

# PRESBYTERIAN STANDARD

LIFT UP A STANDARD FOR THE PEOPLE

ESTABLISHED 1858.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., FEBRUARY 14, 1900.

VOL. XLII—N 7.

## CONTENTS:

EDITORIAL :	PAGE
Note and Comment.....	1
The Lesson from Kentucky.....	2
Card-Playing and Gambling.....	3
The Sheldon Idea.....	3-4
Review of Contemporaries.....	4
Christ Weeping Over Jerusalem—J. B. Rankin.....	5
CORRESPONDENCE :	
Dr. Hoge's Views in Public Prayer—P. H. H.....	6
Letter from Greece—Moschion Petrides.....	6
Our Era—Senex.....	7
Look at This—Clark.....	7
The Euchre-Players.....	8
A Message for Teachers.....	8
CONTRIBUTED :	
Dr. McGiffert's Historical Methods—S. M. Smith, D. D.....	9
Jesus Rejected at Nazareth—Rev. A. A. Little.....	9
Westminster League—J. R. Rosebro.....	10
Thanks! "Spion Kop" is Ours.....	10
CHURCH NEWS.	
Personals.....	11
The Churches.....	12-13
News of the Week.....	14-15
Marriages and Deaths.....	16
The Household.....	17
Young People.....	18-19
Children's Department.....	20-21
Wit and Wisdom.....	22
Farm and Garden.....	23
General Religious News.....	24

The Congregational Church Building Society is now nearly a half-century old. Last year the receipts were nearly a quarter of a million dollars. A large part of this was money returned by the churches to which it had been loaned. The Loan Fund, including one for parsonages as well as churches, is nearly a million dollars and the revolving feature of lending and receiving back makes the fund almost self-supporting. We ought to have such a fund in our Church, but it would take good management to make it succeed.

Father Zurches, a Roman Catholic priest of Buffalo, New York, not long ago attacked the monks who made a business of making and selling beer, and incidentally gave his unvarnished opinion of the priests who ask for money for masses for particular souls on All Saints Day. Father Zurches has been suspended from the priesthood for his refusal to apologize. That is all right. If beer making and particularism in purchased masses on All Saints Day are of the essence of Romanism, let Father Zurches go. All that we have said about Dr. McGiffert, *mutatis mutandis*, applies to Father Zurches. He has denied the creed, which according to the evidence in the case now embraces the rightfulness of the brewery and the

beer saloon, the honesty of asking for money for particular masses, when they were to be said for all souls any way, and the wrongfulness of criticising either course. Unless Father Zurches assents to these articles of faith he has ceased to be a Romanist.

One of the remarks that was imputed to Mr. Moody and which we never saw denied was his statement that when he had to raise \$100,000 for religious purposes he knew in advance that \$80,000 was coming from Presbyterian pockets. However true that may be, those who have charge of the \$3,000,000 Moody fund are acting on the principle that most of the money is to be contributed by Presbyterians. Every member of the Committee is a Presbyterian Elder, unless Mr. Sankey be an exception. He ought to be made an elder and let the vote be unanimous. Suppose that Presbyterians should some time make up their minds to capture everything in which they had a majority vote of men or money or both. Then Northfield, and Chautauqua and Tuskegee and Union Seminary, New York, and the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. and the C. E. and about all the other alphabetic institutions with the possible exception of the W. C. T. U. and the Woman's Right's Clubs, would become Presbyterian forthwith. And who knows that there is not some deep-laid scheme now to do that very thing and the Presbyterians are as narrow as they are said to be supposed to be.

Dr. Vance is a good phrase maker. His sermon on last Sunday had for its subject, The Silent Churches of Tennessee. His text was, We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.

He spoke of the silent pulpits in some thirty churches of the State, silent because the people were unable to secure a minister. Then he had a few things to say of the silent pews, of the people who were satisfied with having preaching for themselves and unwilling to speak to others through their representatives, the ministers of the Gospel. It was Dr. Vance's idea to bring together the silent pew and the silent pulpit, and make both vocal. And we have no doubt that he accomplished his purpose.

Dr. Vance made another good point which shows that he has been reading the STANDARD. He referred to the fact that there were 23,000 Southern and 5,000 Northern Presbyterians in Tennessee. Dr. Vance's views on Organic Union are well known. He proposed that the first step be taken right there in Tennessee and that the 5,000 Northern Presbyterians "cast in their lot with us." There never was any better organic union platform than that of the Hardshell Baptists, "Jine us."

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### Dr. Hoge's Views on Public Prayer.

When my good friend, J. R. B., in his too generous criticism of my work, took exception to the paragraph on public prayer on grounds of taste, I of course had nothing to say, for I have always been taught that "de gustibus non disputandum." Had I spoken at all I would have submitted that while my uncle never disturbed the Church by useless agitation, it surely could not be a matter of indifference to the Church to know what were the views and practice of one of her most experienced and successful ministers on an important question of public worship.

But the letter of "G.," in the last issue of the STANDARD, seems to call in question the accuracy of my facts. I say "seems," for really there is not the contradiction implied in "G's" article between Dr. Hoge's desire for simplicity and his desire for seemliness to which alone my paragraph refers. There is no reference whatever to the introduction of new elements in worship or to elaboration of ritual, but only to the matter of the prayers. There was nothing for which Dr. Hoge was more noted than for his prayers. The Church has a right to know, and our ministry needs to know, how that pre-eminence was acquired. My contention is that to perform this office fittingly our ministry should either do as he did, or make a larger use of existing devotional literature. A partial recognition of this need was made by the General Assembly in the "Optional Forms" for Marriage and Burial Service. In these forms there were prayers written by Dr. Hoge and Dr. Kerr and a form of "committal" which was taken—as explained in a footnote—from John Knox's service book. J. R. B. was a member of the Assembly that first adopted these forms and, if I mistake not, voted for them. I append below the paragraph under discussion, which is all that my book has to say on the subject. P. H. H.

[The preceding paragraph states that "his preparation for the pulpit was the preparation not of language, but of thought."]

Not so, however, with his prayers. Prayer he did not consider the place for "eloquence," but for the reverent and devout expression of the needs of the human heart. For this he felt that the most careful preparation of language as well as thought was necessary. Personally, he believed that a moderate and flexible liturgy, embodying the devotional product of all the ages, with ample freedom for the addition of such original prayers as occasion demanded, would be the most satisfactory vehicle of the church's prayer and praise. The strongest argument for a liturgy, he felt, was furnished by the careless, slipshod and undignified prayers of some of those who most vehemently opposed all forms. This argument he did much to remove by his own careful preparation for the solemn work of leading the people's devotion, so that few that attended his own ministry ever felt the need of anything different; but the elaborate and laborious preparation that he made for this service, as evinced by his papers, surely raises anew the question of the propriety of laying such an additional burden upon the ministry of a church in which so much is expected in the preparation of sermons. If a Moses Hoge could only attain excellence in this service by such laborious means, and if the stock of Moses Hoges is so small, could not the church profitably draw more largely upon the devotional literature of the past? This literature is the heritage of no one branch of the church. Much of it comes down from the primitive church, and some of the most important contributions to it have been made by the great Reformers, whose work is the special heritage of the Presbyterian family of churches. Be that as it may, Dr. Hoge's peculiar power in prayer was not merely the result of what is called the "gift of prayer." Not only

his celebrated prayers on great public occasions were carefully written out, but from his early ministry he wrote prayers for every variety of occasion and service and formulated petitions on every variety of topic. Moses Drury Hoge: Life and Letters, p. 408.

### Letter from Greece.

The enclosed letter, in Greek, from Thessalonica, will, no doubt, be of some interest to you and many of the readers of the STANDARD.

As it will save you some time, a translation is also sent with it, and a few words of explanation, to make it more generally understood, by the many friends who have heard something of nearly all the parties, who are mentioned in the letters.

The preacher, Mr. Tokas, is a young man whom I received into the church and started in his preparation for the ministry.

His wife and mother-in-law are the persons to whom I have often referred as "deserted by their father and husband who went for the pursuit of holiness on the Holy Mountain."

The writer of the letter is the venerable old converted priest whom I have always referred to as "Pappa Moschon."

The son, whom he mentions, is the Rev. Xenophon Moschon, pastor of the church in Smyrna, a young man whom I helped at Athens first and afterwards sent to Scotland, where he was so kindly taken up by Hon. Mr. Charles J. Guthrie, Q. C. You met Mr. Guthrie, I hope, in Washington at the Pan-Presbyterian Council.

The tone, the spirit and the very expressions of this letter are strikingly scriptural.

This is the old man who had the holes, or scars, on his head, made by stones thrown at him, as well as the holes in his umbrella. He also brought to Christ his would-be murderer.

Yours cordially,

T. R. SAMPSON.

SALONIKA, December 21st, 1899.

REV. MR. SAMPSON,

My brother beloved and longed for in Christ:

A good many years have passed since we saw each other, however, having the same Lord, the same faith, the same hopes, we are able to have communion with one another in Christ in prayer. I always remember you in my prayers, and I believe that you do the same. Thus communion in the Spirit exists, the want, however, of bodily presence, and the mutual edification of it is very sensible. May the all good God and our Father, the only omniscient and omnipotent one, supply our needs by his grace! The work which God commenced through your instrumentality continues to increase. When you departed we remained few and orphaned, without a preacher about six months, when we, the members, took our turns at the services. Then Mr. Anestis came and remained for more than a year. Afterwards again we were obliged to take turns. In '96 Mr. Christos Tokas came for the summer, and Mr. Mercurius for the winter. Since the summer of '97 Mr. Tokas has been our regular preacher, with whom we are all greatly pleased. We, the brethren, are all beloved and harmonious, the strifes and contentions by which both you and we were formerly so much distressed have ceased. It is, however, gratifying that those who occasioned these appear to have repented, and we all, united and in one Spirit serve Christ according to the measure of grace given to us. At our meetings we always have good audiences, some members have been added, and there are others who are inclined to accept the faith.

The woman's meetings work successfully under the direction of the wife of the preacher. Our preacher is paid by the church, with some assistance from the Presbytery. My son is in Smyrna, and writes that the work of the Lord progresses. I am now nearly at the end of