

The Sunday School Times.

JOHN D. WATTLES, }
PUBLISHER.

PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 25, 1886.

{ VOLUME XXVIII.
NUMBER 52.

Copyright 1886 by John D. Wattles.
Entered at the Post-office at Philadelphia as "second-class matter."
The regular edition this week is 78,000 copies.
The Sunday School Times will be sent post free for a year to any address in the United States or Canada for \$2.00. It will be sent on trial to any subscriber every week for three months for 50 cents. For sale by newsdealers. Price, five cents.

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:	
Notes.—Battling the Body. Light on Genesis Through Its Criticism. Two Classes of Bible Critics. Walking with God while Walking Among Men.....	817
Christmas Good Wishes.....	817
NOTES ON OPEN LETTERS:	
Possibly, but Not Properly, Every Question Has Two Answers.....	818
FROM CONTRIBUTORS:	
Christmas Bells [poem]. By Susan Coolidge.....	818
Facts and Considerations Bearing on the Origin and Condition of Primitive Man. By Sir J. William Dawson, C.M.G., LL.D., F.R.S.....	818
The Critical Analysis of the Pentateuch. By Professor W. Henry Green, D.D., LL.D.....	820
The Christ-Child's Visit [poem]. By J. H. N.....	821
FOR CHILDREN AT HOME:	
Christmas Carol [poem]. By Eben E. Rexford.....	821
A Christmas Lesson. By Mrs. W. F. Crafts.....	821
LESSON HELPS:	
Lesson Calendar.....	822
[Lesson II. January 9. Sin and Death. Gen. 3: 1-4, 17-19.]	
Lesson Text.....	822
Lesson Plan.....	822
Lesson Analysis.....	822
Lesson Bible Reading.....	822
Lesson Surroundings.....	822
Critical Notes. By Professor W. Henry Green, D.D., LL.D.....	822
Suggestive Jottings. By Professor Dr. Franz Delitzsch.....	823
The Text and its Teachings. By Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.....	823
Lessons of the Fall. By Alexander McLaren, D.D.....	824
Teaching Points. By Bishop H. W. Warren, D.D., LL.D.....	824
Illustrative Applications. By H. Clay Trumbull.....	825
Teaching Hints. By A. F. Schaffner, D.D.....	825
Hints for the Primary Teacher. By Faith Latimer.....	825
Question Hints. By Miss Anna T. Pearce and Eugene Tappan.....	826
Blackboard Hints.....	826
Hints for Lesson-Hymns.....	826
Oriental Lesson-Lights. By Professor Dr. Isaac H. Hall and Professor Dr. Hermann V. Hilprecht.....	826
BOOKS AND WRITERS:	
Aids to Oriental Study.....	826
Ancient Cities, from the Dawn to the Daylight. Heart's Own: Verses. The Philosophy of Education. Contes Tirés de Shakespeare.....	827
WORK AND WORKERS:	
The Sunday-school Work Abroad.....	827
FROM OUR NEIGHBORS:	
Idolatry of Business.....	828
WORTH REPEATING:	
A Thought [poem].....	830
The Hindoos of Southern India.....	830

While we are in the body, we not only have the body to provide for, but we have to battle the body. By grace we may be enabled to keep the body in subjection; but grace does not so change the body that the body no longer needs watching, nor needs battling. Paul said that he was all the time watching his body and battling his body, lest he himself, inspired preacher that he was, should become a castaway. One of the weariest trials of life in the body, is this ever-wearying trial of life's struggle with the body. "Plotinus," it is said, "thanked God that his [immortal] soul was not tied to an immortal body." It would be hard, indeed, if this conflict of the soul with the body must be kept up eternally. As it is, by grace the soul grows stronger, while by nature the body grows weaker; and here is a light at the even-tide of life.

All true progress is through conflict. The progress of an intelligent belief in the Bible as a result of divine revelation, and as a divinely inspired work, is no exception to this general rule. A century ago the Bible was adhered to by very many with a blind acceptance of traditional renderings of its text and its teachings; while, on the other hand, it was, by very many, rejected and sweepingly denounced as a mass of errors unworthy of serious consideration. But

largely in consequence of deliberate attempts, both scientific and critical, to prove the Bible untrue, the Bible has gained in both popular and scholarly confidence, to an utterly unprecedented degree. And now the Bible is accepted and trusted by a larger proportion of intelligent scholars than ever before since the original writing of its earliest pages. No better proof could be given of the inspired authorship of Genesis, than is shown in its increasing lustre, under the vigorous rubbings of merciless critics and of uncompromising scientists.

Concerning scientific questions, it is better to seek information from a scientist than from a theologian. Concerning points of critical scholarship, it is better to turn to a critical scholar than to a scientist. As both scientific and critical questions are involved in the study of the earlier chapters of Genesis, both scientists and critical scholars have been requested to give to the readers of The Sunday School Times the results of their studies, severally, on the main points involved in the current lessons. Sir J. William Dawson, president of the British Association, speaks as a scientist concerning the Bible record of primitive man, of the Garden of Eden, and of the Deluge. His conclusions justify any reverent Bible student in continuing to accept unhesitatingly the narrative in Genesis as veritable history presented in its present shape by a divinely inspired writer; and this in the face of every attempt to show that the myths and the folk-lore of the nations were the source of the Bible narrative, instead of being the perverted outcome of its primal truth. Meantime, the eminent critical scholars, Drs. Delitzsch, Driver, and Green, throw such light on the text itself as supplies added reason for recognizing in it the work of inspiration. The earlier chapters of Genesis stand out in clearer light than ever as the record of a revelation from God, and as a record of absolute truth, in view of all that is said and shown concerning them by the scientific and critical writers who are contributors to this week's issue of The Sunday School Times.

How prone we are to think that nearness to God is somehow dependent on remoteness from our fellows! Yet in both the Old Testament and the New nearness to God is linked with added nearness to God's creatures. Says the disciple who was pre-eminently near and dear to the Son of God: "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen." So it was from the beginning. Earliest among the sons of men who have been distinguished by their nearness to God stands Enoch: "Enoch walked with God," we are told. A marvelous record that! To walk with God is to live as it were a life of divine coincidence; for "how can two walk together except they be agreed?" And Enoch was agreed with God. His soul moved in rhythm with the stately steppings of the eternal One. To walk with God is to be like God, to think what God thinks, to choose what God chooses, to love what God loves, to hate what God hates; in short, to share in God's life. To walk with God is to "follow" God's Son, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Thus Enoch walked, sharing God's character, and so sharing God's beatitude. In briefest phrase, and this too from the testimony borne to Enoch in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "He pleased God." Ay, to walk with God is to

please God, and to please God is to walk with God. Yet in thus walking with God, Enoch was no anchorite or fanatic. Very suggestive is this little record concerning him: "Enoch walked with God after he begat Methuselah three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters." No ascetic celibate was he. It was as true for him as it is for us, that character is unfolded and tested in society. The family, not the monastery; society, not the cloister,—this is the sphere of the divine promenade. May it be for every one of us, like Enoch, to have witness borne to us even in this world that we are pleasing God. Thus walking with God, we shall keep in everlasting chime with him; our communion with him being the ceaseless, blissful melody of the heavenly antiphony.

CHRISTMAS GOOD WISHES.

The Christmas days thaw the chill out of our hearts, and kindle warmth of feeling and affection. Most of us grow less selfish as we think, even transiently and superficially, of the great event which these days recall. There are few people whose moods are not, at this season of the year, a little more kindly than their wont. The man is to be pitied who does not try to put new brightness and gladness into some other life on the Christmas morning. We all have good wishes in our hearts, and we are more likely now than at ordinary times to find expression for our wishes in some fitting word or token. Our interest in our friends deepens as we think anew of God's loving interest in us, as shown in the gift of his Son. Thoughtful pastors and teachers are sure to experience a quickening of solicitude for the souls under their care, as they are freshly reminded of the infinite sacrifice made by Christ in saving the lost. The Christmas days, therefore, should make us all better, purer, kindlier, gentler, truer friends, more faithful in all our ministry of love, more diligent and earnest in all our efforts to help others.

It might startle some of us to consider, for a moment, how unreal, how practically insincere, and even almost hypocritical, are many of our utterances of good-will to men. We say with glib tongue, "Good morning," "Good-by," "Merry Christmas," "Happy New Year," to every one we meet, when, nine times out of ten, there is not in our heart the shadow of a sentiment corresponding to the formula of words we use. Many people send cards, and other tokens of remembrance, at Christmas time, merely because the canon of fashion says it is the proper thing to do,—although their gifts or mementos carry no true message of love. It may be worth while for us to make a struggle toward reality and sincerity, even in so small a matter as the simple formularies of our ordinary salutations. There seems to be no reason why we should not get a little heart into our "Good-morning," our "Merry Christmas," our "Happy New Year." We shall be the better for it ourselves; for this kind of giving blesses him who gives; and, also, a real good wish will certainly be more of a blessing than an empty or insincere one.

It may not be amiss, while on this subject, to think a little of the kind of good wishes which are really worthy of true and wise affection. Old Testament blessings were usually represented under the form of material good things; New Testament beatitudes, however, take the form of spiritual gifts and qualities.

"men of renown," strong, courageous, and aggressive, warring with each other and with the wild animals around them.

If we identify these ancient antediluvians with the oldest men known to science, the parallelism is somewhat marked. Recent discoveries also suggest the possible equivalency with the historical deluge of the great subsidence which closed the residence of palæocosmic men in Europe and Western Asia, as well as that of several of the large mammalia. Lenormant and others have shown that the wide and ancient acceptance of the traditions of the deluge among all the great branches of the human family necessitates the belief that, independently of the biblical history, the great event must be received as an historical fact which very deeply impressed itself upon the minds of all the early nations. Now, if the deluge is to be accepted as historical, and if a similar break interrupts the geological history of man, separating extinct races from those which still survive, why may we not correlate the two? The misuse of the deluge in the early history of geology, in employing it to account for changes that took place long before the advent of man, certainly should not cause us to neglect its legitimate uses, when these arise in the progress of investigation. It is evident that if this correlation be accepted as probable, it must modify many views now held as to the antiquity of man. In that case, the modern gravels spread over plateaus and in river valleys, far above the reach of the present floods, may be accounted for, not by the ordinary action of the existing streams, but by the abnormal action of currents of water diluvial in their character. Farther, since the historical deluge cannot have been of very long duration, the physical changes separating the deposits containing the remains of palæocosmic men from those of later date, would in like manner be accounted for, not by slow processes of subsidence, elevation, and erosion, but by causes of a more abrupt and cataclysmic character.

It is an interesting fact that those ancient cave-men, whose bones testify to the existence of man in Europe before the last physical changes of the Post-glacial age, and while many mammals now locally or wholly extinct still lived in Europe, present characters such as we might expect to find at least in the ruder nomadic tribes of the antediluvian men. Their large brains, great stature, and strong bones point to just such characters as would befit the giants that were in those days. It is farther of interest that, though no relics of civilized antediluvians have yet been discovered, the early appearance of skill in the arts of life in the valleys of the Euphrates and Nile in post-diluvian times, points to an inheritance of antediluvian arts by the early Hamitic or Turanian nations, and is scarcely explicable on any other hypothesis.

THE DELUGE.

9. The occurrence of such a catastrophe as the deluge of Noah is in no respect incomprehensible as a geological phenomenon; and, were we bound to explain it by natural causes, these would not be hard to find. The terms of the narrative in Genesis well accord with a movement of the earth's crust, bringing the waters of the ocean over the land, and, at the same time, producing great atmospheric disturbances. Such movements seem to have occurred at the close of the Post-glacial, or Palæocosmic age, and were probably connected with the extinction of the Palæocosmic, or cave-men, of Europe, and of the larger land animals, their contemporaries; and these movements closed the later continental period of Lyell, and left the land permanently at a lower level than formerly. It is to be observed, also, that the narrative in Genesis does not appear to imply a very sudden catastrophe. There is nothing to prevent us from supposing that the submergence of the land was proceeding during all the period of Noah's preaching, which, we are told, was a hundred and twenty years; and the actual time during which the deluge affected the district occupied by the narrator was more than a year. It is also to be observed that the narrative in Genesis purports to be that of an eye-witness. He notes the going into the ark, the closing of its door, the first floating of the large ship, then its drifting, then the disappearance of visible land, and the minimum depth of fifteen cubits, probably representing the draft of water of the ark. Then we have the abating of the waters, with an intermittent action, "going and returning;" the grounding of the ark, the gradual appearance of surrounding hills, the disappearance of the water, and, finally, the drying of the ground. All this, if historical in any degree, must consist of the notes of an eye-witness; and, if understood in this sense, the narrative can raise no question as to the absolute universality of the catastrophe, since the whole earth of the narrator was simply his

visible horizon. This will also remove much of the discussion as to the animals taken in the ark, since these must have been limited to the fauna of the district of the narrator; and, even within this, the lists actually given in Genesis exclude the larger carnivorous animals. Thus, there would be nothing to prevent our supposing, on the one hand, that some species of animals became altogether extinct, and that the whole fauna of vast regions, not reached by the deluge, remained intact. It is further curious that the narrative of the deluge, in the Assyrian tablets, like that of Genesis, purports to be the testimony of a witness, and, indeed, of the Assyrian equivalent to Noah himself. The "waters of Noah" are thus coming more and more within the cognizance of geology and archaeology; and it is more than probable that other points of contact than those we have noticed may ere long develop themselves.

We have merely glanced cursorily at a few of the salient points of the relation of the primitive history of man in Genesis to modern scientific discovery. Many other details might have been adduced as tending to show similar coincidences of these two distinct lines of evidence. Enough has, however, been said to indicate the remarkable manner in which the history in Genesis has anticipated modern discovery, and to show that this ancient book is in every way trustworthy, and as remote as possible from the myths and legends of ancient heathenism, though showing the historical origin of beliefs which in more or less corrupted forms lie at the foundations of the oldest religions of the Gentiles, as well as of that of the Jews: To the Christian the record in Genesis has a still higher value, as constituting those historical groundworks of the plan of salvation to which our Lord himself often referred, and in which he rested much of his teachings.

I rejoice that the attention of teachers and pupils in our Sunday-schools should be again attracted to these ancient and fundamental portions of revelation. May they be studied in an earnest and thoughtful spirit, leading to the appreciation of their majesty and beauty, and of the value of their spiritual teaching!

THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.

The conjecture of Vitranga and others that ante-Mosaic records may have been consulted in the preparation of the book of Genesis, has no antecedent improbability; and the history reaching back to an antiquity so remote would seem to be better accredited if resting upon a written basis, than if drawn solely from oral tradition. The further suggestion has since been made, that not only were its materials drawn from pre-existing documents, but that it was itself directly compiled from these documents by transcribing sections and paragraphs from them alternately and piecing these together. If this really were the case, it is not impossible that the primitive documents might, to a certain extent, be reconstructed now. The extracts from each, preserving their original style and character, might be recognized as such, distinguished from their surroundings, and so selected out and combined again in something like their original form. Genesis might thus be decomposed into its constituent elements, and those more ancient sources from which it was compiled be reproduced before our eyes. The idea is a fascinating one, and involves nothing prejudicial to the inspiration of this part of the sacred volume. The books of Kings and Chronicles explicitly name the sources upon which they were based, and their exact verbal correspondence in many passages shows that these at least were transcribed verbatim. From whatever quarter their contents were derived, they are accredited to us by the authority of the inspired penmen.

Genesis, indeed, contains no allusion to prior writings as its sources, and no intimation of their existence is to be found elsewhere. There is nothing to indicate that it was framed in the manner suggested, unless this can be proved by the literary analysis of the book itself. Such proof, however, it is claimed, can be furnished not only for Genesis, but for all the five books of Moses and for Joshua in addition; which [six books] it is now the fashion among the critics to comprehend under the common title of the Hexateuch, and to regard the whole as one work. After passing through a variety of phases, the divisive hypothesis has, for the present, at least, settled down upon the recognition of four distinct authors traceable in the Hexateuch, whom Kuenen severally denotes by the symbols P (priestly writer), J (Jahvist, who when speaking of God prevalently uses the divine name Jahve, or Jehovah), E (who calls God Eloheem, as P also does in

Genesis), D (author of Deuteronomy); to whom must be added R, the redactor, or editor, who combined the whole in its present form. Each of these has, it is said, his own favorite words and expressions, his own peculiar ideas, his special aims and tendencies. And the presence of these characteristics in any paragraph or section is sufficient to determine to which of the above-mentioned writers it should be assigned.

Much that is plausible can, no doubt, be said in favor of this hypothesis. It has been successively elaborated by scholars of the greatest eminence, who have employed the utmost resources of ingenuity and learning to adapt it to the phenomena for which it is proposed to account. And it is accepted by a large majority of transatlantic scholars at the present time. I shall not undertake to say here how far it is true or how far false. But, in my opinion, it can be clearly shown that much of the reasoning by which it is supported is fallacious. Of the imposing lists of words said to be indicative of one or other of these writers, a large proportion is manifestly without significance; such as words found in certain paragraphs, but which there was no occasion to employ in others; ritual and legal terms which, as a matter of course, are restricted to the writer to whom all the ritual legislation is assigned; poetic diction, which could only be expected in poetic passages; words of rare occurrence, which afford no indication of a writer's habitual style; synonyms used in different paragraphs, but whose employment is governed by the shade of meaning to be expressed, and contains no suggestion of diversity of authorship. The whole process by which the hypothesis has been built up, is, moreover, open to the suspicion of being altogether, or in large part, fictitious; and the more so since it has no external corroboration whatever, and there is no independent test by which its conclusions can be verified or corrected, or by which the theorizing of the critics can be certainly discriminated from the actual fact. The partition is effected on the presumption that certain expressions and ideas characterize a particular writer. All paragraphs, and even sentences or clauses, which contain them, are, for this reason, regularly assigned to him. And when the work is ended, it corresponds with the hypothesis, simply because it was throughout done by the hypothesis. How easy it is to bring together apparent criteria of separate authorship in large numbers, and how unmeaning they may be, after all, is apparent from the pages which Knobel has filled with expressions characteristic of what he calls the Rechtsbuch and the Kriegsbuch, though no subsequent critic admits their existence.

There are, besides, numerous passages to which the hypothesis, with all its marvelous flexibility, and the amazing dexterity with which it is handled, has never yet been satisfactorily applied, and where even the most ingenious critics are obliged to confess themselves thus far baffled. In so-called mixed passages the criteria of different writers are so inextricably blended that no minuteness of dissection can sever them. And in very many instances besides, it is only by the minute chipping which is resorted to, and the transfer of clauses from the connection in which they are found to a widely different context, that the admission is evaded of phenomena at variance with the hypothesis, or that the continuity of the alleged documents can even measurably be preserved. In repeated instances, also, the contents of one document imply the previous or the succeeding mention of what is to be found only in another, the very sections which the critics have sundered from it being thus essential to its integrity. When a continuous narrative is parceled among different writers, it is often necessary to assume that what is now lacking to each was originally supplied by just such a passage as is found in the present text, but is declared to be an extract from another source; so that what the critics remove with one hand, they are forced to restore with the other. When the attempt is made to carry the hypothesis through with rigorous exactness, it becomes so complicated as to be in danger of breaking down by its own weight. Wellhausen and Kuenen are obliged to assume two, three, or more successive editions of each document, and a long series of redactors. The function of the redactor becomes, in fact, an incomprehensible whirl, when he is called upon, as he incessantly is, to account for everything that conflicts with the requisitions of the hypothesis.

But the irrelevance of many of the arguments adduced in support of the divisive hypothesis, and the inadequacy of the rest to establish it, is the least of the objections which must in fairness be alleged against it. It has notoriously been developed in the interest and under the bias of unbelief in the truthfulness and the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. I am not unmindful of

the ancient maxim: "Fas est et ab hoste doceri" ["It is proper to learn even from an enemy"].

I gratefully accept all the light and help that can be obtained, from whatever quarter, without inquiring anxiously into the motives or the character of those who are competent to afford it. But when a person is asked to adopt in bulk a ready-made scheme, interwoven with principles antagonistic to his inmost convictions, and based on assumptions which he cannot allow, he may well remember the Trojan horse: "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes" ["I fear the Greeks, even when they bring gifts"].

As a purely literary question, to be discussed and decided on literary grounds, no repugnance need be felt to the fullest consideration of the composite character of the Pentateuch, or to the adoption of whatever conclusion the facts of the case, fairly and candidly examined, may warrant. But the critical hypothesis, in its current form, is a very different affair. It rests throughout on the assumption of contradictions in the sacred narrative where none exist, and upon the exaggeration of differences, while all explanatory passages, and those which establish the entire consistency of the whole, are systematically eliminated as forming no part of the primary record. Distinct events, which bear some mutual resemblance, are first identified on the ground of their similitude, and then discredited on the ground of the remaining divergence. If, by any possibility, an interpretation can be put upon disjointed sentences which is at variance with the context, these are straightway erected into a different version of the affair; and everything which renders this interpretation impossible is attributed to a redactor who has striven to harmonize what in point of fact is incompatible. Since the hypothesis has been elaborated in this spirit, it is not strange if the result corresponds with the primary assumption, and the self-consistent and well-accredited historical narrative is converted into a jargon of conflicting and unreliable traditions, whose origin no one can trace, and from which no certainty can be attained; the utmost that can be hoped for is that a modicum of truth may be sifted from the discordant and untrustworthy mass.

The date assigned by the critics to these documents, which they fancy that they have discovered, is utterly incredible. Kuenen, whom in this particular the adherents of the new departure in criticism substantially follow, places what he considers the very oldest of them, J and E, seven centuries after the exodus, or more than eleven centuries after Jacob's descent into Egypt. D belongs to the reformation of King Josiah, nearly two centuries later still. And P was first brought publicly forward by Ezra after the Babylonish exile. The Pentateuch in its present form was, of course, produced subsequently to its several parts. All this, however, has nothing to do with the critical analysis of the Pentateuch. It is in no wise a sequence from its literary dissection. This is abundantly shown by the manner in which former critics have ranged up and down the centuries in their efforts to fix a date for the Pentateuchal documents. The period assigned to J and E rests avowedly on the assumption of the falsity of the patriarchal narratives, not only in details, but in their whole substance and form. The date of D and P is fixed by the affirmation that no law restricting sacrificial worship to one central sanctuary could have existed before Josiah, and that the Levitical regulations respecting the sanctuary and the priesthood were not framed until after the exile.

The contrariety between the laws of the Pentateuch and acknowledged facts in the history of Israel is obvious. This admits of two explanations: either the laws were disobeyed, or no such laws had been enacted. The critics affirm the latter alternative. The unanimous testimony of all the Scriptures declares the former to be the true solution. Before we can accept the conclusion of the critics on this point we must be prepared to admit that all Hebrew tradition is in error about it, that all the sacred historians were mistaken in regard to it; so were the prophets who upbraided the people for willful departures from God's known law in doing what the critics say had never been forbidden; so were the Psalmists, who celebrate God's chosen seat in Zion, and are hence, by a stroke of the critics' pen, declared *en masse* to be post-exilic; so were the inspired writers of the New Testament and the Lord Jesus himself, who declare the laws of the Pentateuch to be the laws of Moses. Deuteronomy is, on this hypothesis, no innocent fiction, no honest attempt to reproduce the legislation of Moses in its true spirit and idea. It is put forth in the name of Moses, and claiming to have been written by him, in order to inaugurate a new departure in the centralization of worship, which is the animating principle of the entire book, and which could only be accomplished by

claiming the authority of the great legislator for this centralization which he never sanctioned, and imposing it in his name upon both king and people. And, strange to say, though the new movement was in opposition to the interests of powerful classes, and to the cherished feelings and practices of large masses, its legitimacy was never questioned, and the imposition was not detected nor exposed until recent critics dragged it to the light. And a like phenomenon was repeated in the Levitical law after the exile.

It is not a theory that is here at stake, or a traditional mode of regarding Old Testament history, which may be discarded, and yet all that is material and valuable in these early Scriptures be left unimpaired. It is a far more vital question, Are the Scriptures true, and do they deserve our faith?

THE CHRIST-CHILD'S VISIT.

BY J. H. N.

There was a sound of music and of song;
The earth was white, the moaning wind was keen;
Bright holly branches wreathed the lighted tree,—
When came the Christ-child looking on the scene.
The yule-log gleamed, the revellers' hearts were light,
And many a carol rang out on the night.

A shade came o'er the face of him who gazed
Unseen by those who thus observed his birth.
In the great gladness of the festal hour
Their happiness was but the joy of earth;
In deeds to him they held but little part;
There was no love of Christ-child in the heart.

And so he turned, and sought a wretched hut,
Where burned no Christmas-tree, no berries red,
But Misery kept ward beside the door,
And Hunger stalked upon the scene instead.
A pale, gaunt man was reading, by faint light,
The birth at Bethlehem that Christmas night.

With pitying eyes the Christ-child calmly gazed,
And swift wings came unto that lonely bed;
Then when the humble reader looked again,
He better knew the story he had read.
He laid his burden down beneath cold skies,
Just where the Christ-child closed his weary eyes.

FOR CHILDREN AT HOME.

CHRISTMAS CAROL.

BY EBEN E. REXFORD.

Ring, Christmas bells, ring clear and sweet,
While listening winds for joy repeat,
In far-off corners of the earth,
Your message of a Saviour's birth.
Ring out, sweet bells, in glad accord,
On this, the birthday of our Lord;
Say to the world, on Christmas morn,
"Rejoice, rejoice; thy King is born!"

Tell of the manger, poor and low,
That cradled, centuries ago,
The Child whom wise men from afar
Came seeking, guided by a star.
O star that rose o'er Bethlehem's height,
And with strange glory filled the night,
Thou shinest still to lead the way
To Jesus on this Christmas Day!

In love and fitting Christmas cheer
To-day let heart to heart draw near,
Forgetful of life's care and fret,
Its discord and its vain regret,
And in this holy Christmas-tide
Draw nearer to the bleeding side
Of Him who died for us and them
Who hailed him king at Bethlehem.

A CHRISTMAS LESSON.

BY MRS. W. F. CRAFTS.

Which do you like best, fairy stories or true stories? Fairy stories are always wonderful; but true stories are even more wonderful sometimes than fairy stories. I will tell you a true story about what came out of a night.

What a night that was! It was dark, just like all other nights. The stars were shining in the sky. The sheep and lambs were lying down in sleep. The good, kind shepherds were keeping watch over their flocks, for fear the wolves and lions that go about in the darkness would come and steal some of their sheep and lambs. All at once the shepherds saw a bright light about them, and an angel standing by them. The shepherds were so frightened by the great light at night, and by the angel,

that they tried to cover up their eyes by putting their faces close down to the ground. Then the angel spoke to them, and told them not to be afraid, for he had brought them good news, even that God's Son had come into the world to make a way for people to go to heaven. Perhaps the shepherds looked up then, and asked the angel to tell them where they could find God's Son. Perhaps the shepherds thought God's Son would be great and strong and beautiful. No, said the angel; you will find him a little babe, "wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger." The manger was the trough in which the hay was put for an ox or a cow.

How wonderful it was that the God who had made all things should come again to the world as a little baby, so that he might show children the way to heaven!

When the angel had told the shepherds where to find Jesus, the whole sky seemed to be full of angels who sang the good news that Jesus was born. Oh, how beautiful must have been their song!

When the angels had finished their song, the shepherds started to find Jesus. They went into Bethlehem, and in a stable they found the Babe, with Mary his mother, and Joseph her husband. The shepherds told what the angel had said, and about the song of the angels, and about the star which had shown them the way. Then the shepherds, when they had seen the little Jesus, went back to their flocks, praising God for what they had seen and heard.

That wonderful night, children, was the first Christmas. Now I am wondering if you cannot tell me what came out of that wonderful night that has filled the whole world. You are always so joyful at Christmas time, I think you surely might tell me one thing,—joy. We have so much joy at Christmas time because we get so many presents, and give so many too. I am not at all well pleased that a sort of fairy called Santa Claus has come into Jesus' place. I fear that some little children think only about Santa Claus at Christmas time, and forget that all their happy times have come out of that first Christmas night, when Jesus was born. Little boys and girls, men and women too, in all parts of the world, feel the joy of that first Christmas in their hearts.

Now let us think of something else that came out of that first Christmas night which is filling the whole world. I wonder if any of you read in the papers, as I have done, about how all the poor children in the city had warm clothes, and plenty of good food, and toys of all kinds, given to them on Christmas Day. Perhaps some of you gave money to help those poor ones have a happy Christmas. This "good-will" toward everybody has grown out of that first Christmas night.

We are talking about what came out of that first Christmas night that is filling the whole world. There is a verse in the Bible which says: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." Away off in China, India, Japan, and the islands of the sea, as well as in our own land, and in every nation, there are some who love him because he first loved them. The love of God, then, which Jesus brought into the world on that first Christmas night, has gone into every part of the world.

We often sing, "The whole world was lost in the darkness of sin." Jesus came to take away the darkness of sin, and in its place he has put the brightness of salvation. He will wash away all sin, and when, at the last day, he gathers together all who have repented of their sins and put their trust in him, men, women, and little children will come out of every tribe and nation. We shall not then, as we sometimes do now, have unkind feelings for those who are not of our own blood.

And what came out of that Christmas night for the Lord Jesus himself? Days of childhood, when he grew in wisdom and in stature; days of toil in the little town of Nazareth, when he was known only as the carpenter's son; days of wandering, sad and lone, when he said: "Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head;" a night of sorrow in the garden, when he sweat as it were great drops of blood because of the anguish of his soul. Out of that first Christmas night grew days of persecution, when he was crowned in mockery as a king, and spit upon, and reviled, and at last was crucified, dead, and buried, and on the third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father, whence he shall come again to judge the world. But how glorious he will be then! And what great rejoicing there will be, for the dead will be made alive; and those who loved and served the Lord Jesus while they lived, he will take back to heaven to be with him forever,—all because "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."