

Printed 10 10

V13
189

(32)

9242
32
ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE MASS.

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

No. 47--JANUARY, 1899.

I. THE PRESBYTERIAN BULWARKS OF LIBERTY AND LAW.

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

V. HOW TO MAKE OUR BRIEF COURSE IN CHURCH HISTORY MOST PROFITABLE.

It is not demanded of me that I vindicate the wisdom of those who placed Church History in the Seminary curriculum. Their wisdom needs no vindication. Next to the Bible and the immediate aids to its interpretation, Church History at once suggests itself as a proper study for those who have consecrated their lives to the service of Christ in building up and extending the borders of the Church. It is an account of their predecessors in the same sphere of service, showing how they wrought, with what success, with what failure and failings. There can be no question as to the propriety of making Church History a part of the course of study for training ministers. The only question open to discussion is, how may we teach it so as to secure for the students the maximum profit? It is a broad, practically a boundless field. In time, covering nineteen centuries; in space, covering nearly the whole earth. It is interwoven with all other history. Very early in the Christian centuries, the Church entered into alliance with the State, and very soon, and for a long period, throughout the wide extent of Christendom, it dominated all other history. It entered into and largely moulded the political, social and family life of the people. It built up for itself a unique empire, and extended its sway over every department of thought and enterprise. It carried on wars both foreign and domestic, founded schools, prosecuted missions and added tribe after tribe, and nation after nation, to its ever-widening domain. The history of the Church, then, in its broadest sense, means the history of all that occurred throughout a large part of the world during a long succession of centuries.

Selection becomes imperative. Immeasurably more must be omitted than can be taught. Only the leading ob-

jects of so vast a landscape can be introduced in the picture. Anything like minuteness of detail is out of the question. Further still, abridge the history as we may, if enough is retained to form a connected narrative, we shall have too much for complete mastery. Yet the question presses, What shall we emphasize? Where shall we lay the stress? On what phases shall we concentrate attention? Manifestly we could spend our time on the mint, anise and cummin to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law. Here is the point demanding a wise discrimination on the part of the teacher. He should be able to distinguish between the great and the small, between matters of mere curious interest and matters of permanent practical importance. Amidst the manifold issues which were raised and decided, the manifold movements which started into life and made their impress, he should be able to fix on those that touched the vital life of the Church, and left their indelible mark, the effects of which continued through all changes, and still abide. It would be sinning against the interests of the students for the teacher to linger a weary time over the frivolous jangling of the logic-chopping schoolmen, and then skim hurriedly over the strenuous conflicts between the champions of truth and error, in which were involved issues of everlasting value.

Can we lay down any specific ends, more important than all others, toward which Church History should conduct us? Can we specify any benefits, more valuable than all others which this study should be expected to confer? In attempting an answer to these questions, I shall perhaps best meet the demands of this occasion.

1. It is obvious to remark that we should enter the field of Church History through the portals of the Bible. We are not prepared to follow the fortunes of the Church until we have learned from God's Word what the Church is. We get our preparation for any intelligent view of the subject by sitting at the feet of the inspired writers, espe-

cially Christ and His Apostles. It is in the light of their teachings alone that we can form any clear conceptions of the great spiritual principles on which the Church is based, and the far-reaching designs for which it was planned. The history of the Church is a history of conflict, of deadly strife between good and evil, truth and error. We cannot study this contest to any purpose, cannot look upon the struggling adversaries with sympathies properly guided, cannot measure victory and defeat without some standard of truth by which to frame our judgements. This standard must be something more trustworthy than our own moral instincts, more trustworthy than even our own cultivated and enlightened religious consciousness. The only reliable standard is God's infallible word. By that we must judge the combatants; by that we must measure the progress of truth, and detect the invasions of error. From that we must learn what the Church was when it left the moulding hand of inspired workmen. Otherwise, as we witness its progress through the centuries, we cannot tell whether it is preserving its divine beauty of form, or being marred by the rough assaults of enemies, or forsooth, by the well-meaning, but misguided zeal of its friends. We must know the nature and limits of the mission on which it was launched. Otherwise we cannot tell whether it is gloriously fulfilling that mission, or whether its energies are being diverted into other channels. We must know the methods ordained by its divine founder for accomplishing its mission. Otherwise we can not tell whether its adherents are loyal to those methods, or whether they are discrediting the wisdom of the divine founder by discarding his methods, and resorting to others of their own devising. It is evident that our view-point is all important. Church History will mean one thing to him who looks upon its battle fields from the serene heights to which the Bible lifts him, and studies its multifarious conflicts in the light which the Bible throws upon them. It will mean a totally differ-

ent thing, if it yield any meaning at all, to him who looks upon its battle fields from the low plain of uninspired reason, and with no light shining on its conflicts save the dim, confusing light of his own speculative opinions. It will mean one thing to the Protestant who tests the Church by the Bible; and another thing to the Romanist who exalts the Church above the Bible.

2. Studying Church History with the Bible for our guide, should not this history be to us a continuous revelation of God? Among the last words of Christ was the promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." As we look upon the ever-shifting panorama of history, with its mingling of light and shade, we have the key to its interpretation in the Book which Christ placed in our hands, and by the use of this we can assure ourselves of his presence. It is interesting to note that God's chosen method of revealing himself has been through the history of his Church. Not only did he make it the depository of his inspired word, but through his dealings with his people, and his own interpretation of these dealings, he has revealed his character and designs. In connection with the history, and as the controlling element of the history he has unfolded his purpose. There was no necessity, so far as we can see, that God should have chosen this method of self revelation. He might have spoken in the audience of the people, not the ten words only, but the whole body of his precepts and promises, so that from an early period the world should have had all that he ever purposed to make known. But it seemed good in his sight to separate a chosen seed and make them the channel through which, during the long stretch of their history, he should acquaint mankind with himself and his redeeming grace. Each generation furnished the occasion for an additional chapter. Did this process of divine manifestation cease with the last inspired apostle? It is not reasonable to think so. True, these

manifestations were no longer committed to record by an infallible penman. The close of the Bible marks the end of what we call sacred history. But we do not intend by this term to make a contrast between history under the guiding and controlling hand of God, and history which lacks this divine element. There is merely a difference in character of record. The course of Church history flowed on without a break when the last writer passed away who wrote only as moved by the Holy Ghost. The Church continues the same, the history, in all essentials the same, only the method of recording it has changed. It contains the same divine factor, in the same dominant proportion. He who was with the Church in the wilderness, was with the Church in its conquest of the Roman Empire. He has never set it adrift, nor removed from it. He was with it in the pillar of cloud; then in the Man of Galilee, and ever since in the person of the indwelling Spirit. We no more hear his voice from the mountain top, nor through prophets' lips; we no more see him in startling theophanies, nor in miraculous incident, nor wearing the veil of flesh. But all that blessed past belongs to us in forms that never grow old, and in values that never diminish. He need speak no more, we carry his word with us. He need appear no more; he has taught us how to discern his invisible presence. We can keep track of him amid the clash of contending sectaries, the confusion and disorder of warring factions, the darkness resulting from decay of piety and learning. At no period has he left himself without a witness. It rests with the teacher at every stage of historic progress to discern and lift into prominence that which comes from God, which has upon it the mark of Christ, which embodies and manifests the ever active spirit. The history should be used to illustrate the fact that God ever reigns and that he hath made Christ to be perpetual head over all things to the Church, which is his body.

3. Studied thus, may not the history become the sus-

tainer and nourisher of both our faith and our hope? The fortunes of the Church have not been what we might easily have persuaded ourselves they would be. Starting with *the* promise that the Church is Christ's blood-bought possession, as dear to him as the apple of his eye, and that it carries with it the pledge of his unintermitted presence and the assurance of his limitless power for its defense, we might quickly pass to the conclusion that its career would be one of perennial prosperity, of unbroken conquest. How different its actual history! Scarcely had its warfare begun before its enemies were decimating its ranks. Its shrines were soon stained with the blood of its noblest children, and its haughty oppressors wrought their cruel will without restraint. Worse, still, its unity was broken by internal dissensions, error ran riot within its sacred pale, and its purity was soiled by those entrusted with its honor. It soon entered into unholy wedlock with the world which crucified its Master, and in course of time by pollutions inexpressible and crimes of crimson hue effaced almost every trace of the divine image. The picture is a revolting one, and in its nature fitted to produce despair. How can such an outcome be the logical sequence of that inspiring commission. "All power in heaven and earth is given unto me. Go ye, therefore, and lo, I am with you alway." We have but to turn on the dark scene the search-light of the Bible, and at once the presence of Christ is disclosed. Ever he is the suffering Saviour, both in his head and in his members; ever he passes to glory through death, conquers the crown by means of the cross. His words come to us through the gloom. "These things have I spoken unto ye that ye should not be made to stumble. They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God a service." With the Bible in our hands we are prepared for the word ⁸¹that may come, for the violence of the world without, and the traitor's kiss within. Grievous as is the spectacle of a Church

over-run with evil, alarming as is the picture of growing apostasy, we find our faith not only unshaken by it, but rather confirmed. It matches exactly the picture which we carry with us: "The Kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field; but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat." The corruptions of the Church, no less than its victories in behalf of righteousness, proclaim its identity with the Church of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Church of Judges and Kings, the Church of ever recurring declensions and apostasies, as well as revivals and reformations. It is ever presided over by the same Providence and conducted to its goal by the same methods.

But hope is cheered no less than faith, for ever the last word of our guide book is the promise of ultimate and complete victory. When the battle seems to be going against us, we reflect that we see only in part, and remember that when that which is in part is done away then that which is perfect shall come. The golden age of the Church is not behind us. It was not the period when the pillar of cloud made God visible as Leader and Defender; nor the period when the incarnate Son taught and wrought divinely in the sight of men. This was progress from good to better, but the best was still in the bosom of the future. "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come, but if I go I will send him unto you." Has not God been ever coming down into closer and more influential and more helpful relations to the Church? Studying its history in the light of his promises we dare not become pessimistic. He is in it, and over it, and through it he is bringing on the long-looked-for glory. Amid the shadows, hope rejoices and abides his time.

4. Will not such a method of study duly exalt and honor the inspired word, and render it increasingly dear to us? Grant that there is no break in the flow of history, no essential change in God's relation to it, yet the revelation

embodied and embalmed in the Bible is the test by which succeeding revelation is to be judged. The two parts of the one continuous history are not coordinate. We would not suffer ourselves for one moment to be classed with those who discount the Bible on the ground that God still dwells in his Church, and still gives, through it, a knowledge of his will. The Church of Rome is not alone in asserting that we have an incessant divine revelation of equal authority with the Sacred Scriptures. There be many who make a Pope out of the Christian consciousness. There be some who teach that by a process of evolution, we have attained an attitude from which we can see certain truths even more clearly than those who gave us the Bible, and who, tho' inspired in a certain sense, were nevertheless largely under the dominion of the crude and superstitious ideas of their unenlightened age. We repeat with emphasis that Sacred History and Church History are not coordinate revelations of God. The former is the light by which the latter is to be interpreted, and the arbiter by which all its questions are to be decided. The Bible is a "light shining in a dark place," and rather to be trusted as a revelation of the divine will than even the voice "from the excellent brightness" which fell on the ears of the disciples who were with Christ in the Holy Mount. When we bid farewell to John on his lonely isle, we hear no other voice like his; we cross no other seer with vision so penetrating; we come on no other man so filled with God as to awe us into silence when he speaks, and into obedience when he commands. From that time forth all other men are recognized at once as compassed about by the same limitations with ourselves. We dare to question their statements, to contest their arguments, to reject their conclusions. The more intimate we become with them the more their weakness grows on us, and the wider grows the gap between them and the fishermen on whom Christ breathed. The descent is not gradual from Apostles to

Apostolic fathers, and then to Church fathers. The drop is sudden, and the distance immeasurable. If we would augment our estimate of Peter, we have only to read the Epistle of Clemens Romanus, his cotemporary and fourth successor, according to Eusebius, in the see of Rome. Clemens commits himself unreservedly to the fable of the Phoenix, and uses the story of its rising from its ashes as an illustration of the resurrection. If we could have our admiration for Paul increased, this would certainly result from the perusal of the general epistle ascribed to his companion Barnabas. They seem not unequally yoked together in the history, but Barnabas, the author, indulges his fancy in the wildest and most puerile allegorizing of Old Testament History. Do we need to inspire our hearts with a more tender veneration for the Apostle John? We have but to read the writings of Ignatius, who is supposed to have heard the word from John's lips, and compare his fanatical craving for martyrdom with John's calm and majestic, but silent resignation. Surely no candid mind can pass from the canonical writings to the writings of those who were either partly cotemporary with the apostles, or removed from them by the space of only a single generation, without a deepening conviction of the prodigious significance of that *theopneustos* of which Paul speaks.

5. This method of studying the history enables us to test the claims of all modern branches of the Church. We refuse to be awed by the appeal to authority. We are not careful to settle the question as to whom the fathers belong. Let them belong to whomsoever they may; they are of no value to us, except as they echo the voice of Scripture. What need to follow the echo, when we have the voice itself. In proportion as a church seeks a basis for its claims in the teachings of the fathers in that proportion does it forfeit its title to our respect. They have "forsaken the fountain of living waters and hewn them out cisterns,

broken cisterns, that can hold no water." The "historic episcopate" becomes for us a chimera as we trace it back through the darkness of the middle ages and try to catch glimpses of it amid the flickering lights of the early fathers. What a hopeless undertaking to track an invisible and intangible line through the confusion of eighteen warring centuries and link it to the apostles. The Church that has nothing more than this imaginary line to offer us as the foundation of our hopes cannot make a very strong appeal to our faith. We carry our foundation with us, the immutable rock of Scripture, and we refuse to exchange it for the quagmire and the quicksand. Not the Church of history, no matter how far it can trace its marks, but the Church of the Bible is entitled to our confidence. After sitting in council with bishops claiming apostolic lineage, and witnessing their spirit and methods, and comparing their voice with that of Christ, their excommunications and anathemas have no terrors. We become more and more enamored of the famous maxim of Chillingworth, "the Bible and the Bible alone the religion of Protestants." The church that can trace its fundamental principles no further back than the fathers, has no divine warrant for its existence. Whatever in any church does not reach back of them should be "cast out and trodden under foot of men." There is no need, however, that a church form a connection with the Bible through the medium of history. Why grope through history for the Bible and the apostles when we have them with us? History can lend no dignity to them; can impart no authority to them. Why follow the winding stream when we are already at the fountain? The ever-living Christ and His ever-abiding word belong to no time, but to all time. Is it to be supposed that there is only one point of juncture with them? Only one way of reaching them? That they are to be approached only through the tortuous channel of history that becomes more difficult to follow the further we trace it? How preposterous! The

Bible is not dependent on history, but history on the Bible. Does any church judge us by history and make it the arbiter of our claims? "It is a very small thing that we should be judged of man's judgment." We lift the Bible into the seat of judgment, and cite all pretensions to appear before it for final sentence. When Christ taught in Galilee he swept away with his own authoritative voice "that which had been said by them of old time." He blighted with scathing rebuke those who were lading men with the heavy burden of ecclesiasticism, and making void the commandments of God by their traditions. His words still have for us the same commanding power. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Having tested the sweets of this freedom, surely we shall "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

6. This method of study enables us to set a proper estimate upon religious novelties. We form the habit of applying to all innovations the touchstone of the Bible, and we are not carried away by the momentary success of new movements which are cried up as the great desideratum of the age. Human nature has not waited till the nineteenth century to devise new expedients for hastening on the triumphs of the Gospel. It has been equally busy in all other centuries. The history of the Church is largely a history of expedients devised by those who were impatient of God's slow methods; and the disastrous consequences resulting from these expedients add force to the presumption that no proper agency for rendering the truth effective was overlooked by Christ and his apostles. We hesitate to believe that any age, no matter how great its intellectual activities, nor how wonderful its triumphs of genius, can improve on the simple devices of the Gospel. Preaching and praying and holy living are the regenerating forces still as in Apostolic times. It is doubtful whether any multiplications of organizations, any additional machinery,

any thrusting of women and young people forward can render them any more efficacious.

We become equally suspicious of doctrinal novelties. It has not remained for this late day to discover defects in accepted symbols of faith, and offer something better in lieu of them. This has been the custom from the beginning. Heresy is as old as orthodoxy, and it is about as difficult to invent something new in the one line as the other. It is no more a sign of originality to be a follower of Arius than to be a follower of Athanasius. Pelagius framed a new theology as much in advance of Calvinism as any that New England seems capable of excogitating in our day. The charge of traditionalism does not affright us. It is largely a choice of traditions, in so far as that term means the association of present creeds with past names. Obviously it is no easy thing to get entirely out of line with all the forty generations of past thinkers. The claim to have done so carries with it no strong presumption in favor of such claimant's views. The more we study the history of doctrine, with the light of the Bible shining on it, the less shall we be inclined to run after reconstructed theologies. They usually mean reconstructed heresies of a former age. The teaching of history is that all true progress in the development of theological doctrines has been in discovering the logical relation and correct interpretation of the statements of Scripture. When we consider how clear and simple and oft-repeated are these statements touching all fundamentals; how they were designed for the common mind of the race, we naturally conclude that nineteen centuries is long enough for devout minds to find a trustworthy exposition of their meaning. Hence the dissenter from evangelical orthodoxy may well be suspected of handling the Word of God deceitfully.

7. This method of studying the history will result, or should result, in a healthy abhorrence of all lies, and especially those embodied in Romanism. Our age has grown

too tolerant. It seems to be losing the capacity for hating. It is learning to look with complacency upon all creeds, Calvinism perhaps excepted; and takes great credit to itself for its broad catholicity of spirit. Dogmatism is sternly denounced, and comprehension is the order of the day. "The Parliament of Religions" was a visible embodiment of the age's indiscriminating indulgence. Above all things, Christianity must be considerate and courteous. It must hunt for the truths that are common to all religions and use these as the ground of compliment, while politely blind, or at most charitably lenient to everything that cannot be commended. The world is to be converted, if indeed it needs conversion by the language of "sweet reasonableness," and not by stern denunciatory phrases.

Is not the study of history, with the Bible to regulate our judgments, fitted to arouse us from this complacent attitude toward error? As we follow the growth of the Papacy and see what desolations it made in the earth, how that degeneracy of morals kept pace with the invention of falsehoods, can we remain indifferent to the dissemination of lies? For many years Church History is mainly concerned with recording the abominations of a growing apostasy from the faith of the Bible. Even before Christ vanished from the eyes of his disciples, they were contending for positions of supremacy. This was ominous, suggesting that nothing but abounding grace could suppress unholy ambitions in those chosen to official rank in the Church. Pentecost did the work for the apostles, and the rich effusions of the Holy Spirit on the primitive Church expelled for a time the lust and pride of power. But when the flame of devotion died down, which it did all too soon, the contention for supremacy revived and grew apace. After the Church became wedded to the State, the Emperor began to purchase the favors of influential ecclesiastics by conferring wealth and honor on them, and by enlarging their priestly prerogatives. He encouraged bishops to live in luxury

and to surround themselves with pomp and splendor, because he found that through them and their ghostly power he could better manage the ignorant and superstitious hordes that were ever threatening the throne with disaster. More and more worldly ambition dominated those who claimed to stand nearest to Christ. The bloody contests of Pagan Rome in the days when Sylla and Marius contended for supremacy were repeated in the contests of rival bishops for the See of Peter. Councils, composed of those boasting apostolic lineage, displayed the fierce passions and the hasty violence of undisciplined mobs. At an early period laws must be passed to restrain the clergy from such sins as drunkenness, simony, concubinage and perjury. Deeper and deeper prelates and priests sank into moral pollution until they became adepts in the practice of every villainy. At length the Papal chair, "the pivot," as a Roman Catholic writer expresses it, "on which the whole Catholic Church turns," became a prize which a succession of women, steeped in the lowest vice, conferred on their paramours and bastard offspring. For some centuries the highest position in the Church, where we would reasonably look for the most exalted types of religious character, was filled by those who, to lives of constant profligacy, added frequently the crimes of murder and secret assassination. And these are the men, be it remembered, who handed down the apostolic succession, so much prized by our modern high-Churchmen. Pollution spread from the heart to the extremities; and through long periods of her history the Romish Church took knowledge of no sin save the preaching of God's pure gospel, and the bearing of testimony against mendacity and iniquity. She knew no heresy, save the doctrines taught by Christ and his apostles. But truth and purity were offenses not to be endured, and fire and sword and treachery and torture were the instruments used to avenge herself on those who dared to lift the word of God against the huge structure of lies which she had so diligently framed.

The strongest argument against Rome is the history which she has made, and surely no one can follow this history step by step without having the feelings of righteous anger and of holy abhorrence stirred within him. If not, then his moral intuitions are not in a healthy condition. But why use this history to stir into life and nourish a present aversion? For the simple reason that Rome has never repudiated her past. She has tried by a perversion of history to cover up the darkest stains, but has deliberately endorsed and embalmed as her lasting possession the hideous doctrines and vicious principles that constitute the basis of all her sins. The decrees of the council of Trent are the ripe harvest of all previous sowing, the rich results of long centuries of labour in the service of the father of lies. Those decrees were confirmed by Pope Pius IV, and the disobedient were threatened with the wrath of Almighty God. Pius the Fourth has since been declared infallible. This gives to those decrees an immutable character. They must stand forever as a true exposition of what Romanism is in belief and spirit. We have a right to assume, that what Rome was when she armed the Inquisition against all who claimed the liberty to speak the truth, that she is to-day and will continue to be. She is only true to herself when she denies the right of private judgment, and exerts her power to rob man of all that constitutes the glory of manhood. She has fixed her immovable anathemas upon all who reject her monstrous dogmas, and refuse to take part in her idolatrous worship. Can we be true to God and not detest Romanism? It robs him of his glory by making him the puny puppet of a wicked Priest, who traffics in redeeming grace to gratify his greed. "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." Was anything more characteristic of Christ than his vigorous hatred of religious fraud? How fiercely his wrath flamed against those who buried the truth under a mass of tradition, and substituted a sanctimonious formalism for "a broken and contrite heart."

We want to be as broad in our sympathies and benevolent activities as Christ was. We want to be as narrow as he was in his hatred of lies, and equally intolerant with him in warning against all who oppose the truth.

It is hardly necessary for me to confess a sense of incompetency. It is enough to say that it would never have occurred to me to suggest myself for this position. The fact that your choice fell on me indicates, I am constrained to believe, a woeful lack in our ministry of men properly furnished for this work. Church History is not a favorite study. It does not occupy a co-ordinate place with other departments of learning that bear no more closely on the minister's duties. Is this absence of interest due to the necessary dryness of the subject? I am unwilling to think so. I prefer to think that it is possible for Church History to be so taught as to kindle a measure of enthusiasm, and awaken a permanent interest in the minds of the students. Of course, students for the ministry, like all other students have their peculiar aptitudes and tastes, and there will always be some to whom history, however taught, will be irksome. But surely for devout minds that love to think God's thoughts after him, Church History opens a field in which they ought to find matter of absorbing attraction. It is wanting in no element adapted to arrest and enchain attention. It carries us over battle fields, resounding with the clash of arms, points us to the pivotal events on which from time to time God has turned the destiny of nations, and decided the future of the race; it leads us to the quiet seclusion of the scholar, shocks us with tragedies vast and diabolical, displays before us examples of heroic consecration, pleases the fancy with bits of romance, furnishes food for reflection in its myths and legends; it acquaints us with the beginnings of things, showing us the cradle in which was nourished the feeble infancy of all those institutions, sciences, arts, literatures, which in their development and maturity give us our pres-

ent civilization. Surely the materials of Church History are not wanting in interest. If as a study they are not made interesting, the fault must be in the treatment. I cannot promise myself any large measure of success, but I propose to keep this end before me as a possible attainment, to take the study of Church History out of the category of the dull and irksome, and place it where it properly belongs in the category of the pleasing and inspiring.

R. C. REED.

Columbia, S. C., May 9th, 1899.

[Inaugural Address. Columbia Seminary.]