pregnant with warning against sin and folly, and an incentive to the diligent employment of every means of grace in order to salvation from ruin and to the possession of eternal life.

That God is supreme and man is free, are unquestionable facts. How both can, as they do, coexist in perfect harmony, is an insoluble riddle in our present state. Here and now "we know in part." (1 Cor. xiii. 9.) Of course, the Eternal Being knows the whole concatenation of events from everlasting to everlasting, "but our recognition of the extreme mystery should dispose us more, not less, to bow to the revelation of the fact." The Lord is a God of purpose and action. He does naught without thought or aim; and he leaves naught to chance or accident, to afterthought or haphazard, to contingency or uncertainty. The good Maker has a wise plan for the conduct of the world he has made and overrules, embracing all things in general and everything in particular. And, blessed thought! "he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," and maketh "all things work together for good to them that love God." (Eph. i. 11; Rom. viii. 28.)

" Safe in the arms of sovereign love,
 Ye ever shall remain;
 Nor shall the rage of earth or hell
 Make God's wise counsels vain.
 Not one of all the chosen race,
 But shall to heaven attain;
 Partake on earth the purposed grace,
 And then with Jesus reign."

Newton, Georgia.

CHAS. O'N. MARTINDALE.

V.

THE ORIGINAL CAPACITIES OF MAN,

AS DEDUCED FROM RECENT EXPLORATIONS.

THE conclusions from recent explorations¹ in the East may be divided into two classes, those which have a biblical bearing along with the secular, and those whose significance is purely secular.

I. In the secular aspect, they are of great interest. One of the most recent is the exploration of a part of the Forum at Rome along with the discovery of the tomb of Romulus. Many of us had considered Romulus as merely a figment of the imagination. The finding of his tomb suggests that there was once a living man and a hero who wore this name, and around whose history have been woven the tissues of romance, which are reproduced in popular Roman history.

So also in Egypt, we have esteemed the stories of Osiris, of his sister-wife Isis, and of their son Horis, to be tales of the imagination—almost pure fiction—and the story of Menes, first king of Egypt, a tradition. But when, in January, 1898, M. de Morgan found at Negada, near Abydos or Thebes, in Egypt, what is evidently the tomb of Menes, the first king of the first dynasty of Egypt, we begin to feel that there was fact behind the tradition.

And then, almost immediately, Professor Amelineau reported that he had found the tomb of Osiris. Egyptian books speak of this tomb as the "staircase of the great god." On New Year's Day, 1898, Amelineau came upon this staircase. Egyptian books speak of the desire of his kings and generals to be buried

¹The writer has not undertaken to peruse all the published reports of these explorers, as indeed he has not had the leisure so to do. The facts here given are such as have appeared in the magazines which treat of these subjects and in other current literature.

near him. Amelineau found around his tomb two hundred chambers, which were obviously tombs of great men, contemporaries of his. Then, at the site of this staircase, Amelineau found a granite monolith in the shape of a bed, decorated with the head and legs of a lion. On this bed was lying a figure, bearing what is known as the white crown, holding in his hands, which came out of a case, a flagellum and a pastoral cane. Near the head were two hawks, and two more were at the feet. The dead king was designated by the inscription, "Osiris, the good being." The hawks were labeled, one of them, "Horis, avenger of his father;" and the goddess is also designated by her name.

This suggests that Osiris was not a creature of imagination, but first a hero, then a demi-god, and then a god. And it gives to the traditions of ancient Egypt a degree of verisimilitude that we may not overlook.

II. In the explorations which have a biblical bearing our interest centres especially. Their suggestions are many. Foremost among them is the great question of—

THE PRIMAL CONDITION OF MAN.

As to the primal condition of man, two theories of the present day meet us. One is our inference from the Scriptures that man was created with vigorous mental powers, such as would fit him to discover speedily the capacities of nature, and would enable him to think with vigor. The other is the inference which belongs to evolution, that man's original condition was one of savagery, that the earlier peoples of the earth were destitute of civilization, and that culture among men is a growth of development. One or the other of these is true—not both.

Before proceeding to the testimony of the monuments, let it be recognized that civilization and savagery may be contemporaneous in different parts of the world; today in Europe and Africa it is contemporaneous. This does not prove that man's original state was savage. It is just as easy—nay easier—for the civilized to become degraded as for the savage to elevate themselves. Especially is this so when there is to be taken into account the tendencies of sin before the flood, or the rewards of sin at the tower of Babel, and the more recent history of Egypt, in which

we see how a nation (within the days of history) has fallen from high civilization into degradation.

It may, therefore, be granted that the course of events in any one country for ten or twenty centuries just past, has been upward, and yet the other proposition may be true, that the original condition of man in the region where he was created, or where he located just after the flood, was one of great mental elevation, and was succeeded by deterioration, perhaps thirty centuries ago.

BIBLICAL DECLARATIONS.

Biblical testimonies as to the condition of man at creation are not wanting.

(a) God created man "very good." This does not suggest a condition of savagery, for it excludes the idea of ignorance or of cruelty or of idleness.

(b) God created man in knowledge. (See Col. iii. 10.)

(c) In the seventh generation after Cain, Jubal "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ," and Tubal-cain was "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron." This was not savagery, but civilization.

(d) If we consider the size, the proportions and the structure of the ark built by Noah, we find it as large as our larger steamships, equally well proportioned, and adapted to the ocean. And this, although it was apparently built in an inland locality.

These things point to high capacity and skill in early days.

EXPLORATIONS ON THE EUHRATES.

Do the discoveries of the explorers concur with this testimony as to the capacity of the earliest generations of men?

Only recently Dr. Koldenberg has reported the results of his explorations in the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar's day. He declares that the tiling he has found surpasses in fineness and glaze and lustrous beauty anything that modern art ever attained, and he expresses the conviction that further specimens will show that in the time of Abraham and earlier, art had reached a high point of development on the plains of Mesopotamia.

Concerning earlier dates, a discovery of about six years ago tells us more about this matter than all others combined. It is

that which appears to us to be, first, of "ancient" Nippur, of early post-diluvian days, and then, underneath this, of "prehistoric" Nippur, probably of antediluvian days.

The location of the Garden of Eden is generally accepted as being near the river Euphrates; and near that point seems to have been the central location of the human race, both before the flood and immediately after the flood. Hence we may seek at Nippur traces of the life of the earliest days of man.

Near the Euphrates river, not far from Babylon, are the ruins of this most ancient city known—called Nippur, or Niffer, or Nuffar. Between the years 1890 and 1895, Professor Hilprecht, of the University of Pennsylvania, explored its ruins and published the results. The ruins which he first explored, of ancient but not antediluvian Nippur, are thus described:

"The terraces of the Temple of Ekur (that is, 'mountain house') rose ever more distinctly out of the rubbish mass which had grown above it through millenniums. The impressive ruins stood above it, about one hundred feet above the level of the surrounding plains, while the foundation lay hidden in the earth's bosom more than one hundred feet below that level. The platform of the first king of Ur, who built there about 2800 B. C., was soon reached: but deeper still sank the shafts of the Americans. What for ages no king among the kings had seen—to speak with King Nabunaid—the old foundation of Naram-Sim), that saw I. The numerous bricks, bearing the name of the great Sargon, who 3800 B. C.,¹ had extended his powerful empire to the shores of the Mediterranean, came forth to the light of day, under pickaxe and shovel. By this, the expedition supplied irrefutable proof of the historical character of this primitive, Semitic kingdom, which had often been doubted."

On the door socket was inscribed the curse of Sargon:

"Whosoever removes this inscribed stone, may Bel, Shemash and Nina rot him out and destroy his posterity."

The later excavations of Professor Hilprecht went thirty-five feet below the platform of King Ur-Gur of Ur (about 3800 B. C.). At that depth he found what we suppose to be the ruins of the Nippur that was inhabited before the Noachian flood. Underneath the buildings of Sargon (3800 B. C.) and of Naram-Sim, he found a well-constructed arch with a keystone. The construction of an arch is ever accounted as a test of mechanical skill such as savagery cannot develop. He says of this:

¹The dates are those of Professor Hilprecht.

"An arch of brick in splendid preservation, and of nearly the same form as is found in the later monuments of the new Assyrian Empire, was laid bare and carefully photographed." "The existence (of the arch) in Babylonia about the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth millennium before Christ was proved."

Without endorsing all of these dates, we have here in the earliest days, probably before the flood, not only the arch, but a temple of admirable construction. Early structures, therefore, were characterized not by savagery, but by civilization.

Prof. S. A. Binion says of this antediluvian Nippur:

"As the work progressed, the archæologists on the spot were amazed to find that the lower city seemed to have enjoyed a higher civilization than the upper one. The carvings were larger, the architecture more elaborate, and the buildings greater in size and more gorgeously decorated."

Obviously these earlier generations had greater skill and knowledge of material than those who lived in subsequent days.

The documents found there are testimonies to early culture. Some of them set forth principles of law which are, in substance, the same as those of the present day in enlightened countries.

But another and richer evidence of the early capacity and activity of man is yet to be named. About October 1, 1902, Professor Hilprecht returned from another season of explorations at Nippur. In the *Philadelphia Ledger* we find a statement from him which gives strong evidence of capacity of those early dwellers on earth. He is reported as saying:

"We have unearthed about 23,000 tablets, and I will make the deciphering of them my life-work. The contents of those tablets when deciphered will change the ideas of the world as to the state of civilization and knowledge among that early people. It will be seen that they then knew (2300 B. C.) that the earth is a globe, and that then astronomers took the same view of celestial phenomena as we now take. . . . The day before I embarked for my homeward voyage I had in my hand a tablet upon which were the minutest astronomical calculations as to the constellation Scorpion. These calculations as to the places and the movements of the stars were remarkable, and showed pretty clearly that the astronomers of those days (2300 B. C.) were as proficient in their science in some respects as are those of today. . . ."

"So thorough were those people, that in all the mathematical computations I have examined I have only found one mistake."

Prof. Sayce is authority for the statement that in the earliest years after the flood and the dispersion of mankind at Babel, Sargon I. was a patron of learning, and caused the library of ancient Agade or Accad to become one of the most famous in Babylonia. For Sargon's use the great work on astronomy and astrology was compiled, in seventy-two books. (Berosus translated it into Greek.) Another work prepared for the same primeval Sargon was on terrestrial omens.

EXPLORATIONS IN EGYPT.

In Egypt, too, there is much evidence of high civilization in its earliest centuries. From the time of the fifth dynasty the bodies of their great men have been preserved in the form of mummies, and from the first dynasty the bones have been preserved so as to be found intact at the lapse of four thousand years. In this, then, is evidence of art and skill.

The Egyptians made axes and sharpened tools of hardened copper: we of the twentieth century fall behind them in this art. The tomb of Osiris, along with later buildings, and Karnak and the pyramids, have resisted the tooth of time for thirty or forty centuries. Can we say more than this—or as much—for structures of the later centuries? Westminster Abbey is only seven hundred years old, and it is perhaps the oldest that is in good condition. Melrose (1400 A. D.), five hundred years old, Dunblane (1142 A. D.), seven hundred and fifty years old, Dunfermline and Dryburgh are all but ruins. Of all the ancient buildings in England, only a few remain intact; one building of the Tower of London, erected 1078 A. D.; St. Giles in Edinburgh, 1450; Stirling Cathedral, 1600; and Cathedral Church in Glasgow, 1197. All others have perished. But the builders of Egypt erected structures to last four thousand years.

Concerning other objects which were found in the tomb of Menes, first king of the first dynasty of Egypt, Flinders Petrie writes: "The jewels and linens in particular, made six thousand years ago, could not be surpassed in our own time." A bracelet has lately been found in a crack in the tomb of Menes, in which

the gold is so skilfully worked that we cannot see the joinings. Prof. Sayce says (*Ancient Empire*, p. 72):

“The art of the ‘Old Empire’ is realistic, vigorous and full of originitive genius; that of later times stiff, conventional and hieratic. Art is at its best in the age of the pyramid builders; its future history is a history of continuous decline. Those who have not seen the diorite statue of Khephren or the wooden statue of the ‘Sheikh el Belad’ in the Boulak Museum, or the exquisitely painted bas-reliefs of the tomb of Ti have no conception of what Egyptian art once was.”

The astronomical skill of those early days surprises us. The orientation of the tomb of Menes is a matter of high comment, and the orientation of the pyramid of Cheops is probably more perfect than of any building on earth. The efforts of eminent astronomers in later days in this direction have not been crowned with equal success. Its passageway points perfectly to the exact north of that day (which is different from that of the present) in the sky above.

The year was calculated in those early times very closely as 365 days. But further yet, the Egyptians recognized their error of one-fourth of a day, and made allowance for it in their Sothic cycle.

In medicine, the “Old Empire” of Egypt showed the mental capacity of the people. According to Manetho, the successor of Menes wrote treatises on anatomy. And a medical work mentioned in the Berlin papyrus is said to have been composed in the second dynasty. (We possess one that dates from between the days of Moses and Joseph, when prescriptions were made out in the same way as in the present day.)

As for literature, as early as the sixth dynasty, we find the tomb of a man, who is described as “Controller of the Royal Library.” We possess an ethical treatise written by the son of King Assa of the fifth dynasty. From it we select one sentence: “Love thy wife and cherish her as long as thou livest: be not a tyrant: flattery acts upon her better than rudeness.”

We may not pass from this subject without allusion to the *Book of the Dead*, which although completed at a later period, is yet based upon the Osiris myth.

We now have no occasion to express surprise at finding that in ancient Babylon there were libraries of six thousand volumes, or that in the days of Abraham there was one poet composing an epic poem in twelve books, or that in the Babylonian tradition of the flood there is a statement that after its subsidence, Xisuthros proceeded to dig up the books which had been buried before that event.

So that from the days of the flood we trace high culture and great mental power in both Babylonia and Egypt; and in antediluvian Nippur, we find like indications of mental activity in days before the flood. This verifies the Scripture declaration that God made man perfect, and calls for the conclusion that savagery on earth is not an original condition, but the outcome of the degradation of sin. It leaves no room for the theories of naturalistic evolution as applied to the history of mankind.

THOS. E. CONVERSE.

L. uisville, Ky.

VI.

THE BOHEMIAN CHURCH.

As we follow the winding course of a stream, its origin is sometimes forgotten, and the obscure locality where it took its rise may be altogether lost to view. Its numerous tributaries swell its volume and put new and varied ingredients into it, altering its complexion and otherwise affecting its character. It is well, therefore, to go back, now and then, to the beginnings, and refresh our minds with the conditions and causes which gave rise to those valued results which constitute our cherished inheritance.

Historical study serves to correct misconceptions which have crept in during the lapse of time, and to refresh the memory with facts which have become obscured by the accumulation of events which have grown out of them. The history of the world's civilization is more than a recital of happenings which appear on the surface, the change of dynasties, the rise and fall of empires, revolutions, and the progress of great movements. It is the evolution of principles working in the minds of men and struggling into active and controlling influence. It is the growth of a great, all-embracing plan by which God is governing the minds of men and controlling all their actions. Hence it is a fact, sufficiently singular to arrest attention, that the great movements which have affected most widely the course of history have originated in obscure places and among comparatively obscure people. Thus "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." The great, the proud and the worldly wise have been led to sit at the feet of the lowly and despised, and receive instruction in the matters of transcendent worth.

This is a sufficient plea for inviting the attention of the reader to an outline review of the history of the Bohemian Church, which for near ten centuries has maintained an existence, in some form, amid struggles the most patient and persistent.

Bohemia is a small inland country, in the centre of Europe, forming an important division of the Austrian Empire, with an area of little more than 20,000 square miles. It lies in a basin, surrounded on every side by mountain ranges, which in some parts rise to near 5,000 feet. It has a mixed population, about two-thirds of which are Czechs of Slavonic origin, the remainder being Germans and Jews. The people speak both the Bohemian and German languages. Their character for morality is said to be quite on a par with that of the people of other countries. The Roman Catholic religion prevails there, as it has for centuries past. The country is governed by an Austrian viceroy, and it has its representative Diets. It is more densely peopled than any other part of the Austrian Empire, its population being between five and six millions. Moravia and Silesia, which belong also to the Bohemian crown, are properly included in any account that may be given of its history.

This little province is one of the most interesting countries of Central Europe. It has a history of its own, and yet a history which is inseparable from that of the greatest movement of modern times. Its people were converted to Christianity in the ninth century by two missionaries of the Greek Church. That church differed from the Church of Rome, among other things, in giving the cup to the laity in communion, in allowing the clergy to marry, and in celebrating public worship in the native tongue. These peculiarities, which are only scriptural ones, the Bohemians retained until in the fourteenth century, when the Roman Church contrived to establish its jurisdiction over the country, and the old Greek practices were abandoned, greatly to the dissatisfaction of the people. In the fifteenth century the spirit of revolt began to show itself by determined action.

Europe was in an unsettled state, both as to religion and politics. Contending dynasties defeated the adoption of any definite policy of government, and conflicts of rulers with the papal power kept the religious mind in a state of fermentation. "The usurpations, venality, tyranny, and avarice of the Court of Rome, during the fourteenth century, produced a general spirit of disaffection towards it." The papacy itself was rent by discordant

factions. In 1308 the seat of the popes was removed to Avignon, and in 1378 it was taken to Rome. Two popes were elected. A schism ensued which lasted twenty-eight years. "Popes excommunicated popes, and, in their angry contentions, gave testimony concerning each other's corruptions the most astounding ever revealed against the papacy": an impressive illustration of that unity of which Rome has ever made arrogant boast. It has been fitly observed, "During this time the most sagacious Catholic cannot distinguish the true successor of St. Peter."

Guizot says: "Down to the fifteenth century, the only general ideas which had a powerful influence on the masses were those connected with religion. The church alone was invested with the power of regulating, promulgating, and prescribing them. Attempts, it is true, at independence, and even at separation, were frequently made; and the church had much to do to overcome them. Down to this period, however, she had been successful. Creeds rejected by the church had never taken any general permanent hold on the minds of the people; even Albigenses had been repressed. Division and strife were incessant in the church, but without any decisive and striking result. The fifteenth century opened with the appearance of a different state of things. New ideas, and public and avowed desire of change and reformation, began to agitate the church herself."

It will be observed that the first attempts at popular religious reform broke out in Bohemia about the time when the Council of Pisa was endeavoring to put an end to the great western schism, and the Council of Constance was trying to reform the church. The efforts of both of these councils failed, as did that of the people, but they showed the existence simultaneously of two reform movements. They were the efforts of the authorities and the people in a conflict for supremacy. Bohemia was involved in a mighty conflict for religious freedom long before Germany at large had become really aroused to its necessity; and Huss and Jerome gave up their lives at the stake one hundred years before Luther thundered defiance at the Vatican, or Calvin wrote.

When Sigismund came to the throne in the year 1410, he found himself confronted with religious difficulties. It is said

the condition of the church was never more deplorable. "The ecclesiastics were administering upon the estate of religion for their own benefit, and the people in their interests and hopes were utterly abandoned, except for spoil, by the spiritual leaders of the age." As early as 1360 this condition of religious starvation led in Bohemia to the rise of a class of parish clergymen—"preachers of the first intent"—who mingled with the people, gave ear to their cries, and ministered to their wants. "The poor rallied at their call, and the weak found in them their natural friends and protectors. The angry priests, unable to control the opinions and practices of the people, took up the axe of persecution, and hewed right and left; but the cause grew in spite of opposition, and though the sower fell in the field, the seed of that great religious revolt was scattered, which, with the coming of the sixteenth century, was destined to bring forth fruit a hundred fold." (*Ridpath.*)

Charles IV. had founded at Prague a great university, which became one of the leading antecedents of the insurrection in the church. John Huss was educated in it. He taught the doctrines of Wickliffe, whose writings had fallen into his hands. He became rector of the university in 1403, and he, with the aid of Jerome, one of the Bohemian nobles, gave character to the doctrines and beliefs of the institution. Their influence was felt throughout the kingdom. "Huss preached against absolution, the worship of saints, the sale of indulgences, and the doctrine of purgatory. He demanded that both bread and wine should be given to all Christians in the sacrament, and not bread alone, as was the practice of the priests. Indeed, his teachings were fully as radical and subversive of the current usages of Rome as were those of Luther more than a century afterwards."

Huss was a man of learning, an able and fearless preacher, and a true lover of his country. An enemy said of him: "His pure morality, his earnest life, his care-lined countenance, his sympathetic kindness, breathed with more wondrous power than all the eloquence that fell from his lips." Summoned before the Council of Constance on the charge of heresy, and refusing to recant, he was condemned to the stake and burned alive on his

birthday, July 4, 1415. Jerome suffered a similar fate the following year.

“Intense indignation against the authorities followed the execution of Huss. He was popular, patriotic, and influential, and his views spread more widely than ever. The people were particularly exercised over the denial of the cup to the laity. Their loudest cry was the demand for its restoration. Ever since that time the cup has been the emblem of the Bohemian Church. It is seen on their tombstones, engraven along with the Bible on their pulpits, and emblazoned in the insignia of their church.” A few years ago a silver cup, elaborately formed, was dug up in a field near Kolin, where it is supposed to have lain for upwards of four hundred years in the grave of a Hussite priest.

The history of persecution is that it scatters the seeds of truth more widely and strengthens attachment for it. Like a desolating storm, it may work destruction in its path, but it casts up* into the air seeds which its own violence helps to transplant in other soil. The intolerance of the Council of Constance, and the cruel death it imposed on Huss and Jerome, had the effect of causing a great part of the nation to adopt their views. This was followed up by persecution which raged against them with great violence from the year 1419. In order to defend themselves against an attack on them by force, a strong body of them assembled on a hill which they called Mt. Tabor. From this incident they were sometimes called Taborites. The results of this movement were disastrous and full of horrible detail. According to Comenius, the historian of the Bohemian Church, upwards of four thousand perished in one year by being thrown into open silver mines. The remains of those mines are said to be visible yet in the neighborhood of Kuttenberg.

For a long period the conflict continued something after the fashion of a civil war, with victory for the followers of Huss. Eventually, however, they disagreed among themselves, which resulted in the suppression of the Taborite Church, until aroused into new life by the stir of the Reformation.

In this reform movement among the Bohemians, Scotland became providentially involved in this way: In the early years

of it the Bohemians sent a man by the name of Paul Craw into that country as a kind of medical missionary. The only reason that can be suggested for it is that the missionary spirit burned hotly within them, and though they were bruised and torn in themselves, they would preach the gospel in the regions beyond. Craw was a follower of Huss and Wickliffe, and bravely preached the scriptural way of life. He was not tolerated, and was burned at St. Andrews for heresy in 1432. Respecting this Dr. Blakie remarks, "This was Scotland's return to the Bohemians and to Craw for their service of Christian love. For four centuries and a half the cruel wrong has remained unredressed and their kindness unacknowledged. It is surely time that something should be done by Scotland, and those descended from Scottish fathers, to atone for such bitter wrong and in return for such pure kindness."

About the year 1457 the Church of the United Brethren was formed. "The origin of this movement lay in the conviction of not a few that it was not by strife and bloodshed that their loyalty to Christ was to be shown, but by humble, godly lives, regulated by his will and devoted to his service. This was essentially a Presbyterian church with a very evangelical creed; simple in its form of worship and thoroughly imbued with the spirit of Christian love. Though much persecuted, it flourished greatly, and at one time had as many as five hundred congregations! To show what manner of men these were who composed this church, McDonald, in his *Glimpses of Bohemia*, relates that in 1464 they held an assembly in the forest of Rychnor, when they agreed to continue submissive, humble, patient and pure, to obey and to pray for those in authority, and to labor honestly, so as to become able to afford help to suffering brethren. He adds that this forest assembly is a picture deserving to be placed beside the pictures of the Pilgrim Fathers embarking on board the *Mayflower* or landing at Plymouth Rock, or of the Scottish Covenanters in Greyfriars churchyard. And there is another picture worthy of a place with these, that of the Waldenses in 1532, in the famous Synod of Angrogna, when the pastors and elders met under the chestnut trees of Cianforan to devise measures for increasing the

spiritual life of the church and encouraging their people to be more fearless in confessing Christ before men.

It may be naturally supposed that such witnessing for the truth by these people had well prepared the channels for the Reformation; and when the movement took hold of Bohemia nearly the whole country was won to the cause. But in 1547, through the efforts of the Austrian Emperor to reconquer it to Rome, additional persecution followed, which resulted in a death-struggle between the two parties in 1617, when the Bohemian crown was conferred on the elector Frederic.

We find here another link between Bohemia and Scotland. "The wife of Frederic was the Princess Elizabeth, only daughter of James VI. of Scotland and I. of England. She was the last member of Scotland's royal family born on Scottish soil. They lost their crown as sovereigns of Bohemia by being defeated in a battle with the Emperor near Prague. After the death of Frederic, Elizabeth took refuge in Holland, where she lived with her large family in poverty. But her fidelity to the cause met with a splendid recompense. Her youngest daughter (Sophia) married the elector of Hanover, and became the mother of George I. of England, the Parliament of England having settled the succession in that branch of the Stuart family. Queen Victoria was thus the lineal descendant of the Queen of Bohemia."

As the years passed the work of persecution went on. "Nobles were executed, pastors banished, Bibles and other books burnt, and extreme penalties visited on the followers of the cause;" edicts of banishment were issued, until the Protestants dispersed in all directions. "The United Brethren went to Poland, Calvinists to Holland and Transylvania, and Lutherans to Saxony. By such measures the three millions of Bohemians were reduced to eight hundred thousand, and the once flourishing aspect of the country was wholly changed. The name of Bohemia, once so famous, sank to a by-word."

One other tragedy deserves mention. "In front of the town hall in the public square of Prague, at five o'clock, on the morning of the 21st of June, 1621, twenty-seven of the leading Protestants

of Bohemia were beheaded in succession. These men had spent the night in prayer and mutual exhortation, and, founding their hope on Ps. lxxxvi. 17, had made it a special request that God would show them a token for good—an evidence that they had not displeased him. And it is related that there was seen above the horizon at sunrise a beautiful bow, surrounding the sun's form, which they interpreted as an answer to their prayer; and, falling on their knees, they clapped their hands and shouted for joy."

An interesting occurrence, connected with this tragedy, followed two hundred and fifty-seven years afterward. Some Bohemian students, residing in Edinburgh, purchased at a public auction there what purported to be an "executioner's sword," and found engraved on the blade, in German, the names of twenty-four Protestant victims, and on the hilt the initials of the executioner, with a statement, in Bohemian, that the sad deed was done on June 21, 1621. This sword is kept as a precious relic in Prague. It was loaned to Edinburgh to be exhibited at a bazaar held for the cause some years ago. It was shown at the Belfast Council of the Presbyterian Alliance, and for a time was entrusted to the care of the Presbyterians of America. It and the cup mentioned in this article were deposited for a season in the fire-proof room of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia.

It was not until 1781 that the Edict of Toleration was issued to this people, and even that imposed ungracious restrictions. "They might have meeting-houses, but only in out-of-the-way places, without bells or steeples, without ecclesiastical windows or doors. And this restriction has continued very nearly to the present day. But the number of those who rose from the grave of oppression at the publishing of this edict was so great as to startle those who had hoped the cause of liberty was dead. The enemies of that cause understood its spirit and trend as little as the prelates of the fifteenth century foresaw Luther and Calvin, or the courtiers of Louis XIV. foresaw the French Revolution. About seventy congregations appeared in Bohemia and Moravia,

out of which was formed the New Reformed Church. Their liberty continued to be restricted. In 1864 a General Synod was called at Vienna to arrange a church constitution, but the constitution was a mixture of Presbyterianism and Lutheranism.

The edict of toleration granted to the Protestant Church of Bohemia the right of regulating, ruling and directing independently her own affairs, yet it placed over her a royal evangelical court, a state authority, to which it is subordinate and responsible. Preachers and office-bearers of the church cannot accept and conduct their offices, to which they are elected, without the sanction of the State. The evangelical churches of Austria are virtually State churches. Although in the whole Austrian Empire there are Reformed and Lutheran congregations, yet in Bohemia and Moravia the number of the former predominates. The most prominent feature of these now is that they are striving after pure Presbyterian principles, seeking to conform their church to the Word of God. The Confession of Faith accepted by them is the second Helvetic Confession. This creed had been accepted by all the Reformed Protestants of Hungary in the year 1567, but by the Protestants in other parts of the Austrian Empire not until 1781. It is interesting to note the "Away from Rome" movement just now in progress in Austria. Roman Catholics are joining the Protestant church in increasing numbers. Reliable statistics show that in Bohemia alone since January, 1899, over 7,000 conversions have taken place.¹

America and Britain have both remonstrated against Austrian oppression of these people, but with little avail; yet the Reformed Church grows. Even their old enemies are moved at times to friendly interest in their cause. "A few years ago there was a national celebration of the five hundredth anniversary of the birthday of John Huss, in which Roman Catholics were most hearty in honoring the memory of one whom they looked on as a patriot as well as a reformer."

¹ More recent statistics place this number at 30,000, of which the Protestant churches have received about two-thirds and the Old Catholics about one-third of the reforming element.

It is said some pastors of this church are infected with rationalism, but a considerable number are evangelical. One has said of them, "To be a member of this church requires strength to suffer blows on the right cheek and on the left, to be stripped of the last cloak, to bear shame, scorn and injustice, to be despised, to be tempted, to be always in a small minority, and even to be suspected by friends." It is mainly a self-supporting church, a little help being obtained from the government. The average salary of its ministers is not above \$300 a year, and of the schoolmasters \$200, raised mostly by the people. The first impulse given to the establishment of Sabbath-schools among them came from the United States. President Cattell, of Lafayette College, gave it a start during a visit to Bohemia in 1869-'70.

It will be remembered that an appeal was made to the Presbyterian Alliance in 1887 for the sum of five thousand pounds to aid this struggling church in its efforts to equip in a suitable way a society for the diffusion of sound Christian literature and the Word of God, and to be the centre of a home mission agency; to assist in the erection of church buildings, and to aid in the establishment and support of schools. These have been and are among its greatest needs. Whenever it stretches out its hands to Christendom for help, God's people everywhere should be quick to respond in recognition of their indebtedness to brethren who bear the scars of battles fought and won in the cause of that freedom which now sheds its light and peace on many lands. Let Christendom measure the degree of her obligation for what she enjoys, by the breadth and depth of that stream which burst out with irrepressible force in that small province of Europe more than five centuries ago.

We cannot close this brief sketch without disclaiming any intention of approving all the measures adopted by the followers of Huss in their efforts to reform the church. Nor were they free from error in some of the views they held respecting the mission and authority of the church. It could not, with good reason, be supposed that at that period, with centuries of darkness behind them, and the weight of mental bondage which rested on them.

their emergence from traditionary and erroneous beliefs would have been complete. They indulged revenge, and applied the principle of persecution to exterminate heresy. They met force with force, and often rivaled their oppressors in acts of cruelty. They had learned too well the lessons inculcated by their masters. But they sought liberty to think for themselves, and to act agreeably to their beliefs. They claimed to be God's freemen, and to be in bondage rightfully to no man. It was their honest endeavor to emancipate human reason—to break the absolute power of spiritual tyranny. What their initial steps, in common with others, have procured, let a redeemed church say.

Richmond, Mo.

T. C. BARRET.

VII. GENERAL NOTES.

CHURCH UNION.

AN organic union of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the Reformed Church in America seems to me "a consummation most devoutly to be wished" for the following reasons:

To begin with, it would be distinctly in harmony with the general movement of our time. So far as I can perceive, the present tendency is by no means toward that Utopian unity of denominations of which some impractical spirits have dreamed, and which Jesus is mistakenly supposed to have had in mind when he prayed "that they all may be one"; but it is rather toward the more perfect segregation of like-minded bodies of believers. Such "denominationalism" is normal, since the human race is gregarious. Men come together naturally, not *en masse*, but in sympathetic groups; and this is as it should be.

But there is no reason why these sympathetic groups should be further broken up as denominations into purely artificial and uneconomic parts. "Fences make good neighbors;" but there should be no fences in family circles. There is a visible reason why Protestants and Romanists, Calvinists and Arminians, Prelatists, Independents and Presbyterians, Baptists and Pedito-baptists, should camp on their several hilltops and keep the peace; but the world knows, and the church is coming to understand, that there is no excuse for domestic intercleavage. We are anatomized too far. We are lacerated and dismembered. We are working at a disadvantage because bodies that are naturally homogeneous insist on working in detached limbs and segments. The community suffers in consequence, not because God's people are in households, but because their very households are broken up. Wherefore I say the present movement is along right and economic lines. Let the families get together! Whom God hath joined in spiritual wedlock, not inertia, prejudice nor mere conventionality should be permitted to put or keep asunder. To be specific; if it is right for our two churches to sit together under

one roof-tree, it is wrong for us longer to live apart. But we had better live apart than unite unless we are agreed. To my mind that is the only question. Are we so agreed on all important matters as to constitute a domestic unit? Let us see.

First. Our ecclesiastical polities are alike. There is not a shade of difference in our Presbyterianism. We hold to the same government of elders. Our four courts are practically identical; your session corresponds to our consistory; your Presbytery to our Classis; your Synod to our Particular Synod, and your General Assembly to our General Synod. The duties of our several judicatories correspond with yours. The only difference is that in our local consistories the deacons sit with the elders for the transaction of general business, though they have nothing to do with the management of the spiritual affairs of the church. This arrangement dispenses with the need of a Board of Trustees, though in some cases our churches retain it.

Second. Our doctrinal symbols represent the same type of Calvinism, and, except in form of expression, are conceded to be substantially identical. The Westminster Confession and the Canons of Dort are used and accepted interchangeably in our leading churches and judicatories. And the Dutch Reformed Church, like your own, stands by its symbols. It does not regard Calvinism as a mere landmark of past doctrinal controversy. So far as I am aware, our orthodoxy is not called in question; on the other hand, our doctrinal conservatism is an occasion of reproach among those progressive people who are apparently more eager to keep up with the *Zeit-geist* than with the leadings of *Heileger-Geist*. We believe that anybody has a right to repudiate the doctrinal symbols of any church, but not while he remains within it, bound by its covenant vows. Candidates for ministerial licensure in the Reformed Church are required to affix their signatures to the following: "We, the underwritten, testify that the Heidelberg Catechism and the Confession of the Netherland Churches, as also the canons of the National Synod of Dordrecht, held in the years 1618 and 1619, are fully conformable to the Word of God. We promise, moreover, that, as far as we are able, we will, with all faithfulness, teach and defend, both in public and in private, the doctrines established in the standards aforesaid. And, should ever any part of these doctrines appear to us dubious, we will not divulge the same to the people, nor disturb the peace of the church, or of any community; but will communicate our senti-

ments to the ecclesiastical judicatories under which we stand, and subject ourselves to the counsel and sentence of the same."

Third. Both churches are pervaded by the enthusiasm of missions. In our Home Mission work we are at a relative disadvantage, owing in part to the fact that the larger bodies can pursue their work with a greater economy of both strength and money; and partly because the name "Dutch," which was cherished for its historic associations until 1867, still imparts a suggestion of foreignism to a body which, in fact, has a presumptive right above all others to an American title. Notwithstanding these facts, however, an examination of our general Minutes will show that our progress in home evangelization has kept reasonable pace with that of other denominations. But our just pride is in our foreign missionary work. No other ecclesiastical body, with the sole exception of the Moravians, can present a better showing in *per capita* gifts or in practical results. Witness the reports of our Indian, Chinese, Japanese and Arabian fields. If I am rightly informed, the conditions are somewhat reversed with you; that is, your Home Mission work presses upon you with a deeper emphasis than that of the foreign field. But both denominations have an honorable record as compared with many; and both alike have fallen short of the imperative call of the evangel. At this particular point the advantage of union should be obvious. If I may use a Dutch proverb, "*Een dracht maekt macht;*" which may be liberally rendered, "Two are better than one."

Fourth. Our two bodies have never been at odds. On the contrary, there has been, from time immemorial, a pleasing commerce of fraternal courtesy and fellowship between us. There was an occasion for recrimination at the breaking out of the civil war; but at that time our General Synod, recognizing the delicacy of the situation on your part, was prayerfully careful—while not committing itself to your views on the slavery question—to refrain from any unfraternal word or syllable that could justly offend you.

Fifth. Both our churches are sectional. Your work lies south of Mason and Dixon's line, while ours is confined practically to certain portions of the Northern States. You are growing in numbers and influence, and so are we; but this growth is wholly along these sectional lines. It seems to me that our success must always be discounted, more or less, in comparison with denominations that are coextensive with the country. Were we to unite, we should be an American church. Our general judicatory could hold its annual

meetings in any of the larger cities between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico. We should effectually rid ourselves of that stigma of sectionalism which, so long as present conditions remain, must abide in the popular mind. And, above all, we should be ready to carry our work of Home Missions to all our needy frontiers, thus falling into line and keeping step with other denominations that labor in no "pent-up Utica," but "provoke one another" by fraternal competition in the unrestricted work of national evangelization. I do believe that, could this union be effective, we should at once forge to the front as one of the most efficient of distinctly American churches.

Sixth. The economic advantage of such a union is worthy of prayerful consideration. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. The irresistible tendency of our time is toward "trusts," and "combines," capitalistic "syndicates" and industrial "unions." If your church were a secular corporation and ours another, the two would get together for mutual advantage in twenty-four hours. Think of the waste of energy and financial resources in the present arrangement; and consider that as both strength and money are the Lord's, held by us in sacred stewardship, we are not at liberty to use them otherwise than in the most economic way. What right have we, homogeneous and affectionately harmonious as we are, to employ two boards for the carrying on of every department of our work when one would answer just as well? Everything that we do thus for the Lord, under present conditions, costs more than it ought to; and every penny, every atom of energy, wasted in such extravagant administration belongs to the Lord, and represents unrealized possibilities in the evangelization of the world.

Seventh. The union of our two churches would possibly strike the key-note of fellowship in the whole Presbyterian household, now so lamentably torn asunder. It is an open secret that there are apparently insuperable difficulties in the way of your reunion with the Northern Presbyterian Church. The effort has been made again and again without effect. Shall the matter, therefore, be dropped? Would it not be wise, in default of accomplishing the larger purpose, to do the thing which is manifestly practicable now? It may be that the entire family will never get together; of that the future alone can tell; but, in any event, we shall so far forth, as members of the household, have set ourselves right before God.

Eighth. So far as I know, there is nothing against the proposed union. "What would our name be?" "What would become of our cherished traditions?" "What adjustment would be made of forms and symbols?" These are trivial considerations in view of the desired end. Other churches have come together again and again, and have found all such difficulties vanishing into thin air. It is probable that no two churches, contemplating union, have ever confronted so few real obstacles as ourselves. If, under such circumstances, we create difficulties, or refuse to let a wise Providence clear the way, the responsibility is upon us. Let us see to it that if the pillar of cloud lifts and advances, we make no tarrying in our separate camps, but rise and follow it.

Ninth. The question of probabilities will have weight in many minds. A year ago a communication was addressed to more than a hundred of the ministers of the Reformed Church, asking their opinion as to this step. Of the answers received, not more than two or three were adverse. Many were enthusiastically favorable; a few suggested that the proverbial conservatism of the distinctly Dutch portion of our body would probably prevent; but in not a single case was there a suggestion of argument against it. Should the matter come before our General Synod for action, no living man can prophesy what that action would be. As for myself, I should regard it as a crime against sound reason to withhold my utmost influence in favor of a measure proposing the greater usefulness of both bodies. If the proposition fails, in my judgment, culpable apathy and ignorant prejudice will be to blame for it.

New York City.

DAVID JAMES BURRELL.

CUMBERLANDIZING THE CREED.

THE most peculiar, and, in some respects, a most significant, outcome of the revision movement is the attitude towards it of the Cumberland Church. Since the publication of the amendments to the Confession, and especially of the Brief Statement, several Presbyteries of that body have taken formal action looking towards organic union with the revising body; in many more, with some Synods, the measure has been proposed, and in a vastly larger number still steps would have been taken but for the plea that it is not yet time to begin such a movement in its formal aspects. With the last named class it seems to be the conviction that there is little in

the way besides the time needful for the formal completion by the revisionist church of its work. The matter has become a burning question in the Cumberland body. It will probably continue to be agitated until a definite conclusion is reached.

That the movement by the Cumberland brethren is untimely, few will doubt. A religious paper here and there does not think so, but the vast majority express the view that events are not yet ripe. The untimeliness, however, as argued chiefly by the Cumberland people themselves, grows not out of the unreadiness of the fundamental conditions in the declared faith of the church with which they would unite, but out of the mere incompleteness of the formal expression of that faith in the method of creed revision. One Assembly must pass upon the proposed changes and additions, these must next be submitted to the Presbyteries for their concurrence, and the following Assembly must then enact, if two-thirds of the Presbyteries have agreed. Of these steps only the first has yet been taken. The others are yet to come. When all are taken, union may be sought. The present difficulty or delay does not grow out of doctrine, but out of form, and is but temporary. Such at least seems to be the position of those in the Cumberland Church who have, for the time being, "scotched" the movement of their brethren on which they were running with something of a whoop and hurrah at first. Some intimation, too, has been added, that it would hardly be polite to the brethren with whom they seek union to act before the grounds upon which union is sought are settled formally, as they are in their belief already settled in fact and principle. On the other hand, some among them claim, and are sustained in it by some of the revisionists, that a part of the work of revision—namely, that comprehended in the Brief Statement—does not have to go through the formal steps prescribed for amendments to the Confession.

It is impossible to avoid the conviction that the Cumberland movement is both a result and an interpretation. Very little has been said concerning this aspect of it, except by one journal of the revising church. The Cumberland Church is practically Arminian in its tenets, much as it attempts and claims to mediate between Calvinism and Arminianism. Its people have not yielded a single one of their own distinctive principles. On the contrary, they have rather stiffened, in the recent revision, in 1883, of their Confession of Faith, in their distinctive ideas. They are justly regarded by almost all outsiders, and by theological scholarship, as upholding

the Arminian faith. The United Brethren and Methodist Protestant Churches are at this very time seeking union with them as a people of kindred beliefs. Many of their members and several of their courts—and many more of the latter would join the others but for the plea of untimeliness—are persuaded that the revision proposed has taken away the obstacles to closer relations with the revising church. The only logical conclusion is that these excellent brethren are convinced that the other party has removed the doctrinal barriers that the Calvinistic faith put in the way, and has come towards the Arminian standpoint sufficiently near to be within reach of those who continue to stand where they have always stood. Their willingness and desire, therefore, for organic union amount to a practical interpretation by them of the real meaning of revision, a yielding of the underlying principles of the Calvinistic faith, and not a mere revised statement of that faith. That such an interpretation is unjust, many will believe. That it is not altogether intelligent, especially in view of the declared purpose of the revising body in undertaking the work, or that it challenges either the sincerity or the skill of the church, has been intimated or may be admitted. But all the same it voices clearly the judgment of the vast majority outside the revising church. Among the other communions, and among the people of the world, the conviction is very common—all the deliverances of the church to the contrary notwithstanding—that the Presbyterian Church is just now doctrinally all at sea. If no more, the Cumberland movement at least emphasizes the care the church should exercise to act in such a way that the good she seeks to do be not evil spoken of.

The attitude of the press of the Northern Church towards this Cumberland movement may, to some extent, indicate the attitude of the several papers' constituencies. In but one paper, so far as we know, has there been recognition of the impropriety of the movement upon doctrinal grounds, and criticism of the Cumberland brethren for their interpretation of the meaning, purpose, and scope of the revision. Only one has boldly expressed the conviction that the Cumberland movement shows the drift towards anti-Calvinism and latitudinarianism in revision. In one or two others there has been criticism of it as a hindrance, because of the interpretation which it makes and voices, of the efforts to revise, causing some who would otherwise favor revision to recoil from the position, lest their good be evil spoken of. In some quarters there has been a slight intimation that the action of the Cumberland courts is just a little

bit of an impertinence. "Do not meddle with our affairs; it is none of your business to do so now at any rate." This seems to be the feeling on the part of some, and the fear of this feeling is one of the main arguments among the Cumberland brethren themselves for a temporary postponement or "dignified delay" in the agitation. In others, strong approbation is given to the movement, and a welcoming hand is held out in advance. It strikes an outsider that so little is made of the doctrinal features of the case, from the standpoint of those with whom the Cumberland Church is seeking union, that the conclusion is just that either the revisionists regard the Cumberland movement as doctrinally warranted, as that church seems to claim, or that they think organic union desirable, even though it be accomplished under a misunderstanding on the part of one of the parties thereto, or that the external union of churches is so very important that it should be sought, even against doctrinal disagreement.

Among the Cumberland Presbyterians themselves there is quite a discussion going on between those who plead for a "dignified delay" and those who urge "dignified promptness" on the part of their church. One argument skilfully employed by the latter is that if their church fails now to take the initiative in seeking organic union, the doctrinal barriers being out of the way, it will be a tacit admission of the claim that has often been made that the original ground of disruption was educational and not doctrinal! In reading the discussions of the matter in the press of both the revising church and of the brethren who are looking sooner or later to a union as the result of the revision, it is observable that very little is said directly against the union. The pleas are almost all simply for a postponement of the question.

Take it altogether, it is a peculiar and interesting problem which has been sprung, whether justly or unjustly, wisely or unwisely, by our Cumberland brethren.

THE CANDIDATE PROBLEM.

It is a problem. In some respects it is the most serious one that now faces the church. Even the great interests of home and foreign missions do not, as a present issue, dwarf it; for if the church has not sufficient recruits for her ministry, where is she to obtain the men for enlargement of the work, or even the maintenance of it, of home and foreign missions? And, as a manifestation of a spiritual

condition, how much more serious! A constant and reliable fruitage of men consecrating themselves to the work of Christ is the best proof of a healthy, normal spiritual life. The absence of it indicates a low state of piety.

The greatest promise just now in connection with the problem is the fact that the church seems to be waking to a realization of the situation and of her need; and in contemplating the situation and the probable reasons for it, she is seeing what her own condition is, and what she must do for herself as well as for the cause.

The better to see the nature of the trouble and the possible remedies for it, there have been gathered and given below the views and conclusions of a great number of the wisest and most earnest men of the church, pastors, theological professors, secretaries and others, wise men in the eldership as well as in the ministry. They have been asked to express themselves freely and fully concerning the great falling off in recent years in the number of those seeking the ministry, and especially concerning what, in their judgment, are the causes, and what may be the remedy. The unanimity with which they have named most of the causes assigned indicates that the sentiment of the church is practically one as to the reasons which underlie the facts. Only one who has given his views appears to be of the opinion that the meagreness of the candidate list is in itself a good thing, while very many express the opinion that this meagreness will arouse the church to thought and action, and thus produce happy results.

The causes for the decline in the number of those offering themselves to the church for her ministry are given as follows, the words of the writers being used wherever possible, and where all or many concur in one thought, the most striking expression of it being given here:

1. The low state of piety in the church. When the church is filled with the Holy Spirit there will be no lack of worthy candidates. When her spiritual life is low she will have fewer candidates, or inferior ones. True ministers are the gift of Christ to his church. When he withholds them the cause must be found in the coldness and unbelief of the church. This cause is, in the opinion of all, the fundamental one. All the others spring from it, or are mere manifestations of it.

2. The prevalence of a spirit of worldliness in the church; of religion without the Holy Ghost; of Christianity without Christ;

of forgiveness without repentance; of the want of thorough-going, deep, pervading sense of sin.

3. The fact that the church at large has apparently not been deeply concerned or distressed by the constant diminution from the early recognition of it several years ago, when it began to be manifest. When the church wants ministers she will cry to God for them, and when she cries to him for them she will get them.

4. The neglect of pastors to preach on the subject of the duty of young men to consider God's call to them, and neglect to choose out able men full of the spirit and apt to teach, and to urge upon them personally the claims of the ministry. It is the testimony of one man of wide experience and observation, and who from the nature of his duties has the widest opportunities to know the work of the pulpit, that he has not heard the subject presented once in the past fourteen years, except as he himself presented it.

5. The decay of family religion, and the disappearing of the family altar. In some cases this has been from growing indifference. In others, the multiplication of Sabbath activities, working in with an already too great predisposition towards neglect, has left, even in our most pious homes, no time for the children and family religious life.

6. Not enough parents have the Hannah spirit, to consecrate their sons to the ministry in their very infancy, and then to rear them with that object constantly in view.

7. The unwillingness of parents to present the matter to their older sons, to urge upon them the duty of devoting their lives to Christ's work. This unwillingness grows out of the worldly ambition of parents who look for something for their boys that has promise of more earthly rewards or comforts. Several cases are cited of fathers distinctly avowing that they could not urge upon their sons a calling which would subject them to so poor a support, and to so many self-denials, and to so short-lived a career of activity and usefulness as the ministry offers. And in certain respectable circles the ministry seems to be held in low esteem.

8. The intense commercialism of the age, felt in every section and in every circle, permeating even the church herself, where the latter measures all her agents and activities by what they can produce of measurable or ponderable results, in "drawing" preachers, large collections, fairs, suppers, excursions, and the like. The question uppermost is, "Will it pay?" or, "What will it pay?" Joined to this

is the fact that seldom in the history of the country have there been as many opportunities to enter business as there have been during the past few years, with confident expectation of success and promotion.

9. The increasing luxuriousness of living, with its necessarily greater expense and worldly affectation, makes a calling impossible in which the pecuniary reward of one's toil is not very large. It is difficult for even ministers and their families to resist this spell.

10. The expenditure of the energy of our youth in young people's societies, out of which they do not grow into the broader work of the church, or from which, as it is often unnatural and forced, they come cold and indifferent. The multiplication of outside activities, too, tends to make some really consecrated youth feel that they can accomplish a true "ministry" in the ranks, and hence the sense of obligation to come forward and give themselves to the formal and authoritative preaching of the word is lessened.

11. The large resort to machine methods for quickening the life of the church or expanding its energies. The strong common sense of thinking men revolts against such methods and against a calling which seems to approve them or which makes use of them. Modern evangelism and church effort of the mechanical kind are responsible for the recoil of many of our young men from a religion and a calling which to the popular mind represent and depend upon such methods.

12. The church is not careful enough in educating her own children, and in making the Bible and the Catechism text-books in the schools to which she commits her sons. Parents surrender the education of their sons to irresponsible secular institutions, whence few come into the ministry, instead of sending them to the denominational colleges, out of which the greater per cent. of candidates have always come.

13. The long delay in our church to take up and vigorously prosecute, as she is now doing at last, the Sunday-school interests of the church at large.

14. The migration of young men from the country districts to the cities and larger towns, the decay of country churches, and the failure to meet the demands of our home mission fields. It is believed that seventy-five per cent. of our ministers come from the country or small village churches. Where these churches are not flourishing or are not adequately sustained the most fruitful source of supply is cut off or enfeebled. The vigorous prosecution of our

home mission work would very soon repay the church by a large increase of young men devoting themselves to the ministry.

15. The feeling on the part of many that we already have more ministers than the church needs. This feeling is more prevalent among the elders and members of the churches than among the ministers. Among the churches the feeling is accentuated whenever a vacancy in an ordinarily good field occurs, by the flood of applications that appear for the vacant place. It is also felt to some extent among the ministers, and especially by the older ones, who, though in the full maturity of their powers and effectiveness, are set aside for a more verdant class.

16. The meagre support that is given ministers as compared with the income of other professions, in many instances being insufficient to maintain their families in any degree of comfort during their years of activity, and utterly preventing their laying up anything for the years of inactivity and old age. The hard conditions of the pastor's life, and the higher cost of living without corresponding increase in salary, make the minister's life so cramped that he hardly has the face to present the call to that form of work.

17. The failure of the church to make adequate provision for the aged and infirm ministers or for the families of deceased ministers.

18. The easy unsettling of pastors, the ministers being at the mercy, not of the many, but of the few, and not of the best judges and the best workers, but of the malcontents and chronic disturbers.

19. The "age dead-line," which seems to be one of the unwritten laws of the church, more and more frequently involving not only the incompetent, but threatening even the most competent ministers, and against which no church or minister can be safely insured. Young men want a business which will largely keep through life. They reason out that in some other spheres they can all through life be doing for the Master in some other calling, whereas in the ministry they may have to give up their active service just at the time when they can do most and live most. Training, experience, success, learning, will be of no use to a minister of the gospel seeking a change of pastorate at that time of life when a physician or a lawyer is at his prime. The minister must face an unstable service.

20. The undue proportion of candidates hastily received under the care of Presbyteries, who apparently look upon the ministry as a profession rather than as a calling, who regard the aid given them as

a "bounty" for enlisting, a "salary" paid them for being candidates, and who, being inferior in intellectual endowments or motives, drop out of line after a year or two or more of candidacy, but not before they have brought discredit upon the calling. A tabulation of the candidate lists of our church during the past ten years will show that a very large number of young men have started towards the ministry and then given up. But especially in our institutions of learning these inferior or unworthy men have first done an injury to the cause among their critical fellow-students which the faithfulness and consecration of the great majority of candidates have not been able to prevent or undo. There is a strong indisposition on the part of some young men of parts and character to herd with the sort of men that seem merely to drift into the ministry.

21. The lack of carefulness on the part of Presbyteries in maintaining a high standard of ministerial qualification, and in exercising a wise and faithful supervision over those who are under their care. They have discredited the ministry as a profession, and even as a calling, in many cases, by the hasty reception of any applicant who has offered himself, and by the hasty licensure as "extraordinary" of almost any candidate who has desired it, regarding the "extraordinary" provision as meaning practically extraordinary inability to become equipped, or extraordinary poverty, or something of that nature, rather than extraordinary gifts which compensate for the ordinary training or course of study and preparation. In too many cases the constitution of the church has been its rule only when it was convenient.

22. The church's giving too big a place to voluntarism on the part of a man who will be a minister, instead of using the God-ordained means of prayer and effort to get men who are fit to have the gospel entrusted to them that they may teach others also.

23. The wide spread of a poisoned and poisonous literature, undermining confidence in the Bible as the Word of God, from the daily newspaper to the latest novel, as well as through the list of historical, scientific, and philosophical discussion.

24. The popularity of radical criticism and rationalistic interpretation, in lowering the sense of the authority of the Holy Scriptures and of the sanctions of religion.

25. The prevalence of theological discussions, the many defections from orthodoxy, and the agitation for creed-revision, causing

those who do not understand all the facts to think that the church is unsettled in her beliefs.

26. And, finally, from one, "The conservatism of our church towards many of the live questions of the day, and the rigidity with which theology is taught in our seminaries, prevent many thoughtful and intellectual young men from going into the ministry." Creeds are right, "and the seminaries should teach theology as set forth in the standards, and the integrity and inspiration of the Scriptures should be insisted upon; but after the students are thoroughly indoctrinated in our system, they should not be discouraged from independent thought and research."

The careful study of the causes assigned, from these varying viewpoints, suggests in many cases the remedies that should be sought. As with the causes, so as to the remedies, there is substantial unanimity of opinion.

1. An earnest effort after a higher spiritual life. When this comes, an adequate and superior ministry will present itself. A quickening of the church's spiritual life is the fundamental demand here as in any other department of church life or work. A revived condition in the church always and everywhere means more men, more means, and more work for Christ, as well as better men, better means, better work.

2. More prayer to the Lord of the harvest, but prayer accompanied by effort, for God works through means, such as pastors' presenting, not to the young only, but to maturer men and to parents, the claims of the ministry, and the cause being presented in our schools and colleges by men of experience and discretion.

3. Practical, concerted action, all over the church, in the way of distinct, combined, pastoral, and personal effort, such as that undertaken last year in the Synod of Illinois, and not relying merely upon resolutions or pastoral letters.

4. Parents dedicating their children to the work, and training them thereto, keeping it ever before them in a wise and faithful manner.

5. Urging the people to show the sincerity of their prayers by providing more ample support for those whom the Lord does call into the ministry.

6. Doing what is possible to abolish the "age dead-line," finding the value and appreciating it, of older men, and making use of it,

and preventing the too easy unsettling of pastors. The strong men and women of the church should stand by one another in defence, and not allow the changeable and chronically discontented to have their way.

7. An earnest effort, and especially in the support of the church's new activity in the cause, to provide for the years of inactivity and old age of those who have served faithfully in the ministry while able. Definitely pensioning, if possible, deserving ministers who are out of work and salary, and who lack the necessities of life.

8. Sustaining the home mission work as the most promising source of recruits for the pulpit, and placing that work upon the very highest plane of the church's estimation and interest.

9. Ridding the popular mind of the idea that the ministry is a profession and not a calling. As a profession, it does not pay, in a worldly sense. As a calling, its reward is rich and ample, both in this life, and in that which is to come.

VIII.

PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

THE TRUE MEASURE OF SUCCESS.

It is easy to make mistakes in estimating the true merit of a spiritual work. A false standard of measurement may be applied, and erroneous conclusions reached. It is possible for the church thus to become elated in the hour of weakness, and to become discouraged in the day of strength. That the church should form a true estimate of her power and vitality is a question of no small importance, and this can be done only when she applies to herself a true and infallible test. The design of this article is to briefly note the fallacy of some of the current standards of measurement, and to suggest the superiority of others too little in use. Much stress is laid to-day upon numbers, amounts of collections, size of congregations, popular favor, and other outward signs of progress. Are these true tests and measures of the strength and vitality of the church?

As to the standard of numbers, it is so obviously deceptive that it is scarcely needful to do more than to mention the fact. Magnitude of numbers may mean strength, or it may mean weakness. In the case of Gideon's army it clearly meant weakness and inefficiency; on the day of Pentecost it doubtless meant strength. In the days of persecution, when numbers were reduced to their lowest limit, it meant purity, fidelity, and a true witness to Christ. It meant power. In the day of Constantine, when multitudes flooded the church, it meant corruption, decay, and degeneracy. Is it not an unquestioned fact that many of our churches to-day would be greatly strengthened by purging their rolls of a large per cent. of their membership? And is it not also a fact that many of our churches receive many into membership whose influence tends to weaken and to demoralize rather than to build and strengthen? So marked was the weakening effect of the increased number of members under the influence of spurious methods of evangelization, which were so popular a decade ago, that evangelists using such methods to-day can hardly gain admittance to any of our churches. In view of such facts numbers in themselves

will not be taken by the thoughtful as a measure of the vitality of the church.

Again, as to the amount of money contributed, does this gauge the strength or success of the spiritual kingdom? In many cases it may, but in many it does not. There are various motives that enter into the act of monetary offerings. In one case a large contribution represents no spiritual life whatever. In another a very small one represents much. It was so in the days of our Lord. The widow's two mites represented more spiritual vitality than the abundance cast into the treasury by the many rich. It is manifest that many are more willing to give their money than they are to give up their sins. There are some who have accumulated large fortunes by unjust means, who contribute liberally as a semi-atonement for their guilt. There are others who make no pretensions even to a saving faith in Christ, and yet give liberally to the benevolent work of the church. On the other hand, many of great spiritual vigor and deep piety are making sacrifices to give their little. Can the amount of gold and silver given, then, serve as the true standard to gauge the strength and fidelity of the kingdom, that does not come by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of God?

Again, the several outward marks in the way of visible progress cannot be relied upon as the infallible measure of success. Large congregations, the good will of men, the applause of the multitude, and advances in the various departments of church work, may, or they may not, measure the true success of the kingdom.

There are times when it takes more strength, effort, fidelity, and heroism to stand still than at other times it does to make advances. There was no visible progress made by the disciples when they fought with the contrary winds and battled with adverse billows in the blackness of night on the stormy sea of Galilee, yet more energy was expended and more faithful heroism displayed in that long struggle than could have been manifested in crossing the sea many times under more favorable circumstances. Some years ago a number of warships were caught in a fearful storm off the coast of the Samoan Islands. Many of these vessels sought protection along the shore, but were dashed to pieces against the coast or sank to the bottom of the great deep. The captain of the man-of-war representing the United States gave orders to move out to sea; then facing the prow in the teeth of the storm ordered the throttles of the great engines to be thrown wide open. Under the mighty power of their utmost

strength the great engines moaned and groaned, and the man-of-war trembled as the battle was waged with wind, wave, and billow. There was no forward movement, no progress, but a heroic stand that told the story of the greatest work that warship ever did, and that culminated in a glorious victory. We are living in an age when the adverse forces to vital godliness have reached the intensity and strength of a storm. The currents are broad, deep, and very swift, and are sweeping many away as on the rising tide of a great flood. Unbelief in the Word of God, an abnormal greed after great material wealth, extravagant self-indulgence growing with increasing riches, the mad craze of pleasure-seeking attended by its floods of vice and sensuality, are but some of the elements of the storm that is now confronting the church. Is it not possible that a brave and successful stand under such conditions might mark the church's greatest work, and manifest her greatest vitality? The kingdom cometh not with observation. Her noblest struggles may not be characterized by forward movement.

We would suggest, in passing, the truest outward gauge of the moral and spiritual life of a people, according to observation, is to be found in "Sabbath observance." The observance of the fourth commandment is closely linked with the observance of all others. A weak spiritual life and Sabbath desecration go hand in hand; a holy Sabbath and a holy life are rarely divorced. The manner in which the Sabbath is kept is the best visible thermometer to measure the moral and spiritual temperature of any people.

But we come to the true, infallible, and divine measure of success in all church work. It is the simple standard of faith, which is given by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, "Let no man think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the *measure of faith.*" Sober thinking will lead the individual and the church alike to think of themselves according to the measure of faith; faith in all of its bearings upon our characters, our relation to God, and our fellow-man. That which is of faith is strength, nothing more and nothing less. What is the faith in its subjective sense that binds the individual and the church to God? What is faith in its objective sense, how pure and true are the doctrines embraced by the individual and the church? How great is the faith as a governing principle in the life? Does it mould and fashion the character after the image of Christ? How great is the faith to fill the soul with the spirit

of the Master? How great is the faith to yield the precious fruits of the Spirit, "love, joy, peace," and such like? How great is the faith to render the church faithful to bear a pure witness to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus? These are the questions the church should ask herself, and the answer will prove the true measure of her success. Faith that yields fidelity to witness for Christ measures the strength and vitality of the church. The ministry of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and of our Lord himself were comparative failures as measured by many of the standards in current use among the churches to-day, but, according to the divine estimate, they were eminently successful. The church of Laodicea made the fatal mistake of applying a false standard, and note the rebuke and counsel our Lord gave her. "Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked; I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thy eyes with eye-salve that thou mayest see." The little church of Smyrna, on the other hand, was faithful, and in this, according to the divine estimate, she was successful. The Lord finds no fault in her, but in the highest commendation says, "I know thy works, and tribulation and poverty (but thou art rich) . . . fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer . . . be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Let the standard of faith that leads to fidelity be applied to the church in all departments of her work, and according to the revealed methods let the church strive to this end. Let her rebuke sin in all of its forms, purify herself from the filth of the world, and proclaim the pure and precious gospel in its simplicity, beauty and power, in the spirit of love; let her be loyal, brave, true and of good courage. She has nothing to fear, but all to hope for. God is with the faithful, and "if God be for us, who can be against us?"

Shelbyville, Tenn.

R. C. ANDERSON, JR.

A PASTOR'S VISIT TO BIBLE LANDS.

A TWENTIETH century American can accomplish a trip to the Orient more easily than his forefathers crossed the Atlantic. With a minimum expenditure of four hundred dollars and two months' time, the best part of the lands of the Bible may be seen. What are the benefits derived from such a visit? Are they sufficient to com-

pensate the busy pastor, of perhaps slender purse, for the time and expense involved? The compensation depends largely upon the information one takes with him, and the sympathy with which he enters into the atmosphere of the past.

The careful and protracted study which one must make as proper preparation for a visit to Bible lands will of itself prove a most valuable contribution to his equipment for future work. The knowledge thus acquired will ever be a well-spring of joy, accompanied only by the regret that it was not deeper and stronger. Even in the preparation for such a visit, as well as in the visit itself, one will feel his intellect enriched. The foundations of learning will be broadened, the superstructure heightened, and all its compartments adorned. In both preparation and visit, the pulse will beat faster, the heart be warmer, and the spiritual energies be revived.

The adequately fitted student now enters upon his tour. He quickly finds that what he knew of oriental cartography is rivetted, and that the history with which he has been familiar has become vivid and striking. The sharper and more distinct knowledge of the geography of the ancient world gives him a more correct understanding of its history, as the just proportions of a picture are only appreciated under a true perspective. It explains the clash of arms, reproduces the fields of battle, and maps out the course of centuries. History, and especially biblical history, becomes a living reality.

But the benediction of a visit to Bible lands is the illumination of Holy Writ. The stars shine most brilliantly in the pure azure of the Eastern sky, and the facts of God's Word form new and more dazzling constellations, the great planets of accepted faith appear even more real, whilst many lights hitherto unseen come prominently to view above the holy hills.

Let one read the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel as he stands looking into the face of Rameses. All around the royal mummies lie cold and dead. Whereas one has hitherto always believed, now he feels the *ipsissima verba* of inspiration. Every word is full of meaning. Ezekiel's description of the dead is an eye-witness' record and perfect. "The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the spirit of the Lord, and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them round about; and behold there were very many in the open valley, and lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest." Ezekiel

xxxvii. 1-3.) Israel was one, Egypt another, but both alike in their dust.

"I am Pharaoh" is a monumental fact in Egypt. It is chiselled on Assouan granite, and detected in the murmurings of the Nile, a fact as great as the pyramids and as broad as the desert. One can feel, as one reads, some of the dread which a command backed by such power and authority inspired. For costliness of material, delicacy of design, and exquisite workmanship the regalia of the ancient Egyptians well compares with the jewels of to-day. What must have been the political prowess and plutocratic preëminence which Moses despised is forced upon the attention, and still the better choice of "affliction with the people of God" becomes a conviction of the coldest heart. The whole of Egypt's fertility is the offspring of the Nile. The annual overflow is the source and boundary of vegetation. Deep canals retain its waters long after the muddy stream has returned to its narrow bed. From these, lesser channels convey the life-giving moisture many miles. What we would call corn rows form innumerable aqueducts carpeting the fields with threads of water. The husbandman, first with his right foot and then with his left, removes the petty levee and turns the irrigating currents to this or that spot at his will. How great and vivid appears the promise, "For the land whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowest thy seed and waterest it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs, but the land whither ye go to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys and drinketh water of the rain of heaven, a land which the Lord thy God careth for." (Deut. xi. 11, 12.)

Over Egypt let us draw the mantle of charity. We admire her for what she has been, we visit her rainless shores for the relics of former splendor, and to behold the ravages of time. To-day a wilderness of ruin, yesterday the embodiment of glory! Her princes sounded "all the depths and shoals of honor," and the greatness of their reward is as unsearchable as their antiquity. How well Falstaff reasons; what a philosopher and teacher he is for us all! "What is that honor? Air. A trim reckoning! Who hath it? He that died o' Wednesday. Doth he feel it? No. Doth he hear it? No. 'Tis insensible, then. Yea, to the dead. But will it not live with the living? No. Why? Detraction will not suffer it. Therefore, I'll none of it. Honor is a mere scutcheon." Egypt is the Necropolis of time, the grave of glory, and the antidote of unsanctified ambition.

Father Ryan is one of the most stirring poets; there is a touch in his melodies that finds a sympathetic chord in every heart, and, eliminating his Romanism, an elevation in his thoughts. What he wrote in Rome expresses a Christian's emotions in Palestine—

“At last; the dream of youth
Stands fair and bright before me;
The sunshine of the Home of Truth
Falls tremulously o'er me.”

How exquisite are the colorings through the prism of faith! How rich the scenes to one who would point others to the object of faith! rich the scenes to one who would point others to the object of faith!

Yonder lies a narrow pass leading up from the Jericho road at the Apostles' Spring. The old highway lay along this ravine, and the hills still echo with the steps of God. The way is rough and rugged, steep and fatiguing, but it is the way Jesus has gone, and the traveller of to-day labors on, hoping and praying that he might learn to follow him. Bethany is at the summit. It was not only the love of Mary and Martha, but the providence which placed their lot in a place so restful that made him “who trod the wine press alone” love to linger there. Gethsemane is a little further on. No one is ashamed to pause reverently and bow his head in this sacred spot. Not far from the present northern enclosure of Jerusalem is another spot, which meets every scriptural requirement—it may not be Calvary; God buries his graves—but certainly it is like it must have been. No one is ever nearer God than in an hour there. One seems to stand beside him as he breathes in prayer the worship of all. While he reads of the resurrection, a voice—it seems as that of an angel—speaks, sealing the truth of what the pastor has preached, and laying upon his heart afresh the great commission. “I know that ye seek Jesus which was crucified. He is not here, for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead.” (Matt. xxviii. 5-7.)

A long morning's ride brings one to “a city of Samaria which is called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph. Now Jacob's well was there. Jesus therefore being wearied with his journey, sat thus on the well.” (John iv. 5, 6.) Tired and athirst the traveller rests here to-day. New meaning and new richness come to his heart as he sings—

“ I heard the voice of Jesus say,
Behold, I freely give
The living water; thirsty one,
Stoop down, and drink, and live.”

Resting on the shores of Galilee, the traveller has fresh views and visions of the Master. His sacred form is still mirrored in the lake, his voice still heard among the crags, his power still master of the storm. The very fish that swarm about the beach have a peculiar interest, and one scans the fishermen's faces for the types of that early band. The sight of the Russian peasant going about with his feet bandaged, to protect him against the loose rocks which cover the highway, remind of the angel guardians who “bear thee up in their hands lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.” The Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, were worthy to be compared with all the waters of Israel, and one might wash in them and be cleaner than when he came out of Jordan—but not his soul.

These illustrations need not be prolonged. They are legion. What is seen and heard gives form to the genius of Scripture and body to its spirit, facts are constantly brought out that had never been seen, and the phraseology and verbiage of the Bible are charged with a powerful current.

We believe that this old world, which has been the theatre of sin, shall become the palace of righteousness, and when all things are new, the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be where we have lived and loved, and where he has wrought redemption. So have thought and still believe many of the fathers and brethren. Shall these holy hills be the centre of that kingdom? Is there more in the old prophecies than we suppose? Is it possible that the New Jerusalem shall be where the ancient has stood, and the throne of David be established in Zion forever—who knows? The present things shall pass away. This earth may be transformed into the realm of glory. Is it possible that the Holy Land may become the seat of its empire? At least, viewing the receding shore of this “Land of Holy Light,” one feels that he can be a better man after walking the streets of the old Jerusalem, his faith stronger, his love greater, and his gratitude to those who have guided his feet in the first steps of life and to Jehovah unspeakable, because he was brought up to know that man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever!

E. T. WELLFORD.

Newport News, Va.

THE YOUNG PASTOR'S LIBRARY.

As a help to the theological graduate of limited means, the subjoined list of the *necessaria* of a young pastor's library is given. It is the product of the suggestions of a number of pastors and professors, each of whom was asked to give a list of the first one hundred books which in his judgment the theological graduate should possess. The several lists thus obtained have been laid side by side, and another list of one hundred, here given, made from them all, the concurrence of very many, and, in most cases, of all the recommendations, determining the placing of the items in this list. It will, therefore, be found to represent the concurrent views of many of the best advisers. It does not attempt to cover a wide range in any one of the departments of ministerial study or equipment. It names only standard works. It does not suggest any of the literature of the broader kind, especially in introduction, criticism and historical study. It is presumed that the young pastor who has a very modest amount of money to spend would rather use that little in the purchase of works which will be of real and permanent value to him. It does not make suggestions for the student of special tastes, or who will pursue special studies, but for the average graduate of our theological schools. It does not mention any of the ready-made homiletical material, in books of sermons, and so-called commentaries and other helps, now so abundant, but takes it for granted that the earnest young pastor would prefer to do his own work, and gather from original sources the material for his sermons. The very brevity and doubtless, in the judgment of some, defects in this list, will, it is hoped, lead to many suggestions which will make it much more helpful.

1. An English Bible, Authorized Version.
2. An English Bible, Revised Version.
3. A Hebrew Bible.
4. A Greek New Testament. (Westcott & Hort's advised.)
5. A Hebrew Lexicon. (Gesenius.)
6. Harper's Elements of Hebrew Syntax.
7. Harper's Elements of Hebrew Etymology.
8. A Greek Lexicon. (Liddell & Scott.)
9. A New Testament Greek Lexicon.
10. A Bible Dictionary. (Davis' or Hastings'.)
11. An English Dictionary. (Standard, or Worcester's.)
12. A Bible Concordance. (Strong's.)
13. A Harmony of the Gospels in English. (Robinson's or Broadus'.)

14. An Analysis of the Bible. (Locke's Commonplace-book advised.)
15. Jamieson, Fawcett & Brown's Commentary on the whole Bible.
16. Matthew Henry's Commentary on the whole Bible.
17. Ellicott's Introductions to the Books of the Bible.
18. Green's Unity of Genesis.
19. Green's Moses and the Prophets.
20. Green on Job.
21. Perowne on the Psalms.
22. Newton on the Song of Solomon.
23. Alexander on Isaiah.
24. Pusey on the Minor Prophets.
25. Broadus on Matthew.
26. Morison on Mark.
27. Godet on Luke.
28. Westcott on John.
29. Alexander on the Acts.
30. Hodge or Shedd on Romans.
31. Hodge on First Corinthians.
32. Hodge on Second Corinthians.
33. Lightfoot on Galatians.
34. Eadie or Hodge on Ephesians.
35. Eadie or Lightfoot on Colossians.
36. Owen or Stuart on Hebrews.
37. Fairbairn on the Pastoral Epistles.
38. Ramsey's Spiritual Kingdom.
39. Zenos' Elements of Higher Criticism.
40. Geikie's Hours with the Bible.
41. Breed's Preparation of the World for the Coming of Christ.
42. Edersheim's Life and Times of the Messiah.
43. Stalker's Life of Christ.
44. Farrar's Life of Paul.
45. Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of Paul.
46. Calvin's Institutes.
47. Dabney's Theology.
48. Thornwell's Collected Writings.
49. Hodge's Theology.
50. Shedd's Dogmatic Theology.
51. Fisher on the Catechism.
52. Shedd's History of Doctrine.
53. Oehler's Old Testament Theology.
54. Palmer's Theology of Prayer.
55. Bernard's Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament.
56. Thomas a Kempis' Imitation of Christ.
57. Fisher's Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief.
58. Schaff-Herzog's Encyclopedia.
59. Dabney's Sacred Rhetoric.
60. Broadus' Preparation and Delivery of Sermons.
61. Shedd's Homiletics and Pastoral Theology.

62. **Murphy's Pastoral Theology.**
63. **Spencer's Pastoral Sketches.**
64. **Trumbull on the Sabbath-School.**
65. **Dennis' Foreign Missions After a Century.**
66. **Dennis' Christian Missions and Social Progress.**
67. **Robinson's Discourses of Redemption.**
68. **Fairbairn's Typology of the Scriptures.**
69. **Peck's Ecclesiology.**
70. **Fairchild's Which is the Apostolic Church?**
71. **Cheney's William the Baptist.**
72. **Blakie's Bible History.**
73. **Humphrey's From Creation to the Giving of the Law.**
74. **Keil's Bible Archæology.**
75. **Thomson's Land and the Book.**
76. **Smith's Geography of Palestine.**
77. **Price's The Monuments and the Old Testament.**
78. **McCurdy's History, Prophecy, and the Monuments.**
79. **Fisher's History of the Christian Church.**
80. **D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation.**
81. **Johnson's History of the Southern Presbyterian Church.**
82. **Alexander's Digest, with Supplement.**
83. **Palmer's Life of Thornwell.**
84. **Butler's Analogy.**
85. **Alexander's Moral Science.**
86. **Dabney's Practical Philosophy.**
87. **Weber's History of Philosophy.**
88. **Macauley's History of England.**
89. **Myer's Ancient and Mediæval History.**
90. **Green's Short History of the English People.**
91. **Bancroft's History of the United States.**
92. **Livingstone's Travels.**
93. **Stanley's Travels.**
94. **Shakespeare's Works.**
95. **Milton's Paradise Lost.**
96. **Tennyson's Poems.**
97. **Browning's Poems.**
98. **Walter Scott's Waverley Novels.**
99. **Dickens' Works.**
100. **Thackeray's Works.**

HOMILETIC NOTES.

THE SPIRIT'S MINISTRY TO THE BELIEVER.

"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. . . . If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you."—ROMANS viii. 9, 11.

THESE verses state the same great truth, negatively and affirmatively, that the same Spirit that wrought in Jesus of Nazareth dwells in the believer.

Did you ever think of it that the human life of Jesus was lived in its perfect beauty, its good works wrought, its victories won, its sacrifice offered, in the energy of the Holy Spirit given him without measure? That that perfect human life was made such, not by its union with the second person of the Godhead, but by the enduement of the third person? That its spiritual power was due, not to the mysterious constitution of the mediatorial person as God-man, but to the revealed fact that the Spirit ministered to him constantly and without measure?

We need to remind ourselves that Jesus lived a truly human life. He loved to call himself "the Son of man." Eighty times the name appears in the New Testament. As man, "he suffered being tempted." As man, "he overcame, and is set down on the Father's throne, and we who overcome shall sit with him on his throne." As man in the glory, he still "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmity, since he was in all points tempted like as we, yet without sin."

Phil. ii. 7, in the Revised is remarkable, "He emptied himself." "Being in the form of God, he thought not the being on equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself."

Of what did he empty himself? Not of his divine nature. It is gloriously true that in his humiliation, he was still the Son of God. "He had power on earth to forgive sins!"

But the divine was in a state of voluntary suppression. He was "emptied," not of his divine attributes, but of their habitual exercise. Without going into the deep waters of theological controversy, without quoting Lange, or Howard Crosby, this much seems quite clear. "The eternal Logos, while retaining his personal identity, did so far put aside the exercise of his divine attributes as to live on the earth a truly human life." As Van Dyke has phrased it, Jesus lived "the

human life of God." He "emptied himself!" He chose to lay aside the exercise of his divine powers in all those reaches of his life on earth which mark him as our brother, pattern and hope of victory.

The Spirit's Ministry to the Son of Man. Note at least ten details of the constant and unmeasured ministry of the Spirit to the Son of man:

1. He was begotten of the Holy Ghost.
2. At his public baptism, he was anointed, sealed, endued, by the Spirit for his ministry.
3. He so lived his life by the eternal Spirit that at its end it was "without spot to the eyes of God." (Heb. ix. 14.)
4. He was taught by the Spirit. "He increased in wisdom" (Luke ii. 52), as a growing child. By what teaching? "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding." (Isa. xi. 2.)
5. He taught others by the Spirit. (Luke iv. 18, 21.)
6. He was led by the Spirit. (Matt. iv. 1.)
7. He wrought miracles by the Spirit. "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, . . ." (Matt. xii. 28.)
8. Having lived his life without spot, he offered himself a sacrifice by the eternal Spirit." (Heb. ix. 14.)
9. He was raised from the dead by the Spirit. (Rom. viii. 11.)
10. Through the Holy Ghost he gave commandments to the apostles whom he had chosen. (Acts i. 2.)

Jesus, the Son of man, the perfected humanity, begotten of the Holy Ghost, uniting in his mysterious person the divine and the human—Jesus received the constant and unmeasured energy of the Spirit that he might live without spot, might learn God's truth and teach it; that he might have daily guidance, and be enabled for daily work; that he might offer himself in sacrifice, be raised from the dead, and give commandments to his apostles.

We are commanded to imitate the human perfections of Jesus. "All God's commands are enablings." Therefore, we have reason to expect the same Spirit to be given us for our perfecting. That the Master who gives the order, "Follow me," has indeed provided the strength whereby we may walk in his steps.

Has he done so? He has! When? At Pentecost!

Pentecost.—Pentecost marked the dawn of the new era. Ever

since, by common consent, the church has lived under the dispensation of the Spirit.

What happened at Pentecost? You say, "Brethren were with one accord at prayer; the fiery tongues fell and rested on them; the apostles were able to work miracles and speak in foreign tongues!" Is that all you can see? Then you see but the surface appearance. You see a physical miracle which perhaps has ceased and forever. Theologians say it has, though the Bible is silent. I see a spiritual miracle which continues to this hour. The spiritual miracle of Pentecost was the moral uplift, the transformed lives, which was, and continues to be, the outstanding fact of Christianity.

Do we realize how great was that uplift? Suppose that from the original manuscript of the Acts the leaves containing the second chapter had been lost; that the sacred canon had come down to us defective in this way; that the modern reader, after finishing the gospels, would come straightway, without explanation, upon the picture in Acts iii., of the spiritual life which followed Pentecost, the love, the fellowship, the liberality, the courage! He would say, "I cannot understand this. Something must have happened that is not recorded. These men are not the same men. Yesterday Peter lied, and swore, and was a coward; to-day he is a hero of courage and a moral giant. John was scheming for a place at the King's right hand; now he is full of love. Something has changed these men."

True! The men were changed. They were not the same. Something had happened. What was it?

Joel's prophecy had been fulfilled. "In the last days, saith God, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, even upon the children and the servants."

The Master's prophecy had been fulfilled. Speaking of the Spirit, he had said, "He dwelleth with you and shall be in you." (John xiv. 17.)

At Pentecost the Spirit came to indwell; "to enter upon permanent and organic union with men." The Spirit had wrought in the world from the beginning. He had striven with the antediluvians. We find God's warning in Gen. vi. 4, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." All through the Old Testament, he had instructed and guided the great leaders of the church. At Pentecost he came to the children even, and to the servants—to all flesh. The Sun of Righteousness had been gilding the lofty summits of spiritual life;

Pentecost **was** the high noon when he began to shine down into the deep valleys **and** bless all life with light and healing. Formerly, he came upon **men** from without; now and evermore he has become the indweller. **At** Pentecost the Holy Spirit began to embody himself in the church; to be the bond of its organic life, making us members in the one mystical body.

So Peter explained (Acts ii. 33), that the enthroned Son of man had received a promise from the Father, and had shed forth—Pentecost! What **was** that promise? The Holy Ghost! But Jesus had received the Holy Ghost long before at the Jordan. He had lived his human life in the energy of the Spirit. Why should he receive another gift of the Spirit, his life lived and he enthroned above?

At Jordan Jesus received his personal Pentecost, if one may so say. **On** the throne, he received the Pentecost for his church. **At** Jordan the Spirit came to perfect the human life of our Pattern; **on** the throne the Spirit was given our Head to be shed forth upon the members of the body.

So, the Spirit has become the bond of our life union with Jesus. "The Spirit applieth to us the redemption purchased by Christ by working faith in us and thereby uniting us to Christ." The Spirit uniteth us to Christ! Partakers of the divine nature! Members of the one body! Branches of the true vine! Filled with the same Spirit of life! "He that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit," *i. e.*, one spirit with the Lord. (1 Cor. vi. 17.) As in the context, Paul teaches that he that is joined in marriage is one body with his wife; the twain are one flesh. In like manner, the spirit of the believer being united to the Spirit of God, the twain are one Spirit.

"Near, so very near to God,
I can no nearer be,
Since in the person of the Son
I am as near as he."

Dr. Dabney once asked the writer, "Why is it that we so seldom hear a sermon on the mystical union?" I pass the question on, "Why?" What truth could be more precious than this, that we are livingly joined to the Living One? "Reconciled to God by the death of his Son; now saved by his life." Or, as Bishop Moule translates, "Kept safe by his life." The life of the Head throbbing in the members.

Life, and life more abundant, love that passeth knowledge, and peace that passeth all understanding, are ours, because they are Christ's, and we are in him by the Spirit.

Did you ever note the amazed rapture in Paul's tone when he speaks of "the riches of the glory of the mystery which is CHRIST IN YOU, the hope of glory?" Are we amazed, enraptured, by this truth? Christ is in you, in you!

Alongside of the new life, born of the Spirit, and by the Spirit, united to Jesus in our body, the old life of the old man coexists. The flesh is not dead. The flesh lives and wars against the new man. We dare not overlook this frightful fact. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit."

But the indwelling Spirit is "against the flesh." He mightily strengthens the spirit of the new man. In this lies our pledge of victory. The Spirit is "against the flesh that we may not do the [carnal] things that we would." (Gal. v. 16, R. V.)

The Indweller's Ministry to the Believer.—It remains to point out some features of the Spirit's work in the believer's life.

I. *What it is not.* He has not come "to fill and to thrill." These words make good rhyme, poor theology. The Bible prescribes no galvanic shock experience to loose the cords of sin. The Bible gives no short cut to holiness. The Spirit's work is not to create mystic frame or pious rant; nor to thrill!

II. *But certain things the Spirit graciously engages to do in the believer.* What are they, definitely?

1. The Spirit reveals Christ. "He shall testify of me" (John xv. 26). "He shall glorify me" (xvi. 14). This is his priceless gift. Like Brother Lawrence, the Spirit-taught believer may "practice the presence of God." He may be like Mr. C. H. Spurgeon, who once declared that during twenty-five years he had not passed fifteen minutes of the waking day without a distinct consciousness of the presence of his Lord. Did you ever pray—

"Lord Jesus, make thyself to me
A living, bright reality:
More present to faith's vision keen
Than any outward object seen,—
More dear, more intimately nigh
Than e'en the dearest earthly tie?"

That prayer is answered by the inward ministry of the Spirit.

2. The Spirit fills the breast with love. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace," etc. (Gal. v. 23.) Love is first of all. We read of "the wrath of the Lamb," never of the wrath of the Spirit; only of his love. We may grieve him, never vex him. Isaiah lxiii. 10,

R. V., reads, "They rebelled and grieved my Holy Spirit." Only love can grieve. You can anger your enemy, never grieve him. But the mother who bore you—grieve her? You can break her heart!

Our bitterness, wrath, malice, and evil speaking grieve him (Eph. iv.) They restrain his fruit of love in our lives. Do we allow these sins which grieve the Spirit? This is not a question of "the higher life." It is a question of Christian life, or else of shameful backsliding. The blessed Indweller would create in us a spirit of perfect love. No mysticism is here, but great grace definitely revealed. The loving Father who maketh the sun to rise upon the evil and upon the good, and who sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust, wills that his children be like him. His Spirit will create that likeness, if we grieve him not.

3. The Spirit gives a spirit of prayer; "a mind clothed with inward prayer." He is called "the Spirit of supplications." He "helpeth our infirmity" in prayer. Those who have yielded their lives to him wholly have abounded in prayer.

Read in the Acts from the day of Pentecost on: ii. 42, They "continued steadfastly in the prayers"; iii. 1, Peter and John going up to the temple at the hour of prayer; iv. 24, 31, Released by the rulers, they returned to their company, and "lifted up their voice with one accord," and the "place was shaken"; vi. 4, Deacons chosen, that the apostles might "continue steadfastly in prayer"; vii. 60, Stephen prayed in dying; viii. 14, In Samaria, Peter and John prayed, and "they received the Holy Ghost"; ix. 11, Said of Saul, converted, "Behold he prayeth"; x. 9, Peter on the housetop waiting for his dinner, is at prayer.

Read the epistles of Paul, and see how constantly the writer turns to prayer. It is his vital breath. He said, "Pray without ceasing." He practiced what he preached.

Note the two prayers in Ephesians. In chapter i. for light; in chapter iii. for power. Then, in chapter vi., after charging them to put on the gospel armor, he adds, "Praying always with all prayer in the Spirit, with all perseverance for all saints." (Cf. Phil. i. 9-11 and Col. i. 9-11.)

4. The Spirit enables to worship, and to do Christian work.

"We worship by the Spirit of God." (Phil. iii. 3, R. V.) Else it is all as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal! And very much of it is. Unconsciously we disclose our own secret thought when

we arise in the pulpit and say, "Let us begin our service." If the whole heart were turned to God to worship him by the Spirit, would we not rather say, "We begin God's worship"?

And what of the Christian work—the deacon work, the Sabbath-school work, the society work, the session meetings, the sermon-making and the visiting—is it a weariness or a delight? Do we go on in the energy of the flesh, because we must, because of duty? Or are we resting in God, receiving his Spirit, and loving, praying, working by the Spirit's energy?

The divine Indweller reveals Christ to the consciousness, fills the breast with love, clothes the mind for inward prayer, and enables to worship and to work.

He is, in fine, the "Paraclete"; the one "called to our side" for all needed help for the character and for the conduct; for purity of heart and for power in service.

"Did we receive the Holy Ghost when we believed?" Have we appropriated our share in the Pentecost gift of our enthroned Head?

A. J. Gordon has summed up the Spirit's ministry to the believer by three words: his anointing, his sealing, and his filling.

The first is connected with our illumination (1 John ii. 20, 27.) The Indweller is our teacher.

The second is connected with our assurance and safety. (Eph. i. 13, 14.) The Indweller is our seal.

The third is connected with our power for service (Eph. v. 18.) The God-intoxicated man has a splendid zeal, energy and forcefulness for God.

For the believer the supreme word of duty is, Be filled! Filled over and over again! In Acts ii. the apostles were all filled; in Acts iv., Peter was filled again.

It is unscriptural to speak of new baptisms with the Spirit. Pentecost was once for all. The formula is, "One baptism, many fillings." (*Erdman.*) Many fillings! As Mr. Moody used to say, "We are all leaky vessels."

Again and again, in deep humility and full surrender, renouncing self in all its forms of self-trust, self-will, self-glory and self-pleasing, we need to come to God and to seek the Spirit's fulness as the energy of our new life.

Sanctification is a growth, of course. But the arm out of joint cannot grow. It must first be put into its place. The believer must get into his place of definite and humble surrender to the will of

God before growth is possible. He is "as a tree planted by the rivers of waters," but he does not grow as a tree grows,—invisibly, inevitably,—because he is a man and not a tree. He has his own power of will.

"Our wills are ours, we know not how"—

We cannot fathom the mystery of human self-action! But—

"Our wills are ours to make them thine."

Exhortations.

(1) Do you believe that a life of victory over sin is possible for you? That you may indeed "put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh to fulfill its lusts?" Do you believe that God's Spirit will enable you to do what God has commanded? Then hold to that faith with all your heart!

(2) Deal definitely with the sins in your life which grieve the Spirit of God. The sins that lurk in the shadows, drag them out into the light and hew them to pieces before the Lord. However trifling or however dear. The right eye, the right hand—pluck it out! cut it off! Resolve, in the Spirit's energy, nevermore to tolerate these sins, but evermore to hold them accursed. So much the will shall determine.

(3) Form the habit of yielding to the will of God. Listen to his voice, follow his drawing. Yield to him.

Thousands testify that a definite appropriation of these truths has brought to them new life, peace, power. J. Wilbur Chapman had one thousand ministers at his Winona Bible Conference last August. He ascribes the power of his ministry to a definite surrender to Christ to be filled with his Spirit. Mrs. Howard Taylor is wonderfully stirring our women for foreign missions; but years ago, while yet Miss Geraldine Guinness, of the China Inland Mission, she learned the secret of yielding to the will of God and of receiving the blessed Indweller's fulness. Bishop H. C. G. Moule testifies, "I will never forget the gain to conscious faith and peace which came . . . from a more intelligent and conscious hold upon the living and most gracious personality of the Spirit. . . . It was a new contact with the inner and eternal movements of redeeming power." Reader, "be filled with the Spirit!"

In Acts x., Peter, praying on the housetop, sees God's vision, and is sent to the house of Cornelius. Vision-taught; God-sent. "Even as he began to preach the Holy Spirit fell!" That is the way to go to our pulpits and what to expect.

In Acts v., the same apostle, brought out of prison by God's angel, is sent by the angel to stand in the temple and preach "all the words of this life." After supernatural deliverance, sent to speak of the supernatural life. Imagine his gratitude, and faith, and zeal! The result, failure! The rulers angrily forbade him to preach, and administered a shameful beating. But Peter departed rejoicing. "Rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame."

Who knows if we are called to success or to suffering?

But we shall rejoice in either fate, give glory to God and work out his righteous plan, if we go to the work in humble surrender to the will of God, conscious of a present Christ, and full of love and prayer and zeal, because "filled with the Spirit"

Corsicana, Texas.

G. L. BITZER.

LESSONS FROM THE LILY.

"And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin."—MATT. vi. 28.

To Christ all nature was a picture-book, filled with illustrations of spiritual truths. Here the primary lesson is "confidence in God," and four times we are told not to worry. He takes care of his creatures, as both the birds and the flowers tell us, and so will undoubtedly take care of his people. This important lesson was once impressed upon Luther by the song of a little bird, which seemed to the despondent man to say:

"Mortal, cease from toil and sorrow,
God provideth for to-morrow."

But the lily also teaches other lessons. *It grows*, and so it seems to say to the Christian, "Grow in grace." "Leaving the principles, let us go on!" "Consider *how* they grow." We cannot see them grow—either the lily or the Christian—but we can see that they do grow. There is much about growth that we do not understand, but there are some things about it that we do know. (a) The lily grows *silently*; does not make any noise or commotion about it, just appropriates the nourishment provided for it, and grows. God has also provided food for the soul. (b) The lily grows *gradually*; not by jerks and jumps, not all in one day, and more some days than others, but constantly; and so should the Christian. (c) The lily grows *unselfishly*—it does not live for itself, but for others, to unfold a flower that brightens the world and glorifies God. Its snow-white

blossom is perhaps earth's fittest symbol of unselfishness, for "while black absorbs every tint of the sun's prismatic rays, white gives forth every color it receives." The rose is red because it is selfish enough to absorb every other tint except the red, which it sends forth to attract admiration; but the pure white lily unselfishly gives forth all it receives! So the mature Christian, whose character is fully developed, is represented as "clothed in white." The lily's mission is twofold: to brighten the world, and thereby to glorify God. When it stands forth in regal beauty, crowned with its coronet of snow, it is not only a significant witness to the divine wisdom, power and goodness, but a silent symbol of that purity and unselfishness which characterize the saints in glory, while it sheds a benediction upon all within reach of its influence; and so it seems to say to men, "You, too, have a twofold mission to accomplish: to brighten and bless the world in which you live, and to glorify the God who made you."

T. M. McCONNELL.

SUITABLE SHOES FOR ROUGH ROADS.

"Thy shoes shall be iron and brass; and as thy days, so shall thy strength be."—DEUT. xxxiii. 25.

ASHER was Jacob's eighth son; his inheritance, the seacoast between Mount Carmel and Lebanon—*rough but rich*. The hills were full of minerals, and the location favorable for commerce. The text is both a *prophecy* and a *promise*. If iron shoes be needed, then the pathway must be rough, and the treasure secured by hard work. Gold and silver are not found in gardens and meadows, but in barren hills, or under huge masses of stone, and men must dig them out; but the very digging develops muscle and promotes health.

So we may expect to find difficulties along life's pathway. In fact, there is no true life without conflict. The best blessings lie along rough roads; the richest treasures are hidden by rugged rocks; the most important lessons are learned in hard schools. "*Per aspera ad astra*"—through difficulties to distinctions, has many illustrations. The kite rises against the wind; the palm-tree bears best when loaded with weights; the pearl-bearing oyster is found only in shallow water, where it is bruised by heavy hoofs and passing wheels. Only rough climbing reveals earth's grandest scenes. It is not best to be "born with a silver spoon in one's mouth." Difficulties develop manhood. The lazy pupil may shirk duty; but if so,

he suffers loss; refusing the burden, he misses the blessing. The world's most successful men have ever been self-made; the most gifted intellects have been developed in adversity's school. If we want the prize we must pay the price. Earth's treasures are reserved for those who are willing to dig. Crowns lie beyond conflicts, and are promised only to victors! But the text is a *promise* as well as a *prophecy*. If Asher's portion was rough, it was also rich; it was not accidental. God gave it, and the shoes, too! and so, now, if such shoes are needed, he will provide them. He ever "tempers the wind to the shorn lamb," and plants the healing tree beside the bitter waters. He places an "Ebenezer" not far from every "Zarephath"; the "place of help" ever near the "place of trial." But iron shoes are not always needed. Dying grace is not given until the dying hour. The stars shine only in the night; manna was found only in the wilderness; special grace is reserved for special need. The promise is only for those whose way is rough; but for them it is sure, and the compensations of a gracious Providence abundant.

T. M. McCONNELL.

WHAT THE SNOW SAYS.

"Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow? or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail?"—JOB xxxviii. 22.

NATURE to-day is beautifully suggestive—a veritable poem in white, written in crystal characters, and illustrated by the matchless touches of the Frost King. Let us endeavor to "enter the treasures of the snow," and learn some of the important lessons it teaches.

First. It is both a witness from God and for God! It says unmistakably that there is a God—no human wisdom nor power could produce it. It is true that man has learned to manufacture a few pounds of ice, but God only can cover the earth for many miles with countless tons of snow. Each flake bears the impress of a divine hand, the "sign-manual" of heaven, the autograph of God! But the snow not only declares that there is a God; it also tells us something about him. Scattered here, there and everywhere, it teaches us that he is omnipresent. It speaks, too, of his wisdom, power, gentleness and goodness.

Second. It assures us that there is another world than this. Such a delicate, immaculate carpet was never woven upon any loom of earth; its marvellous crystals were never fashioned in any laboratory

of man. The Bible says it "comes down from heaven." The flakes fall like downy feathers from the wings of angels, or like the shattered petals of frozen flowers from gardens of the sky! But the snow also tells us something about the other world. It says (*a*) that it is a world where individuality is recognized and harmony emphasized. Each flake is distinct, yet they all unite to accomplish a common mission, and, in so doing, teach us the value of little things and the importance of coöperation. (*b*) It is a world of beauty. There is nothing prettier than these flowers of the sky, of which there are more than a thousand varieties, in the shape of crowns, stars and temples, while united, they transform the dark wintry world into scenes of enchantment. God loves the beautiful! (*c*) It is a world of purity. Freezing removes impurities. Snow is God's own symbol of holiness. The saved and sanctified sinner becomes "whiter than snow." (*d*) It is a world of service. Snow has a mission to perform. It purifies the atmosphere, enriches the soil, protects plant life, like a great blanket which Mother Nature wraps around her sleeping children. There, as well as here, "his servants shall serve him," while angels are, and doubtless ever will be, "ministering spirits."

T. M. McCONNELL.

Gainesville, Ga.

SALVATION IS OF GOD.

"Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."—1 Cor. i. 30.

THE first words of the argument which concludes this chapter surprise us: "Christ sent me . . . to preach the Gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ be made of none effect." We are accustomed to judge that the graces of eloquence, etc., the vigor of a trained intellect, add force, not indeed to the inherent power of the gospel, but in the presentation of that truth and in recommending it to the hearts and minds of men.

Does the apostle intend to condemn all these, not only as useless, but as harmful, as "making the cross of Christ of none effect"? No. This expression "wisdom of words" does not refer to these things, but to a system of philosophy, the contents of which originate in human wisdom. "Christ sent me to preach the gospel, not with wisdom of words," that is, not as a system of philosophy, but as a saving truth revealed from God. In this view, it is easy to understand

how such a preaching of the gospel would make the cross of Christ of none effect. The gospel, turned into a philosophy, loses its divine element, and becomes nothing more than any other scheme of human wisdom. The doctrine of the cross, the substance of that gospel, becomes only the centre of a system, a thread in a well-woven web of philosophy, and, like all other human schemes, is ineffectual to save.

The contrast thus strongly hinted gives impulse to the argument designed to prove that the wisdom of this world cannot save; and, too, the gospel is alone the power of God to save. There is, first, an appeal to Scripture; second, to "actual experience," to the character and condition of the "called." The conclusion finally established is that salvation is of God, independently of human wisdom and power, and, therefore, the glory is due to him alone. The argument might well have rested in this great truth. But the truth, now relieved of confusion, expands in one grand comprehensive declaration, "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom," etc. The text easily falls into two grand divisions, which are yet intimately and essentially connected, forming one whole.

First, union with Christ, essential to salvation, is of God, who is the efficient cause. The doctrine is variously illustrated in Scripture: 1. The vine and its branches. 2. The head and the members of the body. 3. The living stone and the lively stones of a spiritual house. 4. Husband and wife. 5. Union subsisting between Christ and the Father. A union thus described is somewhat more than a mere union of sentiment or of affection. It is mystical, vital, representative, eternal.

This is God's work; it is "of God." This is the point Paul wished to emphasize. And this is the pivotal point in theology. Regeneration, effectual calling, conversion, etc., of man? or of God? The answer will fix the system of theology. The theology we preach hath this introduction, "In the beginning God." And so we declare here that God, the Holy Spirit, is the efficient cause of this vital union. And so the Scriptures teach.

But, perhaps one will say, I understand this, that Christ's true people are in him, and this is "of God"; but what of results? Just here comes the second division of the text. Special and sufficient provision is made in Christ, meeting all the conditions of salvation. He is "made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption."

Note the several terms and their meaning. Note particularly the close connection between two words, "righteousness and sanctification," as indicated by the Greek text. Such a review manifests that there is no lack in this gospel plan of salvation; that there is no defect in it from first to last.

And the element giving peculiar power is not that truth is revealed, but that Christ is "made wisdom unto us"; not simply that righteousness is imputed, but that he is made unto us righteousness, etc. What he is in the scheme of salvation, he is made to us; what he has done becomes ours. And now that every condition has been satisfied, and every difficulty overcome by him, the life, forfeited, is hid away with him in God.

Conclusion.—We gather round the cross of him who died for us and rose again. Do we understand aright? We are in him? Marvellous truth! And who hath done this? God! Ah! but we are poor and ignorant, condemned and polluted, sinners. True, but he is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, etc. Who, then, hath wrought all this? God! And as we lift our faces, and a song of praise bursts from our lips, we scarcely need the injunction of old Jeremiah, which the apostle here repeats, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

W. T. PALMER.

New Orleans; La.

UNCONSCIOUS INFLUENCE.

"That at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them."—ACTS v. 15.

THE incident occurred very early in the life of the Christian church. To aid the church, God gave certain gifts to the apostles. The gifts of prophecy, of tongues, of healing, were at their command. The gift of healing was generally one involving the conscious volition of the one performing the miracle, as in the case of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate. Besides this, there seems to have been an unconscious exercise of healing power. As Peter passed along the streets his shadow, falling on the sick and afflicted, healed them.

May we not gather from this the lesson of the importance of our unconscious influence?

1. We all have a shadow and an influence. So long as life is what it is, and the human body is the opaque substance it is, so long

will each of us cast a shadow. And so long as man's character, made up of his principles, purposes, affections and habits, is what it is, so long will each of us cast a shadow influence. We can neither rid ourselves of our physical shadow, nor of our shadow influence.

In the quaint old German story of Peter Schlemihl, the man who sold his shadow, the point of the story comes from its absolute impossibility. A man cannot rid himself of his shadow. And as absolutely impossible is it for us to rid ourselves of our shadow influence. It will fall on others. Pass down the thronged streets, and it will touch many as we pass. So, along life's pathway, our shadow there will fall on others. We cannot prevent it if we would.

We are responsible for that shadow influence. Unconsciously we may cast it; against our earnest desire we may cast it; but we are responsible for it, for we are responsible for what we are. Because this shadow influence is a silent one, we must not underestimate its importance. The light of day, the warmth of spring, the dew of night, all are silent influences, but all powerful. A spider's web shielding a Mohammed changed the current of history.

2. That shadow influence is generally more perfect an index of what we are than our words or our deliberate conscious influence. The first human pictures are said to have been but the outlining of some shadow. So the truest picture is often the shadow of our character. It is not what we claim to be, or say we are, or think we are, but the shadow of us as we really are, that reveals us.

3. That shadow influence is a power for bane or blessing. It is either like "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land," or "the shadow of death."

John Newton, as a wild and reckless unbeliever in his youth, let his shadow influence fall upon a comrade's life, and that life was wrecked for eternity. John Newton, as a great and good man of God, let his influence fall upon Buchanan the missionary, and Scott the commentator, and through that influence they became two of the most useful men of their generation.

How fearful the responsibility that rests upon each one of us. We need to remember that all around us are better or worse for our silent influence; that those nearest to us in the home, and closest to us in business, together with our friends and acquaintances, and the very casual acquaintance we pass, are influenced for hurt or healing by that shadow influence.

4. That shadow influence is imperishable. It abides forever. A

star, quenched of its light, would still shine on through space for ages, perhaps forever. So our influence is cast not only in life, through time, but for eternity. The influence we exert to-day, albeit unconsciously, may tell upon the character of a child fifty generations off. The bodies of Luther, Calvin, Knox and Wesley have mouldered into dust, but their influence, silent as well as spoken, yet lives on. When we realize, even in a slight degree, the tremendous meaning of this fact, we are tempted to cry out as did the dying man, whose life had been poorly spent, "Oh! that my influence could be gathered up and buried with me." But it can never be. Our shadow influence, unimportant as we may be, and obscure as our life may be, will fall across the coming ages forever.

5. We can only cast the proper shadow influence when walking in the light of the Sun of Righteousness. Our shadow is broken, distorted, harmful, until that Sun rises upon our soul. Then, "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another." The harm we do comes from walking in the darkness. The good we do comes from standing and walking in the glorious sunlight of his presence.

What are you doing with your shadow influence? Is your shadow influence in the home life what it should be? Is your shadow influence in your social life what it should be? Is your shadow influence in your business life what it should be?

T. M. WELLS.

Wilmington, N. C.

IX. CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

TILLET'S "PERSONAL SALVATION."

PERSONAL SALVATION: STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE PERTAINING TO THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. *By Wilbur F. Tillett, D. D., Dean of the Theological Faculty and Professor of Systematic Theology in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.* Nashville, Tenn., and Dallas, Tex.: Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South; Barbee & Smith, agents. 1902. Pp. xx, 536, 8vo, cloth. \$1.50.

These are Dr. Tillett's lectures to the students in Vanderbilt University, delivered during the twenty years of his incumbency of the Chair of Systematic Theology in that institution. They represent the mature conclusions of a ripe scholar and a devout expositor of the Scriptures.

He did not write just to make a book, but to clarify the soteriology of his church, which, he says, has "a storm-centre" of confusion. He is everywhere fervent, clear, simple, virile, and, in places, heated and eloquent! On every page he kneels to the Scriptures; it never occurs to him to question their infallibility and authority, nor even to amend the text. And God be praised for delivering the mind of this faithful servant from traitorous crotchets on this fundamental topic, and for enabling him to call the Methodist host to continued reverent submission to the Bible as the inspired and inerrant Word of God!

His spirit towards the Scriptures, towards the profound and vital subject on which he writes, and towards those who differ from him, is well-nigh all that could be asked. In one place he is needlessly, yet not unjustly, harsh towards the "Second Blessing" wing in his church, and on the last page he claims for Methodists the exclusive right and privilege of "preaching a full salvation." These blemishes of spirit are all in his last chapter, which must have been written under some provocation.

The book has received high praise from Methodist sources. A Presbyterian thinks it would be hailed by every well-balanced disciple of Wesley with an old-time "shout," (1) because it is so clearly and charmingly written, (2) because it undertakes to furnish the proof-texts of the distinctive points in Arminian soteriology, and (3) because it attempts to articulate into a harmonious and logical system the vital elements in that conception of Christian experience.

It is our opinion that every Methodist minister who desires to know, not merely the factors in his scheme of soteriology, but the relations of all its primary items as they stand in an organism of theology, ought to put

this volume on his study-table; and every Presbyterian who desires to know its stronghold and modes of defence ought to look through this latest, strongest and best presentation of Arminianism. It will clear his own soteriology and strengthen his own conceptions of God's method of grace as perhaps nothing else will, for it will enable him to see the other side as it logically conducts itself to conclusions which can have no other explanation than that there is some radical defect in the initial premises of the school.

Dr. Tillett does not waste much space on set polemics. He comprehends the difference between Calvinism and Arminianism. "The real point of departure between Calvinism and Arminianism, respectively," he says, "is in the different answers given to the question as to whose will determines who is to be saved and who lost. Calvinism says that God's will has already in eternity decided that question for every man, while Arminianism says that every created free agent decides the question of his own salvation for himself. . . . Evangelical Arminianism starts with these two premises: (1) Jesus Christ, by his sacrificial life and death, has made possible the salvation of all men; (2) every man is a self-determining agent." He understands both systems; he does not rail at Calvinists, nor spend himself in calling them horrid names; always treats them and their literature with respect, and has the good judgment to know that this system, which is venerable with age and respectability, cannot be decried out of existence. His method of defence is to expound his own system so plainly, make it all appear so consistent, so biblical, so attractive, as that whoever reads may instinctively see and feel the superiority of Arminian soteriology. Near the end of the book he loses his wonted balance and becomes extravagant. He writes:

"Most of the existing creeds of the Christian Church have outlived their usefulness and efficiency. This is not necessarily because they are erroneous, but rather because they are totally inadequate to meet the demands of Christian faith in our day. In our judgment, the sooner the most of them are retired as obsolete the better it will be for the Christian religion. They are clad in the antiquated garments of the sixteenth century, and breathe the murky atmosphere at the mouth of the tunnel whence Christianity emerged from the Dark Ages into the light and liberty of day. But what is needed now is to inflate the lungs of Christian theology with the pure and more invigorating air of this noonday of Christian freedom and truth. Let this be done, or the garments will become grave-clothes, and the air, being too long retained, instead of giving life as it once did, will become the cause of disease and death."

This is intemperate. It also shows temper. It indicates that the writer has, somewhere or somehow, got out of line with the people of God as they have travelled in the past, and that he is vexed because they did not go his way. There is a pathway through the pages of history which is crowded with the footsteps of the flock of God, and when a man gets contemptuous of that beaten highway, breaks with the flock, and sets out in temper to blaze a new road for himself, he has done a heady thing, and proven that he, at least, is not "perfect."

Dr. Tillett again becomes overwrought when he challenges, for himself and those who think like him, whose creed does not smell of the "tunnel," and whose clothes are new and not "grave-clothes," the exclusive right of preaching the gospel.

"To them who recognize man's true moral free agency, and who believe in the universal fatherhood of a loving God, and in Christ for the world and the world for Christ—and to them alone—belongs, by moral right, the privilege of occupying the foremost place in the moral conquest of the world. To them who believe that Christ has redeemed not only all sinners, but that the intensive power of his atonement is, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, as deep as its extension is wide; who believe that he can save unto the uttermost all sinners from all sin—to them, and to them alone, belongs, by right of faith, the privilege of preaching a full salvation." And more to the same effect.

This is ridiculous bombast. Only a class of Methodist the right to preach! Dr. Tillett, in this place, not only thinks he has got out of the "tunnel," but he also thinks he has "seen a great light." He not only thinks he has got rid of his father's "grave-clothes," but he also thinks he is a "boy with his first pair of new boots." At one lick he proposes to dynamite the past and take possession of the future. But we comfort ourselves with the thought that it is a part of his religion to lose what he gets, and it may yet come to pass that he will "fall" into that "tunnel" which his fathers digged through the mountains of error, and that he may yet "apostatize" to those "grave-clothes" which his ancestors wore when they were received up into glory.

Query: Why do those "perfectionists," who alone have the "moral right" to "preach a full salvation," always make such an exhibition of themselves as to disprove their doctrine?

But what is this "full salvation" which Dr. Tillett and the men who believe like him alone have the "moral right to preach"? We go back to the beginning of the book.

God is the Father of all men; all men are the children of God; love is the ruling attribute of God; love begets love; God craves the love of man.

Man is a probationer—everlastingly on trial; "moral free-agency implies and necessitates the principle of probation in the moral government of God": first a probationer under law; he fell by sinning against God, and was convicted and condemned.

This single sin would have ended the career of the race, but through the atonement of Christ, which was alike for all men, God reinstated man upon probation; gave him the privileges of a second trial. The death of Christ made salvation possible for all men; it did not actually save any man; its whole product was salvability. Christ lived and died to effect a mere possibility.

But God, foreseeing that no probationer would, or could, avail himself of the great atonement possibility, put him upon a third probation—confronted him with a third opportunity. The Holy Spirit was sent to convict him of sin—a thing which he could not do for himself, though he were forty times the free agent that he is. It will be noticed that while Christ only

makes him salvable, the Spirit really convicts, and does not merely render him convictable. It is also a part of the system that salvability by the atonement must be equally for all men, or else be partial and unfair, while conviction is not thus universal, but only of some men. But conviction is just as necessary to a "full salvation" as atonement, but this God who loves all his children alike, for some unexplained reason, convicts one of them, and not another!

Salvability by Christ is irresistible: every man is made salvable without any reference to his free will; and some men are convicted forcibly by the Spirit, without any consultation of their free wills. But God now comes to his limit. He "limited himself when he created a free will." He cannot make man repent, nor believe, nor confess. These are the doors through which he enters into the salvability of Christ and into the conviction of the Spirit.

When the probationer repents, believes and confesses, then God justifies him, and regenerates him, and sanctifies him—these are three instantaneous and coinstantaneous acts which are performed for him. Now if the probationer would die at this point, he would end his probation, and salvability would be converted into a "full salvation." But if he lives, it is probation and salvability still, because he still possesses free will and moral agency, which "necessitates the principle of probation."

Here is the Dean's *ordo salutis* down to this point: (1) salvability, (2) conviction, (3) repentance, (4) faith, (5) confession, (6) justification, (7) regeneration and sanctification.

Possessing these seven things, the sinner is "perfect," and possesses a "full salvation"; but he is not saved, he is still a probationer, still on trial, and all may yet go against him, and God may yet behold this child, whom he begat, whom he rebegat, for whom Christ died, whose love he craves, whom his Spirit convicted, who repented, believed, confessed, whom he justified, whom he regenerated and sanctified, who is "perfect," who possesses a "full salvation"—may yet behold this child writhing in hell! The probationer's free will may apostatize. God has created something which he cannot control, which man cannot control, which the Holy Spirit cannot control, which circumstances cannot control, which nothing can control without destroying it; which can be annihilated, but still not controlled. "It is impossible for God to make the believer's final salvation certain without destroying his moral free-agency."

Then, in case of apostasy, will the Deity give up the case? Will he continue to strive to do the impossible? The problem with the Deity is to convert a "full salvation" into a "final salvation"; can he do it? Not without "destroying his (man's) moral free-agency," and "if that be destroyed, man is no longer man."

Here we would give up, and frankly confess that a "full salvation" can never be converted into a "final salvation"; for if God were to do it he would "destroy man," and if the sinner were to do it he would end his "probation," and if he ends his probation he ends his "moral free-agency," and if he ends his moral free agency he "destroys himself." In either case it is destruction if "full salvation" be transmuted into "final salvation."

But Dr. Tillet, nothing daunted, struggles on till death, when he gets the opportunity to fold the pages, without clearly telling us whether man continues a probationer beyond the grave, or whether "free will," which "necessitates probation," is forever shrouded in the tomb. May it die then, if never before, for, according to these premises, as long as we possess it we are probationers on trial for our eternal life, and as long as the issue is in suspense, a "full salvation" can never become a "final salvation"! The great *desideratum* is not to get rid of sin, but to get rid of free will!

Dr. Tillet's superlative difficulties begin with "falling from grace." How many sins does the justified, regenerated and sanctified Christian have to commit to undo all that has been done? Will one, and that the least possible, sin damn him? Will two little ones, or one big one, damn? What is the quantity and quality of that sin which hurls the repentant, believing, justified, regenerate, adopted and sanctified child of God to the burning pavements of hell? The Dean says, "This is one of the most difficult points." Are there any remnants of original sin in the regenerated Methodist? If so, will these remnants damn him? Yes, or no.

If he says "yes," then there is the need of "a second blessing," a supernatural and gracious act of the Spirit carrying that remnant away, for no man can reach heaven with damnable sin in his heart. This is the position and contention of the "second blessing" wing in his church.

If he says "no," then he must distinguish between sin proper and sin improper, between sin damnable and sin indamnable, and refer this remnant of original sin in the regenerate to the latter class. This latter is Dr. Tillet's course. He calls this "root of sin" in the Christian "liability to sin," and deplors the fact that it was ever called "sin." The regenerate, truly described, then have no "sin," but only a "liability" to sin. At that stage he is a sinless probationer. Hence he does not need any "second blessing." It is in this way that the Dean gets on the other side of the Methodist house.

This is a family disagreement, still it ought not to be offensive to these brethren for an outsider to say how it looks to him. Dr. Tillet and his party, it seems to us, take a low view of sin, in that they represent some sin to be not blameworthy; while the other side—the "second blessing" party—take an extravagant view of grace, in that they represent it as suddenly and supernaturally coming into the regenerate sinner and transforming him at a stroke into a saint fit for heaven any number of years before the hour is ripe for him to take his departure. One party holds that grace takes two licks to sanctify a sinner; the other that it takes only one stroke. Both sides are "perfectionists," and find, as the result of their schemes, that they have a *sinless sinner* on their hands. And, pray, what are they to do with such a character? He is not fit for this probationary life, because he is *sinless*; and he is not fit for heaven, because he is a *sinner*. No wonder they quarrel as to what disposition they ought to make of a sinless sinner.

Dr. Tillet's man eventually gets three salvations, rising in grade the one above the other. He gets a "full salvation" at regeneration; he gets a complete salvation at death; and he gets a "final salvation" after death and for eternity. He says:

"We have seen that there are three salvations spoken of in the New Testament: (1) That at conversion, 'He that believeth shall be saved'; (2) that which carries on the salvation thus begun, 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do'; and (3) that which will be realized at death and the final judgment, 'He that endureth to the end shall be saved.'"

At last probation is over; the long trial has come to a close; the sinner has converted salvability into "three salvations"; has lost forever "free moral agency," for that always "necessitates probation," for it is written, "It is impossible for God to make the believer's final salvation absolutely certain without destroying his moral free-agency; and if that be destroyed, man is no longer man." At last, for we reap more than we sow, in struggling for one salvation, Dr. Tillet's man got "three," and they are "absolutely certain," but "moral free-agency is destroyed," and "man is no longer man"; for only in that way can probation be ended.

Dr. Tillet does a great service for his denomination when he points out the fact that Wesley was on both sides of the "sanctification question," and then explains it by the sound, but not disparaging, observation that Wesley was a great preacher, but that he was not a great theologian. The effort to make Wesley an authority upon questions of scientific theology, is the effort to treat sermons as technical forms of composition.

But there lies at the root of Dr. Tillet's soteriology a radical fallacy, one which hobbles him in all his exposition and lands him in all his troubles. It is the doctrine that man is a "probationer." He thinks probation is a necessary implicate of free-agency. But God is a free agent, and he never was, nor can he ever be, a probationer. The saints in glory are free agents, but they are not now probationers, if they ever were. The devils in hell are free agents, but they are not probationers; their destiny is unalterably fixed. These concrete instances prove that his *a priori* inference of probation from free-agency is incorrect. Individual men never have been probationers; instead of being born on trial, they enter this life "condemned already." They never had a personal trial, and have been adjudged guilty without their ever seeing inside of a court-room, or even having so much as antecedent existence. Their trial in Eden was altogether antenatal and representative. They were born with destiny fixed. Dr. Tillet tells us it is repetition of act that fixes character, and the fixation of character is the decision of destiny; pray, when did these men ever have an opportunity to reiterate act until it settled character and destiny, when, according to his own concession, they are born so guilty as to need atonement, the Spirit, and all the factors of redemption? Nor are they—any of them—probationers with respect to the gospel. Their second trial was had in the Second Adam on Calvary. "As in Adam, so in Christ." The first Adam failed; the Second Adam was successful. There never has been any problem about it. Christ came to save, not to make salvable: to redeem, not to make redeemable: to reconcile, not to make reconcilable; *able* and *ible* are not suffixes in the Scripture vocabulary. He is there exhibited as the Saviour of sinners, and not the Provider of salvation. He is agent, they are patient; he acts, they are acted upon. And all this elaborate effort to show how a probationer,

who has a factor of uncertainty in his constitution which is essential to its integrity, namely, free will, can eventually eliminate it, is simply an effort to explain how man can get rid of one of his constitutive faculties. If the author would redefine free-agency, he would not be under the necessity of saying that "probation is eternal" (p. 69), while he represents heaven as the end of it. If it were not unjust in the first instance to condemn without personal trial, neither would it be unjust to save without personal trial. We imagine that if Adam in Eden failed to stand his trial, Dr. Tillett would make no better showing than his father Adam.

Dr. Tillett's next radical fallacy is the assumption of the universal and indiscriminate fatherhood of God. He thus construes the whole administration of God over men as a paternal government. There is, however, a distinction deep and fundamental between rectoral government and paternal discipline. The object of one is to translate justice into law, and then to enforce law everywhere unerringly and impartially. The object of paternal government is to give expression to love, and promote the well-being and happiness of the household. All the inflictions of a father are remedial and beneficent in their design. For a Father to send one of his children to hell would necessitate our thinking of his being sent there for his reformation and future happiness. There is no endless hell in the house of God, and for the children of God. No child of God can be in hell torment. The moment you assert universal paternity, that moment you deny the endlessness of hell.

Dr. Tillett says God is the Father of all men. Our Lord distinctly denied it. "If God were your Father, ye would love me. . . . Ye are of your father, the devil." Dr. Tillett, by implication, teaches that God has a paternal affection for Esau; but God says, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."

If God is the Father of all men, and if he has a paternal love for all men, and if there are any men in hell, they are the sons of God, whom he loves! Is he equally the Father of heaven and of hell? We understand heaven to be a home and hell to be a penitentiary.

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

NEWMAN'S "MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY."

A MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY. *By Albert Henry Newman, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in McMaster University, Author of "A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States," "History of Antipædobaptism," etc.* Vol. I. Ancient and Medieval Church History (To A. D. 1517). Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1901.

The name of this book might mislead. A manual means a hand-book, a compend of leading principles—a primer. Every church history, in a measure, must be a compend, for the reason that the field is so vast that no historian could be so rash as to attempt more than a fragmentary narrative of leading persons and events. But when one names his history a manual, the title suggests a very brief treatment. But we have in the volume before us a book of over six hundred pages, and it is but the half of the history promised. It brings us only to the Reformation, and it will

require a volume of equal size to traverse, with the same fulness, the field yet to be covered. Let it be understood, then, that this manual means a history of over twelve hundred pages—several hundred pages more than either Fisher or Kurtz. There is not so much on a page as in either of these authors, and, therefore, the amount of matter is probably about the same.

A popular church history is not easily prepared. It must combine two qualities that are almost incompatible. It must be compendious and readable. A history of several ponderous volumes is discouraging when one remembers the shortness of life and the number of other things about which he wishes to inform himself. A compendious history may be little more than a dictionary of names and dates. Such a history neither interests nor instructs. The problem is to comprise a history within reasonable limits, and at the same time put some life-blood into it. A name is nothing apart from the character or the event which it designates. Some knowledge of these must be given, and the more minute and circumstantial the knowledge, the more lively the interest excited. For example, if we meet for the first time the statement that the first Ecumenical Council met at Nicea in 325, and nothing further is told us, the statement is neither more entertaining nor instructive than the statement that "they journeyed from Ben-jaakan, and encamped in Hor-hagidgad." We must know what an ecumenical council is, what it met for, and what the result of its meeting. Even these questions may be answered so briefly as to leave us with only a few barren ideas. But give us Dean Stanley's account of this council, running through 120 pages of the most fascinating writing, and we will gladly lay aside *To Have and to Hold*, in order to have and to hold this charming and informing narrative. He carries us with him to Nicea, in the month of May, 1853, and while we stand with him by the tranquil Ascanian lake, amid the fresh glories of opening summer, "the snow-capped Olympus from far brooding over the scene," he reconstructs the ancient Greek city, the old basilica in which the council met, and then reassembles the council in our presence. He points our attention to the deputies as they come filing into the city, every bishop having two presbyters and three slaves as his retinue. Some are in carriages, some on horses, some on asses, some on mules, but "they all come as fast as they can run, in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm." The Dean knows nearly all of them by name, and when that is not the case he can tell us from their varied costumes where they are from. He gives us a picture of a few of the leaders to bring away with us. "Close beside the Pope Alexander is a small, insignificant young man, of hardly twenty-five years of age, of lively manners and speech, and of bright, serene countenance. Though he is but a Deacon, he has closely rivetted the attention of the assembly by the vehemence of his arguments. He is already taking the words out of the Bishop's mouth, and briefly acting in reality the part he had before acted in name, and which in a few months he will be called to act both in name and in reality. That small, insignificant deacon is the great Athanasius." Here is another. It is the picture of a presbyter, "in appearance the very opposite of Athanasius. He is sixty years of age, very tall and thin, and apparently unable to support his stature; he has an odd way of contorting and twisting himself, which his enemies compare to the

wrigglings of a snake. He would be handsome, but for the emaciation and deadly pallor of his face, and a downcast look, imparted by a weakness of eyesight. At times his veins throb and swell, and his limbs tremble, as if suffering from some violent internal complaint—the same, perhaps, that will terminate one day in his sudden and dreadful death. There is a wild look about him, which at first sight is startling. His dress and demeanor are those of a rigid ascetic. He wears a long coat with short sleeves, and a scarf of only half size, such as was the mark of an austere life; and his hair hangs in a tangled mass over his head. He is usually silent, but at times breaks out into fierce excitement, such as will give the impression of madness. Yet, with all this, there is a sweetness in his voice, and a winning, earnest manner, which fascinates those who come across him. Amongst the religious ladies of Alexandria, he is said to have had from the first a following of not less than seven hundred. This strange, captivating, moon-struck giant is the heretic, Arius.” The good Dean bids us glance for a moment at two Coptic hermits from the interior of Egypt. As our eyes fall on them we are reminded that it is only a little while since the fierce Diocletian was trying to destroy the Christian faith. “Each presented the frightful spectacle of the right eye dug out with the sword, and the empty socket seared with a red-hot iron. Paphnutius, besides, came limping on one leg, his left having been hamstrung.” The Dean does us many a good turn in addition to furnishing us these interesting pictures. He introduces us to one whose name has been familiar to us from childhood, but whose “local habitation” was veiled in mystery. It is none other than St. Nicholas, *alias* Santa Claus. He was a member of this council, and is credited with becoming very indignant, and giving Arius a tremendous box on the ear. This was before he became a jolly fat Dutchman, and took to travelling in his reindeer sledge. Then we are treated to a choice bit of legendary lore in connection with one of the members. The bishop from the island of Cyprus, the former home of our beloved Barnabas, was named Spyridion, who had been a shepherd in early life, and continued to follow that occupation after being raised to the episcopate. He travelled in humble style, in company with no one but his deacon. They rode on mules, the one mule being white, the other chestnut. “One night, on his arrival at a caravansarai, where a cavalcade of orthodox bishops were already assembled, the mules were turned out to pasture, whilst he retired to his devotions. The bishops had conceived an alarm lest the cause of orthodoxy should suffer in the council by the ignorance or awkwardness of the shepherd of Cyprus when opposed to the subtleties of the Alexandrian heretic. Accordingly, taking advantage of this encounter, they determined to throw a decisive impediment in the way. They cut off the heads of his two mules, and then, as is the custom in Oriental travelling, started on their journey before sunrise. Spyridion also arose, but was met by his terrified deacon, announcing the unexpected disaster. On arriving at the spot, the saint bade the deacon attach the two heads to the dead bodies. He did so, and, at a sign from the bishop, the mules, with their restored heads, shook themselves as if from a deep sleep, and started to their feet. Spyridion and the deacon mounted, and soon overtook the travellers. As the day broke, the prelates and the deacon were alike astonished at seeing that he, perform-

ing the annexation in the dark and in haste, had fixed the heads on the wrong shoulders; so that the white mule now had a chestnut head, and the chestnut mule had the head of its white companion." This is a very childish story, but it adds a charm to Dean Stanley's history of the Council of Nicea; and there are many other things almost equally trivial which lend a delicious flavor to his narrative. Not only so, but they constitute a very vital part of the history. True, this story is not a veracious part of the history of Spyridion, but it is a veracious part of a later history, to which the Bishop of Cyprus is tied by cords that cannot be severed. That story helps to make him what he is to-day, and has been for centuries, the patron saint of the Ionian Islands, on one of which his body is preserved, and twice a year it is carried around the streets of the capital city in solemn procession.

But we have not yet reached the climax of interest in the assembling of the Nicene Council, as it is made to live before us again by the magic wand of Dean Stanley. It is reached when, after lifting expectation up to a point of painful suspense, and while every one holds his breath, the emperor is ushered in. "The whole assembly arose and stood on their feet; and then for the first time set their admiring gaze on Constantine, the Conqueror, the August, the Great. His towering stature, his strong-built frame, his broad shoulders, his handsome features, were worthy of his grand position."

I have indulged in these long quotations because I can in this way make my point clearer than by any merely verbal statements. It is easy to see that the way to make history interesting is to throw the picture on a large canvas, and make every detail stand out in vivid perspective. But suppose a writer should undertake to give us eighteen centuries of church history, projected on the same scale as that on which Dean Stanley paints the history of the Council of Nicea, "the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." There must be condensation. Little time can be spared for picturing dramatic situations. Personal incidents and anecdotal story must be omitted. If the history is not to run into a lengthy series of volumes, there will barely be space to crowd in the persons that are pre-eminent in their influence, and the events that are fundamental and far-reaching in their significance.

There is still a choice between two methods. One is to give a little of everything; and the other is to omit much, and to give larger space to the remainder. If a historian is content to give only a page to an epoch-marking event, and a paragraph to a century-wide movement, he can thus economize space and give a passing remark to every person and event that have survived the on-sweeping tide of oblivion. But of what use is such a history, save to the few who merely need a reference to quicken and help a well-stored memory? On the other hand, if one is content to leave out of view altogether a vast multitude of persons and things that clamor for recognition, he can hope to give some valuable and interesting instruction touching the matters which he does elect to write about. His readers will be left absolutely in the dark in reference to many things that are well worth knowing. His work will be nothing more than a fragment. Here, then, are three possible ways of writing church history, each of them attended with objection, if the aim is to meet the need of the general public. One way is to write on

all important topics with sufficient fullness to make it vivid and interesting. The objection to this method is the bulk. Another way is to write on all important topics with sufficient brevity to bring the history in narrow compass. The objection is the dryness and barrenness. The other way is to cull out from the mass only so much as can be presented somewhat fully in brief space. The objection is the slighting of much that is worthy of mention. Probably the last evil is the least. A history that appeals to any wide circle of readers must be readable. To be brief and readable, it must not attempt too much.

Dr. Newman has adopted this course. He chooses certain epochs for comparatively full treatment. He does not hurry through the apostolic period. He discusses with considerable fullness the "Constitution of Apostolic Churches"; but devotes very little space to proving that "The New Testament churches were, in the intention of Jesus and of his apostles, made up exclusively of baptized believers." Being himself a Baptist, this statement seemed to him so nearly self-evident as to need little or no proof. It is very easy for any of us to see what we are looking for. His spirit, however, is usually temperate and judicial.

He chooses certain phases of other epochs, and treats them with considerable elaboration, and dwarfs or omits other aspects. He gives much space to the literature of the first three centuries. After a brief sketch of many of the authors, he lets us sample some of their writings. For example, he gives up seven pages to Tertullian and his various writings, and notes, in connection, the condition of the church at Carthage. He gives nearly the same space to Cyprian, and altogether to the writers of that period he devotes ninety pages, about one-seventh of the entire volume. I believe he is wise in this.

Dr. Newman does a good deal of summarizing, and in this way greatly aids the student. He gathers up in a few carefully-worded paragraphs the salient features of a period, or the significant aspects of a movement, or the dominant elements of a type of civilization, and thus helps the student to a practical and permanent possession of the lessons which the history teaches.

Another valuable feature of the book is the literature, prefixed to every chapter, covering all the topics treated. This is a guide for those who have time and taste to go more fully into the subjects.

On the whole, the work is worthy of warm commendation. We have already approved of the omission of some matters, that others may be treated more fully. Of course, there will be difference in judgment as to what should be omitted. We feel disposed to criticise Dr. Newman for giving so little space to the missionary work of the church. There is no mention whatever of the conversion of the Scandinavians and the Slavs. We look in vain for Ausgar, for Cyrill and Methodius. As we now have good histories of missions, such as those of Leonard, Bliss and Smith, perhaps it is no great loss to miss the very scant narrative which alone is possible in a manual of general church history.

The author tells us in the preface that "this work is the product of over twenty years of almost continuous application to the study and teaching

of church history." The work having grown out of his own experience and need in teaching, is designed primarily to supply the need of other teachers. Its arrangement of material fits it for use in the class-room, and no doubt it will come extensively into use as a text-book in the Baptist denomination, and there is nothing, either in the spirit or matter of the work, that should bar it from the class-room of other denominations. We hope the time will not come when each denomination will feel under obligation to write its own text-books in history.

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

WEINSTOCK'S "JESUS THE JEW."

JESUS THE JEW, AND OTHER ADDRESSES. *By Harris Weinstock.* 12mo, pp. 229. \$1.00 net. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co. 1902.

A series of addresses on Judaism and Christianity from the standpoint of a Jew. The speaker delivered them before the Leland Stanford, Jr., University. They show him to be what is known as a "liberal" Jew. The fundamental principle of his studies is that the real Messianic idea is found in the mission of the Jew. This mission, he holds, has been marvellously furthered by the work and teachings of Jesus, though more so by the work and teachings of Paul, whom he regards as the real founder of Christianity, the man who conceived the idea of spreading Judaism among the Gentiles. He does not believe that Jesus thought of extending his following beyond his own people, and that but for Paul, and men like him, taking up the principles and teachings of Jesus, Israel's God would still have been "the God of a handful, the God of a petty, obscure and insignificant tribe." There are some striking passages and testimonies in these addresses, the more noteworthy as they come from an Israelite. "Modern civilization owes a debt to Christianity which it can never repay. The inspired Christian men and women who have labored, and who are laboring, for the upbuilding and uplifting of the human family are civilization's greatest benefactors, and the world has been made better and nobler for their having lived in it." "Let the Christian in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, continue to preach Jesus as 'the divine Man who lived humanly,' and let the Jew learn to look upon him as 'the human Man who lived divinely.' Jesus, instead of being the dividing-line between Jew and Christian, shall thus become the connecting link between the divine mother-religion, Judaism, and her noble daughter, Christianity." The mutual indebtedness of Jew and Christian, in both modern and earlier times, is a thought constantly mentioned and emphasized.

As has already been mentioned, the lecturer, like most of the "liberal" or Reformed Jews of to-day, does not believe in a personal Messiah, and he maintains that the more educated and enlightened among the Jews, even in the times of Jesus, did not look for a personal Messiah. The prophets were not "soothsayers nor fortune-tellers," but only had a grasp of the laws of moral cause and effect, and warned and foretold that certain immoral causes would bring ruin and disaster. It is a Messianic age, rather than a Messianic Personage, whom he expects. This age he believes the twentieth cen-

ture will develop more than all the preceding centuries. To the development of that ideal state of society which will fulfil his conception of the Messiahship, he is generous enough to acknowledge that the principles of Jesus, if borne out in his disciples, will contribute. He admits that the belief in a personal Messiah has served a good purpose, especially in preventing despair, giving faith to the hopeless, and lending courage to the oppressed and downtrodden.

The chapters or lectures on, "Are the Jews God's Chosen People?" "Moses the Greatest Man of Antiquity," "The Ethics of Moses," and "The Jew in Commerce," which are somewhat apart from the title of the book, are of great interest. He rejects the literal interpretation of Exodus, nineteenth chapter, concerning God's relation to Israel as a chosen, elect people, and maintains that the latter belief has resulted in incalculable harm to the Jews and has done the divine purpose great injustice. To it he attributes the arrogance and exclusiveness on the one side which have engendered the hatred and ill-will on the other side, as between Jews and Gentiles. The "brotherhood of man" and the all-fatherhood of God are frequent and favorite expressions. It is in the development of this same idea that he holds that Moses was the first leader who realized that Jehovah was not merely the God of Israel, but the God at once of law and justice, and that, in the providence of God, the peculiar career of the Jews is designed to make them, more than any other peoples of the earth, the instrument for bringing about that reign of peace and truth and righteousness which will constitute the true "kingdom of God."

AGLEN'S "LESSONS IN OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY."

LESSONS IN OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. *By A. S. Aglen, M. A., D. D., Archdeacon of St. Andrews; formerly Assistant Master at Marlborough College.* 8vo, pp. xii, 456. London: Edward Arnold. 1901.

This book is arranged to be used either as a manual by itself, or with the Bible to explain and illustrate its language. It is designed for school purposes, rather than use in the higher education or professional training. It gives results rather than methods or the apparatus of study. It uses no foot-notes, the author thinking that what is worth inserting at all is worth a place in the text. It also introduces its citations of Scriptures, in italics, as a part of the text, using the Revised Version throughout. In its arrangement, incut titles in heavy type, divisions, tables and maps, the work is unusually clear and adapted to the purpose for which written.

The author appears to follow Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church* somewhat closely. To those familiar with the Dean's view-point, this will sufficiently indicate the general principles upon which Dr. Aglen has constructed this work. He does not hesitate to say that he has acted on the principle that he should indicate that not only is Scripture composed of writings of various date and authorship, but that many of what appear as separate books grew to their present form out of materials of uncertain origin, by a process of collecting and arranging which required time and the attention of successive editors. A few specimens may be given, showing

the trend of mind of our author. Of the account of the Creation, and the difficulty of telling how life began, he says (p. 8), "Some day science may be able to tell it in set terms. At present it can only be told, as poets tell it, in figure or parable. Inspired Scripture was written under the same conditions. The Hymn of Creation, which begins the sacred book, is followed by another poetic glimpse into the origin of human society, where, search as we will, we can find only suggestive image or truth veiled in parable." The serpent of the temptation (p. 10) he pronounces to be only a type, a symbol of evil. The Book of Job he connects (p. 367) with the period of Manasseh, with the statement that "the persecutions under Manasseh must have led to reflections on the divine intention in the permission of suffering, and encouraged the belief that the troubles of the righteous are not a necessary mark of God's displeasure." Of Daniel, he speaks (p. 397) as the type of sagacity, courage and devotion to principle, "to the author of the book bearing his name," and suggests that it was four hundred years after Daniel's career that he thus towered so high above the rest of the exiles. In one of the appendices, giving the chronology of the prophets, Isaiah's last twenty-seven chapters are assigned to "the great unnamed," some time after the captivity.

The author does little in the way of studying the deeper meaning of the history and in developing its underlying principles. This, indeed, would have been unsuitable in a work designed for the beginners of the study. Even on the question of inspiration, he offers no theory beyond the facts that the Old Testament contains a revelation of God to a chosen people to prepare for a yet larger revelation, and that this revelation was progressive in its nature.

CUYLER'S "RECOLLECTIONS OF A LONG LIFE."

RECOLLECTIONS OF A LONG LIFE. An Autobiography. *By Theodore Ledyard Cuyler, D. D., LL. D.* Sm. 8vo, pp. x, 356. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1902.

Dr. Cuyler is to-day the youngest old man in the American pulpit. The record of his life, traced in this volume, compared with that of his contemporaries, would indicate a period of rare longevity. The measure of his years, however, must be by force, rather than numbers. His has been, in the highest and best sense, a "strenuous" life. He has crowded into his years more than most men of his own or even greater age. The record of it, modestly, simply, but strongly told, is found in this book. Dr. Cuyler tells briefly of his boyhood and college days, of his post-graduate travels, and of the exceptional opportunities he had, even at that early day, to meet notable and eminent people, such as Wordsworth, Dickens and Carlyle. A good proportion of the book is devoted to the people he has known. Keenly incisive, vivid and picturesque in description, and possessed not only of a keen-sighted appreciation, but also of a ready and tenacious memory, he makes these chapters unusually interesting, without unduly exploiting himself. His work in special lines, as temperance reformer, as author, as preacher, as pastor, is also told with exceeding interest. He attributes a large measure of his success to that department in which the outside world

knew him least, viz., the pastorate. Of the value of this work his own words may best speak, coming as they do from one whose eminence in the pulpit perhaps obscured to the public eye the rich results of his pastoral activity: "The importance of all that portion of a minister's work that lies outside the pulpit can hardly be overestimated. The great element of power with every faithful ambassador of Christ should be heart power, and the secret of popularity is to take an interest in everybody. A majority of all congregations, rich or poor, is reached, not so much through the intellect as through the affections. This is an encouraging fact that, while only one man out of ten may have been born to become a very great preacher, the other nine, if they love their Master and love human souls, can become great pastors. Nothing gives a minister such heart power as personal acquaintance and personal attention to those whom he aims to influence; especially his personal attention will be welcome in time of trial. Let the pastor make himself at home in everybody's house. Let him go often to visit their sick-rooms and kneel beside their empty cribs, and comfort their broken hearts, and pray with them. Let him go to the business men of his congregation when they have suffered reverses, and give them a word of cheer; let him be quick to recognize the poor and the children, and he will weave a cord around the hearts of his people that will stand a prodigious pressure. His inferior sermons (for every minister is guilty of such occasionally) will be kindly condoned, and he can launch the most pungent truths at his audience, and they will not take offence. He will have won their hearts to himself, and that is a great step toward drawing them to the house of God and winning their souls to the Saviour."

Nor does he lay less stress upon orthodoxy and evangelical faith than upon other preparation for a successful ministry. He accepted and preached the Word of God in its fullness and integrity, as the very word of God. This autobiography may well be studied by those who would profit by the experience of a man who is at once a great success and a godly man.

X.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

FAITH AND LIFE. *Sermons by George Tybout Purves, D. D., LL. D., Late Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; some time Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary.* With an Introductory Note by Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. 8vo, pp. xxx, 377. \$1.25 net. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1902.

With loving hands four brethren of Dr. Purves have wrought among his papers and prepared for the press these twenty sermons of one of the most gifted preachers and professors of his day. They do not claim for these sermons that they represent in its fullness and completeness in any single instance the work of Dr. Purves. They are really first drafts, almost extemporaneous writings of discourses, which he afterwards filled out and enriched for oral presentation. But even with this semi-apology for them made before the reading, one cannot but feel their power, their beauty, their soundness and precision. Dr. Purves' rich scholarship and accurate thinking made even the most rapid expression full, suggestive, forceful and correct. The sermons selected for this volume are all upon exalted and dignified themes. There is nothing sensational about them. Few illustrations are used. Their light is chiefly the delightful glow of the preacher's heart, as he speaks out his own life and experience, the reflection of spiritual light as he presents the truth itself under the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, his guide. They are deeply spiritual, and at the same time appeal to the intellect as presentations of truth. "The Disappointment of the World with Christ," "What Think Ye of Christ?" "The Keeper of Israel," "The Father of the Prodigal," "God's Education of his Children," "The Judgment," are some of the themes of the discourses.

Not the least attractive part of the volume is Dr. Warfield's Introduction. As an outline of Dr. Purves' life, and as an analysis of his intellectual and religious ability and career, it is a gem. It first shows how the present volume is not to be accepted as showing Dr. Purves' completed work, as masterful as the sermons are. It then gives an outline of his life, so short, so brilliant, so effective, tracing his lineage back three generations, and showing how much to do with his life was the pious and vigorous ancestry from which he sprang. Some account is then given of his wonderful successes in the pulpit and in the professor's chair, and an analysis made of his power and effectiveness as a preacher and as a teacher. His literary product is then described, the major and more permanent part of it confined,

alas, to but two works, both notable, *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*, and *The Apostolic Age*. The whole is a loving, tender, sympathetic tribute to a man cut down in the midst of his usefulness, paid by one associated closely with him for many of the years of his brilliant career.

THE INCARNATION OF THE LORD. A Series of Sermons Tracing the Unfolding of the Doctrine of the Incarnation in the New Testament. *By Charles Augustus Briggs, D. D., D. Litt.* 8vo, pp. xii, 243. \$1.50 net. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902.

The sub-title describes the nature of this volume. The sermons are chiefly an exposition of the teachings of the New Testament on the subject. Indeed, the preacher puts them forward so much that we almost forget, for the time being, that he holds to any other source of authority than the Word alone. The topics of the discourses are, "The Son of Man from Heaven," "The Son of the Father," "Born of a Woman Under the Law," "The Self-Im impoverishment of the Lord," "The Kenosis," "The Epiphany of Our Saviour," "Made Like Unto His Brethren," "The Advent of God," "The Word Made Flesh," and "Born of the Virgin."

RELIGION, AGNOSTICISM, AND EDUCATION. *By J. L. Spalding.* 12mo, pp. 285. 80 cents net. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1902.

From neither title nor contents would one readily think that this book emanates from a Romanist source. And yet it is from a member of the hierarchy itself, Bishop Spalding. Its most striking feature, wherein it differs from the Roman Catholic position almost universally held by that communion, is its claim that theology is progressive; that it must advance with the culture of the age, and that to this end men, even Catholics, must have "freedom to learn" and "also freedom to teach." We could wish that his latter contention were accepted, but not with such results as some of the minor positions of this book. The work is far more upon modern lines, and far more sympathetic with advanced thought, in the present conception of these words, than one usually finds from such a source.

THE ORIGIN AND PROPAGATION OF SIN. *By F. R. Tennant.* 12mo, pp. 231. \$1.10. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902.

This is an elaborate effort to adjust the fact of sin to the principles of the evolutionary science, together with a theodicy based upon the same principles. Of course it relegates to a theological limbus all such efforts to explain the fall and original sin, and to find a divine provision for the needs growing out of them, as have been set forth in the ages past. Its fundamental idea is that Adam's posterity, having an organic nature, like his, at cross-purposes with moral culture and progress, fell into sin like as their father did, not because he did. The book is reserved for a fuller review in our pages.

THE CREATION STORY OF GENESIS I. A Sumerian Theogony and Cosmogony. By *Dr. Hugo Radau*. 8vo, pp. 70. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1902.

If the author had followed in this treatise the warning which he gives in his preface against careless or improper handling of the Word, it would have been better for him. His treatise is practically a nexus of assumptions, the gist of which is that the creation story of Genesis is a product of ancient higher criticism in eliminating from Babylonian myths the record which we now possess, or that the present story comes to us by a process of literary evolution. This is enough concerning this technical treatise to show us the author's drift and purpose.

CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: THE SONG OF SOLOMON. With *Introduction and Notes by the Rev. Andrew Harper*. 16mo, pp. 96. 50 cents. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902.

In the Introduction and Appendices the editor presents and discusses the different theories concerning the origin and interpretation of this book. He is willing to accept, in a way, the allegorical interpretation of it, the allegorical idea, however, being secondary in the mind of the writer.

BIBLICAL LOVE-DITTIES. A Critical Interpretation, and Translation, of the Song of Solomon. By *Paul Haupt, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore*. 11 pp. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd. 1902.

It is not often, and happily so, that within as short a compass as that of this brief monograph one finds as much that is positively revolting. The author, in the name of criticism and scholarship, first asserts that it is impossible to retrace the original plan of the author of the Song; next, that there is no real author; next, that the traditional arrangement may be very much improved and the received text freed from many subsequent additions and repetitions, and can be made more intelligible than it is in its traditional confusion. He then claims that the so-called Song of Solomon is not the work of one poet, but is a collection of popular nuptial songs and love-ditties sung at weddings, though not originally composed for this purpose. It is, in short, and brutally expressed, but a collection of love-ditties in praise of sensual love, and its allusions in some instances but the language of the parties who would trade in the body of a woman. As to the question whether such a book is not out of place in the Bible, Dr. Haupt simply asserts that it is nowhere cited in the New Testament, that the great Hebraist, J. D. Michaelis, omitted it from his critical translation, and that the canon of Scripture is after all but a human institution concerning which opinions differ. In writing of the judgment of Dr. Franz Delitzsch, that the book is the most difficult in the Old Testament, Dr. Haupt says that "the meaning becomes perfectly plain, in fact too plain, as soon as we know that it is . . . a collection of popular love-ditties, which must be interpreted on the basis of the erotic imagery in the Talmud and modern Palestinian and other Mohammedan poetry."

DANIEL IN THE CRITICS' DEN. *By Sir Robert Anderson, K. C. B., LL. D.*
12mo, pp. 186. \$1.25 net. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell
Company. 1902.

The volume is a "Reply to Professor Driver and the Dean of Canterbury," and is designed to refute their position as to the Book of Daniel. It maintains the orthodox view of the date of the book, shows the errors of the destructive critics, especially Professor Driver and Dean Farrar, and argues with great force from the prophecies of the book that it was inspired.

DANIEL, DARIUS THE MEDE, CYRUS THE GREAT. *By Rev. Joseph Horner, D. D., LL. D., Member of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, London, England.* 12mo, pp. 142. \$1.20. Pittsburg, Pa.: Joseph Horner. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1902.

This study, chronologico-historical, of the three great personages named in the title, is based upon the results of recent researches, together with Hebrew, Greek, and cuneiform sources. It deals with the difficulties of that period which extended from the fall of Nineveh, B. C. 607, to the reign of Darius the Persian, the son of Hystaspes, B. C. 521. Its aim, well carried out, is to furnish from extra-biblical sources an authentication of the Book of Daniel, and to bring out more clearly the general and singular accuracy of the biblical historical allusions to the men and events of the period named. It is a most painstaking, scholarly discussion of the subject, showing profound study and patient investigation. It is opposed, throughout, to the assumptions and conclusions of the destructive critics, as to the date of the Book of Daniel and other points connected with the period studied.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOK OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. *The Hulsean Lectures for 1900-1901.* 12mo, pp. 314. \$1.75. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902.

"The Day of Pentecost," "The Expansion of the Church," "The Witness of St. Peter," and "The Witness of St. Paul," form the subjects of these admirable lectures. The lecturer's use of these subjects is chiefly to maintain and prove that so far as the internal evidence is concerned, the general credibility of the Book of Acts must be accepted. There are no evidences that the speeches of the apostles were written by a later hand.

NEGLECTED PEOPLE OF THE BIBLE. *By Dinsdale T. Young.* Second Edition. 12mo, pp. xii, 277. \$1.00. New York: American Tract Society. 1902.

A most valuable little collection, giving suggestions and lessons drawn from the lives or incidents in the career of many of the obscurer personages of the Bible, such as Isaac, Laban, Caleb, the Witch of Endor, Barzillai the Gileadite, Gehazi, the Rechabites, Barnabas, Apollos, and others. Naturally the imagination must play a large part in the portrayal of these characters, but there is Scripture sanction for the effort at least, and many useful lessons may be gathered from the hints that are given by a single incident or mention.

BIBLE DIFFICULTIES AND THEIR ALLEVIATIVE INTERPRETATION. By Robert Stuart McArthur, Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York. Sm. 8vo, pp. 450. New York: E. B. Treat & Company. 1899.

The subjects treated in this volume are all drawn from the Old Testament. As the author says, they are a selection, rather than a collection, of Old Testament difficulties. Some of the topics will indicate the general nature of the book. "Was there Really Light Before the Sun?" "Was the World Made in Six Solar Days?" "Was the Noachian Flood Universal or Local?" "Who was Melchizedek?" "Did God Mean that Abraham Should Really Offer Isaac?" "Was the Passage of the Red Sea Supernatural?" "Did the Sun and Moon Stand Still at Joshua's Command?" "Did Jephthah Really Sacrifice his Daughter?" "Are the Imprecatory Psalms Justifiable, or Even Explicable?" "Are the Prophet Jonah and the Great Fish Historical?" The form of many of these questions would seemingly suggest that the author leans to the naturalistic interpretation of the Scriptures involved. The reader will find, however, that Dr. McArthur usually holds to the old faith, and is not ashamed to maintain the literal and "traditional" views in many of the cases studied. He lays special stress upon the unimportance to the faith of some of the questions involved, upon the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, and upon the reasonableness and purpose of the miracle, though at times he rather tends towards the minimizing or pushing back of the miraculous elements in certain incidents. But in those cases in which he rather explains away the miraculous character of the incidents, as in ascribing the opening of the way through the Red Sea to natural causes, and as in holding to the theory of "subjectivity" in interpreting the speaking of Balaam's ass, he asserts very emphatically the historic reality of the events.

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD. A Collection of Addresses Delivered at South Place Institute, now Revised and in Some Cases Rewritten by the Authors, Together With Some Others Specially Written for this Volume. 8vo, pp. 824. \$2.50 net. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902.

The addresses gathered together here are upon almost every well-known phase of religious belief, including Secularism and the Ethical Movement. Different forms of Christianity, the early religions, and the non-Christian faiths are all described by representative writers. In the study of comparative religions the volume will be found very valuable.

THE RELIGION OF THE TEUTONS. By P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, D. D. Translated from the Dutch by Bert J. Vos, Ph. D. 8vo, pp. 504. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1902.

This is one of the publishers' hand-books on the "*History of Religions.*" It is a philosophic and careful study of what the world owes in religion to the Teutonic people of the earlier days. The investigation and study are brought down to the beginning of the eleventh century of our era. The author very properly admits that the influence which has come from Teutonic sources

cannot compare with that emanating from Jewish, Greek and Roman sources. The power of the latter is seen in the literature and art which have preserved the thought of the earliest days to the present time. Doubtless the characteristics of the early Teutonic people, so well described by Cæsar, in their independence, lack of unity, and migratory habits, had much to do with this. At the same time, however, it may be found that the Teutonic type of character was of a kind to develop a stronger, more strenuous type of religion, a factor that cannot be ignored in any just estimate of its influence in the world. High ideals and a more strenuous type of life than their Southern or Eastern neighbors probably had much to do with moulding the religious ideas of the Teutons.

BABEL AND BIBLE. *By Dr. Friderick Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin.* 8vo, pp. 66. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1902.

The sub-title to this volume somewhat pretentiously announces it as **A Lecture on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion, Delivered Before the German Emperor.** It is a popular telling of the archæological scientific results of Assyrian and Babylonian excavations. The text is profusely illustrated. The writer claims the monumental evidence gathered by these explorations sustains, substantially, the statements of the Bible, and sheds light upon the interpretation of much of its record.

PREACHING IN THE NEW AGE: An Art and an Incarnation. *By Albert J. Lyman, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 147. 75 cents net. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1902.

It was by a practical means that the author was led to choose his approach to his theme. A series of questions, about one hundred, was submitted to the author by theological students, and the response was these chapters. Dr. Lyman makes the central idea of preaching "a practical art leading up into a spiritual incarnation." Stripped of its imagery, this thought well embodies the principle which underlies sacred eloquence and its cultivation. Of order in theological thought and preaching, he says that the true "is the order of divine truth as it lay in Christ's mind, . . . translated into the preacher's mind, and again translated by him into the mental dialect of the people of his time." He pleads for such preaching as he believes Christ himself employed. After the Introduction, the author's chapters are "Preaching an Art," "Preaching an Incarnation," "The New Age and its Relations to Preaching," "The Preacher of To-day Preparing his Sermon," and "The Preacher of To-day Before his Congregation." He realizes that the term art, as applied to preaching, is liable to misinterpretation, and therefore most carefully guards against this by a thoroughly philosophical definition of the term. Take it altogether, this book is not only a most helpful and stimulating treatise on homiletics, but also one that is peculiarly suggestive as to the needs growing out of the distinctive characteristics of the times.

SUNDAY NIGHT LECTURES ON "THE LAND AND THE BOOK." *By Robert Stuart McArthur, Author of "Current Questions for Thinking Men," "The Celestial Lamp," "Quick Truths from Quaint Texts," etc., etc.* 8vo, pp. xxvi, 433. Philadelphia: A. J. Rowland. 1900.

Most of the chapters of this volume were delivered as Sunday evening lectures in Calvary Church, New York, the exception being those which did not seem to be sufficiently biblical and religious for that purpose. They are a narrative of the author's travels in Palestine during a recent summer. As a book of travels, the volume is exceedingly interesting, as all who know Dr. McArthur's style and ability, as well as power of description, would expect. It is more than a book of travels, however, in that the form in which the contents were given, as lectures on Sunday evenings, by an earnest, evangelical pastor, led him to make of it a happy blending of exposition, geographical, historical and experimental facts, with exhortation to practical duties in the Christian life.

BROOKS BY THE TRAVELLER'S WAY. *By J. H. Jowett, M. A., Carr's Lane, Birmingham; Author of "Apostolic Optimism," etc.* Fifth thousand. 12mo, pp. 216. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1902.

Twenty-six sermonettes, almost altogether devotional in character, but rather more practical in cast than is usually found to be the case with this class of writings. "My Need of Christ, Christ's Need of Me," and "He Calleth . . . by Name," are two most striking treatises and illustrate the titles, method and thought of almost the entire series.

TIMES OF REFRESHMENT. *Devotional Meditations. By George Matheson, D. D. With Portrait and Biographical Sketch of the Author by the Rev. D. MacMillan.* 12mo. \$1.25. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Dr. Matheson has issued other volumes of like nature with this. This one has added interest from the fact that it gives, in Mr. McMillan's sympathetic and happy sketch of his life, a view of the personality belonging to these devotional meditations. The chapters were prepared for a weekly paper, and appeared first in that form. Dr. Matheson's "shut in" condition makes his devotional expressions all the richer. Not seeing the outward world, the invisible seems more real to him.

THE SHRINE OF SILENCE. *A Book of Meditations. By Henry Frank.* New York: The Abbey Press. 1902.

In striking contrast with Dr. Matheson's devotional meditations is this collection by the leader of a little independent cult, if it may be dignified with the name, which has discarded the substantial elements of true devotion in the worship of a personal God who is concerned in human affairs, who rules in providence, who hears the cry of his children, and in the belief in a future life. The devotional from such a source can have in it little of sincerity or depth or power. Souls call for the bread of life, and not for husks.

TRAINING THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE. *By Rev. Francis E. Clark, D. D., Founder of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor. Author of "The Children and the Church," "Young People's Prayer-Meeting," etc.* 12mo, pp. 225. 75 cents net. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1902.

This volume is made up of the author's "Auburn Seminary Lectures on Christian Nurture, with Special Reference to the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor as a Training-School of the Church." He regards it as perhaps the first systematic effort to set forth the principles of Christian nurture as related to the modern young people's movement. The lectures were delivered at many other seminaries besides Auburn. In the first chapter, on the Church of the Future, he begins with the idea that the church of the future is in the nurseries and school-houses, colleges, shops and play-grounds of the present. The development of the church from within is emphasized, and that development is shown to be most promising with youth. The second chapter treats of the Methods of Christian Nurture, Past and Present, and discusses the home, the Sunday-school, pastoral catechetical instruction, and young people's societies. The next two chapters deal specifically with the Christian Endeavor Society as a Training-School of the Church, and is both a history of that movement in its incipiency and an argument for it. Appendices covering nearly a third of the book tell of the constitution, propagating, and development in given lines, and of the world-wideness of the Christian Endeavor movement. From this synopsis it will be seen at a glance that the book is a defence and glorification of this particular movement as the best and most practical in the church's duty of Christian nurture. The volume will be of special interest to members of that society.

HOW TO PROMOTE AND CONDUCT A SUCCESSFUL REVIVAL. *With Suggestive Outlines. Edited by R. A. Torrey.* 12mo. \$1.50. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Dr. Torrey is one of the most conservative and scriptural of recent revivalists, and has been blessed with great success. His recent great work in Australia has been particularly noteworthy. The book before us is, however, not so much a display of his own methods as it is a compendium of the views and work of others. It includes sermon outlines from Moody, Spurgeon, and others.

BIRTHRIGHT MEMBERSHIP OF BELIEVERS' INFANTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH. *By the Rev. Francis A. Horton, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 32. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1902.

A vigorous and practical monograph on the subject given in the title. Dr. Horton considers the subject, and argues it conclusively from the two standpoints of the history of the principle, and the exegesis of Scripture. The birthright membership of believers' children is shown to be accepted by

the great mass of believers of our day, the custom of the church from the days of the apostles down, as traced by Augustine, Cyprian, Tertullian, and others, the absence of any such sharp controversy as would have arisen over their exclusion, the household baptisms recorded in the Scriptures, the silence of the New Testament records as to the institution of the practice, and the previous church life of the Jews for twenty centuries. The exegetical argument is based upon the passage in Mark xvi. 16, Peter's words on Pene-cost recorded in Acts ii. 38, and other such passages. A few pages at the close of the treatise are devoted to a consideration of objections sometimes urged against the doctrine. We most heartily commend the tract.

THE GIFT OF POWER. A Study of the Holy Spirit. *By John Ellery Tuttle, D. D.* 16mo, pp. 60. 25 cents net. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1902.

FITLY SPOKEN. *By William Campbell Scofield.* Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

STRESS-OF-WEATHER RELIGION. *By the same.* Same publishers.

HEZEKIAH'S REVIVAL. *By the same.* Same publishers.

Four sermons which will well repay one the reading. That by Dr. Tuttle will be found especially stimulating and helpful. It is a practical and suggestive study of many of the passages bearing upon the work and relations of the Holy Spirit.

THE CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. *By Rev. R. E. Welsh, M. A.* 12 mo, pp. 188. London: H. R. Allenson. 1902.

MISSION PROBLEMS AND MISSION METHODS IN SOUTH CHINA. *By Rev. J. Campbell Gibson, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 332. \$1.25. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1902.

These two books, both sound, earnest, and practical, discuss much the same principles, the one in general, the other as seen and felt in practical operation in a specific field. The present day challenge of missions is focused on the points, Is the work politically objectionable? is it religiously superfluous? is it socially unsatisfactory? As minor points there are such questions as these, Is the missionary a troubler of peace? does liberal thought cut the nerve of missions? are mission converts a failure? To all of these points the first author addresses himself with candor and directness, though perhaps with an overestimate of some of the forms of criticism interposed, and with too much deference to the spirit of the critics whose animus is hostility rather than inquiry. The lectures of the second book deal to a large extent with the same principles and inquiries, in more concrete form. Their author very justly decries the commercial method of estimating the results, in the cost of means or men in making converts, and such like processes. Both books are most suggestive and helpful.

CHRIST AND ANTI-CHRIST. The Romance of Leonardo da Vinci, the Fore-runner. *By Dimitri Merejkowski*. Translated by Herbert Trench. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1902. \$1.50.

A Russian study of the part that Da Vinci took in the Renaissance, or that some claim for him. It is an interesting description of the times and of life in Italy and France in the days of Savonarola, when thought was awakening and the minds of men were beginning to throw off the shackles of the church, and thinkers were becoming brave enough to express their protest.

JAMES CHALMERS. His Autobiography and Letters. *By Richard Lovett*, M. A. 8vo, pp. 512. \$1.50 net. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

James Chalmers in New Guinea may be classed with Paton in the New Hebrides, Mackay of Uganda, and missionaries of that kind. His career was one of thrilling adventure, as well as of devotion and faithfulness. From full autobiographical papers left by him, the editor of this volume has given us here the story of his life and work. The book is a valuable addition to our missionary libraries.

DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL ETHICS. *By Jane Addams*. Pp. 281. \$1.25. New York: The MacMillan Company. 1902.

The famous head of Hull House here sets forth somewhat fully the fundamental principles upon which her practical work is conducted, and which she regards as essential to a right adjustment of duty to the demands of the times. Most of the chapters have appeared before, in periodical literature. The author's earnestness and intelligence are unmistakable. She is a woman of power, too, as these pages indicate. As to methods of expression, she could easily be clearer. As to soundness, she would do better not to divorce religion and social advancement so completely. For, after all, true ethics must find its basis in the divine will, and whatever tends to bring us to a clearer practical knowledge of that will, and adoration of its supremacy and glory, will the better tend to develop right action and to make us understand subordinate relations and duties.

THE CHURCH AND ITS SOCIAL MISSION. *By John Marshall Lang, D. D.* 12mo, pp. 364. \$1.60 net. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1902.

In this volume, the contents being the Baird Lectures for 1901, the reader will find the direct antithesis of the principles of the head of the Hull House, in her *Democracy and Social Ethics*. It is a treatise, from the standpoint of principle, history and practical application, upon the relation of the church to the social life. It shows how essential this life is to the personal life, and how a righteous social order is required, as well as righteous individuals. The historical and practical aspects of the subjects are shown

in the history of the Church of Scotland, and in the problems now confronting Christian people in Great Britain.

LOITERINGS IN OLD FIELDS. Literary Sketches. *By James B. Kenyon.* 12mo, pp. 250. \$1.00. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1901.

REMEMBERED DAYS. *By the same.* 12mo, pp. 259. \$1.00. *The same publishers.* 1902.

The first of these dainty volumes is a brief and sympathetic study of the character, career and works of Tennyson, William Morris, Keats, George Eliot, Dante and Christina Rossetti, James Russell Lowell, and Robert Louis Stevenson. The second is a series of stories and incidents of camp-fires, fishings and hunts, in light, happy vein, delightful to be taken up for an idle half hour's reading. The poet shows through the prose of both the books, lending a charm to every page.

THE EVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHY. *By L. T. Chamberlain.* 12mo, pp. 67. 50 cents net. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1901.

A statement of what the evolutionary philosophy is, of the "first principles" upon which it claims to found itself, and of the application of these to life, mind or soul, freewill, the moral sense, and the idea of God. While declared to be simply expository, the monograph is from a view-point which evidently favors the philosophy expounded, though perhaps not the more radical forms of it as advocated by Haeckel and his school. The "first principles" upon which it is claimed that the philosophy rests, and from it springs, are the relativity of all knowledge, the non-existence apart from human experience of *a priori* ideas or necessary truths, the persistency of force, and the principle that every event has its cause and must itself determine some succeeding event. The mere statement of these underlying principles shows that, as usual, the evolutionist must needs in his argument use the principles which it is his purpose by their use to disprove. He saws off the limb on which he sits.

NATURE AND CHARACTER AT GRANITE BAY. *By Daniel A. Goodsell.* 8vo, pp. xviii, 219. \$1.50. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1901.

Beautifully printed on heavy paper, with wide margins, beautifully illustrated and vignnetted, and strikingly bound. These descriptions and studies of life and nature as seen in a little summer home on the Connecticut coast are attractive within and without. They may be called "vacation studies." They breathe the air of outdoors, the rocks, the fields, the sea, the animal neighbors, both four-footed and with wings. They study character, as shown among the humble and lowly. The philosophy is both true and tender, and an indescribable grace clothes the words with beauty. We have seldom met a more charming book for idle hours. Each chapter is complete in itself.

SARAH THE LESS. *By Sophie Swett, Author of "The Boy from Beaver Hollow," etc.* 12mo, pp. 174. 75 cents net. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1902.

A WEE LASSIE; OR, A UNIQUE REPUBLIC. *By Mrs. May Anderson Hawkins, Author of "Only a Scotch Laddie," "The Claymore Estate," "A Face and a Life," etc., etc.* 12mo, pp. 277. \$1.00. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1902.

Two volumes well worth a place in the Sunday-school or children's home library. Mrs. May Anderson Hawkins is well-known by the many pleasant and wholesome stories which she has already published. The addition to the list of *Wee Lassie* does credit to her pen. It is a sweet, pure story, describing from real life some characters and scenes not familiar, but the prototype of which she has known. There is perhaps a little excess of the mystical ideas now prevailing, of the presence and work of the Spirit, the nature of the "surrendered life," and such views, and some of the characters are perhaps a little impossible, but the story throughout is elevating and pure.

THE BOER FIGHT FOR FREEDOM. *By Michael Davitt. With Maps and Illustrations Taken by the Author and Others.* Large 8vo, pp. 603. \$2.00. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1902.

THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA. *Its Cause and Conduct. By A. Conan Doyle.* New York: McClure, Phillips & Company. 1902.

The time has not yet come to write properly the history of the recent struggle in South Africa. The smoke of battle must disperse, the wounds must be calloused, the wails of anguish and grief on both sides must be hushed. The two distinguished writers who in the volumes here described have sought to portray that struggle cannot, in the very nature of things, give us anything but partial views. The Irish statesman's work is vehement, intense, eloquent. Through it one gets into the hearts of the heroic people who for nearly three years made the most desperate fight for freedom known since the conflict in America in the sixties. The English novelist is more calm, and gathers into his volume a large amount of official information, in the form of blue-books, pamphlets, etc., describing or showing the causes leading to the war upon the Boers. He seeks to prove that the British Government did its best to avoid war, and the British army to wage it with humanity. Each work will be of value in the years to come, when a better verdict can be rendered from a wider view of the facts.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 62.—APRIL, 1903.

I.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO THE FEDERAL THEORY OF IMMEDIATE IMPUTATION.

WE will notice the most radical objection first. A distinguished theologian, who teaches immediate imputation, and who would be classed as a Calvinist, objects to the federal theory on the ground that "it is extra-scriptural, there being no mention of such a covenant with Adam in the account of man's trial." What he thinks of the covenant of grace may be gathered from the fact that he makes election logically subsequent, in God's decree, to the purpose to redeem. "The true order of the decrees," he holds, "is therefore as follows: 1, The decree to create; 2, the decree to permit the fall; 3, the decree to provide a salvation in Christ sufficient for the needs of all; 4, the decree to secure the actual acceptance of this salvation on the part of some—or, in other words, the decree of election." Such an order of the decrees is obviously inconsistent with a federal relation on the part of the Redeemer to any particular class of fallen men. It implies that his work had equal reference to all. Election is simply an expedient to save the scheme from ignominious failure. We understand this author to make a square issue. The natural relation is the only one we sustain to Adam: our union with Christ begins when we exercise saving faith. The theory of the covenant being extra-scriptural, he does not employ the terms which belong to it. To use Bishop Butler's distinction, he objects to the evidence rather than to the contents of revelation. We agree with him entirely that the question is one of fact. If the doctrine of the covenants is not a matter of divine revelation, then any

theory based upon it is worthless. But is our author correct? If so, our Westminster Confession has been cast in an unscriptural mould. The whole system of theology taught in our Southern Presbyterian seminaries is founded on a legal fiction. We ask those of our readers who are familiar with the argument for the covenant to bear with us while we state briefly some of the main Scripture proofs. The author from whom we have quoted is a favorite with our young men as a book of reference. We write chiefly for their benefit.

If the objection stated means that the transaction in the garden of Eden is not called a covenant in the record given in Genesis, no exception can be taken. Many criticisms have been urged with confidence that have really no bearing on the question whatever. Some, for instance, have hesitated over the existence of a covenant with Adam on the ground of the inequality of the parties, notwithstanding the revealed fact that God made covenants with sinful men like Noah, Abraham, and David. Others have found no place for such a covenant since the Creator had sovereign right of control over the creature, overlooking the fact that this, as well as all other covenants, was made for the benefit of man. In the language of our Confession of Faith, "The distance between God and the creature is so great that, although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him, as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which he hath been pleased to express by way of covenant." But to return from this digression, we acquit our author of holding that nothing is mentioned in the Scriptures but what is mentioned by name. He holds, for instance, that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the Trinity, but he does not find it there under that name. What he means is that no mention of any sort is made of a covenant with Adam in the account of man's trial. The elements of a covenant are not to be found in the record of man's probation in Adam.

The Westminster Shorter Catechism refers to the transaction in the garden of Eden as a *special act* of providence, which God exercised toward man in the estate wherein he was created. The

phrase calls attention to the fact that the record contains an account of some new dispensation—some order of things different from, and additional to, what had been previously mentioned. It is, therefore, not an account of the institution of moral government. By virtue of the constitution God gave him, man was under such a government the moment his existence began. He knew his obligations, and was aware of the danger of disobedience. The question has to be met: What change in the divine administration is mentioned in this record? Now for some proof that we have in it an account of the institution of a covenant. First, as Witsius observes, the whole history of the first man, as given in the early chapters of Genesis, proves that he was not regarded as an individual person simply. It was not said to our first parents only “be fruitful and multiply”; nor is it true of Adam only that “it is not good that man should be alone.” More particularly should it be noticed that the words “dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return” were not confined to Adam. The disobedience of the first man reached, in its consequences, his whole race. They sustained some relation to him by which they, without a single exception, became involved in the consequences of his acts. So much lies on the face of the records. Some of the language might be accounted for on the principle of our natural relation to him as the first father. But the Apostle Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, puts an interpretation upon the first disobedience of the first man which the natural relation utterly fails to sustain. He teaches that the descendants of Adam took part in the commission of his first sin, and that the condemnation which was passed upon Adam was at the same time passed upon his posterity. Several schemes have been devised, by which it is attempted to show that all the descendants were present on the occasion, and actually committed the sin. These will be noticed at the proper time. If they are found untenable, we are shut up to the conclusion that a federal relation obtained, and that it is implied in the account of the fall. If Adam’s posterity did not commit his first sin actually, they must have done so representatively. But do we not find more in the record than simply a hint of a federal transaction? May we not claim

that all the elements of a covenant are there? There are two parties. God, as creator and lord, makes the proposals; Adam, as creature and holy subject, silently, but cheerfully, accepts them. There was a penalty attached to disobedience, as was proper where the parties were Creator and creature. There was a corresponding promise, on condition of perfect obedience. This third feature does not appear in the record, except by way of implication, but it is supplied from the relation of Adam and Christ, the second Adam. The result of the probation in Christ shows what would have been the result in the first trial if Adam had been faithful. The result would have been life in a higher sense than he enjoyed by virtue of his position as a creature under moral government. It would have been life in the sense of confirmation in holiness, and exemption from the possibility of ever coming under condemnation. The race would have been justified and adopted into the family of God. And the transition becomes easy from this reference to the second Adam to the last proof we think it necessary to adduce. In the fifth chapter of Romans, Paul illustrates the method of a sinner's justification by the manner in which all become condemned. He says Adam was a type of Christ; and he indicates the one and only point of resemblance: "Therefore as, by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." By the offence of one, all connected with him are condemned; by the righteousness of the other, all connected with him are justified. There is a union in each case, in virtue of which the consequences of actions are imputed. It is not said in so many words that the bond of union is federal in its character; but we confess that, to our mind, this is the natural inference. It suits both sides of the parallel. It requires no labored argument or ingenious reasoning to make it fit. But we refer to the parallel chiefly because it proves that a covenant in one case involves a covenant in the other. If there is a covenant of grace, then there was a covenant of works. What remains to be done under this head is, therefore, to state briefly a few of the Scripture proofs of the existence of a covenant of grace. That is,

that there is a covenant between God the Father and God the Son in reference to the salvation of the chosen people. The general proof of this doctrine is found in the subordination of the Son in the plan of salvation. The Father gave him a work to do, and promised him a large reward on condition of the execution of that work. To this the Son, as an equal in the Godhead, agreed. No one can read the Scriptures without perceiving the evidence that the plan of salvation is a covenant. Christ speaks of himself as *sent* by the Father; of his delight in doing the will of the Father; as having finished the work which the Father had given him to do. And he speaks of his people as given to him of his Father. Besides this general proof, there are also specific references to this covenant. In Luke xxii. 29, "And I engage by covenant unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath engaged by covenant unto me." In Hebrews vii. 22, Christ is expressly called the surety of a covenant. And in Hebrews xiii. 20 we read of the "blood of the everlasting covenant." Similar passages might also be cited from the Old Testament; but we have trespassed already on the indulgence we craved at the beginning.

We will notice, in the second place, an objection that is brought against the righteousness of the federal principle as a ground of imputation. This objection is urged against the federal principle only as it appears in the covenant of works. Exception is taken to holding the posterity responsible for Adam's sin because they were not consulted, and did not give consent to the federal arrangement. Witsius suggests that this complaint would not be heard if Adam had secured the promise of the covenant, and not the curse. It has also been suggested that the real tendency of the federal arrangement is seen in the case of the second Adam. Attention has been called to the fact that of all arrangements that are conceivable under the circumstances, the federal was the one attended with least risk of disaster. And it has been urged still further that if the federal principle must be ruled out, then no remedy can be furnished in case of disaster. There is force in all these suggestions, but they can hardly be said to meet the objection. They show the benevolence of the federal principle, but the objection is urged against its justice. There should

be no disposition to merge the justice into the benevolence of God. On the other hand, there is also a caution to be observed. Inability to harmonize the principle in question with our standards should not lead us to shut our eyes to its presence in the Word of God, or to criticise the divine procedure in cases where he has employed it. The following from Witsius is pertinent: "Nor does it become us to entertain doubts about the right of God, nor inquire too curiously into it; much less to measure it by the standard of any right established amongst us despicable mortals, when the matter of fact is evident and undisputed. We are always to speak in vindication of God, 'that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.' He must, surely, be utterly unacquainted with the majesty of the Supreme Being, with his most pure and unspotted holiness, which in every respect is most consistent with itself, who presumes to scan his actions, and call his equity to account. A freedom this, no earthly father would bear in a son, no king in a subject, no master in a servant."

Let us dwell for a moment on this question of consent. If we had been present, as Adam was, and consented to the covenant, there would have been no injustice in the arrangement. Such we understand to be the position of the objector. Is there not a mistake made here? Is it true that we are treated differently in the case from Adam? Was Adam's consent asked, or was it assumed? No doubt it was given, freely and heartily given. His holy nature made this certain. But that is not the question. We venture to affirm that there is not a particle of evidence in the record that Adam's consent was asked, or that he had any right to decline the proposals made to him. We will go further, and claim that the Creator had the right to determine on what terms the trial of Adam's integrity should be held. The fact of creation is regulative in all questions as to the ethical right of God to govern his creatures. If, then, Adam's consent was assumed, his mere presence does not count for much. If it be said that Adam gave consent to an arrangement in which he was to be an actor, while we are assumed to give consent where we are permitted to act only representatively, that is true. But even this residuum

of the objection is greatly modified when we reflect that Adam was the only member of his race who could begin life in the maturity of his powers. Ordinarily it is considered a wise arrangement that parents should act for their children, both in sacred and in secular concerns.

Let us now examine some of the schemes by which the objectors would get over the difficulty. When a substitute is offered for a proposition, it is necessary that the mover shall show, not only that a substitute is needed, but that the one he presents should be adopted. Here, if time permitted, we might test the claims of all the substitutes that have been offered. This, however, is by no means necessary. When we remember that Paul teaches that all sinned in the first sin of Adam, and that judgment came upon all unto condemnation at that time, there are only two conceivable solutions; either we were in some real sense identical with Adam, or we were identified with him by some federal arrangement. The range of inquiry is still further narrowed when the scheme of identity advocated by Edwards is by common consent rejected. Now let us see, if we can, what the substitute is which is proposed, and the manner in which it is applied to the case. Then we will be prepared to determine whether it should be preferred to the federal theory. Humanity, it is claimed, existed in its entirety in Adam. If we understand the theory in its unmodified statement, it holds that, numerically, humanity was in Adam. It sinned and was corrupted when he disobeyed the command of God. His act was the act of all men descending from him, because that nature which belonged to him has been distributed to all. The same thing that sinned has been distributed. It forms the basis of unity. Every man actually committed the first sin because his humanity was present on the occasion and acted. On this ground, the sin can be justly imputed to every man. Such, in substance, is the theory, and such its application. A single remark will bring out the failure of this theory. It does not identify us personally with Adam. We have the humanity that sinned, but we are not the person who committed the sin. Adam's personality was his own, and so is ours. Müller, who has insisted most strenuously on causality as essential

to the notion of guilt, says, "Only a personal essence, and not a mere creature of nature, can render itself a subject of guilt. This arises from the fact that only a personal essence is able to be the real author of its actions and states, so as they may be imputed to it."

We have time to notice only one more objection, and that very briefly. It is said that the federal theory contemplates each descendant of Adam at birth as innocent, and that corruption supervenes when God arbitrarily imputes the guilt of Adam's sin. We will set against this objection the following statement from the writings of the late Rev. Dr. John L. Girardeau: "According to the federal theology, every man, before his earthly history begins, had a legal and representative existence in Adam, and so in him really performed representative acts which really entailed legal consequences. In this sense, every man really sinned in Adam, and fell with him in his first transgression. And, in this sense, every man was condemned in Adam, in the moment of Adam's condemnation. The guilt of the first sin, which was really, although not subjectively and consciously, his sin—which was his sin by virtue of the representative relation he sustained to it—was imputed to him, in God's court, as the ground of his condemnation. It follows that every man comes into the world already condemned on the ground of imputed guilt. This, the doctrine of Immediate Imputation, has for the very burden of its teaching; this, precisely this, it was formulated to enforce. How, then, can it suppose the subsequent existence in innocence, even for an instant, of any soul of man? Why, it is this doctrine, and this alone, which accounts for the beginning of earthly existence in inherent corruption. It does this by showing that every man had, before birth, lost his innocence, and was condemned, and that therefore no man could, consistently with divine justice, be brought into earthly existence in innocence."

W. T. HALL.

Columbia, S. C.

II.

THEORIES AND PRACTICE OF CONFIRMATION.

ALTHOUGH confirmation is nowhere commanded in the Scriptures, and is not even mentioned in the Bible, it is nevertheless practiced, in one form or another, in all Christian churches, where pædo-baptism prevails, as a necessary consequence of the latter. At one time the baptized children must be admitted to the Lord's Supper. It is generally admitted that a step of such importance, marking, as it does, a period in the spiritual life of the believer, should not be taken without due preparation, and an examination by the officers of the church as to whether the young believer possesses the necessary qualifications for this step.

In the Roman Catholic Church, confirmation is one of its seven sacraments. Its visible sign is the "chrism," a mixture of olive oil and balsam, prepared and consecrated once a year by the bishop, who alone administers the sacrament, or a representative appointed by him. The person to be confirmed usually has one sponsor, and receives a confirmation name. It is deemed advisable to delay this sacrament until the children have arrived at the years of discretion. If any are unwilling to await the twelfth year of age, then the *Catechismus Romanus* recommends that they postpone it at least until the seventh year. Confirmation proper consists of the bishop's making a cross with the chrism upon the forehead of the person, saying, "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Then follows a slight blow upon the cheek and the salutation of peace. The import of this act is the alleged imparting of the Holy Spirit for confirmation in righteousness, and strengthening for the battle of life. For this reason, only a bishop may administer this sacrament, because only he is supposed to be able to impart the Holy Spirit in his fulness. It is considered a

necessary complement of baptism, but, in reality, is placed above baptism, because the latter may be administered by any priest, eventually even by a layman. As scriptural proof for its confirmation, the Roman Catholic Church claims those passages chiefly in which the Vulgate has the word *confirmare*; thus especially Acts viii. 17, xiv. 22, xv. 32. The first mentioned passage is also considered as proof that only a bishop may confirm. But already the reformers contended that the Apostles Peter and John there imparted special spiritual gifts, as prophesying and working miracles; such gifts as the unregenerate Simon coveted, and which, as a superior magic, he offered to buy of the apostles.

In the Anglican Church, the persons confirmed renew the baptismal vow made by their godparents, who are then released from their responsibility. In this church, also, it is only the bishop who performs the rite, while in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches the pastor does it. According to the Protestant conception, this rite is in no wise regarded as a divine ordinance, but merely as a human institution. "The English Church," says Alford, "in retaining the rite of confirmation, has not grounded it on any institution by the apostles, but merely declared the laying on of hands on the candidates, to certify them (by this sign) of God's favor and goodness towards them, to be 'after the example of the holy apostles.' Nor is there any trace in the office of the conferring of the Holy Ghost by confirmation, but a distinct recognition of the former reception of the Holy Spirit (at baptism), and a prayer for the increase of his influence, proportioned to the maturer life now opening on the newly confirmed."

Confirmation as a sacrament was from the beginning strongly opposed by the reformers. Melancthon calls it "an idle ceremony"; Luther "an apish trick," "a human invention," "a lying jugglery of the bishops." Although they sought to substitute for the rejected sacrament a confirmation according to evangelical principles, even this was accepted at first only by a minority, which may be accounted for by the powerful aversion against the Romish "sacrament," and anything that resembled it. Luther's

Order of Divine Service contains as yet no mention of confirmation. The earlier Books of Church Order only affirm "that quite ignorant children and stupid persons, who neither know nor are willing to learn the ten commandments, the creed and the Lord's prayer, should not be admitted to the sacrament; that otherwise parents present their children, some days prior, to the minister, that he examine them, and see how they are established in the articles of faith, and whether they are worthy and qualified for the Lord's Supper."

According to the Reformed order, too, no one is to be admitted to the communion who had not made a profession of faith and walked piously, or brought certificates to that effect. The "Declaration of Thorn," in 1645, the oldest Reformed symbol taking cognizance of confirmation as an already established institution, says, "To call this prayer for, and commendation of, adolescent believers to God, after the prescribed examination, 'confirmation,' we willingly consent, as also this custom is regularly observed in our churches."

As a separate act of worship, however, confirmation was not generally introduced in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches until the end of the eighteenth century, and it is only since then that it is practiced throughout evangelical Germany, and naturally also with the emigrated Germans in foreign parts. But while it is now a standing institution everywhere in these churches, there are heard complaints on every hand about the evils connected with it. Many people have lost the conception of its true meaning. The opinion prevails generally that to be confirmed is identical with "to quit school." When children have attained a certain age and are about to leave home to earn their bread, it is considered a matter of course that they must first be confirmed. What their inward state is, whether they really mean to be the Lord's, is usually not inquired into; and thus the first step from the parental roof is often sullied with a lie, solemnly uttered before God and the church. As a result of this vicious conception of confirmation, we face the sad fact that many of those confirmed soon afterwards again forsake the church. They are confirmed out of it, instead of into it. Their first communion

is, in not a few cases, also their last. Confirmation is only regarded as a custom which must be observed for decency's sake, or as an act which lends a certain churchly or Christian varnish. With this, they think, they have satisfied their obligations to God and the church.

With such a conception of confirmation, it is no surprise that it is degraded, in many cases, to a mere outward show, and the day of confirmation into a day of worldly feasting and pleasure. It is bad enough that the children usually appear for confirmation showily dressed. In some places, especially where Catholics are numerous, the girls are dressed in white, with wreaths and veils upon their heads, after the Catholic custom. But worse than this is the transformation of the day of confirmation into a day of worldly revelry. Even in better families it happens that on this day receptions are held in honor of the children, at which, by singing and playing, or even by music and dancing, any impression possibly made upon them by the solemn rite is at once thoroughly dispelled.

On account of these lamentable abuses many conscientious ministers entertain strong scruples about the propriety of this institution, and its usefulness is now a burning question both in this and the old country. Of course, it is the church's duty sharply to reprove the evils which have developed in connection with this solemn rite, and to place in the true light its real significance.

WHAT, THEN, IS THE MEANING OF CONFIRMATION ?

It is not a strengthening of baptismal grace, in the Roman Catholic sense, nor a necessary complement of holy baptism, though it is its logical outcome. It is utterly unscriptural to hold that the divine ordinance of baptism needs any perfection or addition by a fictitious sacrament. Neither is it scriptural to say that the Holy Spirit is imparted by the laying on of hands, though this practice is generally retained in connection with evangelical confirmation—not, however, as a means of conferring the Holy Spirit, but because it was a very ancient ceremony, used both before and after Christ. Most of the Lutheran Church

Orders prescribe it. The earlier ones permitted it only with prayer.

Melanchthon says in his reply to the Regensburg propositions of union, with Luther's consent, "This, however, we desire, that the catechism be faithfully used in the church, and that prayer be had over the children, after they have been examined, and have professed their faith and promised obedience to the church. And this prayer, we believe, would not be in vain, nor does it displease us, if the laying on of hands be used with it, as is also the custom in some churches."

Calvin also says, "It was anciently customary for the children of Christians . . . who had been initiated by baptism, not having then given a confession of faith to the church, to be again, toward the end of their boyhood or on adolescence, brought forward by their parents and examined by the pastor in terms of the catechism. . . . In order that this act, which otherwise justly required to be grave and holy, might have more reverence and dignity, the ceremony of laying on of hands was used." (*Institutes*, Book IV., Chap. XIX., Par. 4.) And in another place he says, "I wish we could retain the custom." (*Ibid.*, 12, 13.)

It cannot be denied that an intercessory prayer, with laying on of hands on each individual, must make a deep impression. But it is liable to misinterpretation. There is no scriptural ground for it. The apostles imposed hands on some (but not by any means all) believers, for the purpose of imparting to them special spiritual gifts (*e. g.*, Acts xix. 6). For this they had the Lord's command and promise. It is required to be used in connection with the ordination of ministers and church officers (Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6), and was so used even in the old dispensation (Num. viii. 10; xxvii. 18, 23; Deut. xxxiv. 9). But nowhere in the Scriptures is there a passage indicating that the general gift of the Holy Spirit is associated with it. For this there remain only the ordinary means of grace—the word, sacraments and prayer. Jesus himself makes the reception of the Holy Spirit dependent on prayer (Luke xi. 13).

Does confirmation, then, confirm? If so, in what sense? We have seen that it is not a "strengthening" in the Roman Catholic

sense. For this reason, the Presbyterians and Methodists have discarded the term entirely, though they retain its substance. However, there can be no objection to the name, if it is taken in the sense of ratification or approval, viz., of the children's full membership in the church, and their right to all its blessings. Confirmation, in other words, is a solemn act whereby those recognized in their infancy as members of the church, on the faith of their parents, are now ratified and confirmed in their church standing, on the profession of their own faith. In this sense confirmation is retained in form or in substance in all Protestant churches. (See Charles Hodge, *Princeton Review*, 1855, page 445; *Church Polity*, pages 157, 158.)

The Presbyterian Directory for Worship says, "Children, born within the pale of the visible church, and dedicated to God in baptism, . . . when they come to years of discretion, . . . ought to be urgently reminded that . . . it is their duty and privilege personally to accept Christ, confess him before men, and seek admission to the Lord's Supper."

Baptized children are members, but not yet full members, of the church, not being entitled to all her privileges. Our children are also citizens of the state by birthright, but minor citizens. As such, they are not yet entitled to conclude business transactions in their own name, or to vote in civil elections, or to hold civil offices. Their citizenship is, therefore, limited. In the same way, children of believers are already members of the church, but minor members, not being entitled to come to the Lord's table, or to participate in the government of the church. But their membership was recognized in their baptism. They were baptized, not that they might become members, but because they were members. Under the old covenant, too, the children were circumcised, not that they might become Israelites, but because they were Israelites. Children are members of the kingdom of heaven for the sake of their believing parents. As soon as these become citizens of the kingdom, their children also obtain citizenship in it; yea, if but one of the parents is a believer, "for the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were

your children unclean, but now are they holy." (1 Corinthians vii. 14.)

Our children are precious in the sight of God, and this fact should be brought to their consciousness when they come to years of discretion, and are to be received into the full communion of the church as members of full age and majority, entitled to come to the Lord's table and to all other privileges of full members; not, however, because they have attained a certain age, but only on their voluntary profession of love to the Saviour, and promise of obedience to him: for here there is a difference between the minors in the state and those in the church. The former become of age and obtain all rights of full citizens as soon as they have attained the requisite age; the latter, when they personally receive Christ and his salvation. This leads to the main question, viz.:

WHAT ARE THE PROPER QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILDREN TO BE ADMITTED TO THE COMMUNION?

Ordinarily, no child is, or should be, so admitted, unless it has a fair acquaintance with sacred history and the catechism. The reformers laid the greatest stress upon catechetical instruction. With the Reformation began a new era of catechisms for the instruction of the young. The smaller catechism of Luther made the beginning in 1529. Then followed a great number of others. The Geneva Catechism of Calvin appeared in 1536, the Heidelberg Catechism in 1563, the Larger and Shorter Westminster in 1647. To this day, with German Protestants, confirmation is everywhere preceded by a special preparatory course of catechetical instruction. In other churches this instruction is left almost exclusively to the Sabbath-school and the home, and the results are frequently quite unsatisfactory. All pastors would do well to emulate the example of their Lutheran and Reformed brethren in teaching classes of children with a view to their admittance to the Lord's table. This brings the pastor into closer touch with them than any other method. A faithful pastor would not confine himself merely to instruct the children, but seek their spiritual awakening. It is important that children learn the

Word of God clearly and correctly, but it is more important that they receive it with their heart.

The influence of the Christian home is also an important factor in the religious training of the child. Because they lack the nurture and protection of family religion, so many young Christians turn aside soon after their confirmation. Those who remain faithful, with few exceptions, are sons and daughters of pious parents. As a rule, religion is transmitted from the father upon the son, like a precious family heirloom. If the parents neglect to set a pious example for their children, all the instruction, entreaty and admonition by pastor and teachers are often in vain, and if, nevertheless, the children seek admission to the Lord's table, urged perhaps by their worldly parents, it is only out of regard for the custom, and often an empty form.

The examination to which children are submitted before their admittance to the communion should not be confined, therefore, to ascertain their knowledge of Christian truth. Of much greater importance is the examination of their faith and experience. How far such an examination should go must be left to the discretion of the minister and officers of the church, only that those who are entire strangers to the life from God be not admitted to the Lord's table, but debarred for the time being. The children should at least have renounced all forms of gross sin, manifest a love for the Saviour and his house, and simple prayer should be not merely a habit and a duty, but a matter of heart with them. It is truly appalling to notice that prayer is wholly neglected by many children. A "conversion," definitely fixed as to time, cannot always be expected on the part of those who have prayed from their heart and loved Jesus from infancy; much less is it to be exacted by artificial questioning and pressure. In most cases, they grow gradually into the conscious grace and love of Christ, as they do into the conscious love of their parents.

The holy Scriptures everywhere require repentance and faith as the condition of salvation. Nothing more and nothing less must, therefore, be required of the children admitted to the communion. Either of these may yet be very imperfect. Still, there must be a beginning. The young Christians may not yet have a

very pronounced conviction of sin; it suffices also if the child knows that "there must be a change in me." Its faith may still be very undeveloped or even weak, but it must clearly understand that its hope of pardon is based alone upon the grace of God in Christ; and it must promise that, in humble reliance on the Holy Spirit, it will endeavor to walk as becometh the follower of Christ, forsaking all sin and conforming its life to his teaching and example.

Let no one say that the children are too young and immature for this. If so, then they are also too young and immature to "distinguish the Lord's body" and partake of his sacrament. At what time the children are mature for admittance into the full communion of the church cannot be fixed by any definite rule, but must be left to the prudence of the officers of the church. Not their age, however, but their spiritual qualification alone must decide this. If more stress were laid on this, there would not be so many backsliders. A healthier spiritual life would pervade our churches; the younger members would be more willing and better qualified to engage in church work; more young men would consecrate themselves to the ministry, and for the offices in the church there would more easily be found suitable Christian men, if upon their admission into the full communion of the church the young souls had received a wholesome impulse from above, if they had been spiritually awakened to a healthy life in Christ, to their own lasting benefit.

LOUIS VOSS.

New Orleans, La.

III.

HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

IN current use, this phrase designates and adopts the allegations of fact—and supposed necessary resultant doctrines—of writings put forth as histories of the Christian church, in the earlier centuries after the death of the apostles. These are all by Gentile writers, and naturally enough date the revelation of the Christian religion during the period of the public ministry of the Lord Jesus on earth in the flesh, and the founding of the Christian church, on the Day of Pentecost, after his ascension.

This paper is intended to maintain that on both points there is a wide departure from the plain teachings of Scripture, involving very hurtful results; for, according to the Word of God, the Christian religion is the original and only religion ever revealed by God, and the Christian church thereupon made to consist of those who professedly accepted it, and became its depositary to transmit it to successive generations. Thus the kingdom of Christ was instituted at once, coincident with the erection of Satan's kingdom, and as its opponent and final destroyer; and the whole history of mankind, in every line of thought and action, turns on the warfare between these two kingdoms.

This revelation of Christianity is contained in the promise of redemption for sinners of Adam's race through the interposition of a divine-human Mediator; human, as the "seed of the woman," but divine, as able and commissioned to destroy the devil and his works (1 John iii. 8). This religion is found embodied in the sentence on the tempter (Gen. iii. 15). The seed of the woman shall crush the serpent's head, having his own heel crushed in the process. This so-called gospel germ is the gospel in epitome, the brevity of the record in no wise detracting from the sense: it is the religion of salvation by redemption. If that is not the Christian religion, what is it? and if those who professedly accept it are not the Christian church, how are they to be re-

garded? This gospel of salvation by redemption has formed the faith and hope of God's people ever since, and will continue to do so until—

“Faith is sweetly lost in sight,
And hope in full supreme delight,
And everlasting love.”

It is given as the justifying reason to Satan and all concerned for the apparent failure to execute at once the sentence of bodily death upon our first parents, “In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die” (Gen. ii. 17), and as the ground of assured hope to believing accepters of it. Instead of fleeing from the presence of Jehovah, as did his victims, Satan insolently presents himself, gloating, in malignant triumph, over his supposed success in putting an immediate end to this newly created race, and therefore to any gracious design that Jehovah had in its creation. Instead of this, he finds, to his dismay, that he has not only not outwitted Jehovah, but incurred new and enormous guilt, and added this crowning pang to his final punishment, that out of this very race should arise one who should be his own destroyer.

This doctrine of redemption by blood has not only been central in the faith of believers, but the centre of assault by unbelievers from the time of Cain down, and the fatal effect of its rejection is equally seen in Cain and all those who follow him in this course ever since.

The error in date, though Satan's falsehood, comes in naturally enough through the fact already mentioned, that the authors of these earlier writings were all Gentiles, to whom the proclamation of redemption was the revelation both of a new God and a new religion, for they had long lost all knowledge of the true God (Rom. i. 21-23), while to the church, as constituted under the Old Testament, it was only the proclamation that the long-promised and expected “seed of the woman” had now come. It is true that in every community of the Roman Empire, of any note in the way of trade, there were Jewish synagogues, with many proselytes won over from idolatry to the worship of Jehovah; but the hateful pride of these Jews, pluming themselves as being the special favorites of this Jehovah, indulging often in the

lowest lusts of the idolaters (Rom. ii. 21-23), and treating them with perfect contempt, made both themselves and their God hateful and justly hated; and the argument between them and these heathen turned on the question whether Jehovah was really the true God. But now, the advent of Jesus, claiming to be the Christ, brought that question to the front, and, for the first time, the Gentiles had salvation proclaimed to them, irrespective of receiving the Jewish ceremonial law (Acts xi. and xv.).

The fulness of time for his advent consisted in the fact that the period had come to give full effect to the second promise of the covenant with Abraham, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Before that date, every one who accepted the promised Redeemer must become a member of the church, as then constituted, and appear at Jerusalem at the great stated feasts (Deut. xvi. 16). He need not be a citizen of the Jewish state, but must be a member of the Jewish church. There must be one place, centre, priesthood and mode of worship, to manifest both the unity of the Godhead and of the plan of salvation, thus placing an insuperable barrier to idolatry. There could be no "congress of gods," nor of religions, in Jehovah's kingdom.

The establishment of the state was a necessity in order to provide a place where the first command could be obeyed, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." All existing states had their own gods, rivals of one another, and warring with each other for superiority and world empire. This was the only state ever taken into covenant with Jehovah, or that ever will be; but now the Lord Jesus directs his church to establish itself in all nations, as something separate altogether from civil government.

In fact, even in this covenant state, the church and state were kept carefully separate. In the state, as finally developed, the ruling power was in David and his line, representing Christ as King; and in the church, it was in Aaron and his line, typifying Christ as Priest—both, in their different spheres, to be governed directly by Jehovah himself, speaking through the priests and prophets.

The demand for the establishment of the kingship, although severely rebuked by Jehovah as apostasy from himself, was

yielded to in order to give the type of Christ as King, and constituted no change in the supreme dominion of Jehovah, but only in his method of administration. He prescribed the form of the kingdom, and the manner and spirit in which it should be administered. This is emphasized by the fact that Saul, appointed as first king, forfeited the kingdom by his failure to obey, both in spirit and action, while David was continued in the kingdom for his unflinching official obedience, and made the type and ancestor of Christ. He represented him as the conquering king, able to subdue all to himself, while Solomon, his son, represented him as a peaceful king, in the full enjoyment of his kingdom.

The two Books of Samuel cover the period of transition and that of the reign of David; the two Books of Kings are evidently the history of the covenant state, while the two Books of Chronicles are a history of the church for the period which they cover. This period runs through the captivity in Babylon, to the proclamation of restoration under Cyrus, by which they were to be only a tributary people, and never again were they reinstated as an independent state, but permitted to exist only as a church. Though recovered from idolatry by the discipline of the captivity, they were not brought into anything like spirituality, except as always before and since, on the part of the elect few; and its rulers continued for the most part thoroughly worldly minded, corrupt, ambitious and unscrupulous, of whom the Saviour said, "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will to do."

Though an absolute monarchy with regard to its Lord, the church is a republic with regard to its earthly rulers, and therefore exposed to all the follies and sins incident to human administration. Its whole history gives melancholy evidence of this, and the frequent domination of the devil in it.

As the Scriptures show, Jehovah, or Yahveh, is the personal and incommunicable name assumed by God as the Redeemer of his Israel—that is, of his church. The Old Testament church perverted the Scripture representation of him, as a conquering king, to signify that he should put himself at the head of the armies of the Jews, and overthrow the Roman world-empire, and

establish one like it of his own, with its capital at Jerusalem. Instead of this he declared his kingdom was not of this world, invited even the publicans and harlots into it, and wrought miracles of healing among the Samaritans and Gentiles, and all who sought his help.

His advent and claim to be the Christ brought that question to the front, and made it the all-absorbing one in the church wherever it existed; but the perverse claims of its unscrupulous rulers could be set aside only by the utter destruction of Jerusalem, and all opportunity to continue the typical ceremonial of the Mosaic dispensation.

The Day of Pentecost marked, not the founding of the Christian church, but the continuance of it in the line of the accepters of Jesus as the Christ, and the utter rejection from all covenant relations to Christ of those who rejected him. They, by this rejection, became the synagogue of Satan (Rev. ii. 9). The fact that this was what took place at Pentecost is plainly asserted in Acts ii. 36, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

The accepted view as to the date of the revelation of Christianity and the founding of the Christian church leaves the Old Testament entirely out of the list of the Christian Scriptures, and confines us to the New Testament, while the latter builds upon the Old, and constantly refers us back to it as the sure foundation of our doctrine and practice, saying nothing but what "Moses and the prophets did say should come." And to treat the Old Testament as altogether typical and ceremonial is to confound types, consisting in persons and things used in the administration of the religion, with the religion itself—which has been one and the same in all dispensations. What the New Testament does is to assure us that this "seed of the woman," the Christ, is the Lord Jesus. This is testified by God himself on the Day of Pentecost, in confirmation of the testimony of the apostles. Only divine testimony could settle the question.

The muddle into which commentators and theologians fall on these points is melancholy evidence of their failure to see the

truth of God. They discuss much as to what part of the Old Testament is "Messianic," while in fact, from the time of the fall, all Scripture is Messianic, and nothing but that.

The first two chapters of Genesis, recording the creation of the world—the first as the act of God, and the second as that of Jehovah God—answer the question whether Jehovah is able to do that which he promises. That answer is, of course I am; for whatever exists, whether personal agent or operative force, I created and control; and from that on, Jehovah God is represented as conducting the whole business of providence and salvation.

One of the leaders of the "School of Modern Criticism" in this country declares the fact of the appearance of the name Jehovah in the second chapter of Genesis to be utterly "inexplicable," while to any one who accepts the Scriptures as the Word of God, the reason lies on the very surface.

When Moses was commissioned to set forth the Word of God in the first books of it, the title "god" was applied in common to a multiplicity of real or supposed beings, so in answer to the question what god had sent him, Moses was to reply, "Jehovah hath sent me," and to identify him with the God Almighty, who had been known to their fathers (Ex. iii., iv., v.). This personal and incommunicable name, while applied indifferently to each person of the Trinity, and not to be assumed without blasphemy by any created being, is preëminently used of and assumed by the second person of the Trinity, and the Lord Jesus assumes it when he says, "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58). He was so understood by the Jews, and they undertook to stone him for blasphemy, which it would have been in the highest degree unless it was the very truth of God. The whole work of creation and the administration of divine providence is ascribed to him, as God manifest in the flesh (John i.; Heb. i.), as he claimed after his resurrection, when he said, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth," and on this based his directions to his apostles to go into all the world and disciple all nations.

The Old Testament church was fully informed of two truths concerning God: one, his omnipresence and invisibility, the other,

that a being claiming all the divine names, attributes and authority appeared frequently, as occasion seemed to call, in visible personal form, probably the form he afterwards took in the flesh, and gave to man at creation, down to at least the time of Nebuchadnezzar; this, the last of his recorded appearances, was with the three young Hebrews in the fiery furnace, when Nebuchadnezzar also saw him. It was this being, who, as their Creator, dealt with our first parents in the garden of Eden; whose prescription of worship by bloody sacrifice, and, therefore, whose divine authority was rejected by Cain; who personally dealt with Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; who appeared habitually to Moses during his career as law-giver; to him, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders in the mount, where they "saw the God of Israel," and did eat and drink before him (Ex. xxiv. 9-11); who appeared to Joshua, as the armed captain of Jehovah's host, and gave directions for the campaign against Jericho; he was the angel Jehovah who appeared to the whole congregation at Bochim, to Gideon, to Manoah and his wife, the parents of Samson, and lastly, as above stated, to the three young Hebrews, when Nebuchadnezzar saw him.

The Father and the Spirit are invisible, and never manifested except, as to the Father, by audible voice, and, as to the Spirit, by visible symbol, as the "dove," or the "cloven tongues," or the rushing sound as the wind; therefore, it is manifest that all of these so-called "Theophanies," or divine appearances, must have been of the second person of the Trinity, the Son, and in direct prosecution of his work as Redeemer. The Old Testament church fully understood this command, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," as forbidding also any such conception of the Godhead as would admit of any visible local representation, for this would subject him to the limitations of a creature, and yet these personal appearances of a divine being in human or visible form did not in the least interfere with that conception of the Godhead as invisible and omnipresent. This is expressed in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. vi. 18; Job xxviii.; Psa. cxxxix.), and the Old Testament *passim*. The prevalent view that these were manifestations of the God-

head, without distinction of persons, and merely to keep alive the sense of the being and activity of the Godhead, is utterly unscriptural, and greatly derogatory to the dignity of Christ, and to any proper conception of him as peculiarly the Holy One of Israel and its Redeemer, working constantly since the fall in carrying out the plan of redemption, and maintaining his kingdom as opposed to that of Satan. The harm to the church also is incalculable; it is not only left without constitution and laws, but dealt with as non-existent; and we have no Christian Scriptures, according to this theory, until the advent of Christ in the flesh, the Old Testament being by this eliminated from them, and reduced to a mere system of types, applicable as containing important lessons, but, excepting the ten commandments, not binding on the church; which, in the view herein maintained, has been Christ's visible kingdom on earth from the first, in manifest and steadfast opposition to the kingdom of the devil.

Those who talk about "Judaism," or Jews' religion, or "Mosaism," as different from Christianity, misapply these terms, as though they referred to the religion revealed by God from the first, when, in fact, they refer precisely to that perversion of this religion into external formal ritualism, found under the New Testament in prelatie and popish communions, as established by civil governments in their state churches.

These latter also are a perversion of the doctrine established under, but not by, the state government of Israel, and instead of constituting them Christian governments and churches, render them thoroughly unchristian, and the churches true daughters of the Babylonian harlot, the "mistress of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast," under the supreme control of the devil. Moreover, that the church under the Old Testament was, and always had been, Christian, was manifest from what occurred at the advent of Christ, when the wise men from the East came inquiring, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews." Herod, with the priests and scribes, at once understood this to refer to the Christ (Matt. ii. 2-6); so the revelation made to Zachariah concerning the birth of John the Baptist (Luke i.), and the message of the angel Gabriel to Mary, the language of Elizabeth to

Mary, and of Simeon and Anna, when Jesus was presented in the temple—all show that the doctrine of the Christ had been the accepted faith from the beginning, and that the Christian religion was no new thing to the church.

Then the fact that the disciples of Jesus were first called Christians at Antioch, at least ten or fifteen years after the Lord's ascension, and then by the witty heathen Romans, and not by the Jews, shows that the term was not considered as distinctive between the disciples of Jesus and those who rejected him. In fact, it was centuries before the Jews accepted the distinction between Jew and Christian, as marking the difference between the disciples of Jesus as Christ and themselves. Probably these heathen invented the term as a gibe at what seemed to them the measureless absurdity of the faith toward Jesus entertained by his disciples, that they should be looking for eternal life from one who had been judicially executed by his own people, who claimed to be the church of the only living and true God, and on the charge of blasphemy against God. As to his asserted resurrection, they disbelieved it entirely, and the claim that there would be a general resurrection of the dead seemed to them equally absurd.

There never had been any question in the Old Testament church that the Christ, the "Seed of the woman," was to come, and the only question when Jesus came was whether his claim was true or not. How entirely opposed, therefore, to the testimony of Scripture is this claim that the Christian religion was first revealed at the advent of the Lord Jesus. Such claim can be accounted for only on the ground that those who made it were, up to that time, as already pointed out, utterly unacquainted with the true God, and that its reception without question by the Old Testament church, in the spirit then prevailing in it, can be accounted for only on the ground of their irreconcilable enmity to the Lord Jesus, and consequent determination to reject anything that favored his claims.

The views herein maintained are the result of study of the Scriptures themselves, allowing no controlling authority to any dictum of man, ecclesiastical or other. While this has made the

writer a *jure divino* Presbyterian, it would equally have made him a Mormon, or howling Dervish, had the Scripture so taught. Like all who honestly profess to be disciples of Christ, the writer holds the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, from beginning to end, as the very Word of God (1 Thess. ii. 13). Any view that they are less or other than this dishonors God, who claims this for them, and is destructive to man, who needs just this divinely authoritative revelation, equally binding on reason and conscience. Any suggestion, therefore, that they are less than this, by whomsoever made, and with whatsoever personal intent, comes from the father of lies, and is to be rejected at once. As to the pretence that they are merely the record of man's thought about God, how he regards it, is evident from the Scriptures themselves, as for example in the Book of Deuteronomy, Romans i., and the Scriptures everywhere; and this divine judgment is confirmed by the remains of heathen literature and art that have come down to us, showing it to be a shame even to speak of those things said and done under the influence of "man's thought about God." In fact, all these objections to the Word of God come only from a lawless self-will, dishonestly perverting what is manifestly the truth. In Scripture we find no toleration of that of which we hear so much from men, who have the Word of God in possession, and yet fail to discover and accept the truth unto eternal life. This failure comes only from "holding the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. i. 18-25), that is, perverting it in order to indulge human lusts and passions, undeterred, as far as possible, by fear of final judgment for character and conduct.

The evil results of lowering this estimate of the Word of Jehovah, seen in modern efforts to effect this, are apparent in the abounding irreligion, lawlessness, and immorality now so alarmingly and increasingly prevalent.

Of course, in the estimate of the "advanced thought" of the day, these views will place the writer on or below the level of the late Rev. John Jasper (colored), of "Sun do Move" celebrity; but, nevertheless, they are those upon which he unhesitatingly ventures himself, body and soul, for time and eternity.

We seem now to be under the full force of the original temptation, under which Eve fell: the universal cry is for education, increase of knowledge being urged as the panacea for all evils; of course, this is against all experience and common sense, as it was with Eve—the acceptance of the voice of the devil as against that of Jehovah—and equally against what she did not have, experience of its fatal results. It is the result of a perverse will, determined to walk according to its own devices, and adopting what is asserted in that homely saying, “A lie well stuck to is as good as the truth.” Under the dominion of this spirit the forgers of lies in matters of religion swarm over the land as the frogs over Egypt. Take, for example, the resurrection of ancient superstitions and their introduction into nominally Christian lands, and even the gathering of their disciples into so-called churches. For instance, “Theosophism,” with its theory of preparing, by meditation and good works, for attaining “Nirvana,” or final absorption into the Godhead. Another instance is the revival of “Spiritualism,” with its pretense of communication with the disembodied dead (Isa. viii. 19, 20; Deut. xviii. 10–13), controlling life and activity by their direction. This, like Theosophy, has its circles, forms its churches, and spreads like leprosy. As to the more modern snares of the devil, the age is producing them, as the ground brought forth thorns and thistles to Adam and his descendants.

Many years ago, it would have seemed that that combination of falsehood, obscenity, blasphemy and murder called “Mormonism,” or self-styled, “The Church of the Latter Day Saints,” would soon disappear under the force of its own corruption; but now it is not only exhibiting new life and vigor, but is abandoning its policy of concentration, and establishing its congregations, blasphemously called churches, in every city that it reaches, and gathering numerous converts.

Again, that combination of self-contradictory and blasphemous folly called “Christian Science”—Mrs. Eddy’s scheme for raking in the shekels—yet how rapidly it spreads, establishing its so-called churches in every city. A later example of this mad folly is found in the pretensions of “Dowieism,” its inventor

claiming to be the impersonation of the prophet Elijah in his promised return. In this, too, greed for the shekels and success in raking them in are as prominent as in Eddyism. Every day seems to be bringing forth some new folly of this sort which gains its adherents by multitudes, while the churches abound in self-styled evangelists, distinguished only by their claim to be prophets of the Lord, and each in his own way pushing his schemes, and making merchandise of souls (2 Peter ii. 1-3).

More mischievous, as having the appearance of zeal for Christ, are the attempts to improve on his organization of the church, in such bodies as Young Men's Christian Association and Christian Endeavor, which are really additions of man's pole cabins to the King's ivory palace (Psa. xlv. 8). Besides being an insult to Christ's authority and wisdom in organizing his church, they are a terrible draft on his treasury in their continual demands for money for their buildings, and travelling expenses to their ceaseless conventions.

Under the Old Testament, he forbade his ark to be touched except by those authorized, and punished with death those who disregarded this prohibition. But under these organizations, every pretender considers himself at liberty to make any change or addition he pleases, with the result that instead of being the temple of the Lord, the church is treated like a deserted building, to be entered and dealt with as any one may choose, so that practically the idea of Christ's sole authority to prescribe whatever is to be received, whether in doctrine or practice, in it, is lost sight of, and even scoffed at.

Without particularizing further abuses in connection with the church, we must mention the rise of the School of Advanced Criticism," which devotes itself to overthrowing the truth that we have any church, or any Word of God, divinely authorized, and is Satan's chief instrument in opening the way for the present universal outbreak of unbelief, irreligion and immorality.

The Smart-Aleck-wiseacres of this school, crazy with their own conceit, and given over to judicial blindness, amuse themselves with denying almost all Scripture, and substituting their own guess-work, both for fact and doctrine; and are so well

satisfied with their performances of this sort that they hasten to put them on permanent record in their "Polychrome," or crazy-quilt Bible, a work of which they seem as proud as does a monkey who has seized a paint-brush and daubed out the masterpiece of some eminent artist; or, to vary the figure, they keep up a steady bombardment with their paper pellets, from the pop-guns of their own self-conceit, convinced that these constitute the heaviest artillery possible to man, and must soon batter down that Word of God, which he declares "shall live and abide forever" (1 Peter i. 2, 3). The work of these men reminds one of the words of the Spirit by the Apostle Paul, "Where is the wise, where is the scribe, where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" (1 Cor. i. 20, 21.) They seem to be altogether undaunted by the fact that almost every shovelful of earth thrown up by exploration parties in the lands mentioned in Scripture buries some of them or their theories out of sight. Coöperating with these is that false and shallow materialism, which controls in what is called "Human Science," which denies that it comes in the range of such science to take any note of a divine first cause, or supernatural operative force, while God declares that he who does not infer a divine personal Creator from things that are created is without excuse (Rom. i. 20). A chief element, if not the essential nature of that reason, by which God elevates man above the brute, is his capacity to apprehend the relation of cause and effect, and its chief activity to trace the one from the other. In fact, this human science consists entirely of facts cognizable by sense perception, arranged and classified according to their relation to the underlying cause or producing force. The things thus cognizable are always some change in the state of these facts, or, as we call them, phenomena. The producing cause is never to be known but by this change. We talk, and justly, of various such forces, vital, electrical, chemical, and the like, but who ever saw force, or knows, or can know anything about it, except by inference from these changes? Explaining his theory that the earth is a square superficies, its four corners resting each on an elephant, the elephants each on a tortoise, the tortoises each on a rock, when a too-inquisitive student

asked, "What do the rocks rest on," the theorist's answer was, "Foolish boy! the rocks run all the way down." Precisely; but down to what? and until that question is answered, the human mind is so constituted that it cannot rest satisfied. And no honest use of reason can be made which does not recognize one personal, living and true God, himself uncreated, but Creator and Controller of all things.

Passing to the point of Christ's resurrection from the dead, note, first, that here we have the first light on the reiterated prohibition in regard to the paschal lamb, "A bone of it shall not be broken." Had the bones of our Lord's legs been broken on the cross, like those of the two robbers, although God could have healed this as easily as any other injury, this would have constituted a disproof rather than a proof of the personal identity of the risen Saviour, for both injury and cure would have been unseen. But when he was seen walking about with a wound in his side still open, which would have been immediately fatal to any living person, not only was his personal identity indisputably manifest, but also that the life he had resumed was no longer dependent on the blood, the life of the flesh (Gen. ix. 4), that is, the life derived from the Virgin Mary, but was that derived from the Holy Spirit, by whom he was raised from the dead (Eph. i. 19, 20). Thomas recognized this fact, and its measureless significance, when he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!" (John xx. 27, 29; also 1 Cor. xv. 45). The blood that he shed on the cross was an eternal sacrifice (Heb. v. 9, and ix. 12). In fact, all that Jesus was in the flesh was the result of the Spirit having been given to him without measure (John i. 32, 33). He knew what to say, and was enabled to do what he did only as the Spirit worked within him. It is frequently asserted that he was omniscient, and this on the ground of his personal union with the divine nature of the Son; but if this union made him partaker of divine attributes, what need of the Spirit? In fact, as to the powers of his human nature, he was just like any other human being; what he possessed beyond that was the work of the Spirit (Luke ii. 40, 52). This accounts for the fact that while generally he seemed to be possessed of full knowledge, at other times he arrived at such

knowledge by personal inquiry, or confessed his own ignorance. (Mark xiii. 32; Acts i. 7.)

Should any deign to read this paper, they will see that the views expressed, however far from those in general acceptance, are not without a good show of Scripture support, and the writer believes are in exact accord with Scripture. He also believes that they not only are not useless speculation, but have important practical bearings, and he commends them to the careful consideration of his brethren.

A. W. CLISBY.

Thomasville, Ga.

IV.

THE ADAMIC PRINCIPLE IN THEOLOGY.

IN the PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY of July, 1902, appeared a partial discussion of original sin under the title, "The Adamic Principle in Theology." In the maintenance of the federal theology, or what the author is pleased to call "the historic system of Protestant theology," he really attempts to establish that system of rigid Calvinism which is exhibited in the doctrine of immediate imputation. Yet he does not directly meet the issue, and argue to his own view. He seems to think it sufficient to point out objections to the views of others, and thus establish his own view by process of elimination, else he might have devoted some space to showing the superiority of that view. The process of elimination is not always satisfactory, even when all the phases of opinion have been dealt with, but especially is this true in a process which avoids some of the most important views of this question.

The author reviewed seeks to define the Adamic principle by telling us that "three fundamental hypotheses as to the nature of the union between Adam and his posterity, and . . . our participation in his guilt and depravity" have been proposed, viz., the "parental," the "realistic" and the "federal." He does not stop to tell us how he arrives at this analysis. In view of the fact that all federalists, perhaps, hold to the doctrine that "original sin is conveyed from our first parents unto their posterity by natural generation" (L. C., Q. 26), how is it possible to apply this analysis to Calvinists? He applies the first, "the parental," to Arminians, thus apparently separating them by a hard and fast line from Calvinists; but this is about equally unjust, forasmuch as the Wesleyan Methodists, represented by Wesley, Watson and Pope, follow the Calvinistic theology pretty closely on this question; so much so that Watson is more justly classed with the federalists, while Pope aligns himself with the realists. To

whom, then, does the word "parentalist" apply? To the lower Arminians? It is questionable in its application even to them, if it is intended to exclude the idea of the transmission of guilt, and this seems to be the meaning. "According to parentalist, Adam sustained no other relation to his posterity than that of a father to his children. . . . As a race-father, Adam sinned; as children, all mankind heir his misery and the defects of his character." This statement might apply to the Pelagian theory, but is not just of Arminius or Arminianism, as Watson's exposition clearly shows. After reviewing some similar misrepresentations of Arminianism, Watson says (p. 45), that this is a very defective view of the effects of the original offence upon Adam and his descendants must be acknowledged; . . . that the corruption of our nature, and not merely its greater liability to be corrupted, is the doctrine of Scripture will presently be shown. He then defends Arminius by saying that the semi-Pelagian views attributed to Arminianism were not the opinion of Arminius, nor of his immediate followers—that it is not the opinion of the large body of the followers of Wesley, but that such views were traceable to Dr. Whitby, and several divines of the English Church. But the fact that Wesleyan Methodists had been held responsible (on representations of Dr. Whitby) for doctrines which they did not teach shows "how little pains many divines of the Calvinistic school have taken to understand the opinions they have hastily condemned in mass." It would seem that this remark of Watson's bears directly upon the writer in review, since he has not only lumped all the Arminians and semi-Pelagians together, but evidently misrepresents Watson himself.

Watson quotes the following from Arminius: "The immediate and proper effect of this sin was, God was offended by it, . . . from which he conceives a just wrath, which is the second effect of sin. But this wrath is followed by the infliction of punishment, which here is twofold: 1. A liability to both deaths (Rom. vi. 23). 2. A privation of that primeval holiness and righteousness, which, because they were the effects of the Holy Spirit dwelling in man, ought not to remain in man who had fallen from the favor of God, and had incurred his anger. But the whole of

this sin is not peculiar to our first parents, but is common to the whole race, and to all their posterity, who at the time when the first sin was committed were in the loins, and who afterward descended from them in the natural mode of propagation. . . . Whatever punishment, therefore, was inflicted on our first parents has also pervaded all their posterity." This must be regarded as sound from the Calvinistic point of view. Dabney has shown that Calvin and other Reformed theologians did not teach the doctrine of immediate imputation.

Dr. Miley is quoted by our writer as saying, "Expressions are frequently met, particularly in the older Arminianism, and in the Wesleyan, which at least imply a judicial ground of the common depravity, but never in contradiction to its genetic mode." The latter clause might be said of all Calvinists who are not immediate imputationists. "The tendency," he says, "is towards the recognition of this law as the sufficient and whole account of it. This is definitely and explicitly the view of Whedon." Thus Whedon appears to be the only one who has "definitely" taken this view. A very slender basis for a universal charge upon Arminians.

Our writer fails to give Watson credit for anything but the parental view, despite the fact that in his effort to show that Adam was "a public man, and head and representative of the human race," he cites Romans v., and says, "Adam and Christ are contrasted in their public or federal character, and the hurt which mankind have derived from the one, and the healing they have received from the other, are also contrasted in various particulars." After speaking of mediate and immediate imputation, and defining the former as "our mortality of body and the corruption of our moral nature, in virtue of our derivation from him," he concludes that this does not go far enough, and quotes Dr. Watts as giving the correct view, which is that the descendants of Adam incurred the "guilt or liableness to punishment" for his sin, but that they are not held responsible for the act in any other sense (p. 54), a statement which none but an immediate imputationist would feel any disposition to question on the ground of being too weak.

Dr. Strong classes Whedon and Raymond together, and quotes the latter as follows: "The race came into existence under grace. Existence and justification are secured for it only through Christ; for, apart from Christ, punishment and destruction would have followed the first sin." This is sufficient to show that Raymond holds to the doctrine that corruption and guilt were both involved in original sin.

Perhaps our writer has failed to distinguish the fact of original sin from the theories, or, to use his own word, hypotheses, which the theologians have advanced in attempting to solve the knotty problems connected with the *rationale* of the subject—the question of the justice of God, and the precedence in the order of thought of the sin and the guilt. Dr. Dabney, in his able review of Dr. Hodge's theology, has made the issue perfectly clear as to the order of thought. Rejecting both mediate and immediate imputation, he has given us the most rational and satisfactory view of this question. On the question of the Wesleyan theology of original sin, Dabney admits that they are sound. He does remark that what they give with one hand they take back with the other. But this is hardly just, for they teach just as clearly as the Calvinist that salvation is of free grace. If they seek to make this free grace begin a little in advance of the Calvinist (if this is possible), it is not to their discredit.

On the precise point under discussion, then, there can be little difference between moderate Calvinists and the Arminians, and yet our writer thinks the difference so serious that an overthrow of their position will necessitate their constructing a new theology. Let us follow the argument.

He says, "This hypothesis logically denies the penal character of our Adamic inheritances." It is difficult to see what significance the word "logically" can have. As applied to Whedon, it is entirely superfluous, for he states outright that there is no such element. With regard to the balance, it does not follow at all, any more than Dabney is involved in the same logical consequence because he insists that personal sin must (in thought) precede personal guilt, rather than the reverse order. They are, in fact, simultaneous. If there were anything in the argument it would

bear against the Westminster explanation of the transmission of original sin, equally with the thirty-nine articles and the same statement in the Methodist articles.

Our writer says, "The rugged sense of mankind buffets with scorn the damnation of the child for the father's sin." This is a remarkable argument for an immediate imputation Calvinist to use against an Arminian. It is like a blunderbus which kicks over the man who fires it. This is just the reason why the common sense of mankind rejects the immediate imputation of another man's sin. This is just the reason why Dr. Thornwell finally adopted the realism which he had formerly combated in Baird. The covenant idea is worthless as affording any help to a solution of the equity in the case. What it is wrong to do, it is wrong to bargain to do; the supposition, therefore, that Adam bargained with God for the life or death of his descendants, upon his successful probation or failure, does not change the status of the question at all; but the absurdity, nay, the absolute moral contradiction of God's bargaining to hold men legally and morally responsible for the sin of another, should make men pause and re-examine the foundations upon which so remarkable a proposition rests. It will be found, upon examination, that it rests where it was conceived—only in the imagination of men. We are told by Strong that it was first broached by Cocceius; Dabney says Tertullian. Well were it for theology if Cocceius (or Tertullian) had never dreamed this dream. It was the same order of dream which old Augustine, the author of realism, dreamed when he constructed his theory of an essential oneness in Adam.

Theologians have not been as diligent sometimes, in the earnest study of the Scriptures from an exegetical point of view, as they have been in working their imaginations, and following out logical sequences. The present writer does not reject the common conception of the covenant of works without being prepared to make an argument against it. He came to the conclusion of its unbiblical character before learning the position of Shedd or Strong or Pope, in the pursuance of a study of the covenants from a purely exegetical point of view. This study consumed a

period of nearly two years, taking into consideration the review and partial rewriting of the treatise. The discovery of the un-biblical character of the covenant of works, as defined and explained in theology, was purely incidental, the discovery being made that there was no clear mention of it in the Scriptures. This led to an examination of the arguments by which the theologians have sought to sustain the theory, with the result that the conviction became strong that it is without any real scriptural foundation. The writer believes that he has seen the question in its various relations, and is prepared to assert with confidence that the covenant of works as sometimes taught is an excrescence upon the biblical system of doctrine as interpreted in the Calvinistic system of theology; that, so far from being the "interpretative principle" of theology, this covenant, together with that peculiar interpretation of the covenant of grace which is regarded as its corollary, is a useless lot of lumber which should be torn away from the temple of truth, that its grand and simple proportions may stand out with greater force and beauty. This part of theology is like the campanile in Venice, built upon rotten piling, and it is surely destined to totter and fall. The whole fabric, to change the figure, is suspended upon the rotten pegs of two mis-translated and misinterpreted passages of Scripture.

The author of "The Adamic Principle in Theology" has really rendered a service to the church by the rigid logic with which he has pressed the opponents of immediate imputation; but the argument may tend to the overthrow of his own view.

To return to the review of the argument. Ezekiel xviii. is cited in proof that God's plan of government is not to hold the son responsible for the father's sin. Very well, that has no bearing on Whedon's Arminianism, but it may be regarded as an argument against immediate imputation, which supposes God to have bargained to do the very thing which he protests in Ezekiel that he does not do, for he must have known beforehand the result of Adam's probation just as well as afterwards.

From his own inference of the non-penal character of man's fallen nature, considered as a natural inheritance, our writer charges that man's condition is only a pitiful misfortune, a

natural weakness of constitution. "According to the logic of the system," he says, "and according to some of its exponents, native depravity is not native demerit." The logic does not hold, for the reason that the death which comes by sin is, in effect, itself sin—originally a privative quality, it is non-conformity to law, and involves guilt. The statement is unfair, because it again seeks to hold Arminians responsible for the Pelagianism which they do not teach. It has no bearing upon Whedon.

Again, it is charged that parentalists "cannot construct a theodicy." This is like telling a man he cannot cure a fever when there is no fever to cure. "They admit," he says, "the facts of depravity and death, which come without their personal agency, and cannot be put out of their destiny by their most earnest and intelligent endeavors. In other words, under this hypothesis no man is responsible for his depravity and death." No one but a Pelagian holds that depravity and guilt can be separated. No one contends that native corruption is unattended with guilt simply because it is native; it is death—that is the scriptural word—and death is death: there is no use trying to make anything else out of it. It is a fact which does not need to be reasoned about, but only recognized as a fact. The question of original sin is, Is the man dead? The question as to who is responsible is entirely a different question. The dead man may hold that he is not responsible, but how does this help the case? The immediate imputationist says you cannot construct a theodicy. That is to say, the dead man must be held responsible for his own death; he must be a suicide, or else not dead at all, so that God may be relieved of the responsibility. The answer is: The supposition that the dead man is not dead is inadmissible, for all the reasoning in the world cannot change the fact; but neither is it admissible to say that the man is responsible for his own death—that his consciousness and conscience can never admit, and to ask him to do it is to ask him to derationalize himself. If, therefore, God is not responsible, some other explanation must be sought. Reason can justify God without the supposition that the man killed himself thousands of years before he was born, and that is to place the responsibility where the Scripture places it, upon

our first parents. Adam and Eve sinned as free agents, and the moment they sinned, they died, spiritually, as God had distinctly forewarned them that they would. Since they were the progenitors of the race, the death which came to them through sin "passed through unto all men" (Rom. v. 12), so that all died, and are now "dead in trespasses and in sins." (*Cf.* Confession, Chap. VI., Sec. 2.) In other words, "death reigned" (Rom. v. 14, 17, 21) over all. Is there any question here of God's responsibility? Nay, verily. If the theologians will interpret the Scripture correctly, they will save themselves a good deal of trouble.

It is hard to understand how the idea of physical death came to be attached to the passage in Romans, and in 1 Cor. xv. (exclusively), when it is so opposed to the Apostle's use of the word, not only in this epistle, but elsewhere. Not only in Eph. ii. 1 do we have the true idea, we have it in Rom. vii. 9 (*cf.* 11), and its counterpart "life" all along. For instance, the "reign in life" (vs. 17), the "reign of grace" through righteousness (vs. 21), the complete view of salvation contained in chap. vi. 11, "dead unto sin, alive unto God, alive from the dead" (vs. 13). See same contrast in 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11; v. 15. "The wages of sin is death," the natural, inevitable, self-executing law (vs. 23). This puts the question out of the reach of cavil. Death came into the world (of men born) by a natural law of creation: "like begets like;" and God is no more responsible than he is for the operation of the law of gravitation in any given case. Is God responsible for man's death? You might as well ask, If a man gets pushed off a precipice, is God morally responsible for his dashing to pieces on the rocks below? Since Adam and Eve fell into a hole, the race was born in a hole, and it is just as irrelevant and foolish to ask why, or question God's justice in the matter, as it is to ask whether it was just for God to create man at all. Such a question would not deserve a reply. Thus it would seem that the theologians, both federalists and realists, have worked their imaginations and their reasoning powers to no purpose, unless it can be shown that man did kill himself before he was born. Does the Scripture teach anything like this? The answer is, No, it does not. Federalists and realists alike have gone upon the

assumption that it is a fact that it does. The federalist rejects the attempted explanation of the realist, and sits down to construct an explanation for himself; but it would seem that neither of them has thought to investigate the supposed fact upon which both have proceeded. Is it a fact that the Scripture does teach that the race of man, the posterity of the first pair, participated in any sense in their first act of disobedience? The answer is no, not in any real or literal sense.

Where, then, is the trouble? It appears to lie in the mistranslation of a single phrase of Rom. v. 12, "for that all sinned." The words in the Greek are *epi ho* "upon which." How, then, comes it about that they get to mean "because"? The Vulgate reads "in which" (*in quo*). Meyer tells us this is according to "the traditional Catholic interpretation," naming Origen and Augustine. It is well to note that here is the logical starting point of Augustine's realism. Meyer rejects the translation on linguistic grounds, but he thinks "the thought which this exposition yields is essentially correct." From this it is evident that the ancient interpretation has swayed the translation in an uncalled-for way. So persistent is the old idea that it must needs be read into a phrase which it is admitted does not mean "in which." Meyer says, "*Epi ho* is quite identical with *epi hois*, and means 'on the ground of the fact that,' consequently, in real sense, *propterea quod*, 'because' (*dieweil*, Luther)." How the singular and the plural form of the relative can give the same result he does not tarry to explain, or how either of them can mean "because." It is preferable to take the lexical meaning of these common words, and read "upon which." This may have reference to time or condition, or both. The very phrase occurs in Liddell and Scott under *epi* (*Novi*), as an example of the use which signifies condition. Now this yields an excellent sense, and both the ideas of time and condition may be combined in the word "whereupon," which is perhaps the more idiomatic English, and gives an excellent translation. The indefinite past is the very tense that is needed, and "whereupon all sinned" means that the death, the corruption of nature, was in every case, in all past history, the cause of actual sin. This saying applies

to the very springs of action—that perverse nature which Dabney prefers to regard as active rather than privative. The sin cannot, of course, antedate personality, but in this view of it, it is contemporary with personality, and so literally applies to all. Meyer gives a long list of modern commentators who take “all sinned” to mean actual sin. What need is there now for the hypothesis of realism? What need for the hypothesis of immediate imputation?

It is hardly necessary to mention Rom. v. 18 in this connection, because the idea that the judgment followed immediately upon all is only the impression made by an unnecessary, and so unwarranted, supplying of words.

It seems proper just here to answer the objection (No. 5) which is made to the offering of the law, “like begets like,” as a sufficient account of original sin. The objection is that it “requires the assumption of a species sinner.” Turretin offered the same argument against the doctrine that the soul was propagated at all: We cannot be of the same species unless God created each soul separately, because Adam was created, not born. Dabney’s reply is, “By the same argument we could not be of the same corporeal species at all. Further, the very idea of species is a propagated identity of nature.” But is there any objection to including sin as a moral attribute of the species? If there is, it bears equally against the immediate imputationist, for there is no controversy as to the fact of universal original sin. Creationism does not relieve the question at all. The objections to creationism are more serious than the doctrine that man is born as a whole, soul as well as body. He argues, “If sin is propagable, if it appears uniformly and unavoidably in every generation of the human race, and in every individual of each generation, it would be at once put into the category of essential qualities, . . . and would be necessary to the very identity of the race. Man without it would not be man, but some other sort of being.” This argument is a mere logical quibble. Erase the first clause, and the supposed condition applies as well to the immediate imputationist as to the Arminian, or moderate Calvinist.

Did Adam cease to be a man after he sinned? if so, how

would he be described? If he did not lose his identity by sin, how can a propagation of his acquired imperfection make him and his descendants of different species? The trouble with the argument is that it fails to recognize that sin is simply the not being and doing what God requires. It is not an entity, it is not a new faculty of the soul, but is the maladjustment and improper action of the faculties which already exist. If sin changes the nature of the species, Adam's disobedience must have made him cease to be a man.

This brings to mind a serious counter-objection to the doctrine of immediate imputation. As the above argument fails to take into account the nature of sin, so the theory of immediate imputation in general fails to take into account the meaning of the word "guilt," as well as the meaning of "sin." The doctrine of immediate imputation is that men are regarded and treated as sinners on account of Adam's first sin. It insists that guilt precedes sin in the order of thought. Men are first guilty, and consequently corrupt. But how is it possible to hold a person guilty until he is personally sinful? The word "sin" applies either to an act or to a state and disposition of the soul; in either case it can only be predicated of a person. It implies a relation, for "sin is lawlessness," non-conformity to law. "Guilt" is a companion word which can scarcely be distinguished with clearness from it. It brings prominently into view another relation, which is, obligation to punishment. Guilt has reference to the penal sanction of the law, and to personal responsibility for sin. Immediate imputation, in putting guilt first, posits a relation before there is anything to be related. It goes without saying that a person cannot be related to anything before he has an existence; therefore, to hold him guilty is an absolute contradiction. We may apply to Dr. Hodge's (or Turretin's) immediate imputation theory similar language to that which Hodge employs in reference to the theory of the realists. He says, "Even on the extremest realistic assumption that humanity, as such, is an entity, the act of Adam was not the act of all men. His sin was an intelligent act of self-determination; but an act of rational self-determination is a personal act. Unless, therefore, all men, as persons;

existed in Adam, it is impossible that they acted his act. To say that a man acted thousands of years before his personality began does not rise even to the dignity of a contradiction: it has no meaning at all."¹ The same thing may be said of making men guilty thousands of years before they were born, except that it does rise to the dignity of a contradiction to speak of a relation with nothing to be related. Personal guilt necessarily implies personal sin. Guilt is just as truly a personal relation as sin is—a relation to a part of the same law; in fact, in Scripture language, "sin" contains both ideas of moral ill desert, and obligation to punishment. To hold men guilty antecedently to sin is to propound a logical contradiction, unless it can be shown that "all men, as persons, existed in Adam." The covenant theory does not help at all to a solution of the real difficulty as to how God can hold men responsible for the sin of another. It offends against common sense and the moral judgments of mankind for nothing, greatly increasing the difficulty which it attempts to solve. The difficulty disappears upon a correct reading and interpretation of Scripture.

Returning to our examination of the argument against Arminianism, one finds that the whole of the scriptural argument must be thrown out because it is based on the same incorrect interpretation of the views of Arminians. The writer argues against his own incorrect inference instead of against any real opinions.

Again it is argued, "The doctrine of paternalism logically imports the propagation of moral and spiritual character by the law of genetic transmission, without, however, propagating the ethical qualities of the character." Not even Pelagius taught the existence of character without ethical qualities. Moral, but not ethical! This has no meaning, and needs no answer.

The next point is, "The law of genetic transmission should rule in the instance of regenerated and sanctified parents, and determine their offspring in subjective holiness." It is difficult to see how such reasoning can be put forth as possessing any real force against the doctrine of the propagation of original sin by natural generation. Presbyterians and Arminians alike believe

¹ Quoted in Meyer's *Commentary*.

in supernatural grace by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. By what species of logic is it that a necessary inference is drawn from the supernatural to the natural? What comes by supernatural grace is not naturally communicable by ordinary generation. Some little color of plausibility is given to the argument by the fact that it is aimed at the doctrine of "entire sanctification," but it is not even a just argument *ad hominem* to the Arminian, for even the entire sanctification Arminian does not assert that the acquired perfection is a product of nature. Our writer seeks to hold them responsible for this view, but it is not just. He argues that because "the change is really in the nature of the parent, according to the law, it ought to go out from the parent into the offspring and condition his being." That is to say, the supernatural ought to become the natural. We may ask upon what principle should this take place? The argument overlooks or forgets the nature of regeneration and sanctification, that this is the implanting of a new principle of life, not merely the transformation of the old nature. It is the introduction of a new force from without, rather than the obliteration of the forces of evil. The forces of evil are counterbalanced and neutralized and overcome rather than destroyed. How, then, can regeneration be expected to be communicable by natural generation? We do not defend the doctrine of entire sanctification, but we do hold that the objection to the law of genetic transmission, based upon this doctrine, is not justifiable. Does the supposed perfection of grace change its nature or its source? If not, the objection falls to the ground. It is true that if Adam had stood, his children would have been holy, but it does not follow at all that a perfect sanctification must be propagated.

We may notice in this connection the effort that is made to show that the second commandment does not necessarily teach that "sin is a virus in the blood, descending from father to son indefinitely, as scrofula is supposed to be propagated." The answer is that nobody teaches such a doctrine. Sin is not in the blood in that sense, for it is not in the body, but in the soul of man. The second commandment, which speaks of visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations, does not refer, doubtless, to sin in general, but

to special sins, whose outward effects are transmitted either in the form of bodily disease or social degradation. In the former case it does have a bearing upon the law of genetic transmission. If it be said that "God, not nature, is the agent in this visitation," the answer is, this does not by any means indicate that the visitation is entirely apart from nature, or that the visitation is purely a reckoning of guilt without any reference to "the consequences of sinning," an interpretation which is hardly borne out by the usage of the word "iniquity."

We come now to the famous parallelism between the first and second Adam. It is contended that the parental theory, or propagation by natural generation, destroys this parallelism. We are told that "the career of the race began under moral government modified by the covenant of works, and that career must be finished under moral government modified by the covenant of grace." It may be remarked in the outset that this argument, which is constructed upon the covenant of works as taught by the theologians, is worthless against those Arminians, such as Whedon and Pope, who reject the doctrine of a covenant of works. It is useless to argue from a premise the truth of which is not admitted. But the argument does not hold against those who hold to a true scriptural interpretation of the so-called covenant of works in Eden. It is the theological form of this covenant that is objectionable. The true scriptural conception is that which is contained in the Larger Catechism, Ques. 20 and 93. This makes it a dispensation of pure law, and not a reciprocal promise, or a promise of eternal life at all. It was a rule of obedience, "a moral law" (Ques. 92) intended as a "declaration of the will of God to mankind, directing and binding every one to personal, perfect and perpetual conformity and obedience thereunto." It promised "life [not eternal life] upon the fulfilling, and threatening death upon the breach of it" (Ques. 93). It is, therefore, rightly called, in Ques. 20, a "covenant of life," where we have also the same words, "personal, perfect and perpetual obedience." The word "perpetual" shuts out that interpretation which makes it a requirement of a limited obedience, for a promise of eternal life. That it was used in two questions so widely separated as Ques. 20 and 93 shows that it was used advisedly, while the

phrase "binding every one" shows that it was not conceived as a trial for Adam individually, either in a private or a representative capacity. Now, this is the conception which our writer definitely rejects, with no attempt at disproof, except the consideration that we cannot suppose that a substitute could work out a vicarious salvation under such a scheme. The sufficient answer to that is that we do not need to suppose a vicarious obedience. Such supposition is a pernicious dream, founded upon a particular conception of the covenant of works, and the equally gratuitous supposition of a complete parallel between Adam and Christ. Both premises are without any solid scriptural basis, and the conception of the covenant of grace which this false logic yields is positively anti-scriptural—a very caricature of the gospel scheme of salvation. The language of the covenant of works is supposed to be, "Obey for a limited period of time, and in respect to a particular matter, and then live forever." The corresponding language of the covenant of grace is supposed to be, "Obey in a substitute, or federal head, the penal and preceptive law for a limited time, and then be forever justified." While the conception of the covenant of works thus interpreted is purely a dream of the imagination, a matter purely extra-scriptural, the covenant of grace is a matter upon which the whole Scripture speaks, and the interpretation given is not merely not the language of Scripture, but a positive contradiction to its teaching. We are not saved by law in any sense, according to the Scriptures, and to teach that we are is to preach another gospel similar to that against which Paul inveighed with all his might. If this is the net result of that peculiar view of the covenant of works upon which the doctrine of immediate imputation rests, it is not merely a piece of useless lumber, but it is positively hurtful and misleading—a substitution of man's vain imagination for God's revealed truth. Fortunately it may be said that this interpretation of the covenant of grace does not coincide with the burden of Presbyterian preaching. The Scripture word is not "obey," but "believe," which is sharply contrasted with it; nor can it be said that "obey in a substitute" is equivalent to "believe in a substitute." It may be confidently asserted that no such language is to be found in Scripture. Nowhere is obedience by proxy

enjoined. The thing is really contradictory, for law never contemplates obedience in a substitute. How could a man render for another what he is required to render for himself? Was not Christ himself, as a man, under law? How, then, could he obey for others? Is it anywhere said that he did? We think not. The Scriptures will be searched in vain for any statement of the separate imputation of Christ's active obedience to the sinner. Will Romans v. 18, 19 be quoted as teaching such a doctrine? The answer is, The passage does not say it, and cannot properly be construed to mean it. When it says, "Even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous," this obedience is to be interpreted by the preceding verse, which tells us that justification of life came through "one act of righteousness"; in other words, the obedience spoken of was his "obedience unto death," and his obedience to the preceptive law is not contemplated at all. That is all included in the sacrifice, for it was necessary that the victim should be a spotless lamb. If the Saviour had not been a perfect man, how could his sacrifice have been vicarious? If he had laid himself personally liable to the penal sanction of the law, how could he have died for others? It would have been just as impossible to have died for others as to have rendered active obedience for others, when he himself was under penalty of law as a man. The sacrifice, therefore, which he made upon the cross as an offering for sin includes the whole of his work as surety for his people. The life which results from this justification is a free gift of God (Rom. v. 15, 16; vi. 23; cf. John vi. 40). It is Christ which "giveth life unto the world" (vs. 33), and this is given to "every one that beholdeth the Son and believeth on him." It is, moreover, a gift of "eternal life" (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iv. 11; v. 15). The right to give this life he purchased by his death, and not by his active obedience to the preceptive law.

The proposition, "Obey in a substitute the penal and preceptive law" contains a double contradiction. Not only do we find the contradiction of one obeying for another the law which requires individual obedience of every one; there is a contradiction in the idea of obeying at the same time "the penal and preceptive law." This pictures the law as exacting payment in two separate

and contradictory methods. Reverse the order of the words, and the contradiction becomes more apparent. If a man has obeyed (vicariously, if you please) the preceptive law, how can he come under its penal sanction so as to "obey the penal law"? How can the law demand punishment of a man to whom it secures immunity through obedience? Again, if a man has been punished by the law for disobedience, how can the law have any more hold upon him? Can the law hang a man twice? Can it exact more than one life from a single person? How, then, can there be an obedience to the penal and preceptive law at the same time? The matter is a hopeless jumble, and it contradicts the Scripture, which speaks of the Christian as having "died to sin," and as having been buried with Christ through baptism into his death. Now "he that hath died is justified from sin," and since he henceforth lives with Christ, "death hath no more dominion over him." As Christ "died unto sin once," and henceforth liveth unto God, "even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. vi.). Here is where the life comes in: it is through Christ's life. It has nothing to do with his active obedience. Obedience to the penal and preceptive law in the same person and the same sense is contradictory; it is equivalent to exacting a double payment of a note, and the assertion of salvation by obedience to law is diametrically opposed to the gospel scheme. This jumble of contradictions is the outcome of an imaginary transaction in Eden, and a virtual identification of that imaginary transaction with God's plan of redemption; for the rigid parallel which it is sought to introduce is simply a projection of the so-called covenant of works into the covenant of grace.

But the covenant of works, in the sense which our writer holds, is without Scripture foundation. It is an inference in the first instance from the words spoken to Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden, with reference to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The words are, "Thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt [wilt] surely die." The word is a simple future, and since "shall" was formerly used in English as a future with the second and third persons, a usage which has been allowed to stand generally uncorrected in the Re-

vision, even the English version cannot certainly be quoted in proof of a threat, as against the idea, which is the more natural, that God, in these words, gave a simple warning of the natural and inevitable and instantaneous effect of disobedience. The Hebrew "dying thou wilt die," means, "you will certainly die." The knowledge of evil was an experimental knowledge of death. They already knew the good, but not evil. The moment they disobeyed they died through this entrance of evil, sin being itself death. Where now is there any room for the inference that God promised Adam eternal life upon a limited obedience? No such inference is legitimate. Dr. Thornwell admitted that it did not follow from the idea of a threat, and the idea of the threat itself rests upon a misunderstanding of the English word "shall." Read the Hebrew and it disappears, as does also the doctrine of a promise of eternal life upon a limited obedience. Remove this rotten peg, together with the one supposed to be derived from Romans v. 12, and the whole structure of immediate imputation, as well as that of realism, falls to the ground.

All the other arguments by which the theologians have sought to support their doctrine of the covenant of works are easily disposed of. It is a matter of great joy to the writer that the Larger Catechism does not support the ordinary conception of that covenant.

It must be confessed, however, that this joy is considerably marred by the fact that Sec. 2, Chap. VII. of the Confession does not appear to be reconcilable with the more extended and explicit statements of the Larger Catechism. The trouble lies in the single phrase, "and in him to his posterity." Since the word "posterity" cannot be restricted to Adam's immediate offspring, the life which was promised according to this must be understood as eternal life. This favors the ordinary interpretation, in spite of the fact that nothing is said about a limited probation. We prefer to take the Larger Catechism, because of its scripturalness in following the narrative in Genesis without imaginary addition.

We should welcome a general discussion of this subject, hoping that thereby the truth may become manifest, and the theology of the Protestant churches be brought into closer harmony.

Washington, Mo.

LUTHER LINK.

V.

THE RELATION OF GALATIANS III. 27-29 TO INFANT BAPTISM.

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”—**GALATIANS** iii. 27, 28, 29.

THIS passage does not appear to be quoted, as it used to be, in proof of the right of infants to be baptized. To leave this out appears to the present writer very much like abandoning the citadel, and then attempting to defend the outworks. That it is left out seems to be due largely, if not entirely, to the fact that the baptism is taken to be the baptism of the Spirit.

If language is to be taken in its simple, ordinary sense, this certainly cannot be. The persons spoken of evidently put on Christ by the baptism. Putting on Christ is their own act. Then, if it is done by the baptism, the baptism is their own act; not, of course, in administering, but in receiving it. They are baptized by their own consent, at their own request. But the Spirit’s baptism is not the act of the subjects in any such sense that they can be said to put on Christ, or *do* anything by it. Robinson’s Lexicon of New Testament Greek gives as the meaning of *enduo*, in this place and Rom. xiii. 14, the only other place in which the words “put on Christ” are used, “to be filled, imbued with Christ.” This is a strange twisting of a word to accommodate it to a theory: “indue” changed to “imbue,” and the active to the passive, and the subject in that which he is said to do, either made passive or represented as doing the Spirit’s work upon himself. In Romans it stands in the midst of an exhortation to outward duties, and would most naturally be taken to mean exhibiting Christ in the outward life. In the passage we are considering, if *enduo* is taken in its ordinary sense, and “baptize” in

the sense in which ninety-nine readers in a hundred who have not been taught otherwise would take it, all is in harmony. Making a public profession of one's faith, taking on the badge of discipleship, may well be spoken of as putting on Christ.

Another reason is found in the language of the twenty-eighth verse, "There is neither Jew nor Greek," etc. This is evidently intended to show a difference between the old and the new dispensations. But if the baptism is that of the Spirit, there were no such distinctions under the old any more than under the new. Whoever had faith was wrought upon by the Spirit, without distinction of race, sex or condition, just as much then as now. But these words do mark distinctions that were made under the old, and removed under the new in applying the seal. The advantage that belonged to the Jew, the profit of circumcision (Rom. iii. 1), are now free alike to all.

The apostle is dealing, here and in Romans iv., with the claim of the Judaizers that circumcision and keeping the law were necessary to salvation. He meets the claim by going back to the Abrahamic covenant, and showing that by it the terms of justification were fixed forever, and that beyond the possibility of change. Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, and all who have faith like him are justified, whether the seal has been applied to them or not.

There are two things brought out in the discussion with which we are especially concerned. The first is that circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith. Romans iv. 11 expressly says that it was so to Abraham; but Baptists—some Baptists, at least—say that it was not so to his seed. God, in the covenant, promises to be a God to his seed as well as to himself, and the seal is to be applied to his seed as to himself. This promise is a promise of imputed righteousness (among other things) to his seed, and how can the seal be less than a seal of that promise? We might quote several passages from Paul bearing upon the question, but for our present purpose one is sufficient. In Galatians iii., after showing, by several statements, that all who have faith are children and heirs of Abraham, he illustrates the unchangeableness of the inheritance by comparison with a man's

covenant. He appeals to a familiar business principle. A man who has put his seal to a contract, and had it confirmed according to the law of the state, cannot go back on it to annul or alter it. Paul would not have us understand that God's "word is not as good as his bond," yet God has condescended to give us this assurance of the perpetuity and unchangeableness of this covenant promise. He has put his seal to it, and he could not go back on it to make the keeping of the law a condition of justification. This assurance is just as good to-day as when these words were written. It is just as much impossible that God should have made baptism a condition of justification as it was that he should make the keeping of the law such a condition. All such claims are squarely in the teeth of this covenant. And circumcision, the seal of the covenant, is the assurance that God has given to all believers that the promise is unchangeable.

The second thing is that Christ is the seed of Abraham—the Seed, as emphatically as though there was no other. There is no other except in and through him. Christ is the Son of God, and to belong to him is to be a son of God. So he is the Seed of Abraham, and to belong to him is to be Abraham's seed. It is not that the promise is to Christ; it was made to him, and from the beginning it was as true as it is now, that none were true seed of Abraham except through connection with Christ, *the Seed*. It was as true of Isaac and Jacob as it is to-day of any Gentile believer. The Jews arguing with Christ claimed that they were Abraham's seed. Christ shows them that, though his seed according to the flesh, he was not their father, else they would do his works. Though of Israel, one cannot be Israel (Rom. ix. 6), except by union with the Seed. The chief significance of circumcision to the Jews was that it showed them to be Abraham's seed, and heirs of the covenant, and the lack of it showed that one was not Abraham's seed. Though they had not learned to look upon the coming Christ as the Seed, it was none the less true that circumcision was a sign and seal of union with him.

The claim of the Judaizers was abundantly answered. But showing the insufficiency of a reason for not doing a thing is not giving a reason for doing it. No reason has yet been given for

leaving off the practice of circumcision. A reason is given for not continuing to observe the ceremonial law: it was intended to be transient—added until Christ should come. The question concerning the law and that concerning circumcision were very different. The law covenant was conditional, "If you will obey, I will be your God," etc. The covenant itself and all the promises connected with it were on condition of the people's obedience; and when, by a long course of disobedience, they had forfeited all rights under it, there was nothing in the way of its abrogation, and a new covenant being substituted for it. But the Abrahamic covenant was unconditional and everlasting. The statement concerning a man's covenant may be applied with greater force to the seal: no one removeth the seal. If the seal is gone, the covenant is of no force. There are those who say that the Abrahamic covenant is not now in force. If the seal is gone, have they not reason to say so? What would we think of the promise that the earth shall not be again destroyed by a flood if the rainbow should disappear from the clouds? The authority of God is to be pleaded for it, of course, but God does not do things that he himself tells us he cannot do. Does not his word give us good reason to say that a seal is inviolable? The manner in which the seal of the Abrahamic covenant was given seems designed to show that it was to be as truly everlasting as the covenant. After the promise of the covenant, it is said, "This is my covenant which ye shall keep. . . . Every man child among you shall be circumcised." And again, "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Surely we have good reason to say the seal of the covenant could not be removed. It has been said that the Jews were to continue to circumcise. The only Scripture quoted in evidence, as far as I know, is the account of the circumcision of Timothy. But this, with the reason given for it, if it proves anything, proves just the contrary. We may be very sure that if Paul had regarded the command to circumcise all males of Jewish birth as still in force, we should not have been told that he did it because of the Jews that were in those quarters. Paul did not make obedience to God's commands a matter of expediency. It is manifest that it was done in pursuance of his

purpose of being made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some.

Why did, or how could, God command that the seal was not to be applied? Remember that the great question under discussion was concerning circumcision. The passage we are considering stands just where an answer to this question is to be looked for; and it is a question which if not answered will always press for an answer. There is not a greater puzzle in the Scriptures.

We have to say, in the first place, that if the baptism of the text is that of the Spirit, there is in it no answer, at least no direct answer. Underlying the whole discussion is the fact that whosoever has faith is Abraham's seed and heir. With faith always goes the work of the Spirit, and in this view, the text only explains how those who have faith become Abraham's seed. By faith they are Abraham's seed *de jure*; by the work of the Spirit they become his seed *de facto*. As to any answer to the question concerning circumcision, it leaves it just where it was before. Important as the truth may be in itself, it is a lame conclusion of the argument concerning circumcision. In fact, it makes it look as though Paul saw the necessity of an answer, and being puzzled as to what it should be, had given us what is really no answer at all.

But if the baptism is water baptism, then it answers the question. It answers it by showing the identity in all but outward form of baptism and circumcision. The seal of the covenant is not removed. The device of the seal is changed, but it is none the less the King's seal, and means the same things it always meant. Baptism is a sign and seal of the same things that circumcision was: of union with Christ, the seed, and of that which goes with the union, the promised imputation of righteousness. But it is not merely that the same things are sealed to us; they come to us in the same way, by inheritance. We are heirs of the promise. The promise especially referred to is, of course, that of which the whole chapter treats, viz., justification by faith. But it is a promise of the covenant, and if one of its promises comes to us by inheritance, then we are heirs of the covenant as a whole, and baptism is the seal of it.

The theory that the baptism of the text is the baptism of the Spirit does not rob us of all that we contend for in this passage. We may say, in the first place, that whatever the baptism of the Spirit does, water baptism signifies and seals. Then, since the Spirit baptism makes us Abraham's seed and heirs of the covenant, water baptism is a sign and seal of the transaction, and thus fills exactly the place of circumcision.

Again, the language of verse 29 taken by itself, independent altogether of what has gone before, is enough to prove the same thing. To be Christ's is to be Abraham's seed, and an heir under the covenant. The converse is equally true—to be Abraham's seed and an heir of the covenant, is to be Christ's. The two are inseparable; we might well say are one and the same. That which is a token and seal of one is necessarily a token and seal of the other. Thus, again, baptism is shown to be indetical with circumcision.

The puzzle of the missing seal, then, is solved, however we read the text; but if Paul wrote this with the thought of the Spirit baptism only in his mind, it places him in the light of having solved the puzzle for us without knowing that he was doing it.

We have thus abundant proof in this passage that baptism is now the token and seal of inheritance in the Abrahamic covenant.

Perhaps some one may ask, "If this is true, why was it not more distinctly stated?" Those to whom the Apostle was writing, and especially those against whom he was contending, did not need anything plainer. If we had been in the thick of the fight, and as much excited over the question of what was to become of the practice of circumcision as they were, we should not have been in any doubt of the meaning of it. And we would hardly have given to the meaning of *enduo* a twist that deprived this passage of all direct bearing on the question under discussion.

The same circumstances that called for the change of the device of the seal called also for an enlargement of the sphere of its application. There was nothing in the nature of the case to prevent this, that all who inherit the benefits of the covenant

should enjoy also the benefits of the seal. But the logic of the entire situation goes to show that those upon whom the gift of the privilege of the seal was once conferred could not be deprived of it. The gift was unconditional and unlimited. Even if it were in its own nature forfeitable, it was conferred on those who could not, by any act of their own, forfeit it—infants eight days old. Infants, seed of believers, have an inalienable right to have placed upon them the seal of the covenant.

L. TENNEY.

Brownwood, Texas.

VI.

OUR DUTY TOWARDS THE NEGRO.

THE existence of nine millions of colored people in the Southern States imposes upon us, as individuals and as a church, a duty which we cannot evade, any more than we can escape our own consciousness or surrender our own being. Every now and then some one, who has surveyed more or less carefully something like a few square acres of ground, tells us that, like the Indians, this race is dying out, and is destined to extinction. If this were true, it would not alter our duty to the nine millions of living members of that race, and to their gradually decreasing descendants, who must last for many generations. But this view of the gradual decrease and final extinction of the negro race in America is not supported by the best authority we have on this subject, viz., the various censuses of the United States, in which various flaws may be picked here and there, but which give us the best approximation to the truth on this subject we can obtain. This authority promises us no relief in the way of gradual extinction from the pressure which these millions of colored people impose.

Some years ago an interesting writer published a book entitled *An Appeal to Pharaoh*, in which he advocated the forced colonization of this race in the original home from which they were brought: a view which has found advocates in the Senate of the United States, but whose impracticability, from every standpoint, is its condemnation. If one hundred ships carrying five hundred passengers were to make two trips a year in the work of the enforced governmental transportation of this race to the continent from which their fathers came, after all the expense and suffering which such a measure would entail, there would be just as many left in this country at the end of the year as when the work began, for they are increasing at the rate of more than

one hundred thousand per year. Our duty, therefore, toward this race is one which we can in no wise escape, and from which our children and children's children for untold generations will doubtless find no door of escape opening for them through either the gradual extinction or the enforced colonization of this people. What, therefore, is the duty which the white man owes to the negro? There is a wide field opened here, but we write now as a minister of the gospel, and answer, The white man owes the negro the gospel of Jesus Christ. We stand on a platform which must command universal assent when I say we owe the negro the gospel, and ought to pay the debt. We might go further and say that all our conduct toward the negro ought to be inspired by the principles of the gospel, but that opens too wide a field, and purposely narrow the scope of this note to the single point that we ought to give to them the pure gospel of the Son of God.

I. OUR DUTY.

1. The negro is a part of that whole which Jesus Christ had in mind when he said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

(a) The negro was with the white and all other races, in the loins of Adam, when they were all created, and afterward all together sinned and fell. By creation, he shares the common human nature which all races alike derive from their common ancestors, the first parents of all the sons of men. There are not two or more distinct species of men, created at different times, endowed with different powers, made out of different substances, and descended from different stocks, but there is only one human species, created at one and the same time, with bodies and souls similarly endowed, and all the individuals alike descended from the one pair of universal parents—"God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The Scripture is explicit as to the unity of the human species, and the offer of the gospel and the mission of the church are as wide as the species, "Jew and Gentile, Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free."

(b) In his assumption of human nature, when he became the

"Son of man," Jesus Christ assumed a blood relationship which binds him as closely to all the parts of the human race as to any one of its parts. Our Lord, as to his human nature, was born of a Jewish mother, but, in strictness of speech, he was not a Jew any more than Roman, Teuton or Slav; in fact, he transcended, as no mere man could have done, all the limitations of time, race and circumstance, and as the "Son of man," sustains relations to all the "sons of men." He is the blood-brother of every human being, born out of the Adamic stock, whose common nature he assumed; and loyalty to Jesus Christ requires us to give his gospel, as far as in us lies, to every one of his brethren—that is, to every one of the members of our race.

(c) The colored man is capable of redemption through the blood of Jesus Christ, and by the renewal and sanctification of the Holy Ghost. We have seen their lives transformed by the gospel of God's grace, and every Southern man and woman carries precious memories of the faithfulness and godliness of men and women of the colored race, in the genuineness of whose religious life they must continue to believe as long as they continue to believe in religion at all. Many of us have seen the fruits of the indwelling of God's Spirit in pious servants as manifestly as we ever saw in the lives of our own pious fathers and mothers. There is no skepticism on this point that the gospel of God's grace can do its work for them, just as truly as its saving work may be done for us.

(d) The colored race needs the pure gospel of God's truth and grace. In some places they have competent and faithful ministers of their own color, who lead them in the path of righteousness, but in multitudes of instances, all over our Southland, "blind leaders of the blind" emphasize the spiritual destitution of this people, capable of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and sustaining the same relations to the Son of man as do the other peoples of the earth. Their destitution is not an argument to let them alone, but it is an argument taken out of the very heart of Christ to do the utmost we can for them.

2. The providential position of the negro is another argument for giving him the gospel.

The race has been thrust by God's providence upon us in such a way that we must take account of their presence. It is not a theory, but a condition which confronts us: a condition for which neither we nor our ancestors were responsible, but no speculation as to origins alters the stubborn facts which stare us in the face. Nine millions of colored people in our homes as servants, upon our streets, and in our fields and stores, cannot be ignored by the thoughtful citizen, or by the earnest Christian. The naval officer may ignore the ice-berg which stands in the path of his gallant vessel of iron and steel, but the mad crash and the sudden descent in the whelming waters must be the sequel. We cannot ignore these people, for they are here in our land, in our homes and places of business. The problem of dealing with them has been committed to us. It is our problem, which God has thrust upon us; and with all proper humility, we would like to say that the white people of the South are as well qualified to deal with this problem as any others to whom it might have been committed. A strong and homogeneous people, of the purest Anglo-Saxon stock to be found in our country, conservative and orthodox, with only a few of the debilitating and fever-breeding "isms" which harass and debauch some less favored regions, and with an understanding of and an affection for the colored race acquired by more than a century of intercourse, our people are as well qualified as any that may be found to serve as the kindly teachers and wise leaders of these dusky millions. Contrast the condition of their savage ancestors of two centuries ago with their descendants to-day. Their ancestors spoke a barbarous dialect, which perhaps had in it no word for God, or spirit, or the primary religious duties or graces; their descendants know something of the English language, and can understand the religion of Jesus Christ as preached in this noble tongue. Of course, they are not masters of English. Who is? But the gospel through this medium can effectively reach them. Their ancestors knew nothing of the making of crops, of obedience to law, of the religion of Christ; their descendants know something on all these subjects, and who can doubt that as our loving Lord looks down on them, he counts multitudes of them as his disciples? But you say they are not

accessible to us. We reply, they are more accessible to us than the savages of the New Hebrides, who drove the famous missionary, John G. Paton, to the hiding of the trees to escape their wrath, than the wild men who slew Bishop Hannington, or the cruel Indians who lashed missionaries to the trees, that they might slowly hack them to death, and yet Christ-charged hearts, under the impulse of love, carried the gospel to all of these. That they are growing more accessible is the testimony of those who are working in this field. Many of them, including their best leaders, have recovered from the mad craze after political domination, and the whole race is in a fair way of seeing that there is nothing in politics for them as a people, that the whole power of the Federal Government could not permanently make thriftlessness and ignorance the masters of intelligence and morality, and that their best friends are the best white people of the South. As they are learning these lessons, there increases also their accessibleness to influence, from those who know them best, care most for them, and can do most for them, viz., the most intelligent, moral and God-fearing of the Southern men and women.

3. The third argument for giving the gospel to these nine millions of negroes is that thereby we may preserve the safety and the purity of our own institutions and life.

If a large proportion of these people are to remain ignorant, superstitious, immoral and irreligious, it must react injuriously upon the interests of our entire section of country. For our sakes as well as theirs we must give them the gospel. Education as given in the public free schools, or in the institutions established by philanthropists, does not meet the needs of the case, and even the practical industrial training, which thoughtful men of both races, and of all churches, from Cardinal Gibbons through the long list of patriotic, public-spirited men everywhere, are beginning to see is so much needed, is not a sufficient solvent for the hazardous issues which perplex the subject. Nor can political measures go deep enough to furnish a remedy, though it is worth while to ask if it were not immoral to thrust the royal function of the franchise into the hands of ignorant, vicious white men, or of ignorant, vicious black men, who are no more competent to

exercise this grave responsibility than to shape the movements of a planet; certainly such a measure cannot end all the difficulties which attend upon the relation of the two races. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the only hope; and if this does not succeed, then the sun and the moon and the stars shall fall, and the "reign of terror and of blood" shall come. But who can doubt that as the gospel regenerates the hearts of the men and women of both races, there will be no dark problem vexing our Southern sky with its prophetic threats? We must give the pure gospel to the ignorant, vicious, superstitious everywhere as the guarantee of our own best life.

The Presbyterian Church is peculiarly adapted to discharge this mission to the colored race. It stands for an educated ministry, furnishing instruction rather than bald and vehement exhortation. It stands for a quiet, spiritual worship as opposed to all modes of formalism or of wild emotionalism. It stands for a home in which the children shall be carefully trained and instructed in the Word of God, and in the faith of the church. It stands for care in the admission of persons to church membership, and careful discipline of communicants. These are just the points where this race most needs buttressing and reënforcing, and while it would perhaps be rather sanguine to expect that multitudes of them would hasten to flock, "like doves to their windows," to the Presbyterian Church, yet the influence of our church amongst them may be out of all proportion to the numbers of this people enrolled in its membership, setting a standard, as it certainly may, for other churches, and, "like a little leaven, leavening the whole lump." The primacy of Presbyterianism is not due to its numbers, although, taking the world over, it is the largest of Protestant churches, but it is due to its orthodoxy, elevated spirituality, stalwart morality; and these rare gifts it ought to give with a lavish hand for the healing of the nations and the races. If Presbyterianism has these good things, it has no right to refuse them to any and all.

It needs no further proof to show that it is both our duty and our interest to give the gospel to the colored man.

II. OUR PLAN.

The mature and settled policy of our church is to organize into a separate and independent African Presbyterian Church, and to train for the service of this church and for the reaching of the unevangelized negroes a native colored ministry—an educated ministry, passing through the curriculum of studies which would give the necessary training and knowledge for this work.

Against this policy not a word can be said; it does not raise the spectre of either social or ecclesiastical equality, since the African Presbyterian Church is as separate from us as any other communion in Christendom. Meantime, the preparation by us, in our own Colored Theological Seminary, of a competent and trained colored ministry, provides this African Church with ministers who have no racial prejudice to overcome, who understand the life of the people to whom they are sent, and who can be supported at a comparatively small cost. And this work of training has been so carefully and successfully done that this colored seminary, now called the Stillman Institute, has never turned out a graduate who, if living, is not now doing a good work, either at home or in the Dark Continent, among his own people. If we willingly give to support Sheppard and his wife in Africa, why not give also with equal readiness to maintain the more than threescore equally deserving colored ministers, whom we have raised up and trained, and sent out to preach to the negroes of the South, and who are doing a work which it is far more necessary for our welfare should be done here in our own land? "It is wonderful how cheaply these ministers can live. Some years the appropriations have not averaged over forty dollars per year. They could be well sustained by appropriations averaging one hundred dollars each. Many of these men, like Paul, work with their own hands, that they may preach the gospel to their own people. I do not believe that anywhere in connection with our church, either at home or in the foreign field, a greater spirit of sacrifice and self-denial is manifested than by the workers in this field, and yet our church as a whole contributes but a small proportion of what it ought to give to this great cause. The fault lies at the door of the pastors of the

church, for if they would inform themselves of this work, tell God's people, whom they serve, plainly and forcibly about it, and urge upon them, in the spirit of Christ, its needs and its claims, the people of God would pour out the means necessary for its extension and support."

These words are written under the influence of the traditions and history of the church of which the writer is the pastor. Perhaps the first colored Presbyterian minister in the United States was a member of Lexington Presbyterian Church, as he was certainly taken under the care of the Presbytery of Lexington when meeting in this church, in October, 1799, and licensed one year later by the same Presbytery, when meeting in Lewisburg, W. Va., the Rev. John Chavis by name, for nearly forty years a preacher in the Presbyterian Church. And our lecture-room, with its historic colored Sabbath-school, officered and taught by "Stonewall" Jackson and others, whose names are honored far and wide, makes an appeal which must be heard. And all over our Southland are scattered churches which, if true to their traditions, to their present duty, and to their Lord, must so give that as he "sits over against the treasury watching their gifts," he will say, "They have given much." Amen!

THORNTON WHALING.

Lexington, Va.

VII.

PRESBYTERIAN EDUCATIONAL WORK IN KENTUCKY.

PRESBYTERIANISM has ever been the foe of ignorance and the friend of education. Ever since John Knox placed the parish school under the shadow of the parish church, education and religion have ever been bound together by a holy and abiding bond wherever Presbyterians are found. Hence it is that Presbyterianism has been the founder of schools and academies, of colleges and universities, and of theological seminaries, and the patron of sound and solid learning everywhere. Wherever it has prevailed we find a high degree of intelligence among the people, and a capacity for self-government in the citizens who are influenced by it. And Presbyterianism believes not only in a well-informed and intelligent people, but also in a thoroughly trained ministry, so that her people may be intelligent subjects of the kingdom of God, as well as worthy citizens of the domain of Cæsar. Such is the genius and such are the traditions to which the Presbyterians of this day have fallen heir. It shall surely be the constant effort of those who have such an inheritance to be faithful in their own day to all these noble traditions of the past. Indeed, it should be their aim to deepen the educational genius of Presbyterianism, and to make sure that their noble traditions do not become traditional in these days of manifold blessing.

In tracing out the story of the educational activity of the Presbyterians in Kentucky one is deeply impressed with the large part these people have had in this activity, both directly and indirectly. In the very earliest times many schools and academies were founded by Presbyterians. Even in the wild wilderness the log school-house was given a prominent place; and in the organization of the public school system later on Presbyterians bore an important and honorable share in this great work.

In the early part of the century, they organized that college at Danville which has rendered such excellent service to the cause of higher education for three-quarters of a century. Later on in the century they founded the institution at Richmond, which for a quarter of a century faithfully rendered a similar service. In perusing the minutes of the undivided Synod in early days, and of the two Synods in later times, it is very notable that a large share of the Synod's attention was devoted to the subject of the academic and theological education under its auspices. Centre College and Danville Seminary, Central University and Louisville Seminary are constantly on the pages of these records. And during the past two or three years the record of the proceedings touching the consolidation of these institutions has had a large place in the minutes of both Synods, as well as in the thought and prayers of these bodies.

First of all, let us see how the early Presbyterians of Kentucky were true to the genius of their system for popular education of all grades. This appears in the founding of academies in the very earliest days. Boone came to Kentucky in 1775, and David Rice in 1783. In 1780 the Legislature of Virginia, of which Kentucky was then a part, granted eight thousand acres of land to found Transylvania Seminary or Academy. In 1783 its Board of Trustees had David Rice as its chairman; and Rev. John Todd, Col. John Todd and the Hon. Caleb Wallace, all Presbyterians, were among the active promoters of this early educational scheme. In 1785 this Seminary was opened in the house of David Rice, near Danville. It did not rise above the grade of a simple grammar school, and in 1788, after some controversy, it was moved to Lexington. In founding this institution and in all its early history Presbyterians were very active.

But tendencies soon began to manifest themselves in this institution, in its new home in Lexington, which made it more and more unsatisfactory to the Presbyterians. This fact led to a movement among them, about 1794, to found a grammar school and seminary, which should be more directly under the control of the church. David Rice was again active in this movement; and in 1798 he obtained, on behalf of the Presbytery of Transyl-

vania, a grant of six thousand acres of land, and a charter for the Kentucky Academy. Messrs. David Rice and John Blythe obtained from various sources subscriptions amounting to ten thousand dollars. On this subscription are the names of George Washington and John Adams for one hundred dollars each, and of Aaron Burr for fifty dollars. The meeting of the Presbytery of Transylvania which initiated this vigorous movement was held in the old Woodford Church, and the academy known as the Kentucky Academy was located at Pisgah, in Woodford county. The grammar school began its operations in 1794 or 1795, and Andrew Steele, James Moore, and John Thompson were successively its early teachers. For the location of the collegiate work of this academy offers were made from Paris, Harrodsburg and Pisgah; and in 1797 it was located at the last-named place. But in 1798, on the request of the two Boards, and for reasons which do not very plainly appear, Transylvania Seminary, at Lexington, and the Kentucky Academy, at Pisgah, which were both founded mainly by Presbyterians, were united, with all their funds, to form a single institution at Lexington, under a board of twenty members, of whom a majority were Presbyterians. The name given to this joint institution was Transylvania University, whose checkered career in later times it is not necessary to follow out in this article. The humble stone building in which the Kentucky Academy began and really did its good work, still stands near by the Pisgah Church; and it may be interesting to some who read these lines to learn that the people of Pisgah Church have recently so repaired this building as to prevent it from falling into decay.

But there were other academies founded by the Presbyterians of Kentucky in pioneer days. Some time prior to 1806 the Rev. John Lyle conducted a country boarding school, mainly for girls, in Clark county; and in 1806 he was called to take charge of Bourbon Academy at Paris. This academy seems to have prospered for a time, for we learn from the records that in 1809 it had eighty-five pupils, of whom twenty-five were girls. It seems, however, that about 1810 some trouble arose between the teacher and the trustees, the result of which was that it suspended its

work in the following year. Mr. Lyle, of this academy, published an English grammar, which, Dr. L. G. Barbour says, "was probably the first English grammar published west of the Alleghanies."

One of the most noted of the early private academies was that at Black Pond, in Woodford county. It was in charge of Dr. Lewis Marshall, who engaged Mr. W. R. Thompson, known as "Dominie Thompson," to teach in this school, which was really held in the home of Dr. Marshall for the benefit of his own and his neighbors' children. Another assistant of Dr. Marshall was "Dominie Moore," who also seems to have been a man of force and scholarship. This academy was for many years quite famous, and some of the ablest men in the State, of a generation ago, received their early training here. We may name, among many others, Robert J. Breckenridge, Lewis W. Green, Thomas Marshall, Charles Marshall, Humphrey Marshall, Henry Walter and John Hardin. There were also other private academies. Rev. James Vance and Rev. Joshua L. Wilson, in the early years of last century, had a prosperous school at Middletown, in Jefferson county, and Messrs. Wilson and Rannals had private academies in Jessamine and Mason counties, respectively. The grammar school in Danville, connected with Centre College, and taught by James Graham in early days, deserves mention in this connection. These were all in the hands of Presbyterians, and there were doubtless others of a like kind in other parts of the State of which we can make no note here. But those mentioned suffice to show how deeply Presbyterians were interested in education in these primitive days, when they were subduing the wild wilderness, and resisting the savage Indians.

Nor were Presbyterians unmindful of their daughters in the matter of educational facilities in these earlier times. Indeed, excellent provision was made for the education of young women quite early in the last century, and it is to be feared that the Presbyterians of a later day have scarcely fulfilled the good promise of the early plans which their fathers made. As far back as 1806, the year in which the Bourbon Academy was founded at Paris, the Rev. John P. Campbell was conducting a

prosperous school for girls at Harrodsburg. Dr. Campbell seems to have been a man of much force and fine learning, and a very successful educator. The Rev. John Lyle, who went to the academy at Paris in 1806, had founded a school for girls in his own house, in Clark county, at least as early as 1804. This school was near the Salem Church, and was quite successful for several years. Other academies for girls can only be mentioned, such as that by Rev. J. H. Brown, D. D., at Richmond; that by Rev. Dr. VanDoren, at Lexington; that by Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson, at Frankfort; that by Rev. D. T. Stuart, at Shelbyville; that by Rev. John Montgomery, at Harrodsburg; that by the Rev. J. V. Cosby, D. D., at Bardstown; that by Rev. Dr. J. J. Bullock, at Walnut Hill. In addition, in our own time, we have Sayre Institute, at Lexington, with the names of David Sayre and H. B. McLellan related to it; Caldwell College, at Danville, with the names of Dr. Ely and others connected with its history, and Bellewood Seminary, at Anchorage, whose prominent names are Hill, Bedinger and Lord. In addition to these schools there are others in different parts of the State in which the influence and support of Presbyterians has been strong and helpful. These statements clearly show that Presbyterians have sought to provide good educational advantages for their daughters as well as for their sons.

But the Presbyterian people of Kentucky have not been content to make provision only for primary education. They, in very early days, as we have already seen, were busy planning for higher collegiate education. They, indeed, had high ideals in both Transylvania Seminary and Kentucky Academy, and the early prosperity of these institutions under Presbyterian auspices was really remarkable. It seems to us now such a pity that this prosperity should have been so sadly interrupted. By the union of these two institutions, which seems to have been done rather hastily, in 1798, to form Transylvania University, the right of control by the church was given up by Transylvania Presbytery. Ere long, as indeed might have been expected, disputes arose concerning the policy of the institution. The Presbyterians, some of whom never really favored the hasty union of the Seminary

and the Academy, became more and more dissatisfied with the trend of things in Transylvania University, which nevertheless, both financially and in popular esteem, seemed to flourish in a remarkable way during the early decades of the last century.

In 1818 matters had come to such a pass that the Presbyterians felt forced to take definite steps to obtain a charter from the Legislature for an institution which should be entirely under their own control. This movement, however, was not made at first by any Presbytery or Synod acting in an official way, but by Presbyterians in their private capacity at first. There were reasons for this, not in the reluctance of the church to assume control of the institution which was proposed, but in the difficulty of securing a charter from the Legislature of the day for a distinctly denominational college. This new college was to be located at Danville, and was to be distinctively Christian in its character. At first the charter was actually refused, but it was obtained the following year, 1819, on condition that the funds should be controlled by the Legislature rather than by the Synod. The first trustees were not appointed by the Synod, but by the Legislature; so that, although this new college was founded entirely by Presbyterians, it was not in any formal way under the control of the church. Indeed, the Synod firmly refused to accept the charter in this modified form, and resolved to wait till it could obtain the control of the funds as well. The charter, however, went into operation under the trustees named in it, but without any ecclesiastical oversight. The origin of the name given to it, Centre College, is interesting and somewhat obscure. Various names were proposed for it. One was "Kentucky College," and another was "The American Bible and Missionary College." Davidson says that the name "Centre College" was finally adopted on account of its central position. The name "Central College" was also suggested for the same reason, but "Centre College" finally came to be its name. In 1824 the charter was amended in such a way as to enable the Synod to assume control of the college. The condition was the raising of twenty thousand dollars for the treasury of the institution, in return for which the Synod was to be given the right to elect the trustees. By 1830 this sum was

raised, and ever since that time the members of the Board of Trustees have been chosen by the Synod, and the funds have also been under the control of this board. This institution has done a noble service, and it has had as its presidents: Jeremiah Chamberlain, Gideon Blackburn, David C. Proctor, John C. Young, Lewis W. Green, W. L. Breckenridge, Ormond Beatty, William C. Young, and William C. Roberts, the last being now in the office.

After the disputes and divisions incident to the civil war, those Presbyterians in Kentucky who constituted the Synod of Kentucky, South, were left without any college, although they had done much for Centre College. After several efforts had been made, without success, to arrange for a joint occupancy of Centre College, they projected a college of their own, and proceeded, with much energy, to carry their plans into effect. They obtained their charter in 1873, and proposed to found an institution on the university plan, with literary, scientific, legal, medical and dental colleges, and a series of preparatory schools associated with it. This institution, after much discussion, was located at Richmond, and it bore the name of Central University. The college of letters and science was opened there in 1874, and for twenty-seven years it did excellent service to higher education in the State. Robert L. Breck and Lindsay H. Blanton have been its two chancellors, and John W. Pratt and John V. Logan its presidents of the faculty.

But the Presbyterians went a step further in their educational work. They believed in an educated ministry, and they felt the need of an institution for the training of their young men for this holy office as near home as possible. In very early times, before Princeton Seminary was founded in 1812, the young men in Kentucky who had the ministry in view were compelled to pursue their studies privately under some minister. It is interesting to read how David Rice, John Gordon, Gideon Blackburn, Thomas Cleland, James Vance, John Blythe and others, amid their varied duties as pioneers in a new region, found time to train worthy young men to be efficient ministers of the gospel. It is a very interesting fact that so early as 1806 the Presbytery of West Lexington appointed John Lyle its professor of Theology.

Another thing which reveals the plans of the fathers of Presbyterianism in Kentucky in regard to theological education, is the fact that in 1828 the Synod organized a theological department in connection with Centre College. This expedient was evidently intended to utilize the college courses, and give such theological training in addition as was possible under the circumstances. The Rev. J. K. Burch, D. D., was chosen the first professor in this theological department of Centre College. The plan was to have three professors, and thus in the course of time to establish a seminary which should be quite fully equipped. But for some reason this plan did not work well, and it came to an end in 1831.

The next decided movement in theological education by the Synod was made in 1847, sixteen years after, when the Synod, after much deliberation, agreed to coöperate with several other Synods across the Ohio River in the management of New Albany Seminary, in Indiana. The Synod of Kentucky raised a fund of twenty thousand dollars, which most fortunately it held in its own hands, and used only its income in the support of its professor in that institution. This professor the Synod retained the right to appoint. This fund of twenty thousand dollars constitutes what is known as the Theological Fund, and it has been used for theological education in one form or another ever since. This plan was continued till 1853, a period of six years, when it was deemed expedient by the Synod not to continue the plan any longer.

In 1853, another important step was taken, when the Synod offered its theological fund to any first-class theological seminary that the Old School Assembly would establish in the West, and, in addition, it also offered forty thousand dollars more and ten acres of land if the institution were located at Danville. This definite and liberal offer elicited a good deal of interest in the Old School Assembly of that year. The vote in the Assembly for the location was: Danville, 122; New Albany, 78; St. Louis, 33. This gave Danville a majority of eleven over the other two places combined. From the first, this new seminary was efficient, and for a number of years it greatly prospered. The names of Breck-

enridge, Humphrey and Robinson gave it strength and standing from the first. It soon had over fifty students in its classes, and it did much in the early years of its history to supply ministers for the vacant fields in this wide and growing region. The trying incidents of the civil war very seriously affected this institution, though it kept on with its work, and in later years was rendering a larger service.

As the years passed, and as the western section of the Church, South, was growing, the need for a well-equipped theological seminary, planted somewhere in this region, was more and more felt by the Synod, South. To meet this need, in part at least, in 1891 a theological department was founded in connection with Central University at Richmond, just as there had been at Centre College, Danville, about sixty years before. The late Rev. T. D. Witherspoon, D. D., was called to organize and conduct the theological classes at Richmond, and for two years he did splendid service. Meantime, the feeling in favor of a fully equipped seminary was gradually deepening in the minds of those who best understood the situation. After much discussion in the Synod, and conference with the Synods of Missouri, Arkansas, Nashville and Memphis, and with the authorities of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, at Clarksville, Tenn., the plans were matured. The Synod of Kentucky, desirous of unifying the theological work in the Southwest, proposed to the other Synods named, to go to St. Louis, Nashville, or Louisville, as might be deemed best. Only the Synod of Missouri could see its way clear to coöperate with the Synod of Kentucky in founding the seminary, and Louisville was finally chosen as the location. In the autumn of 1893, the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary began its work in Louisville, under the auspices of the Synods of Kentucky and Missouri, with a faculty of six professors, and in a few years it had upward of sixty students in its classes. It continued its separate work for nine years; and in 1901, when the consolidation of the educational work of the two Synods of Kentucky was effected, Danville Seminary and Louisville Seminary came together, under the title of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky. Such, in brief, is the story

of the work of the two Synods for theological education up to 1901, though it should be added that out of the Synod, South, large gifts went, about twenty years ago, to endow a chair in Union Seminary, Virginia, to be called "The Stuart Robinson Chair"; and that other gifts went to Columbia Seminary many years ago, in the time of its need.

But the record of the part which Presbyterians have played in the welfare of education in Kentucky would not be complete were one or two other things not added. The Institute for the Deaf and Dumb, though now under the State, was really founded by Presbyterians. It was organized in 1822, and was constituted a part of Centre College. Although Centre College was not then formally under the control of the church, it was under Presbyterian auspices. The early trustees and teachers were nearly all Presbyterians. In due time, when Centre College came under the oversight of the church, this institute naturally passed into the hands of the State, and in that relation has continued its useful service. Many of the superintendents of public instruction in the early part of the century were Presbyterians. A few of them may be named: Joseph J. Bullock, 1837-'39; Robert J. Breckenridge, 1847-'53; J. D. Matthews, 1853-'59; Robert Richardson, 1859-'63. These men did much to shape the work of public instruction in the State.

A brief survey of the present condition of the educational work in which the Presbyterians of Kentucky are engaged may properly conclude this article. It is impossible to tell in figures all that has been done, nor can any measure be made of the sacrifices made in earlier and later days by these Presbyterians for the cause of education. Since Centre College sent out its first class, in 1824, it had graduates in each successive year, till, in 1901, its alumni numbered fifteen hundred. In addition, about two thousand six hundred had taken partial courses therein. Among its alumni are about three hundred and fifty lawyers, two hundred and twenty-five ministers of the gospel, and more than one hundred physicians, and many more who have adorned other callings in life. Its roll of alumni is distinguished for men in eminent positions. On that roll there are twenty-five college

presidents, forty-six college professors, twenty-five congressmen, six United States senators, two vice-presidents of the United States, one justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, nine State governors, thirty-nine circuit judges, six moderators of the General Assembly, and fifty editors.

The first graduating class in old Central University went forth in 1874, and its graduates in 1901 were nearly three hundred in number, and about five hundred more received their education in part in this institution. It has given about forty ministers of the gospel to the church, and its alumni are found adorning every walk of professional and business life. Its Hospital College of Medicine, in Louisville, has nearly nine hundred graduates, and four hundred and six have already graduated from its Dental College, also in Louisville.

In regard to Danville Seminary, it is not easy to get at the precise list of its graduates, but it cannot be far from three hundred, all told. Louisville Seminary, during its separate existence, had ninety-one graduates. Then, in both of these institutions many others took part of the course, but did not really graduate. It may not be far from the mark to say that these two institutions, taken together, may have given to the ministry of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church about five hundred men. This takes no account of those who have graduated from the colleges for young women, nor of those who have received a good education at the preparatory schools under Presbyterian auspices.

A few remarks may serve to explain the status of the educational work of the Presbyterians in Kentucky, as it was consolidated in 1901. For nearly a generation prior to 1901, there were two colleges in the Synods, and for nearly a decade there were two seminaries. There was Centre College at Danville, with its Law School and Preparatory School, under the Synod, North; and there was Central University, at Richmond, with its Law School, and several Preparatory Schools, and its Medical and Dental Colleges, under the care of the Synod, South. By the action taken by the boards of these institutions and by the Synods in 1901 all of these institutions were consolidated into one, under

the title of "The Central University of Kentucky," of which "The Centre College," of Kentucky, at Danville, is the literary and scientific branch. The property and endowments of the University is about eight hundred thousand dollars, of which six hundred and eighteen thousand dollars is devoted to the interests of Centre College at Danville. The courses of studies have been expanded, the faculty now consists of fourteen men, and there are about two hundred men in the college proper, and about thirty in the law classes.

The two seminaries, as they came together, had property and endowments amounting to nearly five hundred thousand dollars. New buildings are planned, and one wing of the group will be under construction this season. The number of students in attendance is about fifty. The faculty consists of six regular professors, and the library has sixteen thousand volumes.

The property invested in other academies which are not directly under the control of the Synods must be about one hundred thousand dollars, which may be quite under the mark. Then there is at least another one hundred thousand dollars pertaining to the colleges for young women conducted by Presbyterians, though not under the control of the church. This gives an aggregate of about one million and five hundred thousand dollars, which the thirty thousand Presbyterian Church members have now devoted to all the forms of education already described in this article. It may be added that a movement has been on foot for several years to found a college for women, under the joint control and support of the two Synods, and it gives promise of taking definite form at no distant day.

Such is the position to which God, in his providence, has brought the Presbyterians of Kentucky in matters of education. Compared with their neighbors, the record is creditable, yet, in view of the needs, it can hardly be said to be up to the mark. Mistakes may have been made in the past, and there may have been some things to regret; yet there is much to be thankful for, and not a little to give cheer for the future. Taking everything into account, what the Presbyterians of Kentucky have done for academic, collegiate and theological education is worthy of praise.

They have prayed and planned, they have served and made sacrifices for their institutions of learning. They have been ready to take the steps, one at a time, which God, in his providence, was making plain for them. Not for many years have the skies been brighter and the future more hopeful than at this time. Broad foundations, at least, have been well laid, upon which the men of coming generations may safely and securely build.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

Louisville, Ky.

GENERAL NOTES.

CHURCH UNION.

IN the last number of the QUARTERLY, the article of the Rev. Dr. David James Burrell, on the organic union of his church—the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America—with the Southern Presbyterian Church sets forth, with his well-known ability, clearness, and warmth of heart, weighty reasons to show that such a union is “a consummation devoutly to be wished.” If it can be accomplished with loyalty to truth and to the grand traditions of both churches, and with hearty, practical unanimity on both sides, then surely our people would rejoice in it with very great joy.

A statement of what has been done in this direction may help us in considering the subject. A little while before the last meeting of our General Assembly, in the spring of 1902, many of our ministers received intimation that many ministers of the Reformed Church were in favor of such a union; and that any movement on our part to open negotiations to that end would be heartily responded to by their General Synod.

As the stated meeting of the Presbytery of Nashville had passed, the ministers of Nashville prepared and sent to the Assembly an overture, praying for the appointment of a committee to take the needful steps for a conference with our sister church on the subject of union.

The General Assembly declined to appoint the committee, saying, in reply to the overture, “A question of such grave importance should come before the Assembly in a more official manner; therefore, we deem it inadvisable to take action until the desires of the two churches are more definitely known.”

At its fall meeting of 1902, the Presbytery of Nashville asked the Synod of Tennessee to send the following overture to the next Assembly:

“Whereas, A closer union of those churches which hold essentially the same doctrines and forms of order is desirable, if it can be brought about without sacrifice of principles, and if such union shall be for the promotion of the interests of Christ’s kingdom; and

“Whereas, The Reformed Church in America (formerly known as the Dutch Reformed Church) holds symbols of faith and forms of government which are in essential harmony with our own standards of doctrine and discipline; and

“Whereas, The Reformed Church in America is confined territorially to the Northern and Northwestern sections of our country, and our church is exclusively confined to the Southern and Southwestern sections, and a union of the two churches would form an organization coextensive with the territory of the United States; and

“Whereas, Such union would, as we believe, increase the efficiency of both churches, as well as promote economy in administration of our general work of evangelization at home and abroad; and

“Whereas, We have reason to believe that a strong sentiment in favor of such union exists among the ministers and members of the Reformed Church; and

“Whereas, The Reformed Church in America was the first to enter into fraternal relations with us after our organization as a separate church, and these relations have ever since been maintained with great cordiality;

“Therefore, The Synod of Tennessee, in session at Nashville, Tennessee, October 28, 1902, respectfully request the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United State to appoint a committee of ministers and ruling elders, who shall represent our church in a conference with a similar committee, if it shall be appointed by the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, to confer on the whole question of the feasibility and terms of union between the two churches, and report to the next succeeding General Assembly.”

This overture the Synod ordered to be sent to the Assembly.

Thus the status of the question now is that it will come officially for consideration before our highest court at its next meeting.

It will be seen that the overture anticipates, and so is strengthened, by the arguments of Dr. Burrell's excellent article.

If such a union, as we all desire, is ever consummated, it will require time and careful consideration. Both churches are slow-moving bodies—sometimes we think “majestically slow,” like an army with banners—when any new movement is suggested. But their conservatism is their strength and their glory. They are deliberate in taking position or in advancing; but they hold the ground they win—there is no retreat. We may be sure that when negotia-

tions are begun, every step will be thoroughly discussed. No popular clamor nor sentimental gush will be allowed to obscure the real interests of Christ's cause, nor to sweep the churches into a union regardless of those interests. Hard-headed Dutchman and cannie Scot are not apt to be unduly carried away by soft-hearted appeals. Both of the churches have a sufficiency of backbone. But let it not be thought that they are lacking in tenderness or sentiment.

"The bravest are the tenderest,
The loving are the daring."

When once the way is clear for union, when earnest, patient thought and effort have brought the churches together, there will be no lack of enthusiasm and of demonstrative affection.

It is told of a very noted minister of the Church of Scotland, who lived more than a century and a half ago, that he loved a lassie and would fain make her his wife. The godly man and learned felt that marriage should be in the Lord. The *douce* Scot and *cannie* thought so important a step should be taken only after deliberate consideration, in view of possible future dangers. So while he led the maiden to expect a proposal in due time, he delayed for several years. At length, after satisfying himself that she would be a proper help-meet for him, he solemnly offered himself, and was as solemnly accepted. Then he gave way to his feelings, "Janette, wumman, I hae been veesitin' ye and lovin' ye for twal' year, and I've never had a kiss; dinna ye think noo ye should gie me a kiss?" When she modestly consented, the good man said, "Let's ask a blessin'. Lord, for the creature comforts we are about to receive, mak' us duly thankfu'." The kiss was given and taken with generous ardor, and the minister was so carried that he cried out, "Ah! wumman, but that was gude; let's hae anither, an' return thanks." Demonstrations of love belong to the times of espousal. We may give way to sentiment after the terms of the marriage are fixed. If our church in May shall take any action looking to union, she must be convinced that there is, on the part of the Reformed Church, a real and general desire for closer relations with us. We would not be willing to take the initiative unless we had assurance that our advances would be met in a spirit of generous confidence, and cheerful readiness to consider the question of organic union.

We recognize the evils of the multitudinous divisions of the church of Christ, especially of the many sub-divisions in families

holding the same general system of belief and forms of order; and we note with gratitude the tendency to unite these various bodies into compact organization. Yet we believe that, in the providence of God, many of these separate organizations have been called to witness for and emphasize some special great truth which was denied or forgotten, and so their separate existence has been justified; at least, until their testimony is heeded and the truth is vindicated. So, if any union among the various divisions of the church is consummated, it should not be by ignoring or surrendering their distinctive principles.

Now, if we rightly apprehend the history and principles of the Reformed Church in America, we could find a basis of union on which we could join forces in the glorious work of building up and advancing Christ's kingdom, and neither church would be called to sacrifice its traditions nor surrender its testimony. The united church would thus be "heir of all the ages" of a glorious past, and would stand, too, "in the foremost files of time." She would give added strength of emphasis to truths for which each church has witnessed, and which are especially needed in this generation.

Our church stands to-day not only for the great doctrines common to us all, but she lays special stress on certain truths which have been ignored in the past, and are in danger, as she thinks, of being rejected in this age of material progress.

1. She holds to the absolute and inviolable integrity and authority of the Holy Scriptures, as the infallible revelation of God's will for our salvation. She notes the tendency to put human speculations or the maxims of earthly business in place of the divine rule of faith and practice. She watches with sadness the efforts of a negative and destructive criticism to undermine the authority of the Bible by destroying its authenticity and integrity. So our church has maintained a robust Calvinism, founded on a close interpretation of the Word of God.

2. She holds strenuously to the spiritual and non-political mission of the church. As it was on this issue that we organized separately, so we still feel that our testimony is yet needed. We see the effort to make the church a direct agent in all kinds of social, political and economic reforms, under the catching title "civic righteousness." While we believe that the church is the mightiest agency and the gospel the greatest instrument for elevating and civilizing a people, yet her influence is indirect, by converting souls from sin to God.

We cannot forbear a quotation from an eminent theologian of the Northern Presbyterian Church. Dr. Shedd says, "That unearthly sermonizing of Baxter and Howe, so abstracted from all the secular and temporal interests of man, so rigorously confined to human guilt and human redemption; that preaching which, on the face of it, does not seem even to recognize that man has any relations to this little ball of earth; which takes him off the planet entirely, and contemplates him simply as a sinner in the presence of God; that preaching so destitute of all literary, scientific, economical and political elements and allusions, was nevertheless, by indirection, one of the most fertile causes of the progress of England and America. Subtract it as one of the forces of English history, and the career of the Anglo-Saxon race would be like that of Italy and Spain."

3. She interprets strictly the Bible injunction as to the place of woman in the family and in the church. She absolutely refuses to commission women as authorized teachers in her pulpits, or as entitled to rule in her assemblies; and she believes that God has given to woman, as wife and mother, the noblest place a human being can occupy. As we see the restlessness and agitation which tends to revolt against God's order, claiming to "emancipate" woman, as we see the breaking up of families, the result of this revolt, we are more confident that we need to stand by our testimony.

Now in all these things we feel that it would be a great help and encouragement to us to have by our side or joined with us so grandly conservative a body as our sister church.

The tendency of this age is to radicalism in everything. The great need is a body of conservatism thoroughly organized and compacted together, and of sufficient weight to be a check or balance to these radical tendencies—not to stay progress, but to control it in the right direction and to the best end. All real progress is the result of both forces working for good. The union of these two churches might furnish such a body; or, at least, it might form a nucleus, as Dr. Burrell suggests, around which might gather the tremendous forces of the whole Presbyterian and Reformed faith, utilizing alike the conservative and progressive tendencies, to stand as a bulwark against the inflowing tides of skepticism, and to lift high a banner because of truth, when the enemy cometh in like a flood. We trust the reader will pardon an illustration from personal experience. During the civil war the writer belonged to a brigade that fought hard and endured much. In the same division was a

brigade from Arkansas, which always stood shoulder to shoulder with us when called on. Whenever a difficult position was to be held or a fierce charge made, we wished to know who would support us. The question was, "Where is Arkansas to-day?" and as the answer rang out, "Here," our confidence was firm. We feel that the Dutchmen would be "Arkansas" to our church in time of need.

JAMES H. MCNEILLY.

Nashville, Tenn.

EXPUNGING THE LATIN THESIS.

THE General Assembly, sitting at Jackson last May, did recommend and send down to the Presbyteries, for their advice and consent, the following amendment to the Form of Government, Par. 132, touching the requirements for the licensure of probationers for the gospel ministry, to-wit: "From the sentence marked '1,' and reading, 'A discussion in Latin of a "thesis" on some common head of divinity,' strike out the two words, 'in Latin,' so that the sentence will read, 'A discussion of a "thesis" on some common head of divinity.'" This action was in response to overtures from seven Presbyteries asking that such a step be taken.

The requirement for this thesis has been in our constitution *ab initio*. The Assembly of 1870 declined a similar request. When a new Form of Government was adopted in 1879, after eighteen years of careful study and frequent revisions in its preparation, the church left this requirement untouched. Nor was there any suggestion, during this period of recasting, that a change be made on this point. In the Assembly of 1891 a herculean effort was made to lower the standard for licensure, and readjust the requirements for it to those to be exacted for ordination. This proposed the omission of the thesis altogether for licensure, shifting it over to the tests for ordination, and abrogating the requirement that it be in Latin. The effort failed in that Assembly, and the attempt to revive the scheme, after a year's campaign of education, still more signally failed in the Assembly of 1892. The comprehensive and radical changes in the tests for licensure and ordination sent down by the Assembly of 1894 included an entire omission of a thesis for either examination. This, too, was lost, in the Waterloo that overwhelmed the whole overture, when it came to be considered in the Presbyteries. Having failed to command assent singly on its merits, and been vetoed twice over, in a campaign running through four years, when linked with

other revolutionary proposals, the project, after a sleep of eight years, has again bobbed up, this time as a single proposition, uncomplicated with other features of change, and is now before the church as a candidate for its suffrages. But no one need apprehend that it will be adopted. Already a sufficient number of Presbyteries have been heard from to indicate that it will be buried beneath an avalanche of adverse votes. Even one of the Presbyteries which brought it into court and petitioned for its adoption—one of the largest Presbyteries in the church—has, on second thought, repudiated it by a vote lacking but one of unanimity.

There is no such demand for this amendment as entitles it to regard. It is a needless piece of tinkering, and was born of that restlessness that is ever craving a change, and that sees a revitalizing power in the remodelling of machinery. It is claimed for it that there is no purpose subserved by this thesis being in the Latin tongue, that it is usually prepared in a slovenly and perfunctory manner by our candidates, being made up largely of quotations from the Latin Bible and the works of standard Latin theologians. But, if the manner in which this requirement is met by our young applicants be farcical, the fault is with their Presbyteries, and can be remedied. But the writer has not found this to be the case. He has been an instructor of theological students for the past ten years, and is annually consulted by nearly all his classes as to the character of theses they should write. He has found no disposition to shirk this as task work, or to make light of it relatively to the other tests for licensure. Nor has he in Presbytery found that this part of our candidates' work has been negligently done. Our candidates are pious and honorable men, and strive to do faithfully what is expected of them in view of the holy office to which they aspire. Men who like to do so may joke about liberal excerpts from Turretin, Calvin, the Vulgate, and the Reformed Confessions, but no student can drink at these fountains without benefit.

But we are told that the Latin thesis was meant to be simply an exhibition of the candidate's skill in treating a topic in divinity, a test of his aptitude in doctrine, not in Latin, and that this can as well be shown by the discussion of a theme in the English language. If that be true, the wonder is how it ever came to be set down in the book that it must be in Latin. We are told that "in order to make trial of his talents to explain and vindicate and practically to enforce the doctrines of the gospel, the Presbytery shall require of

the candidate, 1. A Latin exegesis on some common head in divinity." But these prefatory words, found in the old book, are general, and apply equally to the critical exercise, the popular lecture, and the sermon, and are not limited to the thesis. Furthermore, they were not incorporated in our present book, and the requirement for the thesis stands without any statement of why it is exacted, or why it must be in Latin. But we are told, further, that Par. 132 has already provided for examination in Latin, and that a test in Latin composition following that is superfluous; and we are reminded that university training takes a wider range to-day than formerly, that the development of the physical sciences and their larger cultivation, along with the more systematic and rational treatment now given to English literature, have resulted in a diminished prominence of the dead languages in the practical education of this age. If this be so, let us by all means stand up for Latin, and by no act so significant give the faintest color to the impression, sure to result from the adoption of this overture, that we think the minister of the Word has to-day less need of classical culture than formerly. The pulpit needs as much as ever that mastery of words, that facility of expression, that precision of utterance, and that vigor of thought which is imparted by no method of training so admirably as thorough discipline in the classics. Strike at the ancient languages, and you strike at that special type of culture needful in the minister as teacher, writer and speaker. In a day when composition of original Latin by the pupil has come to be so largely emphasized in our best schools as a mode of instruction, the demand for a specimen of such composition cannot be regarded as exacting. Especially when there went up to the last Assembly from the faculty of Union Theological Seminary a report that there was an alarming decline in the attainments of its students in Greek, a study cognate to Latin, can we ill afford to take a step that looks like receding from our insistence upon the most liberal training in the ancient languages. That was the complaint of an able and watchful faculty, while this overture is a special plea for the boys, and was apparently born of a suggestion published and championed in an article in the magazine conducted by the students of that institution. Whether it is wiser to heed the older men or the younger, the case of Rehoboam may be to the point.

Nothing would be gained by adopting this overture. The Presbyteries do not find the inspection of these theses a burden. Their preparation may be a bore to the student who found Latin a bore in

college. In saying this we have said about all that is to be said. It is legislating in behalf of the weak. But the effect of enacting this change will be prejudicial, and our motive or want of motive will be everywhere misconstrued. Relax this test, and we will see a slackening of the sense of requirement, and that in the branch which is with us the basis of linguistic culture.

The gravest objection to this change is that it will be a change. We are too much given to change. The feeling gets abroad that change means betterment. But when iconoclasm is rampant, and old landmarks are being torn down, it is a virtue to resist. The restless spirit that clamors for revision does not discriminate between what is minor and what is vital. The cry goes up for the recasting of our symbols, and agitators demand restatement of fundamental truths and surrender of the ancient faiths. Conservatism was never more a virtue than to-day. Its price is above rubies. For this reason we should put a quietus on the spirit of tinkering, even in lesser matters. It is not here a question, Shall we require such and such tests of scholarship? but, when these tests are already required, shall we discard them, and thereby not only encourage incompetence in candidates, but also encourage that restlessness that will only be satisfied with further changes. The next step would doubtless be to abolish the thesis altogether, as has already been attempted. And an argument could be constructed for that just as plausible. It could be said that the examination in didactic theology, if thorough, will answer the purpose of testing the applicant's grasp on all the common heads of divinity. Then an attack on the requirement of any Latin whatever would be in order. The effort of eight years ago bore in that direction, so far as licensure goes; and, by inevitable trend, would have made it virtually impossible to hold to it as a requirement for ordination. We ought not to enact by piece-meal what has hitherto collectively been refused.

It has happened more than once that the Assembly has let overtures proposing amendments to the Book of Order pass, in order that they may be ventilated in the Presbyteries, in the persuasion that if the proposed change did not appear to have merit, it would be slaughtered in the lower courts, and seemingly forgetful that its act in sending down is a positive endorsement, one of the essential steps in the guarded mode of amending our organic law. This, we fear, was the case with this overture. At a late hour, after night services, with a thin attendance, it went through, after a few minutes'

debate, under the eloquent appeal of a gifted young brother, and with a rush that fairly took the breath from the soberer part of the body.

Changes in our standards should not be lightly made, and then only in the way of more perfectly developing the genius of our system, or rectifying such administrative features as are found to impede the courts in their practical work. More amendments have been defeated in the Presbyteries than have ever been enacted into law, and none have been enacted by the Presbyteries but have justified themselves as beneficial. Nor have any been adopted save by majorities that approached unanimity. The necessity for these alterations grew largely out of the fact that in 1879 we radically changed our standards of government and discipline by adopting our present Book of Church Order, which more perfectly stated the cardinal principles of Presbyterianism than had ever been possible in the undivided church before 1861, by reason of the influence of the old alliance with Congregationalism in our more Northern States. This vital contact had so diluted the conception of Presbyterianism over a large part of the church that we were hindered from realizing in practice or formulating in our standards that purer type of Presbyterianism that was embraced in the convictions of our Southern brethren.

But so cautiously did the church then proceed with its work that not till it had spent eighteen years on its preparation, and subjected it to many revisions, did it achieve a book it was prepared to adopt. Nearly every amendment adopted since then has been to perfect such minor defects as experience showed to exist in the book, and which no skill in the wise framers of it could have anticipated, in advance of practical trial. The abrogation of the Latin thesis does not come under this head.

W. A. ALEXANDER.

Clarksville, Tenn.

BLESSING THE PEOPLE.

THIS is mentioned in our Form of Government as one of the "ordinances established by Christ, the Head, in his church" (see Book of Church Order, Chap. II., Sec. 4, Par. 5). It is further described as one of the official functions peculiar to the pastor (see Chap. IV., Sec. 2, Par. 4). Of course, it is not meant to restrict this function to the pastor, as distinguished from the evangelist, or from any other minister of the Word. What is meant is that it pertains to the office

of the teaching, as distinguished from the ruling elder. Thus defined, it differs from the ordinances of prayer and praise, and is classed along with the administration of the sacraments and the preaching of the Word. A ruling elder—or, for that matter, a private member—may lead in prayer, or praise, but only a preacher may administer the sacraments, or bless the people.

Just what is meant by blessing the people is a question which has been much discussed, and touching this question the mind of the church is not yet fully made up. It has been quite a while since public attention has been called to it, and doubtless there are many in the church whose attention has never been called to it. The great mass of the people have an impression that there is something peculiarly sacred in the benediction, and yet not so sacred as to deter many from using the time allotted to it in getting hats and overcoats and cloaks in place for a speedy exit from the church. But, however sacred they may regard it, they have no intelligent conception, indeed have never tried to form any conception, of its meaning. They know it is a very decent ceremony with which to close the service, and that is as far as their thoughts have followed the subject.

It has occurred to the writer that there might be a peculiar propriety in asking attention to this long-dormant question just at this time. It will be seen from the *Catechism on the Church*, which has been in the hands of our ministers for the past two years, and which will be presented to the next Assembly for approval, that it is proposed to teach the rising generation that "blessing the people" is one of the ordinances appointed by Christ in his church. It would seem, we may note in passing, that the catechism is a little defective in that it does not mention this ordinance as belonging peculiarly and exclusively to the functions of the preacher. In response to the question, "What authority, in addition to ruling, have the teaching elders?" the answer is, "In addition to ruling, the teaching elders, or ministers of the Word, have authority to preach the gospel, to conduct public worship, and to administer the sacraments." From aught that appears in the catechism, others than the preacher might bless the people. But the Form of Government has guarded this point. Without violating the express provision of our constitution, no one but the minister of the Word can administer this ordinance. Perhaps it might be made to appear that it is more unequivocally and decidedly reserved to the preacher than any other ordinance. Ruling elders may preach unofficially, and in doing so they may approximate

so nearly the official preaching of the teaching elder that it requires an expert to show the difference. Ruling elders may also bear some humble part in administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But they may neither bless the people unofficially, nor may they take any part, however humble, in the administration of this ordinance.

Have all the ministers of the Word settled it in their own mind what precisely it is they do when they bless the people? When we come to teach the children the new catechism, how are we going to explain this ordinance? As already intimated, the mind of the church has not been at one touching the matter. Not only have different views been cherished at all times by cotemporary ministers, but the whole church has shifted its ground in some respects from time to time. We have inherited from the Westminster Assembly the doctrine that blessing the people is an ordinance of worship established by Christ in his church; but we no longer go to the same source with them to derive the doctrine, nor do we support it by the same proof texts. In the Form of Government framed by the divines of Westminster it is stated that it belongs to the office of the pastor "to bless the people from God, Num. vi. 23, 24, 25, 26, compared with Rev. i. 5 (where the same blessings and persons from whom they come are expressly mentioned); Isa. lxvi. 21, where, under the names of priests and Levites to be continued under the gospel, are meant evangelical pastors, who, therefore, by office, are to bless the people." It may aid us to see clearly the source from which the Westminster divines drew their doctrine, if we have before us these Scripture references. The reference to Numbers is as follows: "Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face to shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace"; compared with Revelation, "John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you and peace from him which is and which was and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before the throne: and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth"; Isaiah, "And I will also take of them for priests, and for Levites, saith the Lord." The line of argument is as follows: The evangelical pastors of the Christian dispensation have succeeded to the names of the priests and Levites of the Old Testament dispensation. They have, therefore, succeeded to their

office, and may, therefore, discharge their official functions, one of which was blessing the people. Is it not a little remarkable that these Puritan divines, who had fought so strenuously against the sacerdotal ideas of Laud and his school, should have deliberately committed themselves to such a view of the Christian ministry as this? It is easy to say, of course, that Archbishop Laud claimed for the clergy of the English Church certain functions of the Levitical priesthood which found their fulfilment in Christ, whereas the office of blessing the people had no typical reference to Christ, and, therefore, did not become obsolete with his ministry. But, after all, did they differ very essentially from Laud? The Archbishop did not believe in transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. He did not believe the papal dogma, that a priest, who had been ordained by the laying on of a bishop's hands could transmute bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ and then offer these as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. He was thought to ascribe a kind of magical virtue to the sacraments when administered by those who had been episcopally ordained. This seems to have been the extent of his sacerdotalism. Was he very far apart from those who thought that a peculiar virtue was imparted to the benediction by those who had succeeded to the office of the priest and Levite? In either case, official position made one a channel of grace; in the one case this grace took effect through the sacraments, in the other case through the benediction; but equally the logical result was to exalt officialism.

No time need to be consumed in showing the weakness of the interpretation that makes evangelical pastors the successors of priests and Levites. The Protestantism of the present day, especially as represented in the Presbyterian Churches of the United States, utterly repudiates such an interpretation. It did not take American Presbyterianism long to revise all Old Testament references out of that part of our Form of Government. If "blessing the people" was a function of the Levitical priesthood, and if one must succeed to their office in order to bless the people, then we will have none of it.

But the church, while repudiating the grounds on which the divines of the Westminster Assembly based the doctrine, has not felt called on to repudiate the doctrine itself. It still teaches that blessing the people is an ordinance established by Christ in his church, and that to the minister of the Word belongs exclusively the right to administer this ordinance. On what ground does it now

rest the doctrine? The proof texts offered in support of the doctrine are two, both from Paul's epistles, and both to the same effect. These texts are 2 Cor. xiii. 14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen"; and Eph. i. 2, "Grace be to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." The text from Ephesians is a salutation, placed at the beginning of the epistle, and is seldom, if ever, used as a benediction by Christian ministers. It makes no recognition of the Holy Ghost, and therefore affords no argument for the doctrine of the Trinity, and the special relation of the sinner to each of the three Persons. The text from 2 Corinthians is that which is generally known as the "Apostolic Benediction." It is no doubt to this text that reference is made in our Directory of Worship, where we are instructed to dismiss the assembly "with the apostolic benediction." In order to consistency, the Directory should have given specific instruction with reference to blessing the people. It has devoted a chapter to each of the other ordinances of public worship, giving elaborate suggestions to secure the proper singing of praise, reading of the Scripture, offering of prayer, and preaching of the Word, but not a syllable by way of helping the preacher to discharge the function of blessing the people. Is it taken for granted that the preacher can and will discharge this function properly without instruction? Probably so, and yet, as a matter of fact, does he discharge it properly? Does he bless the people when he uses some other form of words than the apostolic benediction? Does he bless the people when he converts the apostolic benediction into a formal prayer by prefixing the auxiliary verb, "may"? Quite a variety of practice prevails, and this would seem to indicate the need of direction. Either many of our preachers do not realize that "it belongs to their office to bless the people from God," or they think this office can be performed without the use of any prescribed formula of words. But do not the proof texts, to which reference has been made, indicate that the framers of our book supposed the use of the apostolic benediction was essential in blessing the people? Was not this also in the mind of those who drew up our Directory of Worship and instructed us to dismiss the assembly "with the apostolic benediction"? What relevancy would these proof texts have if any other phraseology would answer as well? Obviously, the doctrine that blessing the people is an ordinance of worship, and that the administration of it pertains exclusively to the

minister of the Word, is based on the view that the apostolic benediction is other than and more than a prayer. This view regards it as significant that the language is not in the form of a prayer, but in the form of positive declaration. The advocates of this view tell us that the apostolic benediction is exactly the reverse of a prayer; that whereas a prayer is the voice of the people addressed to God, this is the voice of God addressed to the people. Paul is not one with the Corinthian Christians, offering up supplication in their behalf; rather is he one with God, and bestowing spiritual blessings on them. As one has expressed it, "He is the ambassador for Christ, and in pronouncing the benediction, he represents Christ. We also are ambassadors for Christ, and when we pronounce the benediction, we represent Christ."

Did we not say well that the church has shifted its ground? No longer do "evangelical pastors" bless the people as successors of priests and Levites, but as successors of the apostles.

But we may pause and ask if we have not approached a little more nearly to Archbishop Laud than were the Westminster divines? He believed that, in virtue of succession from the apostles, those who had been episcopally ordained could impart special virtue to the sacraments. We believe that, in virtue of succession from the apostles, those who have been ordained to preach the Word can impart peculiar virtue to the benediction. We may differ from Laud as to how the succession is transmitted, but that is a small difference, seeing that we agree substantially as to the benefits that flow from it. But it may be said that we are not dependent on the apostles for this high prerogative, that the Presbyterian preacher stands, not after Paul, but side by side with Paul, and is constituted an ambassador of Christ by his call to the ministry. He receives from Christ directly the high honor of ambassadorship, and this carries with it the duty and privilege of blessing the people in his name. But wherein does this differ in kind from the prerogative claimed by the pope? As the vicar of Christ, he both blesses and curses the people; he opens and shuts the kingdom of heaven. Of course, our evangelical pastors cannot do so much, but they can do a little of the same kind. The magicians of Egypt could not turn a whole river into blood, but they could "do likewise with their enchantments." Is it not a dangerous thing to assert prerogatives based upon the simple fact that we are ambassadors for Christ? An Episcopal bishop lays his hands on the heads of a class of catechumen, kneeling before him

to be confirmed, and breathing on them, says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." What authority has he? or what warrant to suppose that the Holy Ghost will go with his words? He is the vicar of Christ, and he is therefore authorized to do in Christ's name what Christ did in person. He lays his hands on the head of one who is entering the priesthood, and says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." On what does he base his right to confer the Holy Ghost, together with the power to forgive and retain sins? He is the vicar of Christ as were all the apostles, and like them he may discharge, in Christ's name, these functions, which Christ discharged in person. Suppose an ambassador for the United States in the court of St. James should argue that, inasmuch as he represented the United States, he could give away, at his pleasure, anything that the United States possessed, and on this ground should proceed to make England a present of Alaska? He would probably not remain ambassador long. Nobody acts under stricter limitations than ambassadors, and no one is under more stringent obligations to keep within the limits of instructions.

After all, our safest ground is to keep to the apostolic benediction. Then we have to assume two things: first, that it is not merely a prayer, and second, that we have fallen heir to the apostles' prerogative. We can find no safer ground than Laud had for his magical sacraments.

Can we be sure that the benediction is anything other than and more than a prayer? Calvin's comment on 2 Cor. xiii. 14 is as follows: "He closes his epistle with a prayer, which contains three clauses, in which the sum of our salvation consists." Let Calvin stand for the ancients. Dr. Charles Hodge's comment on the text from Ephesians is as follows: "Verse 2 contains the usual apostolic benediction. Paul prays that grace and peace may be granted to his readers." Let Hodge stand for the moderns. Neither one of these eminent worthies considers any other view as even deserving of mention save the view that Paul was speaking for the people to God, and not for God to the people. We have found no commentator advocating any other view.

If there was any special virtue attaching to the apostolic benediction, the other apostles seem not to have been aware of it. James

uses for salutation only the one word, "greeting," and closes his epistle without even saying, "Good-bye." John has no faintest trace of benediction in either his first or his third epistle. Now, if by reciting a certain form of words they could become channels of grace to the people, it was evidently a serious omission for them not to use those words. Likewise, we may say, if evangelical pastors can bestow a peculiar blessing in the use of the apostolic benediction, such a blessing as they cannot secure for the people by intercessory prayer, they should never neglect an occasion to use the benediction for this purpose. On the other hand, if we are claiming a prerogative of the same kind with that claimed by the high-church bishop, or by the pope of Rome, had we not better quit it? Will it not be a wise thing for the approaching General Assembly to look closely into this matter when the *Catechism on the Church* is brought before them, and see just what they wish the children to be taught with respect to this ordinance of worship?

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C.

IX. PRACTICAL AND HOMILETIC NOTES.

OUR METHOD OF SELECTING MISSIONARIES.

So far as the foreign department of our Foreign Mission work is concerned, the church at large probably has an exaggerated idea of the amount of "administration" done by the Executive Committee at Nashville. Previous to the adoption of our Revised Manual in 1895 it was the custom of the Committee, in considering the estimates for appropriations sent in by the missions, to subject them to a careful and detailed scrutiny, and sometimes to spend considerable time in discussing whether, for instance, this missionary should be authorized to have a well dug, or that one to have his house roof repaired, or another to spend several thousand dollars in opening and equipping a new station. But the futility of this effort to "administer" the minor details of the work became more and more apparent, and in the new Manual the mission is given entire control of all funds other than salaries and those specially designated by the donors. The Manual says, "It is the duty of the mission, in case the estimates are reduced, to apportion the reduction in the various items according to the best interests of the mission work, the mission being made responsible for the judicious expenditure of all appropriations of the second class, as it is in better position to know how to use them wisely."

This control of the funds necessarily carries with it the control of the work. Any dissatisfied member of a mission can appeal from its action, in a given case, to the Executive Committee, but such appellants have usually been told that "the Committee feels that only for the most imperative reasons should the action of the mission be reversed."

The wise conduct of our work in foreign lands, therefore, depends almost entirely on the character of our missionaries. It follows from this that by far the most important work the Executive Committee has to do is the selection and appointment of missionaries. The important thing for the owner of a ship is, not to know the

science of navigation, but to select those who do know it to navigate his ship. Then the less he tries to direct them in matters of detail the better.

The aim and avowed policy of all responsible foreign missionary agencies is to limit their appointments to men of wisdom and strength, for such only can deal successfully with the problems with which our missionaries are constantly confronted. Working in grooves that others have cut and building on foundations that others have laid, many men can have a useful ministry in the home church, whose ministry would be only failure and disappointment in the foreign field, where they would have to cut their own grooves and lay their own foundations. The qualifications deemed necessary for success in the work are enumerated in the Manual, under fourteen specifications. It is a question whether any living human being possesses so many good qualities with a bearing in any one direction. At any rate, the essential qualities of one suitable for appointment as a foreign missionary are these: A good physique, good mental gifts and training, good judgment, freedom from eccentricity, and a sound, healthful piety. The method pursued by the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions in ascertaining who among those who volunteer for the work possess these qualifications should be a matter of deep interest to the church, whose representatives the missionaries are, and for whose support, by their appointment, the church becomes responsible.

The ideal arrangement, supposing the supply of those willing to undertake the work to be adequate, would be for the Executive Committee to take the initiative, looking out suitable persons, and ascertaining their fitness beforehand, and then calling them to it. In the Assembly's Manual this is emphasized as the duty of Presbyteries and church sessions, but these courts have never taken the Assembly's injunction seriously, and have almost entirely contented themselves with giving their "endorsement" to such applicants as have come before them after negotiations with the committee were concluded. The writer hopes to see the time when the Executive Committee will be fully empowered to call men to the Foreign Mission work just as individual churches now call them to the pastorate, and when there will be enough men open to such calls to make the plan practicable. The present plan is to rely on volunteers, and, except in rare instances, the committee deals only with those who come before it as "applicants" in response to a general call.

The first step in the process of appointment is to ask the applicant either to appear personally before the committee, or to send a personal letter, accompanied by a photograph, giving information as to his or her personal history, circumstances, training, religious experience, motives, experience and success in religious work at home.

It is then required that this personal statement should be confirmed by testimonials from ministers, teachers and others who have had opportunity to know the qualifications of the applicant. These testimonials must be sent to the Executive Committee, not *via* the applicant, but directly, and are held as private and confidential. Those who send testimonials are furnished with a blank on which the qualifications required in the applicant are enumerated, and expression of opinion is asked on each separate item. Alas for the abundance of Christian charity in the matter of testimonials. But the committee's effort is to secure full and fair and impartial ones, and, as a rule, we believe those sent to us are so.

The question of health, in one sense the least important, is, in another sense, the most important of all, for the most magnificent mental and spiritual gifts are rendered nugatory for service in a foreign country by one's physical inability to live and work there. The immense waste of mission funds in the journeying to and fro of those who did not have the strength to endure the unhealthy climates and conditions of most mission fields has led all mission agencies to be more and more exacting on this point. It is now required of our candidates to furnish a health certificate based on that of the New York Mutual Life Insurance Company. Having found that the family physician, unconsciously influenced by personal friendship to further the applicant's wishes, would sometimes lean to mercy's side in his diagnosis, the committee now requires this health certificate to be signed by two physicians, one of whom is not the family physician. As a further safeguard against unsuitable appointments it is required that some member of the Executive Committee shall be personally acquainted with the applicant. This acquaintance being usually formed under circumstances of some constraint, where the committeeman is conscious that the candidate is conscious of being investigated, is not of very great value, but is worth something as a safeguard.

Finally, the Manual requires that "before any appointment is made the committee must receive official information that the proposed missionary, if ordained or to be ordained, has, upon full know-

ledge as to his fitness and call to the work, been recommended for appointment as a foreign missionary by his Presbytery. And in the case of one unordained, that he or she has, upon like knowledge and information, been recommended by his or her church session or Presbytery, and has subscribed to standards of our church."

One would naturally think that with all these requirements and precautions we ought to have a very remarkable body of men and women for our foreign missionaries. The writer thinks that we have. Some mistakes have been made in our appointments which have been acknowledged to be such by all the parties concerned, and some which will have to be acknowledged later on, and some which may remain undiscovered to the end. *Humanum est errare*, and sometimes there is the lack of sufficient earnestness and faith in our prayers for divine guidance. But the writer has been present at meetings of our missions in China, Japan, Korea and Brazil, and does not hesitate to state that, in his judgment, there is no Presbytery in our home church in which the general average of ability is equal to what it is in any one of these missions. And the proportion of our missionaries who, had they remained at home, would be bright, particular stars in the home church, is very nearly, if not quite, as large as is now to be found in our home ministry. It is the view of the Executive Committee that it should be the policy of the church always to maintain, and, as far as possible, improve this quality of our missionary force, and on no account ever to allow it to be sacrificed to mere numbers.

S. H. CHESTER.

Nashville, Tenn.

MINISTERIAL HUMOROUSNESS.

A RESOLUTION BROKEN.

"BROTHER FITZGERALD, you should do nothing else but go around telling anecdotes."

So said Dr. Lewis Bascom to me at his dinner-table one day in 1857. I was one of a very lively dinner party given by the mistress of the Bascom ranch, near San Jose, in the beautiful Santa Clara Valley, California. Blessed little woman! She saw both the tragic and the amusing side of human nature, and had a heart as tender as motherhood, and a wit, not biting, but as bright as sunshine. Dr. Bascom was the half-brother of the great pulpit orator Bishop Henry B. Bascom. He was a steward in the church of which I was then the pastor, and he had named a boy for me.

His remark was kindly meant, but it was a centre-shot, hitting me in a vulnerable spot. He had "laughed until he cried," as the saying goes, over some anecdote related by his young pastor, and all he meant was that he was mightily amused over it.

"Is that so?" I said to myself. "Only fit to tell anecdotes? Here is a revelation and a warning. I will never tell another anecdote as long as I live." And I did quit, for the rest of that day.

Of course, the friendly reader knows that I backslid—so to speak. But the remark of my friend did me good. It ought to have done me more good than it did. I have told too many anecdotes, yielding to a tendency in that direction that manifested itself at a very early period of my life.

What do I think of this matter now as I look back over the forty-five years that have flown by from 1857 to 1902? Well, it seems pretty clear that my resolution was on a right line, but rather ultra. It seems that it should have been not prohibitory, but regulative. It would have been about as wise to have made a resolution against shedding tears. It is no more wrong to laugh than to cry. The risible muscles are as truly God's work as the lachrymal glands. There is a time to laugh, says the Old Book. It takes both good sense and good taste to decide when that time comes. Many times have I left the pulpit in a penitential mood because I had allowed myself undue latitude therein. The people laughed or smiled and kept awake while I was talking to them. And I have not seldom observed that on meeting, years afterward, persons who had "sat under" my preaching, the parts of my sermons most distinctly remembered were the parts that had a flavor of humorousness.

This tendency toward humorous preaching comes under the operation of a general law of homiletics, and grows by habit. The denunciatory preacher began with pertinent and pointed allusions to evils and errors, and ended by becoming a common scold. The slangy preacher began by the use of an occasional vulgarism that was striking, and before he knew it the larger part of his talk ran into that muddy stream. The brother who astonished his brethren by the fury with which he rode a doctrinal hobby began by expressing only a righteous and rational displeasure at the utter neglect of it by his colleagues. The brother who left the pastorate to champion a moral reform on the hustings began to stir up his parishioners with no such intention. Blessed is that servant whose Lord when he cometh shall find giving all their portion in due season—preaching a gospel that

searches the depths of men's hearts, and strikes at the root of every evil that curses the world. Am I digressing? If so, so be it. The substance of what I wish to say is this: Let preachers of the gospel guard against all sorts of mere oddities and eccentricities, including funniness for its own sake. There is a time to laugh—but it does not come often to the pulpit in a world like this. There is not much room for giggling by the preacher who stands in the presence of men and women who are burdened with care and pain and grief, and are hastening to death and the solemn mysteries beyond.

The pastor whose heart is human and whose soul is devout will be wanted alike at the bridal and the burial in the homes of his parishioners. It requires no mechanical effort on the part of such a man to obey the Master's injunction to "rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." He has the spirit of the Master, who at the wedding feast turned the water into wine, symbolizing thereby the infusion of a heavenly joy into human love; whose word to the grief-stricken ones at the grave threw upon its gloom the glory of the gospel that brought life and immortality to light.

O. P. FITZGERALD.

Nashville, Tenn.

THE PARABLE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD.

JOHN x. 1-5.

THIS chapter begins, "Verily, verily," an expression which is not used in the commencement of a discourse; and the words following, "I say unto you," prove plainly that Jesus was continuing a discourse previously commenced. To ascertain what Jesus designed to teach we must learn it from the preceding chapter. The two chapters should be read as one. In reading the ninth we should keep in mind the fact, that when the things took place which are recorded, the Jews knew that Jesus claimed to be the Christ promised, and that he was the Son of God. This claim of Jesus had roused the most inveterate prejudice and bitter opposition. We read in verse 22, "For the Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogues." This penalty was so severe in its operation it was well calculated to deter any Jew from making such a confession. The first thing we learn is the wonderful miracle Jesus wrought, giving sight to a man who had been blind from his birth. This miracle caused great excitement and disputation among the Pharisees, who were the largest sect of the Jews. They thought

themselves to be righteous, and that they knew the Scriptures, and obeyed all their precepts. "Therefore, because Jesus had done this wonderful miracle on the Sabbath day, some of the Pharisees said, This man is not of God. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them." Again, these incorrigible Pharisees said to the man Jesus had given sight, "Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner." How inconsistent blind unbelief is, "Give God the praise"; was not this equivalent to saying, "None but God could do such a miracle?" And yet they said, "This man is not of God," and "we know that this man is a sinner." It was truly God in Christ that wrought the miracle, and it was incontestable proof that Jesus was all he claimed to be. We learn how great the unbelief of some of the Pharisees was, and how strong and bitter their opposition to him. Jesus had said, it may be, to these very ones, if not, it was to some like them in their unbelief and opposition, "If ye believe not that I am he [Christ], ye shall die in your sins." Was Jesus willing that even one of these unbelieving, persecuting enemies should die in his sins and perish? "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." The great and gracious object Jesus had in view in coming into the world was to save sinners. There was no spite, enmity, nor disposition to retaliate an injury in the loving, pitying, gracious heart of Jesus. He taught his disciples, saying, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." And did not Jesus himself obey this instruction perfectly? He even prayed for his enemies when they were putting him to the most cruel and shameful death. Did Jesus ever have a more virulent, persecuting enemy than was Saul of Tarsus? Yet Jesus loved him, and brought him to repentance, and to faith in him, and saved him. And although Saul claimed to be the chief of sinners, Jesus not only saved him, but made him a chief of saints, and "an apostle not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." Jesus labored assiduously to save all, and to destroy none. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners [enemies] Christ died for us."

The design of the parable is in full accord with the above statements, and with all his life-works to bring sinners to repentance and faith in him, and salvation.

1. **THE SHEEPFOLD.** The sheepfold was a plat of ground inclosed with a high, strong wall for the protection and safety of the sheep. It symbolizes the church or kingdom of God. The sheep symbolize the regenerate people of God. As the wall around the sheepfold was essential to the protection and safety of the sheep, it was designed by Jesus to be a type of the protection and safety of the Lord's people. It is written, "They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever. As the mountains round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people from henceforth even forever." "Door" is often used in the Scriptures metaphorically, with a variety of meanings and applications, but its leading meaning is "a way." A door opened is a way to enter in. That, as a metaphor, it has a variety of applications, any can see by consulting the following references: Acts xiv. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 8, etc. And do we not rejoice and thank God that a door of salvation is opened to sinners, and that whosoever will may enter in, and be saved?

2. **THE SHEPHERD.** Who is the Shepherd of the Lord's people, or sheep? If we can find out who is, then we shall know beyond doubt who is referred to by the shepherd of the parable. Christ or Messiah was predicted under the figure of a shepherd (Ezek. xxxiv. 23; xxxvii. 24, and Zech. xiii. 7). This in Zech. xiii. 7, Jesus applied to himself the night in which he was betrayed, and but a very little while before his betrayal. He said to his apostles present, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad." Jesus, in his exposition of the parable, declares twice, "I am the good shepherd." Peter, writing to Christians, says, "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." This settles the question as to who is the shepherd referred to. The Lord Jesus Christ is the Shepherd.

3. **THE PORTER.** If the divine Christ is the shepherd, who is the porter, and what door did he open? The Holy Ghost is the porter, and the door he opened is the way pointed out in the Holy Scriptures by which Jesus Christ should come, and the way Christ did come, a way that no other ever came, or ever will come. The Holy Ghost inspired the Scriptures. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. To him, Christ the Shepherd, the porter

openeth, and the sheep hear his voice. And he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out."

4. THE SHEPHERD'S WORK.—"And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice." For an explanation of these words Jesus said to the disputers of his being the Christ, "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." For an explanation of the verses, the reader is referred to the explanation Jesus himself gives them. "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep. 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." These verses, read together, make it plain that Jesus, in the parable, referred to himself as the good shepherd he figuratively described in it.

5. THE STRANGER.—"And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the voice of strangers." This is literally true, and was no doubt designed to teach that Christ's sheep will not follow another.

"This parable spake Jesus unto them: but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them." Then Jesus explained it to them. "Jesus said unto them again, Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." Note, Jesus does not say or intimate, here or elsewhere, that he is the door of the shepherd or shepherds, or pastors of churches. As there is but one shepherd of the Lord's sheep, and as Christ is that shepherd, he could not say, "I am the door of the shepherd." Jesus makes it still plainer, "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them." The plain, natural and obvious meaning of this is, "All that ever came before me," claiming to be what I am, the Christ, are thieves and robbers, and such they emphatically were, thieves and robbers. How many such came before him we know not. Two false Christs are named in Acts v., Theudas and Judas. Jesus had no reference to scribes, Pharisees or pastors, but to false Messiahs. Jesus explains in the ninth verse what he meant by being the door of the sheep, "I am the door; by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." He meant the same by the door here that he did when he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

The expression, "And shall go in and out, and find pasture," is explained by the twenty-third Psalm, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want; he maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters." Jesus probably had reference to this precious Psalm when he uttered the words, "Go in and out and find pasture."

This tenth chapter of John is one of, or among, the most precious chapters in the Bible. Christ the door—the way of salvation—is open to any man; if he enters in, he is safe, and saved forever. 2. Supremely blessed are all who can, in the full assurance of faith, say, "The Lord is my Shepherd." 3. Is it not delightful to our souls to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is our shepherd, "In whom our souls take delight"? 4. Is there a word in human language more expressive of love and care than is the word "shepherd"? See how plainly and beautifully striking this love and care is exemplified in the parable, and its exposition by Jesus himself.

Daisy, Tenn.

JAMES L. REED.

A QUESTION FOR THE LAST SUNDAY IN THE YEAR.

"And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, How old art thou?"—GENESIS xlvii. 8.

SOME have seen in this question of the Pharaoh, and the somewhat garrulous answer of old Jacob, merely an illustration of the stately forms of oriental politeness. They tell us we may mingle among the people of Egypt to-day and hear, when one of the fellaheen addresses a pacha or some one above him in rank and station, language almost exactly similar to this, "Few and evil have the days of the years of my life been." Yet Jacob was one hundred and thirty years old, and though famine had brought him to Egypt, the prosperous head of a flourishing tribe. But it is not good manners to appear too prosperous in the presence of your superiors (*cf.* our old darkies, who always have a "touch of misery").

But if the forms belong to the East, we need not resort to any such explanation to understand the spirit of the old man's words, and the vein of sadness that colors them. A question may mean much or little according to the condition of our own minds, and the experiences through which we are passing; a mere formal salutation or an electric spark that sends a flash through the mind and brings out into clear view a long-buried past. The events leading up to

this meeting were enough to arouse any one, and send the mind back over the years of his pilgrimage—Joseph coming back as one from the dead, the removal from their old home in Canaan, the coming into a new land, the fulfilment of promises made to his fathers, about which old Israel had often thought; how could he help being in a reminiscent mood? and when the question of the Pharaoh was asked, what a flood of thoughts and feelings were behind the old patriarch's answer! All those "years of his pilgrimage," from that far-off day when, as a lonely lad with his staff in his hand, he went out from his father's house to seek his fortune in a strange land, on down to this remarkable series of providences that had brought him and his household to Egypt; and as it all came back to him, two things must have stood out clearly before his mind, (1) The crooked line along which his own cunning, crafty disposition had led him, and (2) the straight line made by God's promises and providence, bounding, controlling, defending, chastening, overruling, bringing good out of evil, and carrying forward his purpose of grace towards the family of Israel. He must have seen very clearly his waywardness and folly set over against God's goodness and mercy, and felt as never before the sins of early manhood—"Few and evil have the days been." Is it not so with us all? When we look back upon life, it is very short, but yesterday, when we were children; but yesterday when Jacob, with a stone for a pillow, lay down to sleep and had that vision of the ladder, symbol of hope to countless generations since, reaching from earth to heaven. And when we look at it in the light of God's goodness, the Redeemer's cross, that pilgrimage has been "evil" also.

And the question suggests another, namely, How shall we measure the length of our lives? What unit of measurement shall we use?

1. We answer the question by saying, "I am so many years old," but that is manifestly an inadequate standard. Not the number of heart-beats, or times the sun has risen and set, or the new years that we have heard ushered in by the ringing of bells. Time may be the stuff of which life is made, but it is not all of life. We must ask also what is written upon the fabric? What experiences were stamped upon the moments? Time may be the goblet that holds the wine of life, but what is the flavor of the contents?

But even in this lower sense—measuring our lives by the flight of days—the question has meaning. "How old art thou?" How much of the time God has given you has already been consumed? The old year, soon to die and pass away, has a very distinct voice for

each of us. It says to the young, "Make haste"; the time for preparation is slipping away. To the mature, "Work the work of him that sent you," etc.

2. Jacob seemed inclined to measure his life by its "evils," the difficulties, sorrows, bereavements through which he had come, and some go to the opposite extreme and measure it by its moments of joy and pleasure; but, while looking back over the past, we may see much that is pleasant, yet this is no proper standard by which to measure life; not for this that life was given.

3. Others measure it by the attainment they have reached in wealth, or honor, or position; but life consisteth not in the abundance of the things one possesseth. Is it not better and closer to the Christian meaning of life when we measure it—

4. By our individual growth in grace, strength, purity, Christ-likeness? How old are you: babes in Christ, or full-grown? Feeding on milk or meat? Not simply, How many days? but, What are you putting into the days? And—

5. By the good you have done and the influences for Christ you have set in motion. How old is Paul? or Martin Luther? or John Howard? or Elizabeth Fry? Such lives are not confined to three score and ten—they are still living. But our lives, measured by opportunity, etc., are "few and evil." May they be better.

Clarksville, Tenn.

J. H. LACY.

KNOWING HOW TO ABOUND.

"I know how to abound."—PHILIPPIANS iv. 12.

ABASEMENT and abounding are the two extremes of the life of contentment. Knowing how to be abased is knowing how to glorify God through limitation, and in failure; knowing how to abound is knowing how to glorify God in success and triumph. The latter, though not readily admitted, is the more difficult thing.

I. The life of abounding is the experience of spiritual satisfaction, and must be distinguished from the ordinary conception of success. The successful man is one who gets things done in the world; he prospers in his trade or profession, he acquires wealth or learning, he perfects his plans, and realizes his ambitions. The difference between a successful and an abounding life is not in what a man accumulates, but the satisfaction of soul which such accumula-

tion gives to him. Abounding is not an accumulation, or a possession; it is an experience. It is not out there in the world in stocks and bonds, in fame and glory, but in the soul.

This is admitted as a matter of belief, but we do not readily accept it as a programme of life. On the surface it would seem that success does give satisfaction: First, by the ease and independence, the undoubted content in getting one's plans executed, which success can give. Secondly, we act, at any rate, on the supposition, if we could realize our immediate desires, we should be content. The man who gets one dollar per day thinks if he could have two he should be content; the young lawyer thinks if he could have one great case, and leap into fame, he should be satisfied; the young investigator thinks if he could happen on some great discovery in science, he should be happy. These are the conceptions which rule the present generation. Youth is told to get money, get fame, get learning, get popularity, and these things shall bring content.

But a little reflection shows how inadequate this conception is. The man who wanted two dollars per day discovers, in the possession of his immediate desire, that he wants a little more. His desires increase in geometrical ratio, and when he gets a million he still wants a little more. Why? Not because he loves money, but because he is still an unsatisfied man, and finds temporary satisfaction, not in possession, but in pursuit. What is true of the pursuit of wealth is true also of all other purely earthly objects of desire. Permanent satisfaction is always just beyond these things. Discontent is always present in the pursuit of an ideal, which, in the nature of the case, cannot give satisfaction.

To abound one must look beyond success, and raise the question, Why pursue these things at all? Why is life a restless striving for something which ever seems to elude the most patient effort? Because of soul hunger: behind all manifold pursuits of men, religious or secular, is this pursuit of God. To find God is to find satisfaction.

But what do we mean by satisfaction? It is not such satisfaction as shall stop all growth, suspend all struggle. Such satisfaction, if possible, would not be desirable for the reason that it would not be compatible with progress. It would mean stagnation. And man feels he must act or die. It is not for absolute suspension of activity, but for satisfactory progress and growth in divine things, that man is seeking. He must move from goal to goal, for the soul is a restless energy, driving man to something beyond himself. His reach

always exceeds his grasp; without the largest circle of achievement, he must draw a larger circle of aspiration. The difference, then, between a life of abounding and the restless life of success is not in the suspension of struggle or effort, but that in finding God, a man concentrates his energy on this one object, and finds his keenest sense of living, his deepest satisfaction, in the progressive realization of his spiritual desires in God.

The restless seeking of the soul is the search for a full life; the sensation of life's fullness is one and the same with the sense of reasonable progress and growth. I press towards the mark is the note of the Christian life here, and is, I verily believe and devoutly hope, the mark of the life beyond. We shall not cease growing, nor striving, even in heaven. Why should we? The real pain of strife here is really the sense of sin and the presence of failure. These hindrances removed, shall not heaven's highest life be progressive understanding of God? Shall not the same infinite God be the object of desire? Shall not knowledge grow from less to more, and deepen into reverence, and reverence translate life into service there as here? I think so. Man's real distinction is his capacity for infinite development—to grow consciously in the divine life is the life of abounding: for religion leads to the satisfaction of spiritual hunger through self-expression, self-realization, the enlargement of vision, the development of personality. Man's personality grows in proportion to his growth in freedom. Spiritual hunger is the hunger for a completely fashioned will. It is to do the best for our wills, to choose the highest, to fashion them into character that constitutes the life of abounding. He who seeks first the kingdom of God, with spiritual hunger and thirst, finds in the passion for goodness the highest goodness itself, for such seeking fashions the will into character through obedience. He who chooses the highest thing for his will, already possesses it—in the strife for its embodiment, in the effort to express it. The obedient will seeks not simply to acquire, but to put acquirement to use; not simply to satisfy hunger, but to realize itself in action; not simply to receive, but also to give. To acquire in order to express—this is the nature of freedom.

II. The abounding life, the life of self-expression through the fashioning of the will, is realized in doing the will of God.

Why was man created free? To do the will of God. Our wills are ours to make them his. Man's real distinction in the world is freedom.

It is evident from his difference from his own achievements. The poet is greater than his poem, the singer than his song, the painter than his picture. Why? Because the greater thing is still unexpressed, unrealized. It is man's power to reach beyond his best achievement, to aspire beyond his best attainment—that constitutes his distinction from his works. The best of his dream or his song is still within the soul. All accumulations of learning or of wealth get their value from their relation to man, and not man from them. His works get their worth from their relation to man's will.

It is evident when we consider man's relation to the universe. Why was the world made? If we think of the world in mass, or regard it as a manifold of inscrutable forces, there seems no answer. Its great size, its mysterious laws of action, the silent depths of the sky, and the wanton splendor of the earth bulk so largely in our imagination that we feel our nothingness. As motes in the sunbeam, so seem we 'mid life's mysterious whirl. Why is it that man, who knows this, walks the earth with conscious ownership, with kingly tread? Because he knows his real distinction. It is not a matter of quantity, but the quality of his being. He is free. This intuition is deeper than any argument by which to explain it; he assumes it in order to account for himself. Is God a creator? So is man, creating the world he sees; out of its chaos come the order and beauty, the harmony and splendor as it passes through his mind. The world is the symbol of man's mental glory and creative power. It is his workshop, his play-house, his arena, to provide him occupation, to give him struggles, to stimulate his intellect and imagination with its manifold mysteries that he might search through it for the meaning of life—to discover the will of God. The world exists for man, and man alone exists for God. The chief end of the world is to glorify man; man's chief end is to glorify God. Man's struggle is to discover in this world the purpose of his freedom—to do God's will. When he learns this, nature can do no more for him.

It becomes increasingly evident when we consider the personality of Christ. He shows us how completely and perfectly God can reveal his glory through an obedient human life. He shows us also how beautiful and desirable human life becomes, both to God and man, when it is a completely fashioned will. The will of man is completely fashioned when it perfectly does the will of God. I come to do thy will, O God: this is the note of our Lord's earthly ministry. Christ is the divine pattern of what a man should be; the prophecy

and potency of what human life shall be when the will is completely fashioned into the character that seeks self-realization through obedience.

It is practically evident when we consider the purpose of Christ's redemptive work. Sin is largely misdirected energy. It is the doing of the will of the creature rather than that of the Creator. It is to worship self instead of God. It is to expend our energies on self instead of God. It is to abuse instead of use our freedom. The fall of man brought guilt into the world, and with guilt spiritual slavery. Christ redeems us first by establishing the eternal law of righteousness through his atonement, and secondly by directing our liberated wills from earthly and sinful ends back to God. To follow Christ means more than imitate him; it means obey him; it means to accept him with trust and confidence as the supreme authority in religion; it is to follow him with profound conviction, with passionate enthusiasm, and with a definite purpose. Our wills are ours to make them God's. Our wills become realized as we do the will of Christ, for Christ is the supreme expression of God's will.

The life, then, of abounding is the experience of growth through the fashioning of the will. Obedience of Christ is, therefore, to realize one's self. To lose life is to find it, to be abased is to be exalted, to die is to live.

But this means more than self-surrender. Self-surrender is the halfway house between opposition and obedience. The child of God does not yield to God as did the Stoic. The Stoic said, The universe is unknowable, hence it is better to endure its visitations than to repine. The child of God yields, not because he is ignorant, but because he knows what God is. He may not understand this immediate reversal of his plans, but he sees beyond the present to the heart of God. He yields because he grasps the significance of his freedom. He obeys gladly, and not through constraint, because he is admitted into partnership with God.

And obedience practically applied means the use of all one's powers, of mind and heart and will, to glorify God. It does not mean to underrate earthly success; it means not to overrate it. It does not mean separation from life's practical duties, to become a hermit, a cave-dweller; it means to use one's gifts, to invest one's talents, to have ambitions, to strive for success; to be industrious—but to subordinate all these ends to the master passion of obeying Christ. It means to get all out of life one can, in order to put some-

thing back into life it never had before—a completed manhood, progressively realizing itself through obedience, a life that gives light and inspiration to the world.

We should bring to the practical task of saving the world our finest powers of mind and heart. We should seek, above everything else, action. To know in order to act. To believe in order to do. Through such lives as these God makes his glory known. These are the burning and shining lights, the cities which cannot be hid, the strong lives, the great rocks in a weary land, in whose shadow weaker men grow strong. Such lives alone, through toil and strife, reach those serene heights of contentment, above storm and cloud, where the Master waits with good comradeship, with heaven's benediction, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord." Amen!

HARRIS E. KIRK.

Baltimore, Md.

"CONCERNING THE COLLECTION."

1 CORINTHIANS xvi. 1, 2.

THE collection concerned the apostle. It has always been so. The congregation would be surprised should the minister not weekly stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance concerning the collection.

A discussion of money may be interesting or annoying according as its key-note is get or give, possess or contribute. A discussion of the latter is necessary for human good and divine glory.

Giving is one of the most important questions connected with religion. The apostle treats of it immediately after discussing love, gifts, and the resurrection. Practical duties follow doctrinal discussions. Beneficence is doctrine demonstrated, exemplified—works proving faith.

Giving is the question in practical religion. The text demonstrates that there should be business in religion as well as religion in business.

Two questions, one relating to the necessity, the other to the method of giving, are answered in the text.

I. WHY SHOULD YOU GIVE?

1. There are those in need. The saints referred to were those "in Jerusalem" (Rom. xv. 26). Poverty was greater there than in any other part of the church. Why? (Acts xi. 28.) Paul was keenly

alive to this distress. His promise (Gal. ii. 10). Collection was taken wherever he went. The first Christians considered themselves members of a common family, the weak having claims on the strong, the poor on the rich.

These conditions still exist. "The poor ye have alway." This need should be met by revenues raised among God's people. His visible kingdom depends upon its subjects for support and extension. His revenue laws and offices place us under a legal obligation, and our covenant vow under a moral obligation to provide for its maintenance. Our giving should know no limit other than the limit of the church's need and our ability.

2. We are commanded. "I have given order." The language of authority. Imperative command spoken by inspiration. Giving is a duty. We dare not disregard what God orders. The command is neither local nor temporary.

3. Others are doing it. "As . . . to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye." The power of example (see 2 Cor. ix. 2; Rom. xv. 26). To us is proposed the example of the apostolic church, many local churches of our own denomination, sister denominations, and those in foreign lands. The same with individuals. The example of one self-denying Christian should inspire others.

While giving is thus a duty, God is not dependent on us for the support of his church. He might accomplish the same end in other ways (Psa. l. 10-12). The necessity is ours. By nature we are selfish. Christianity is opposed to selfishness. One of the main branches of selfishness is love of money. To slay this root of evil God has laid upon us the duty of beneficence. To this end we are surrounded with poor and needy. By making sacrifices for others we combat selfishness. A close-fisted Christian is a cold-hearted Christian, if a Christian at all (1 John iii. 17). Sanctification can be only as we cultivate benevolent dispositions and perform acts of beneficence. Christians who do not give do not grow. Giving is an important means of grace.

II. HOW ARE YOU TO GIVE?

The Apostle speaks with the same authority on this question as on the first. Obedience to the divine method is as imperative as it is to the necessity. A thing worth doing at all is worth doing the very best. God's way is always the best. His method is before us. Four fundamental principles and one reason therefor.

1. Give as an act of worship. In all forms of religion the worship of deity with offerings of wealth has been recognized. The Jews had always been accustomed to this mode. The Old Testament required offerings as an act of worship. This custom was adopted into the Christian church. Thus came the wise men of the East. Paul classes giving with "faith," etc., and admonishes that "ye abound in this grace also." Giving of gifts is a natural and substantial expression of gratitude. Its incense should blend with the other modes of appeal to God. The collection is received on the Lord's day and during the solemn service, because it should be rendered under the notion of worship. The Master still sits over against the treasury and notes if the giving is as an act of charity or of worship.

2. All should give. "Each one." None exempt, however poor or young. As a means of grace and as a mode of worship, giving should be confined to no one class. The head of the family can no more give for the whole family than he can do their praying, singing and Bible reading. Each must worship for himself, making his own sacrifices and efforts. None are so poor as to be excluded (2 Cor. viii. 12). A mite sometimes measures more than a mint. See case of the poor widow. Her offering had sacrifice in it. She gave till she felt it. It is the sacrifice, and not the offering, God wants. He can no more dispense with the pence of the poor than he can with the pound of the rich. All can and should give, if ever so little.

3. The amount to be given is, "As he may prosper." Proportionate giving. This was the principle of the Old Testament tithing system. In the New Testament the per cent. is dropped, but the principle endures. The per cent. of the Christian should be greater than that of the Jew, because his blessings are more, and the needs of his church are greater. It was so with the early Christians (Acts iv. 32). Not that they relinquished all right to their property. Some of them are afterwards spoken of as having their own houses, but, as verse 35 shows, they held it subject to the needs of God's cause and people. The tenure by which they held property was that of a steward of God, not as original owners. High ground, but scriptural.

People are prosperous or straitened in proportion as they obey or disobey this rule of proportionate giving. A liberal hand means a full barn. He that robs God robs himself (Prov. xi. 24, 25; Luke vi. 38). Case of Jacob and of cruise of oil. Either you must proportion your giving to your income or God will proportion your income to your giving.

4. Give systematically. "Upon the first day of the week . . . lay by him in store." Systematic regularity is opposed to the haphazard custom of giving just what you happen to have. The recurrence of the Sabbath is divinely appointed to call for a gift at our hand. By thus exercising our benevolent feelings at stated periods they become habits. If providentially prevented from attending public worship, then "lay by in store." Systematic giving is the easiest and the only business-like way.

The Apostle's reason for recommending the adoption of this method was "that there be no gatherings when I come." The system, if adopted, would remove the necessity of the minister's weekly remarks concerning the collection, and would secure more time for the other parts of the service. The people would then give, not because their emotions were excited by moving fact, but because it is right—because the wants of the soul require it, because it is due as homage to God, and in gratitude to Christ.

St. Louis, Mo.

C. L. MAUZE.

THE BEST INSURANCE.

"Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life."—1 TIM. vi. 19.

It is the prudent and wise thing nowadays for a man to insure his life. The only question raised is as to the best kind of assurance. There are many good companies, but the best assurance society is the church.

First, it is safe. There is no danger and no risk to be taken: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation." The church is built upon a foundation which God himself has laid. The stone was laid firmly and squarely and for all time. Upon this corner-stone, "all the building, fitly framed together, groweth into an holy temple in the Lord," in whom Christians "are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his."

"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."

Second, the dividends are larger and are daily paid. "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." "Blessed be the Lord, who daily

loadeth us with benefits." He giveth us "day by day our daily bread." "As thy day is so shall thy strength be." "In the daytime also he led them with a cloud, and all the night with a light of fire."

"My tears have been my meat day and night." "Put thou my tears in thy bottle." "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever."

Third, the final settlement will be satisfactory. "Unto God the Lord belong the issues from death." Hence there will be no question as to the time, place, or manner of our death, whether violent or natural, whether in our senses or disordered by disease, for "precious in his sight is the death of his saints." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." "And they shall be mine saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him." "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness."

Exhortation: the wisdom of "laying up against the time to come." In the affairs of this life men provide for the future. We think and look ahead.

Entirely apart from religion, we admire the man who has the sense, the long-headed prudence, to provide for the possible and the probable. The man who does not provide for the contingencies in this life does not get much sympathy from his neighbors. So if we are not agnostics in the affairs of the world, why should we be in religion? The argument is as clear as sunlight, and as strong as reason can make it.

If it is wise on earth, and along these lower lines, to make provision for the "time to come," is it not preëminently wise on the higher lines that reach over the border and into eternity?

W. O. COCHRANE.

Bristol, Tenn.

X.

CRITICISMS AND REVIEWS.

STAGG'S "CALVIN, TWISSE AND EDWARDS."

CALVIN, TWISSE AND EDWARDS ON THE UNIVERSAL SALVATION OF THOSE DYING IN INFANCY. *By Rev. John W. Stagg, D. D.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1902. Cloth. Pp. 163. 50 cents.

The accomplished pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Charlotte, N. C., has set for himself the task, mainly of expounding the views of Calvin, and secondarily those of Twisse and Edwards, on the subject of infant salvation.

His purpose is to show that these great fathers did not, as is so widely supposed, teach the damnation of any infants dying in infancy.

By way of a suitable starting point, he examines the "distinctive systems" of Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism and Episcopalianism, and finds that all of those, because of their sacramentarian premises, logically involve the doctrine of the damnation of those infants dying unbaptized.

The Pelagian system has no difficulty whatever with the subject, because it holds the sinlessness of all infants.

Calvinism he stoutly defends against the charge of infant damnation, declaring it to be nothing less than slander to impute it either to the logic or to the heart of the holders of this great form of theology.

He sets out to rescue these three great representatives of Calvinism, who are judged by many to be indisputably on the side of infant damnation.

His expository difficulties are very great, being partly inherent in the subject itself, one of the most perplexing in all theology; partly in the voluminousness of the discussion which centuries of rancorous debate have gathered around the subject; but principally in the polemical character of the writings which he has under examination. These abound and super-abound in arguments *ad hominem*, arguments *ad absurdum*, arguments *ea hypothesi*, in statements and counter-statements, in replies and sur-replies, until it is almost impossible always to command the writer's exact point of view, and see at just what angle and for just what purpose he argues.

Dr. Stagg proceeds upon the principle, indisputably sound, that the exigencies of debate create a context indispensable to the construction of controversial literature.

Had this rule been more fairly and intelligently applied to the writings of Calvin and the other two, the author thinks abhorrent doctrine would not have been imputed to them.

"We undertake to show," says Dr. Stagg, "that Calvin states positively that infants are damned, and that he exempts from damnation those dying in infancy."

That is, Calvin, from one point of view, teaches the universal damnation of all infants, and, from another point of view, the universal salvation of all infants.

For proof of the first proposition, take this sentence from his *Institutes*: "I inquire, again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, *with their infant children*, in eternal death, but *because such was the will of God.*" This Calvin characterizes an "awful (awe inspiring) decree," and Dr. Stagg says that it, with other contexts, proves that he taught "infant damnation."

As a specimen of the proof of the second proposition, take this sentence from his *Tracts*: "Every one whom Christ blesses is exempted from the curse of Adam and the wrath of God. Therefore, seeing it is certain that infants are blessed by him, it follows that they are freed from death." Here he argues, as in many other places, to the specific conclusion that all infants are "freed from death."

How can the great Genevan be reconciled with himself? Is reconciliation possible? If we must leave him in contradiction to himself, which view shall we elect to charge upon the heart and consciousness of the great theologian—the view that infants are damned, or the view that infants are freed from death? If we elect the former, and charge that infant damnation was Calvin's conscious doctrine on the subject, we must do so in spite of his explicit statement that "to exclude from the grace of redemption those who are of that age (infants) would be too cruel."

Dr. Stagg is confident that the great theologian of Geneva did not thus contradict himself, nor was he either consciously or logically guilty of the great "cruelty" of excluding infants from the grace of redemption. All the antecedent probabilities are overwhelmingly on the side of the commentator; but, in view of much that Calvin has written, and in view of the able criticisms which have been written on the contrary side, it behooves Dr. Stagg to give us a rational theory of harmony. If he does this—if he makes it rationally possible for us to believe that Calvin did not hold and teach what he characterized as a "cruelty"—fairness, to say nothing of generosity, requires us to accept the explanation which makes the great writer consistent with himself and with the sentiments of his own heart.

What is the author's theory of explanation? Its development is always intricate, sometimes not clear, but finally triumphant. We now attempt its reproduction.

When Calvin treats of predestination, he divides the human race into two classes, those predestined to life and those predestined to death. As all men are at one period of their lives infants, these two classes become—infants predestinated to life and infants predestinated to death. In the development of this aspect of his theology he uses language which clearly implies infant damnation. This is not the proper "head" under which to treat the subject of infant salvation, and observations upon it here by Calvin would be premature. But his system is in a process under his hand: there are sequæ.

So, too, when he treats of the fall and original sin, he reaches the broad conclusion that the entire race, infants not excepted, are guilty and tainted, and so are justly damnable, and are actually condemned. Here, again, the door is wide open for him to use language which implies the damnation, not of some, but of all infants. Calvin's logical moment is still antecedent to redemption, and all his statements are made from that point of view.

When he comes to treat of the covenant, he is face to face with the sacramentarianism of the hour, which ties all the grace of redemption to the church and its sacraments. Here Calvin concedes that this sacramentarian and ecclesiastical conception of grace would be adequate to explain the salvation of the children of believers, but denies that such a premise would be effective for the infants of heathens and aliens. These denials, *upon these premises*, are construed by some of his commentators as his denial outright and point-blank of the salvation of the infants of heathens and aliens on any basis whatever.

What, then, was Calvin's premise? How did he ground infant salvation? Not as the Pelagians, in the childness of the child, in the innocency and sinlessness of the infants, for he held to the culpability and damnability of original sin, and taught that all infants were implicated in the fall and ruin of Adam. Not in the premises of Romanists and sacramentarians, for he combatted the whole *ex opere operato* theory of the sacraments, and sought to show how these premises would exclude unbaptized children from the grace of redemption. Calvin, on the contrary, held that there was such an application of the atonement of Christ as carried away from every infant descendant of Adam the guilt of original sin, the liability to an eternal doom. In the language of Dr. Stagg, "In Christ the consequence of the fall is destroyed, unless, by actual sin, one may incur the consequences. There is left, then, only the corrupt nature consequent to the fall in infants." From this remnant of the fall, "the corrupt nature," they are purged by regeneration.

"What are we left to," says Dr. Stagg, "but to conclude that Christ blessed the *state* of infancy, and assured us that those dying in this *state* are regenerated by the Spirit, and saved."

It will be noticed that Dr. Stagg, in his examination of Calvin's writings, makes three points, to-wit:

1. That Calvin consciously and avowedly held the doctrine of the salvation of infants dying in infancy.

2. That this faith of Calvin can be reconciled with all statements which he has made to the contrary, by observing the logical and polemical point of view from which the great theologian gave utterance to adverse opinions.

3. That Calvin not only held to the fact of the salvation of infants dying in infancy, but that he also had a theology of infant salvation—a scheme by which he explained, and premises upon which he defended, this fact. The Genevan denied the salvation of infants upon the Pelagian premise of their inherent innocence and sinlessness; he denied it upon the sacramentarian premise of their participation in baptism; but affirmed it and explained it by predicating the atonement of Christ as the cause of the elimination of infant guilt, and the regeneration of the Spirit as the efficient

cause of the elimination of infant depravity. Over against the guilt of original sin attaching to the infant he set Christ and the atonement, and over against the corruption of original sin he set the Spirit and regeneration.

We think Dr. Stagg has made out his first point irrefutably. We think he has made out the second point probably. There is an element in the third about which we are hesitant.

If we have not missed the author's meaning, he holds that Calvin taught that Christ exempted, not infants, but the *infant state* from the wrath and curse of God, when he took little children in his arms and blessed them; consequently any child dying in this *state* was necessarily a subject of salvation. This view is interesting and original, but not altogether satisfying.

Dr. Stagg next defends Twisse and Edwards with like ability, and then, briefly and bitingly, repels some "present day slanders."

This done, the way is clear for him to construct the Scripture doctrine on this subject. He lays down, as proof texts, three passages—"Suffer little children to come unto me;" "except ye be converted, and become as little children;" "the promise is unto you, and to your children"—and from them infers two facts: "The first is, we are told what the kingdom of God is like, and who shall enter it. The second is, we are told that the covenant of grace is as extensive as the human family."

This second inference is not to our mind clearly involved in these texts, and we are apprehensive of the theological consequences it implicates.

Dr. Stagg finally comes to the conclusion that the celebrated clause in the Westminster Confession—"elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved"—needs no amendment. "The Confession does not need revision, nor does it need any such weak prop as a 'foot-note.' The Confession needs nothing. The people need to be taught what the framers of the Confession meant, and that they stated what they meant, and nothing more."

In this judgment we concur. The Confession teaches all that can be taught, all that needs to be taught, on this subject.

We cannot refrain from adding an argument of our own upon a topic which is at this time so prominent among us.

All infants are federally guilty, subjectively corrupt, and, therefore, damnable.

The decree of God distributes all infants into two classes—elect and non-elect.

Many elect infants die in infancy, and are saved by the gracious imputation to them of the righteousness of Christ and the regenerating and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; while all other elect infants live to the years of maturity, and are saved in the same way. The only difference between the two cases being that those dying in infancy are saved *without* the use of "the means of grace," while those who live to adulthood are saved *through* "the means of grace."

All the non-elect infants live to adulthood, transmute federal sin into actual and conscious sin, and perish on that account. A non-elect infant does not, and cannot, die in the state of infancy. Why not?

Because it would defeat the whole end of punishment, which is not the prevention of crime, but the administration of justice.

Suppose the State should execute a criminal unconscious of his offence, mentally incapable of appreciating the reasons for his execution, and in a state of unconsciousness at the time of his hanging? If a delay would bring him to his senses, would not justice require a stay of execution?

The figure is inadequate, but it illustrates how justice would defeat itself by a premature infliction of penalty.

The infant has no consciousness of original sin—there is no sense of evil in his conscience. He is a sensitive creature, and can feel pain, but he cannot appreciate *penalty*. To him, hell would be pain, but his incapacity of understanding and appreciating the reasons for hell would prevent him from looking upon it, or feeling it, as *penalty*. But God sends no creature to hell just to inflict suffering, but that he may appreciate penalty—that he may experience the consequences of transgression.

An infant in hell would be mentally incompetent of asking the question, Why am I here? If he should ask the question, he would be mentally incapable of answering it, or of understanding the answer were it explained to him. His endless sufferings would be an endless enigma.

What course, then, shall providence pursue with that infant whom grace has passed by? Preserve his life until he passes out of infancy into adulthood, when he will become conscious of his sin and guilt, and will then be able to say "Amen" to the judgment which consigns him to death.

This is all inference, very fallible and meagrely expressed, but, it strikes us, as a safer explanation, and one more consistent with Calvinistic premises, than that offered by Dr. Stagg, who seeks to make some sort of universal application of the atonement of Christ to the redemption of "the infant state."

Still, it would be a thousand pities to have to support an amendment to the Confession of Faith with his, or ours, or anybody else's, mere theologizing.

R. A. WEBB.

Clarksville, Tenn.

VAUGHAN'S "SERMONS."

SERMONS. *By Rev. C. R. Vaughan, D. D., of the Synod of Virginia.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication. 1902. Cloth. Pp. 363. \$1.25, net.

Dr. Vaughan is a stalwart champion of Calvinistic orthodoxy. He always sees clearly, feels truly, fights intelligently, and triumphs splendidly. He perceives issues in their trueness and gravity, and grapples in earnest and awful debate with premises. It is a joy to see him in the arena. You feel his strength, you see his skill, you foreknow his victory. Truth never suffers dishonor at his hands. The hosts of Israel never lament over his championship.

The sermons before us are classified as "apologetic, doctrinal, and miscellaneous." They are not pitiful sermonets, scissored anecdotes, recitations of trifling experiences, sensational pyrotechnics, sophomoric phrases and figures. The preacher is incapable of trifling. These sermons are discussions. They lay down grave propositions; they draw clarifying distinctions; they deal in rational arguments, and make appeals to the sober and sane hearts of hearers. They compel thought, force instruction, expose fallacies,

and send the auditor from the sanctuary convinced in understanding, and satisfied that the foundations of his faith are adamantine.

It is a great and abounding joy to hail this volume, to praise and commend it in strong language.

We have in all twenty-two sermons—seven on the Scriptures, six on sin, four on salvation, and five on the supernatural.

The seven on the Scriptures discuss important phases of the rule of faith. In the first he argues the right and duty of "man as such, or as a lost sinner," to search the Scriptures. The second treats of the "indelible responsibility" of man in the discharge of this right and duty. The third gives an interesting and edifying explanation of the failure of the students of Scripture to come to a uniform belief in their interpretation, dealing most effectively with the competing papal theory and claim.

The fourth sermon treats of the relation of the minister to the Word, and endeavors to show both what he is to preach and how he is to preach. The fifth enumerates the qualifications of a public teacher of religion, emphasizing knowledge, spirituality, candor, aptness, meekness, discrimination, balance and proportion. The sixth is upon the manner of using, and the seventh upon the manner of hearing the Scriptures.

In these seven discourses the competing premises of the Romanists and rationalists are fairly stated, skillfully analyzed, and overwhelmingly refuted. In some places the polemics are splendid, and the replies of the preacher are as neat as complete.

Following the sermons on the Scriptures are five on sin, its nature, effects, guilt and penalties. In its essence and formal nature, sin is moral evil—wrong. Its effects are guilt, pollution, an evil conscience, misery, pledge of more evil, displeasure of God, condemnation, loss of heaven, all ending in hell. The component elements in the guilt of sin are two—desert of suffering, and liability of suffering. In the two sermons on the penalties of sin, he argues for endless punishment, first from nature and then from the Scriptures. The last is particularly strong and convincing.

We next have four sermons in soteriology. They begin with the necessity of repentance, and give it a threefold grounding: (1) It is morally necessary; every wrong-doer is in conscience and honor bound to repent, whether he is benefited by it or not. (2) It is legally necessary, for the obligations and precepts of the law abide, whatever the transgression; evil-doing does not abolish the jurisdiction of law, nor put an end to duty. (3) It is religiously necessary; the honor of God, when violated, fairly requires repentance at the sinner's hands.

The next sermon takes up the subject of justification, explains the meaning of the term and doctrine, then expounds the purpose of justification, and concludes with showing how the sinner can be justified. According to Dr. Vaughan, the object of justification is to "lead up to adoption in the family of God." We do not quite see it in this light. Adoption is a grace coördinate with justification, and not the fruitage or culmination of justification. Adoption gives us right and title in the house and family of God; justification gives us right and title in the kingdom of God. It is quite conceivable that a servant might be justified as a citizen of the divine common-

wealth, without ever being translated into God's family. The two relations—the servile and the filial—are compatible, but entirely distinct. Grace provides for both relations—justification for one, and adoption for the other.

The next sermon is a particularly strong one on justification by works. The publishers have made the blunder, however, of heading every page of this sermon with the caption, "Justification by Faith." That is not the title, nor the subject treated in the sermon.

We are particularly charmed with the discourse on "Substitution and Representation," in which a distinction is drawn between "imperfect imputation," which involves children in the sins of their parents, and "perfect imputation," which is the principle of federal representation. That the parental headship and procreative idea does not rule the transmission of sin and righteousness is clear, "for it is evident that not only are children implicated in the sins of their fathers, but fathers are often implicated in the sins of their children; and that the wave of distress is not confined to the immediate circle of the criminal's household, but spreads over collateral connections to a greater or less degree." The law of nature works both forwards and backwards; not only from the father to the son, but from the son to the father; while the law of the covenant operates persistently in one direction only—from the federal head to the legal posterity. There is no resisting such argumentation for the federal as distinguished from the propagative theory of sin.

The sermon on the "Function of Faith in Justification" abounds in fine and clarifying distinctions. As a specimen: "The peculiar reason why faith is necessary, and no other grace is available, is found in its own nature as adjusted to the work of receiving things. It is not because of its superior moral value to other graces of the Spirit, for Paul makes it equal in this respect to hope, but inferior to charity. It is exclusively related to justification, because it is a natural gesture of acceptance. The hand is the bodily organ for receiving things; it is naturally adapted for that purpose."

There are three sermons on the Miracle, dealing respectively with their possibility, their capability of proof, and finally the actual proof of biblical miracles. To prove the genuineness of Scripture miracles the author lays down and applies thirteen tests: (1) "Divine miracle is inseparably correlated with a revelation of God." (2) "True miracle is never done in favor of a religion already established." (3) It must consist with the "dignity of Almighty God." (4) It must be "clearly cognizable by the human senses." (5) It must be "performed openly, in public, in the presence of witnesses of discriminating character." (6) "Public tests must be applied." (7) It must be generally recognized "by the universal public." (8) "Public and organized arrangements" must be made to permanently preserve miraculous events. (9) There must be "prophetic announcement beforehand." (10) It must stand the test of "variety and wealth of action." (11) It must occur "infrequently." (12) "The character and work of the official witnesses" must support its pretensions. (13) It must command "the testimony and assent of the enemies of the Christian system." All these points are magnificently developed, and prove that no pseudo-miracle is like to pass the challenge of this discriminating judge. What a presumption in favor of Scripture miracles that they can command the faith of one so searching and cautious!

The last two sermons are on the relation of the natural and supernatural. Space forbids any attempt to exhibit their contents. It may be said of these, as of them all, they are clear, massive, splendid discussions of some of the greatest themes which stand in waiting at the portals of human thought.

Would that a multitude of preachers would take this volume, and learn from it that strength which these weak times so perishingly need!

Clarksville, Tenn.

R. A. WEBB.

ROBBINS' "CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC."

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC. By Wilford L. Robbins, D. D., Dean of the Cathedral of All Saints, Albany, U. S. A. 12mo, pp. 194. Longmans, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London; New York and Bombay. 1902.

This neat little volume is one of a series of "Handbooks for the Clergy," edited by Arthur N. Robinson, Vicar of Allhallows, Barking by the Tower (London, England). This series is evidently prepared mainly for the clergy of the episcopal branch of the church, but it will be of service to the ministers of other branches of the church also.

The series, of which this volume is one, consists of ten numbers. Six of these are already published, and four are in course of preparation. Their titles will show their general nature and scope: "The Personal Life of the Clergy," "Patristic Study," "The Ministry of Conversion," "Foreign Missions," "The Study of the Gospels," "A Christian Apologetic," "Pastoral Visitation," "The Study of Church History," "Authority and the Principle of Obedience," "Science and Religion," "Lay Work." The authors are all men in the Episcopal Church in England, and their expositions are suited chiefly to the conditions of that branch of the church in the old land. It will be seen also that the subjects discussed are mainly practical in their nature.

The little volume before us is rightly termed, "A Christian Apologetic," for it makes no claim to be a systematic treatise on apologetics, as this term is now understood. It is simply one line of the vindication of the reasonableness of the contents of the Christian faith. It is by no means a defence and vindication of Christianity at all points. Yet it has its distinct value.

The titles of its chapters will show its aim and limits: "Introductory," "Definition of Aim," "Apologetics in the Light of Modern Thought," "Jesus Christ, and the Moral Ideal," "The Divine Claim of Christ," "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ," "The Trustworthiness of the Christian Records," "The Witness of Prophecy," "The Demonstration of the Spirit."

In the introduction allusion is made to the dislike many people have of this study, and some reasons are stated for this temper among many good people. Yet our author claims a place and value for this branch of religious discussion.

In defining his aim the author simply assumes the results of the whole theistic discussion, which is the subject matter of fundamental apologetics; and he announces that he proposes to deal with Jesus Christ, and to make good his historical reality, and the divinity of his person and mission among

men. He makes the question, "Was Jesus Christ Divine?" the thesis he proposes to prove.

In dealing with apologetics in relation to modern thought, our author rejoices that present-day modes of thought and methods of inquiry are helpful to the Christian apologete. He lays special stress on the inductive method of modern science as very useful in the religious sphere in our own time, and he proposes to follow it himself. Here we can go heartily with our author, only we might attach more value to philosophy than he does.

In the chapter on Jesus Christ and the Moral Ideal, the moral grandeur of the Man of Nazareth is made the basis of a valid argument for his divinity, or at least his uniqueness. The moral influence of Jesus Christ in the world is well brought out by our author, and its apologetic value is justly estimated. Care is needed at this point by the apologete. Sinlessness of itself may not prove that Jesus Christ is a divine person, for the unfallen angels are sinless, yet not divine. Still, the fact of a sinless human life, lived amid universal sinfulness, gives the life of Christ a uniqueness which suggests that in some sense his personality transcends the sphere of mere humanity. The argument has value in this sense.

The chapter on Christ's most remarkable claim is perhaps the best in the book. It makes good the position that the only explanation of that claim, and the way in which it was sustained, is the fact of his divinity. The exposition of Christ's resurrection, while brief, is satisfactory. An empty tomb and an absent body is best accounted for by the fact of the resurrection. The trustworthiness of the records of the gospels and the witness of prophecy are also treated in the same simple and satisfactory way, though many points of value had to be untouched by reason of narrow limits of the discussion.

The last chapter, on the demonstration, suggests the argument from the effects of the Christian religion, alike in the individual and in the race.

The impression of the book as a whole is good. Because of its brevity, it leaves much to be desired; yet it will be read by many who will not take time to go through larger treatises. It strikes us, however, that, being intended for ministers, it might have been a little more thorough. For intelligent laymen it is also suited to be of great value.

Louisville, Ky.

FRANCIS R. BEATTIE.

SMITH'S "THE INTEGRITY OF SCRIPTURE."

THE INTEGRITY OF SCRIPTURE. Plain Reasons for Rejecting the Critical Hypothesis. *By the Rev. John Smith, M.A., D.D., Broughton Place Church, Edinburgh.* 12mo, pp. viii., 283. \$1.25, net. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Dr. Smith is the busy pastor of an Edinburgh church. The chapters of this book were given to his congregations in monthly lectures. They are the work of a scholar as well as of a preacher. They express the results of careful and discriminating study in popular terms. As such they appeal especially to the educated layman, the representative of a large class of people who are inquiring what there is in the claims of the new criticism.

There is need for just such a work as this. The supreme effort of the advanced critics has been, during the past few years, to popularize their views. A multitude of books has poured from the press for this purpose, all adapted to set forth in most glowing colors the conclusions of their authors, and to disarm the opposition of the conservative masses. Many of the most widely circulated semi-religious magazines of the day also echo the pretensions of the advanced school, and endeavor to create the impression that that is the side for all to take who desire to be regarded as respectable scholars or intelligent inquirers. These semi-religious publications have a wide circulation, and are doing more than the conservative suspect in creating a general familiarity with the new ideas, and first toleration and soon acceptance of them.

Dr. Smith gives in this volume seven chapters, the subjects of which are "The Searching Issues," "The Unbroken and Growing Strength of the Traditional View," "Is the Critical Hypothesis Valid?" "Christ and Criticism," "Objections to the Disintegrating Process," "The Reconstruction of the Scriptures Inadequate," "The Rights of Revelation."

In this volume Dr. Smith first presents the searching issues, showing the crying necessity for speaking out clearly and distinctly in defence of the truth, and showing especially how sharply drawn is the issue between the self-witness of revelation coming down from remote centuries and the critical view which originated but yesterday, an issue between the self-witness of revelation and the claims of modern critical hypothesis. He next shows the unbroken and growing strength of the traditional view of the Scriptures. Here he also exposes the lack of unity among the exponents of the radical school. Taking up the question, "Is the Critical Hypothesis Valid?" he examines the "suppositions" of the critics, which, after all, are their chief stock in trade, to see if they rise to the dignity of scientific hypotheses, and shows that they are not capable of this. Over against them, too, he sets the testimony of Christ, showing that he was an ardent student of the Scriptures, that he regarded them as pointing to himself and his work, that he had weighed every word as a counsel of God, that he was no mere "traditionalist," that he did not "accommodate" himself to the men of his time, that he was not silent, but explicit as to his views of the historicity of the events named in the Old Testament, and that he cannot be denied that insight into the truth which the advanced critics so freely arrogate to themselves. Dr. Smith then arrays many objections to the disintegrating process. He demands that the critics enter the field as plaintiffs, not as judges. He shows that their conclusions must have in them more than hypothesis before they may justly ask to be received by the church; that, with the materials at hand, they are attempting the impossible; that their analysis is complex and elusive in character; that there is lack of internal and external testimony, and that, as heightening their improbability, the disintegrations, being numerous, complicated, and highly uncertain, only lead to further disintegration. Taking up the actual work or results of the reconstruction of the Scriptures, the author shows its inadequacy and improbability. The gravamen of its sin is in its taking away the very soul of revelation from the divine book. It pays more attention to supposed harmony with scientific theories of progress than

to congruity with spiritual fact. It arrays itself against the fact that the Old Testament is a true revelation of God, and a preparation for the Christian revelation. In a chapter on the rights of revelation at the hands of criticism, Dr. Smith unfolds the methods and purposes of true criticism, showing that he knows how to appreciate a science to which no scholar fails to acknowledge his just indebtedness. He emphasizes the fact that the true critic takes cognizance of what might be called the experimental aspect of the question, and respects the findings of innumerable saints, martyrs, confessors and thinkers, who have gone before him, and set up a world-wide kingdom. In a closing essay on the relation of modern criticism to the preaching of the Old Testament, he maintains, not that the reconstructed Bible takes away from the preacher the materials for sermons, but that it bears upon the Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture. By undermining its historic base and weakening revelation, it takes away that authority with which God's messenger speaks in the name of God to men.

The book is finely written, in strong, vigorous, simple language; it glows with spiritual fervor; its reverence for the Word is shown on every page; it is scholarly without being pedantic, and popular without being vague and inconclusive. It is a book to be given an unqualified commendation.

MACARTHUR'S "CURRENT QUESTIONS FOR THINKING MEN."

CURRENT QUESTIONS FOR THINKING MEN. *By Robert Stuart MacArthur.*
8vo, pp. 422. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

The seventeen addresses or papers contained in this volume are marked by the fervor and smoothness and clearness of style characteristic of the author. They furnish delightful reading, whether one agrees, or does not agree, with the positions taken. In vigor of thought and felicity of expression they are not to be surpassed. Delivered as separate addresses, and on different occasions, and before different classes of hearers, they naturally have not the unity that would mark a series developed the one from another.

Four or five of the papers, or chapters, bear upon denominational problems, or are for the maintenance of denominational doctrine. Of course these are written from the standpoint of the immersionist and anti-pedobaptist. Dr. MacArthur's "Reasons for Being a Baptist" follow the stock arguments, as personal faith being necessary to baptism, the asserted testimony of scholars, historians and others against infant baptism, the assertion that infant baptism necessitates a belief, if the pedobaptism be consistent, in baptismal regeneration, etc. It seems a pity that he should resort, in this chapter, to the claim that infant baptism is declining in the churches which have practiced it, and that they are "beginning to realize their inconsistency." Nothing whatever new is developed here. In the chapter on "Baptist Polity and Historic Creeds," he glories in the fact that there is in his church no formal, authoritative statement of polity, claiming that this apparent weakness is a marked element of strength, making impossible such trials as those of Professors Briggs or Smith. The historical resumé in this chapter is very interesting. The author pays special attention to the Westminster Confession, pronouncing it at once

the most elaborate and comprehensive of all the creeds, and as prepared with great logical skill and rhetorical beauty. He thinks it should never be lightly spoken of, and were he a Presbyterian, he would strongly oppose its revision, leaving it intact as a monument to the wisdom and theological learning of its age. The chapter on "Historic Baptist Principles" repeats much found in other parts of the book. As to the possibilities of church unification, he does not feel sanguine, nor does he believe that any great end would be gained thereby, justly arguing that a visible church union would not be likely to secure real unity in faith and work. He has no sympathy with the expression, "The scandal of a divided Christendom." He claims, however, that each separate organization should follow the principle of Chillingworth's famous dictum—the Bible, and the Bible only; and, further, that no denomination has a right to a separate existence which does not represent and teach some important doctrine or doctrines of the Word of God which other denominations either oppose, reject or inadequately present.

The address on "The Regeneration of a Race," delivered before the American Baptist Home Mission Society, in its attempt to glorify the negro for his soldier-like deeds, shows either a rather surprising lack of information or a very strong prejudice, as does also the rather marked glossing over of the negro's part in the reconstruction period, the "reign of terror" in the South. His hopes of the negro race as our country's salvation from sectionalism, from anarchy, and from a dangerous ecclesiastico-political Romanism, show that he does not know the race except through the large end of the glass, and at a great distance. The address on "The True Function of the Minister" is admirable. In the author's conception, the minister must be a student of God's thoughts, a prophet of God's thoughts, and the impersonator of God's thoughts, with all of earnestness, authority, culture, character and life that these duties demand. A very practical chapter is given on "The Selection of a Church," by the young minister, its importance, and certain principles that should control the young minister in making his first settlement.

SPEER'S "MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE."

MISSIONARY PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE. A Discussion of Christian Missions and of Some Criticisms upon Them. *By Robert E. Speer, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.* 8vo, pp. 552. \$1.50, net. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

This is the most ambitious of all the works of the young Secretary of Foreign Missions in the fulness and scope of its discussion. Some parts of it have appeared before, in various weekly papers and monthly magazines, while one chapter was given in the *Twentieth Century Address*, noticed in a recent number of the *QUARTERLY* (October, 1902). The book is divided into four parts, of from eight to fifteen chapters each, entitled "General Principles Stated," "General Principles Applied," "Need and Results," and "Privilege and Duty." Under the first head, or part, the

author shows that missions are primary and essential in Christianity; that common honesty demands of those who have accepted Christ that they send or take the gospel to others, and that the world needs Christ. He then, in answer to the inquiry, "Why do you send missionaries to these people, anyway?" deals with the purpose of missionary enterprise, showing that it is not to clothe or alter the dress of the heathen, nor to improve their industrial conditions, nor to institute political reforms, nor to reform morals or check social abuses, but to make Christ known and to show the power of a supernatural life. He here rightly condemns those whose primary end in sending or going as missionaries is political, philanthropic or social, while at the same time he emphasizes carefully the fact that the result of true evangelism will be the improvement of the heathen in all material, moral, social, industrial and political relations. He carefully distinguishes, in considering these questions, between the aim of missions and the methods of missions. He further discusses the science of missions, the kind of men needed in the work, and some of the current criticisms of missions. In the second part, he takes up the character and results of the work as carried on in China, discussing, to some extent, the missionary problem as related to the recent outbreak in that country. The third part gives the author's impressions of missions in Asia, and some account of the conditions which cry for renewed and vigorous effort on the part of God's people everywhere. The fourth part discusses the missionary spirit, what Christ has done for woman, prayer and missions, the resources of the Christian church, and kindred topics.

The book is written from the standpoint of an acute observer, an experienced traveller, a fine administrator of the work, and a man with a great heart full of love for souls and loyalty to Christ. The convictions which underlie the discussions are that Christ is the only Saviour and Lord of human life, and is certain, in the end, to rule the world, and that he is Master not only of the life that now is, but also of that which is to come.

The spirit of the author and the purpose of the volume cannot be better told than in the author's introductory words: "(1) To set forth some of the main principles of the mission movement on which it rests in its appeal at home and in its work abroad; (2) to apply these principles in some illustrative instances, especially to the conditions in China, with which men are now most familiar, and which many regard as putting the missionary enterprise to its conclusive test; (3) to suggest, by a few sketches of mission fields and the results of mission work in life, both the need and power of the work; and (4) to enforce the duty and privilege of the serious attempt speedily to evangelize the world, and thus enable Christianity at once to display and to realize its divine commission to all mankind."

XI.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE OLD BOOK AND THE OLD FAITH. Reviewed in a Series of Lectures. *By Robert Stuart MacArthur, Pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York.* 12mo, pp. 432. New York: E. B. Treat & Co. 1900.

We count ourselves fortunate in having in our hands for notice in this number so many good books from the hand of Dr. MacArthur. A Scotchman born, the pastor for thirty-three years of a great church of the metropolis, his first and only charge, a vigorous writer as well as able preacher, he has another charge that far outnumbers the two thousand church members who delight to call him pastor, and he shows a vigor of both body and soul that promises yet many more years of usefulness. In reading this book one will find largely the secret of his unusual success. He honors God's Word, and God honors his work and ministry. The volume gives the substance of a series of Sunday evening lectures delivered by the author to his own people. These lectures, popular in form, and evangelistic, are designed to affirm the old faith and to maintain the Word upon which it is based, as against the destructive critics. It is irenic in spirit and utterance, scholarly, popular and effective. By inspiration, he understands the divine control over the minds of the writers of the Bible which enabled them to write a book which is a sufficient and infallible rule of faith and practice. The principle of the inerrancy of the Scriptures he regards as essential. The authority of the Bible he holds to be clearly taught, necessary and absolute. A number of the lectures deal with the poetical, musical and literary features of the Bible, its domestic felicities, and kindred themes.

THE BIBLE FOR CHILDREN. Arranged from the King James Version. With a Preface by Rev. Francis Brown, D. D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; and an Introduction by the Right Rev. Henry C. Potter, D. D., Bishop of New York. With Twenty-four Full-page Illustrations from the Old Masters. Sm. 4to, pp. xxiv, 475. \$3.00. New York: The Century Company. 1902.

A sumptuous, and yet not expensive volume, printed in two colors, in large, clear type, and beautifully illustrated with reproductions of classical paintings, this is a most attractive book. There may be a question in some minds as to the propriety of culling from the Bible such parts as an editor may select, and putting them together in a book such as this. This selection, however, is precisely what almost every parent makes, anyhow, and it is hardly just to condemn such a publication on that account. On the

contrary, it is to be commended, if judiciously done, as it has been done in this work. The selections, all of them in the words of the Bible itself, are of those parts most suited to children's minds and appropriate to their moral range. They are given in subjects, so as to form complete stories, as, for instance, in the life of Jesus. Verse divisions have been disregarded, and a new system of chapters introduced. The book will be a delight to both parents and children. Our only criticism upon it is that the title is not as happy as it might have been made, inasmuch as it suggests that it is the Bible for children, rather than selections from the Bible.

MOSES AND THE PROPHETS. *By Milton S. Terry, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute.* 12mo, pp. 198. \$1.00. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1901.

This is an "Essay Towards a Fair and Useful Statement of Some of the Positions of Modern Biblical Criticism." Its purpose is "to furnish a much-needed statement of some of the rights and reasons of modern biblical criticism." The author aims to make it "constructive and conservative." The preface contains a proper defence of Biblical Criticism as a Science, but foreshadows the thought that appears more fully later, that the critics of the destructive critics are needlessly alarmed, the results of the modern criticism not affecting matters of a vital character. In his study of the Books of the Law, Dr. Terry does not find any word to indicate that Moses was the author; he finds internal evidences of composite character and different ages of authorship, and he concludes that to Ezra "and his collaborators we may ascribe the gathering up of old traditions and written documents, the genealogies of the fathers, and the great poems which are referred to Jacob and Moses and others, and combining them all in the fivefold volume which thereafter was most appropriately called 'The Book of the Law of Moses.'" He then asserts, with the usual assurance of the most advanced critics, that "it ought not to be difficult for us to see that a post-exilian composition of the Pentateuch is by no means inconsistent with a Mosaic origin and warrant for its manifold laws." Of Isaiah and Zechariah, which he classes among "Compilations of Prophetic Oracles," he asserts that "it has come to pass that there are now comparatively few biblical scholars of acknowledged rank" who accept them "as the sole product of these two great prophets." Of the references of Christ and the evangelists and apostles to Isaiah and the Pentateuch, he flouts the idea of their doing more than acting in accordance with popular and common methods of quotation. The latter part of Isaiah he declares to be history, rather than prediction, and he tries to discriminate here between the supernatural, against which he would raise no issue, and the unnatural and far-fetched. The Book of Jonah, and its historical facts or incidents, and Christ's allusions to them, are reasoned away, or resolved into an allegory. Daniel, of course, is separated from his book, and the authorship of it is placed in the Greek period, a doubt insinuated as to the historicalness of the contents of the book, and a plea made for fiction as a mode of divine revelation and inspiration.

THE GIST OF THE LESSON—1903. *By R. A. Torrey, author of "How to Bring Men to Christ," "What the Bible Teaches," etc., etc.* Pp. 157. 25 cents. Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

In vest-pocket size, red edges, morocco binding, and brim full of facts and points and suggestions about the International Lessons for 1903, it is no wonder that this compact little book has reached its thirtieth thousand. The author's previous three years' contributions prepared the way for this, the fourth year's issue of his concise exposition. The text of each lesson is given, with words and phrases worthy of special attention printed in black-faced type. Important changes made by the Revised Version are also noted. In addition to the comments, there are also given leading questions on each lesson, and reviews. It is a wonder to us how so much matter could be packed into such small compass.

ETERNALISM: A THEORY OF INFINITE JUSTICE. *By Orlando J. Smith.* \$1.25. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1902.

An attempt to found the principles of eternal justice upon the eternal pre-existence of the soul. The soul is not only immortal, but uncreated; there is no such thing as creation possible; the Genesis religion is superstition; the doctrine of fatalism is unavoidable by any who accept the theory of a creation of any kind—such are the assumptions of this book. The author devotes more attention to the reconstruction of historic theories or adjusting them to his notion than to showing any warrant for that notion. The book is of very little value.

THE MINISTRY OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL. *By T. Harwood Pattison.* 12mo, pp. 264. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society. 1902.

The author's primary end is to show the relation of the church and its ministry to the children, and especially to the children organized into Sunday-schools. He regards the latter as the providential means of correcting many unscriptural views. He rather unduly glorifies them as contributors to the church. He rightly stresses the early coming of the soul to Christ, towards which the proper care for the children is essential. The book contains the author's lectures before Regents' Park College, London, and the Hartford Theological Seminary, of Connecticut.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MANUAL FOR 1903. *By J. R. Miller, D. D., and Priscilla Leonard.* Pp. 112. 10 cents. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1903.

This hand-book contains the Christian Endeavor pledge, the Northern General Assembly's Statement of Principles for Young People's Societies, a list of the year's daily Scripture readings, with practical suggestions, and the Junior Endeavor topics for the year. To those who are members of this Society it will prove a useful manual.

THE PRESBYTERIAN HAND-BOOK. *Prepared by William H. Roberts, Stated Clerk, and F. R. Craven, Secretary of Publication and Sabbath-School Work.* Pp. 96. 5 cents; ten copies, 25 cents. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1902.

This handy compend contains the leading facts respecting the history, statistics, revision movement, theological seminaries, boards, societies, publications, etc., of the Northern Presbyterian Church, and, in addition, lists of the International Sunday-School Lessons, prayer-meeting topics, Bible readings, etc., for the year 1903. The leading acts of the General Assembly of 1902, the proposed amendments to the Confession of Faith, and Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith, are given a prominent place.

OPPORTUNITIES IN THE PATH OF THE GREAT PHYSICIAN. *By Valeria Fullerton Penrose.* 12mo, pp. x, 277. \$1.00 net. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1902.

This little volume traces the history and development of medical missionary work. In the first chapter, following Tennyson's beautiful "In the Children's Hospital," some general comparisons and testimonies are given, and then follow chapters devoted to the medical mission work in Korea, China, Siam and Laos, India, Persia, Syria, Turkey, Arabia and Africa. The unused opportunities of the work are portrayed in a final chapter, entitled, "Where Little is Done." Good summaries are given, together with outline maps and a full index.

THE ATTRACTIVE CHRIST AND OTHER SERMONS. *By Robert Stuart MacArthur.* Sm. 8vo, pp. 327. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society.

All who know or who have heard the eloquent Calvary Church pastor will know what to expect in the twenty sermons gathered together in this book. The book's title is taken from the first of the twenty discourses. It is from the text, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." This and all that follow are fine examples of fervid, earnest, rhetorical, helpful preaching, and preaching that magnifies the Word while it shows the scholar and thinker.

THE SINLESS CHRIST. *By George Tybout Purves, D. D., LL. D., Late Pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York; some time Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary.* 12mo, pp. x, 186. 75 cents net. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 1902.

FOR WHOM CHRIST DIED. *By William R. Richards, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Church, New York.* 12mo, pp. viii, 157. 75 cents net. The same publishers. 1902.

The Presbyterian Pulpit is a series of sermons which will be issued from time to time, and of which the above are the first two. Two others, containing sermons by Drs. M. Woolsey Stryker and Herrick Johnson will probably appear before this notice is published. Each volume will contain

eight sermons. The selection will be made of discourses which have been recognized as specially blessed.

The volumes above described are named, in each case, by the title of the first sermon given. Dr. Purves' sermons, like those gathered in the larger collection, *Faith and Life*, are not so much sermons as he preached them as they are the full notes and outlines which he used, and of which he was largely independent in the pulpit. They have all the fervor, however, of the spoken word, and withal the beauty and finish of the written discourse. The topics are the "Sinless Christ"; "The Crisis of a Soul"; "Confessing Christ"; "Samson's Riddle"; "Peter's Shadow, or Unconscious Influence"; "The Way, the Truth, and the Life"; "Earthly and Heavenly Lights"; "The Waiting Dead." Dr. Richards is not so well known a preacher as was Dr. Purves. His ministry has been for some time past in Plainfield, N. J., whence he has recently gone to the prominent pulpit of the Brick Church. The call to such a place indicates his ability and grace as a preacher. The sermons gathered in the volume bearing his name show that he is worthy of the distinguished place he holds and of his growing reputation. The subjects of the sermons are "The Brother for Whom Christ Died"; "A Complaint and an Answer"; "The Monotony of Sin"; "The Three Taverns: A Missionary Sermon"; "The Power of Personality: A Word to Students"; "But if Not;" "The Gates of the City;" "The Home of the Soul."

THE HEALING OF SOULS. A SERIES OF REVIVAL SERMONS. *By Rev. Louis Albert Banks, D. D., Author of "The Great Saints of the Bible," "Christ and his Friends," etc.* 12mo, pp. 302. \$1.50. New York: Eaton & Mains. 1902.

A collection of thirty-one sermons, preached during the month of January, 1902, in a series of revival meetings, and, as the author says, "fused in the midst of the campaign, while the blood was hot and the nerve tense with the greatest of all spiritual excitements which the true preacher ever knows." We are further told that each of these sermons was followed by the conversion of souls. They are characterized by the usual and well-known traits of their author, and especially his great gift of illustration.

DOCTRINE AND DEED. Expounded and Illustrated in Seventeen Sermons Preached in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. *By Charles Edward Jefferson.* 12mo, pp. viii., 376. \$1.50. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1902.

The sub-title to this collection tells what the contents are. The sermons are marked by directness and practical character. They do not seem to attempt to sound any theological depths, but to be prepared for people who think they have no time for such study. The themes are varied, from a discussion of the Holy Spirit to a dissertation on the Bramble King.

INCENTIVES FOR LIFE. *By Rev. James M. Ludlow, D. D.* 12mo. \$1.25, net. Chicago, New York, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Dr. Ludlow dedicates his book to President Roosevelt, in remembrance of the latter as a boy in the pew who has since, in public life and character,

signally exemplified the precepts contained in the book. The volume is made up of a series of essays or familiar discourses designed to emphasize the importance of the will in the formation of character and to show the incentives which move it to action in that direction which will make life forceful, pure and true.

LIFE OF ULRICH ZWINGLI, THE SWISS PATRIOT AND REFORMER. *By Samuel Simpson, Ph. D., Lecturer on American Church History in the Hartford Theological Seminary.* 12mo, pp. 297. Net, \$1.25. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1902.

Zwingli is one of the most unique and interesting characters in history. His career has not been as familiar, however, to ordinary readers or casual students as that of others of his day. This is due to the fact that that career was short and was so greatly overshadowed by the conspicuous lives of his cotemporaries. Besides, there has not been large attention paid to his life by English writers, and the French-speaking portion of Switzerland, and its part in the Reformation, has become far more familiar to English readers than the movements and men of German-speaking Switzerland. The book before us will do much to popularize the knowledge of Zwingli. It is written in good style, is well reinforced by notes and references to the literature of the subject, and is accompanied by a very full bibliography. A number of attractive half-tones illustrate the book. Altogether, it will do much towards giving Zwingli that place which he deserves, beside Luther, Calvin and Knox, as one of the greatest spirits of his day, and as a man who would have sealed his faith with a martyr's blood just as readily as he so unfortunately took up the sword and perished in battle.

THE HOLY LAND. *Painted by John Fulleylove, R. S. Described by John Kelman, M. A.* Illustrated. 8vo. \$6, net. The Macmillan Company. 1902.

The chief charm of this volume is in its illustrations, numbering nearly one hundred, reproductions in the best form of original pictures in water-color by Mr. Fulleylove. The notes and letter press accompanying these illustrations are worthy of them, in attractiveness of style and clearness of description. The book is suited to the sitting-room table rather than the student's library.

AROUND THE WORLD DUE WEST TO THE FAR EAST. *By Robert Stuart MacArthur, Author of "Current Questions for Thinking Men," "The Celestial Lamp," "Quick Truths from Quaint Texts," etc.* Sm. 8vo, pp. xii., 532. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press. 1900.

This volume embraces the record of a five-months' tour by Dr. MacArthur, starting from New York westward, and girdling the earth. It is delightfully written, its descriptions are vivid, and many most valuable facts are brought together. The author moved with his eyes wide open, and with a great big heart that was full of love to mankind and of interest in all that will bring men to Christ and a better life. The spiritual tone of the book is one of its most marked features. Travel, geography, history, ethnology, missions, edu-

cation, social and family life are all traced with wonderful clearness by this versatile and charming writer.

THE EAST OF TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW. *By Henry Codman Potter, D. D., LL. D.* Cloth, pp. 190. \$1, net. New York: The Century Company. 1902.

In six chapters, entitled, "Chinese Traits and Western Blunders," "The Problem of the Philippines," "Impressions of Japan," "Impressions of India," "Impressions of the Hawaiian Islands," "India, its People and its Religions," which appeared some months ago in the *Century Magazine*, Bishop Potter has given in this collection his impressions of the East, and especially of the new American possessions. His visit to the East was for the special purpose of studying on the field the problems that that region presents. As a book of travels or as a source of information, it is not of any particular value. It is largely what it claims to be—a record of impressions. The impressions, however, are those of a keen-sighted man of wide information and high ambition, and as such are of great interest to the reader.

EDUCATION AND THE LARGER LIFE. *By C. Hanford Henderson.* 12mo, pp. 386. \$1.30, net. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1902.

A most thoughtful book, in eleven chapters, discussing educational methods, from the kindergarten to the university, and the bearing of the different methods in vogue, and of those which the author would substitute for them, upon the progress of civilization. Civilization and education the author believes to be closely linked. By civilization, in the discussion, he means a force, a progressive idea expressing itself as social environment. By education, he means an inner experience, a practical process for the nutrition and growth of the civilization idea. After the first two chapters, in which he states his point of view, in the philosophical aspects of the study, and develops the principle of the social ends of education, the author considers the source of power, in youth, in its strength and radiancy, and joyousness and physical health. He then studies the adequacy or inadequacy of present methods to use and develop the best that is in youth for the accomplishment of the end of education. The underlying principle of his suggestions as to method is that true education must take cognizance of man as a unity, and that no method is sound which treats separately the mind, body and spirit. Thus true education will be found in the unfolding of all the powers of the individual. The author's spirit is admirable, his ideals are most attractive, his criticisms are keen and intelligent. Altogether, he gives us a book which, while it impresses one as impractical in many of its ideas, is most suggestive. Its pages will attract and will awaken thought.

LITERATURE AND LIFE. STUDIES. *By W. D. Howells, Author of "Literary Friends and Acquaintance," "Heroines of Fiction," "My Literary Passions," etc.* Illustrated. 8vo, cloth, pp. x., 323. \$1.50. New York and London: Harper & Brothers. 1902.

Beautifully bound, uniformly with *Literary Friends and Acquaintance* and *Heroines of Fiction*, and beautifully printed and illustrated, this hand-

some volume is worthy of a prominent place in the library or on the sitting-room table. It is a collection of sketches and essays of the "Easy Chair" kind, all interesting and readable, but not closely related to one another. The author, indeed, intimates that he regards them as having a "palpable relation," but to others there seems to be a very loose tie between such essays as *The Man of Letters as a Man of Business*, and *Sawdust in the Arena*, or *At a Dime Museum*, or *the Psychology of Plagiarism*. This, however, is not saying that they are not entertaining from the first to the last. The very variety is attractive. The title is a mistake, we think, for it seems more serious than the liveliness of many of the essays warrant. The volume, as a whole, is a setting forth of the author's literary experience and ideals. He regards literature and life as practically interchangeable terms. "If I did not find life in what professed to be literature, I disabled its profession, and possibly from this habit, now inveterate with me, I am never quite sure of life unless I find literature in it." The essays are, many of them, worldly-wise, in their counsels to young writers, as well as helpful from the literary view point. It is a book to be taken up at odd times for literary refreshment.

A SURVEY OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE. WITH SELECTIONS. *By Isabel F. Hapgood, Author of "Russian Rambles" and "The Epic Songs of Russia."* 12mo, pp. 279. New York, Chautauqua, Springfield: The Chautauqua Press. 1902.

This small volume was prepared for special use in one of the reading courses of the Chautauqua system. It is in popular style, and is not intended to be scientific and exhaustive. It gives a comprehensive glance, however, at the subject, and will largely increase the store of knowledge in the general mind concerning a literature that is not much familiar.

UNDER CALVIN'S SPELL. A Tale of the Heroic Times in Old Geneva. *By Deborah Alcock, Author of "The Spanish Brothers," etc.* Sm. 8vo, pp. 365. \$1.50. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1902.

Among the semi-religious historical novels, this, with its scene laid in Calvin's Geneva and in Calvin's day, deserves to take high rank. It is full of interest, its parts well sustained, its introduction of the characters natural, and its descriptions vivid. Calvin appears in it not so much as a character of the romance as in the dominance of his will over those who are introduced, and over the affairs of the city in which he lived. The impression which the book gives of that great personage is not at first happy, but as the tale progresses it brings out into bolder relief some very attractive pictures of the great reformer. His contests with the Libertines and his missionary enterprises are given special attention in the development of the plot. The book is one which, when once taken up, is not apt to be laid down till the last page of the earnest, pretty, wholesome story is read.

ADNAH: A TALE OF THE TIME OF CHRIST. *By J. Breckinridge Ellis, Author of "Garcilaso," "The Dread and Fear of Kings," etc.* 12mo, pp. 308. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co. 1902.

While displaying no marked familiarity with Eastern and early customs, modes of life, and architecture, the author of this piece of fiction has wrought out an interesting tale. The scene is laid chiefly in the city of Capernaum, and among the leading characters are the nobleman of that city whose son Christ healed, that son himself, who is made a most despicable character, Simon the leper, and others. The story is not effective or strong, and hardly adjusts itself to one's conception of the circumstances of the day.

THE ANGEL OF HIS PRESENCE. *By Grace Livingston Hill, Author of "In the Way," "Long Point," "An Unwilling Guest," etc.*

GABRIEL THE ACADIAN. *By Edith Nicholl Bouryer.* 12mo, pp. 80 and 136. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1902.

The first of these two stories, so short that they are bound in one volume, is the story of a picture of Christ which was so marvellous in its effects that it cured the smoking, drinking, and general worldliness of the young man to whom a Sunday-school presented it, and eventually led to his marriage to the girl who chose it for the givers. It is somewhat overdrawn.

The second of the stories is a romance of the early days of Eastern Canada, illustrating the power of the Roman priesthood among the French, and setting forth the troubles of that period in which the English were taking possession of the land. It is interesting, and lures the reader to inquire more concerning that unhappy period, and concerning the causes which led to the scattering of the French of Acadia.

THE CITIZEN IN HIS RELATIONS TO THE INDUSTRIAL SITUATION. *By Henry Codman Potter.* 12mo, pp. 248. \$1, net. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. 1902.

A series of lectures delivered before Yale University by Bishop Potter. They deal with the relation of the individual, as a member of the political body, to the workingman, the capitalist, the consumer, the corporation, and the state. The author devotes special attention to the study of the industrial situation, and the practical difficulties and conflicts which it develops. The chapter on this is introductory to the rest. It specially emphasizes the fact that the recognition of moral obligations is the basis of all good citizenship, and therefore furnishes the true solution to most of the practical problems that confront us to-day.

THE GREAT WORLD'S FARM. *By Selina Gaye, Author of "The World's Lumber Room," "Coming," etc.* 12mo, pp. vi., 283. New York, Chautauqua, Springfield: The Chautauqua Press. 1902.

A little, popular work on the forces of nature, and plant and animal life, at work on the soil. It derives its title from a phrase of Henry Drummond, in his *Tropical Africa*, where he speaks of the world as one vast garden,

bringing forth its crops, of luxuriant and varied kind, without furrow or visible tillage. This edition of the book is an abridgment of a larger work, to bring it within the limits of the books designed for the Chautauqua Reading Circle. The various chapters are most interesting. The titles of some of them will suggest to the thoughtful mind the author's scope, such as "Pioneer Laborers," "Soil-makers," "Soil-carriers," "Soil-binders," "Field-laborers," "Leaves and Their Work," "Seed Carriers," "Nature's Militia," etc.

THE MASTER'S BLESSEDS. A Devotional Study of the Beatitudes. *By Rev. J. R. Miller, D. D.* Cloth, pp. 182. Price, \$1. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This daintily bound white and gold volume commends itself at once by its appearance and title. The unworldliness of the Master's Beatitudes is set in strong contrast with the blessings of the world. It is a book full of comfort and cheer to sorrowing hearts.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE EXAMINED. *By Henry Varley.* Paper, pp. 80. Price, 15 cents. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

A vigorous criticism of the "illogical and grotesque propositions" contained in Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy's remarkable production.

THE PROPHET OF HOPE. Studies in Zechariah. *By F. B. Meyer, B. A.* Cloth, pp. 157. Price, \$1. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

Mr. Meyer is always readable, suggestive, devotional. He, like A. T. Pier-son, R. A. Torrey, and a few others, seems to have the writer's gift. This volume maintains the author's standard and reputation. It is expository with the "single aim to give the salient features and lessons of each chapter, with the object of alluring the Bible student to a more searching and careful acquaintance with this prophet." The title stresses the one thought which Mr. Meyer believes to pervade the whole prophecy of Zechariah.

THE YOUNG MAN OF YESTERDAY. An Inspiration of the Young Man of To-Day. *By the late Judge Asa W. Tenney. With an Introduction by David Gregg.* Cloth, pp. 62. Price, 30 cents. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This attractively bound little book sums up briefly the various achievements made by warriors, poets, painters, reformers, and inventors as examples of how much has been accomplished in the past by men who had not reached their prime.

THE CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN. *By Rev. Louis Albert Banks, D. D.* Cloth, pp. 123. 12mo. Price, 75 cents. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

A series of addresses delivered at the Young Men's Christian Association Hall at Cleveland, Ohio. They are ennobling, purifying, strengthening, elevating.

HOW TO PRAY. *By R. A. Torrey.* Cloth, pp. 130. Price, 50 cents. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

This book, from the consecrated pen of Mr. Torrey, might also be titled "A Call for a Revival." Forcibly and earnestly the power of prayer is declared, and the methods suggested by which Christians may obtain that power and prevail with God. If every member of the church could be induced to study and practice the precepts here laid down for the prayer life, the needed revival would surely ensue. Such literature as this ought to be scattered far and wide. If Christian people would read such devotional books instead of much of the trash they do read, the church would be blessed with a far stronger faith and deeper spirituality.

THE COMMUNICANT'S MANUAL: OR, SACRAMENTAL MEDITATIONS. *By Capt. Hugh A. White, of the Stonewall Brigade.* Second Edition. *Revised by Rev. H. M. White, D. D.* Paper, pp. 30. Price, 5 cents. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

A tract of thirty pages, giving very helpful meditations for use before and after communion, with a brief sketch of the author. It would, indeed, be well if communicants would reflect more, and prepare in spirit for the Holy Supper. We could wish that there was a demand for many more such meditations.

THE MORMONS. *By Rev. E. O. Guerrant, D. D.* Paper, pp. 12. Price, 2 cents. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

This tract on the dangers of Mormonism should be widely circulated. It would be well for pastors to purchase and place it in the hands of their congregations. The agencies of this false doctrine are active; why should opposition to it not be active also? Certainly the people should be informed.

THE MINISTRY OF INTERCESSION. A Plea for More Prayer. *By Rev. Andrew Murray.* Cloth, pp. 226. Price, 75 cents. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

"The Ministry of Intercession" is an intensely practical plea. It urges believers to more earnestness in regard to supplication for others. Mr. Murray always says helpful things; but, for the deepening of spiritual life and experience, he has, in this volume, almost surpassed himself. Distressed by the impotency of God's people in prayer, and conscious of the richness of the Lord's promises, upon concluding the reading of a book like this, we experience the sentiment of Mr. Torrey's *Finis* in his volume on prayer, "Let us pray!"

PRINTING!

BOOKS belong to the "high art" of Printing. There are first-rate carpenters, but the cabinet-maker can turn out work the carpenter cannot do; and there are good house-painters, but the artist is away above him in handling the brush. So, in Printing, Bookwork stands in the same relation.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON love to put into elegant garb the work of the Theologian, the Literary Genius, and the Poet. Their Bookwork is of the best.

The following works are some of the more recent issues from their presses, and they would respectfully refer authors and publishers to them as the class of work which, with the aid of skillful workmen and the most efficient machinery, they are enabled to present:

Life and Letters of Rev. Moses D. Hoge, D. D.

Life and Times of Rev. Dr. Adger.

Discussions of Philosophical Questions, by Dr. Girardeau.

Sermons, Apologetic and Doctrinal, by Dr. C. R. Vaughan.

The Threefold Fellowship, by Dr. B. M. Palmer.

The Universal Salvation of Infants, by Dr. Stagg.

Also numerous volumes for Sunday-school Libraries, published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

As examples of Magazine Printing, they would refer to those numbers of THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY which have been issued since July, 1902, and also to THE UNION SEMINARY MAGAZINE.

They make a specialty of printing MINUTES OF PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS, undertaking to relieve the Stated Clerks of the distribution of the printed copies. The arrangement has been very satisfactory, and they are desirous of extending this line of work, and invite correspondence.

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL AIDS,

PUBLISHED BY

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,

for the

PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

The Earnest Worker

Furnishes full expositions of the International Lessons and other helps. Issued monthly. Thirty-two pages and cover, Five or more copies to one address, 50 cents each; single, 60 cents.

The Children's Friend.

Published weekly. \$30 per 100 per year, in any quantity; single subscriptions, 50 cents.

Pearls for the Little Ones.

Published weekly. \$15 per 100 per year, in any quantity; single subscriptions, 25 cents.

The Lesson Quarterly

Contains Lessons for Advanced and Intermediate Classes and other matter. Thirty-two pages and cover. Five or more copies to one address, 12 cents each per annum; to separate addresses, 20 cents each.

The Primary Quarterly

Contains the Lessons and matter suitable for Primary Classes. Sixteen pages and cover. Five or more copies to one address, 8 cents each per annum; sent to separate addresses, 12 cents each.

The Lesson Papers

Contain the weekly Lessons, with Questions for the use of scholars. They will be furnished at the following rates: 100 copies, one year, \$7.50; 50 copies, \$3.75; 24 copies, \$1.80; 10 copies, 75 cents.

Bible Lesson Pictures.

Printed in bright colors, illustrating the Lessons, with questions and answers bearing on the subjects taught. Per annum, 10 cents. Issued quarterly.

Large Lesson Picture Roll.

Size, 2 x 3 feet. With the same illustrations as on the Bible Lesson Pictures. One year, \$3, or will be sent quarterly at 75 cents per quarter.

All the above are sent postage paid. Payments should accompany the order.

Orders for the above should be addressed to

WHITTET & SHEPPERSON,

1001 Main Street, RICHMOND, VA.

