

THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXVI.—DECEMBER, 1893.—No. 6.

REVIEW SECTION.

I.—WHAT THE MINISTRY MAY LEARN FROM THE CHARACTER AND WORKS OF JOHN G. WHITTIER.

BY PROFESSOR J. O. MURRAY, D.D., PRINCETON, N. J.

It is a natural impulse in the preacher to turn to those men of his own calling whose lives have embodied the true elements of power in the pulpit, for examples which may give him inspiration for its labors and guidance in their prosecution. Obeying it, he does only what the lawyer or the physician does in his calling. Certainly he will gain the most direct and fullest help by such a selection. The ranks of the Christian ministry are so full of shining models for the preacher and the pastor, contain so many in whom the heroic virtues blend with rich and deep Christian experience, that he can be at no loss to know men whose biography should be a storehouse of quickening and strengthening helpfulness. Every Christian church contains them. From Paul, the apostle, down through the Christian centuries these figures rise and beckon the ministry of to-day onward in their sacred calling, and it might seem as if there were little need for him to turn aside from these, to look elsewhere for any example in other callings which shall train him for his work. Here and there perhaps may be found a man whose career has been so exceptionally great in virtues, so fruitful in all the higher traits, that it makes an object-lesson on which the preacher may most profitably dwell. The minister who has not known something of the lives of such men as John Howard, Thomas Fowell Buxton, or the late Earl of Shaftesbury—all of these philanthropists of the Christian type—has lost valuable hints and helps. Such a man, such a poet as Whittier belongs certainly to this category. His biography is yet to be written; but gleaning such facts as is possible now from varied sources, a brief sketch of his career will, we think, justify us in pointing the ministers of to-day to that life for certain valuable lessons.

It is worthy of note that while on his father's side Whittier was of Quaker ancestry, on the mother's his ancestors were Huguenots. In his veins ran the blood of two religious sects, both of which had suffered dire

who reads the heart and knows how every penny is employed that is entrusted to them. And in winning his approval we win the approval of all his kindred—all like-minded beings on earth and in heaven. In being truly faithful here and now in "little" things, in seeking God's interests in the use we make of worldly wealth, something that is entrusted to us by the Lord for a few days, we shall be entrusted with true riches hereafter—that which through grace will be ours forever. Unless we do this now we cannot expect a position in God's eternal mansions, for we cannot serve God there if we serve Mammon here.

"The Gift of God."

By TRYON EDWARDS, D.D.

For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.—Eph. ii. 8.

THIS verse is very commonly understood as teaching that *faith*—the faith through which we are justified—is the gift of God—that is, it is *so* the gift of God that men can never come to Christ until this faith is specially imparted to them from on high; and the wording of the Revised as well as of the Authorized Version is such as to give ground for the impression.

This, however, as the original plainly shows, is not the true sense of the passage. What the Greek says is, not that *faith*, but that *salvation* (which comes

through faith), is "the gift of God." Had it meant to say that *faith* is the gift of God, the pronoun would have been *αυτη*, and not *τουτο*, as it is, the *neuter* pronoun referring to the general subject—*salvation*—which is that of which the apostle is speaking, and of which it is said, "It is the gift of God." So that what the verse means is, "By grace, through faith, you have *salvation*, which is not from yourselves, but is the gift of God."

The word "faith" is used in the Bible in different senses. As in Gal. ii. 20 and in 2 Cor. v. 7, it is descriptive of Christian character and conduct, "walking by faith," "living by faith," etc. But here it is used to indicate that first voluntary act or choice of the sinner, through which, yielding himself to Christ, he is justified, pardoned, and accepted, and so enters on the Christian life. To this faith we may be led through the truth as applied by the Holy Spirit, but it is nowhere in the Bible said to be God's gift in the same sense in which (in John iv. 10) Christ is said to be "the gift of God." The provision and offer of salvation, as also its bestowment, is "the gift of God." But the faith through which we are justified, like the look which the bitten Israelites gave to the brazen serpent, is our part, our voluntary acceptance of God's gracious and free gift to all who will accept it. It is the *salvation*, not the *faith* of which the text says, "It is the gift of God."

SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

The Parliament of Religions and the Christian Faith.

By REV. D. S. SCHAFF, D.D., JACKSONVILLE, ILL.

"THE meeting of so many illustrious and learned men under such circumstances evidences the kindly spirit and feeling that exists throughout the world. To me this is the proudest

work of our Exposition. There is no man, high or low, learned or unlearned, that will not watch with increasing interest the proceedings of this parliament." So spake Mr. Higinbotham, the President of the Columbian Exposition, of the World's Parliament of Religions at its opening exercises, September 11th, 1893. If we judge by the vastly larger throngs which attended its

meetings or the vastly larger amount of attention paid to its deliberations by the daily press of Chicago and the press of the country at large, the Parliament of Religions not only appealed to a larger constituency, but was of far more significance than the other congresses held in connection with the World's Fair.

The conception of gathering together in one conclave representatives of all the religions of the earth was as bold as it was brilliant. The execution involved a great venture. To the Christian public the undertaking was one of grave responsibility, suggesting the antecedent question whether it did not antagonize loyalty to Jesus Christ as the supreme Prince of Life and only Saviour of the world. Many who at the first proposal assumed an attitude of hostility have maintained it. Some, like myself, and perhaps many who at first were not friendly, have been led, upon reflection and observation, to assume the position of advocates. There are others still who, before the Parliament sat, were friendly to the movement and have come to look upon it with regret for having, as they think, become an occasion for the dissemination of error. It is the writer's view that the Parliament will in the future be looked back to as an epoch in religious thought and the onward and conquering progress of the Christian faith.

The project of holding a convention of all religions was quite in line with the general project of the Exposition to display the forces and products of the earth and man. The latter was designed to be an *omnium gatherum* of all that could be brought together that was valuable from all lands and peoples. "Now, while we are looking in this direction," it occurred to some bold minds, "why should not also the religions current among men be brought together?" But how? Through a collection of their sacred books placed side by side in a Library of Religions, or through addresses by competent scholars of the Christian world, or by representatives and devotees of the religions

themselves? Plainly the last was the only method congenial to the spirit which created the Exposition.

The chief dangers from such a convention were that it would give to the ethnic religions an unexampled chance for airing themselves and of creating an impression that they were parallel with Christianity. That the chief promoters of the project, or any of them, had it among the least of their purposes to elevate the religions of nature to the eminence occupied by the system of Revelation there is not a whit of evidence. It was felt by some that the juxtaposition of the imperfect religions at the side of Christianity on the same platform might encourage the unfaith of some in this Christian land and give opportunity for perverting the minds of more. "We do not bring malarias from the swamps and jungles and uncork them at the side of pure atmospheres taken from Colorado and Maine. Health is too precious a thing to be thus ruthlessly imperilled." The illustration is not sufficient for the spiritual sphere. Nor is it exhaustively true for the material, where it might be most wise to bring even malarias into the laboratory that the skilled chemist might try them if so be that by his experiments the sanitary well-being of the world might be advanced. The reports from the ethnic religions cannot be suppressed. The knowledge of their antiquity is not any longer confined to scholars, nor the knowledge of the vast numbers who acknowledge their authority in excess of Christian believers. Oriental theosophy is in the air. The great religious movements in India, China, and of Islam appeal to the serious examination of increasingly large Christian constituencies. The "Light of Asia" has awakened a widespread curiosity to know all about Buddha and other founders of the ethnic religions. To say the least, such a congress, under the management of a World's Fair committee, could not inure to the disparagement of Christianity except as it was unwisely managed. The true be-

comes more manifest by comparison with the false. Truth in the end cannot be dimmed, much less destroyed by error. The true David will be discovered when he comes to play on the harp strings. The manner in which the Parliament was called was most favorable to the best results. It is doubtful whether it would be at any time proper for a Christian denomination or a concurrence of denominations to convoke such a congress. But under the circumstances the Congress is likely to be regarded as providential.

It was creditable to Christianity that such a conclave should have been thought of. The recognition of some good in whatever system serious minds have elaborated and the readiness to learn from them is honorable. No doubt Paul listened respectfully in the Athenian market-place. He was there, it is true, to preach the Gospel. The professed object of the Parliament was not such. It was juxtaposition and presentation. No host could invite with the distinct purpose of proselyting. But the inevitable result would be the magnifying of the truth unless there was defect in the presentation of truth. On the plane of reason and intelligence the religions of the earth were brought together, and from the council went out, as it were, again the sounds, "Let him that heareth understand." "Take heed how ye hear." It was not of so much importance what these people from China and India said, as that they had an opportunity to say. And it was a matter of no slight importance in this material age that from all parts of the earth (as far as it was possible to secure them) men came to talk over the nature of God and human destiny. This constitutes the phenomenal event of the Parliament of Religions in Chicago, not the content of the addresses and the papers.

The programme may be justly criticised for its lack of system, logical development, and clear topical distinctiveness. It was a jumble of many relevant things and some not relevant. But the

difficulties staring Dr. John Henry Barrows in the face, and the committee of which he was the courageous chairman, were vast. To draw forth from convents and temples of the East representatives of the Asiatic religions was a great undertaking, involving much correspondence, great perplexities, and multiplied disappointments. In view of the obstacles in the way the success was very great.

The Parliament had no power of authoritative declaration. It was well it did not indulge in debate. Had there been discussion, Babel would have ensued. No new doctrine was evolved. No creed was formulated. If in one respect the results seem to be intangible, the beneficent influence may for that reason be none the less pervasive. It is of consequence that a certain visible embodiment has been given to the common Fatherhood of God. It was an achievement of great significance to unite even for a time in a common fundamental aim the most ancient as well as the younger religious faiths. It ought certainly not to be without some blessed results that from many lands and from many creeds the reverence for God has been proclaimed, as it may not be unacceptable to the Father of Spirits Himself.

The chief advantages resulting from the Parliament, when looked at from a scriptural standpoint, may be stated as follows :

1. A very decided impulse has been given to the comparative study of religions among the people. This study, which is of comparatively recent origin, if reverently pursued, cannot but have two results, to widen the horizon of our human sympathies and to strengthen our reverence for Christianity. Probably no such opportunity as this has been offered in history for the comparison of the religious faiths of the race. The various systems which have attracted the religious nature of men and inspired them with hope were represented. *Nihil humani a me alienum puto*. All that is human, living and dead, interests me. And while I

do not want to adopt the manners of Dahomey or the religion of Ceylon, I am glad to know about them, both because anthropological studies are entertaining in themselves, and because the knowledge they give may aid me in better fulfilling the precepts of Christianity to do good unto all men.

Ecumenical councils have been held which will always continue to attract the attention of the ecclesiastical student. At Nice, at Chalcedon, at Ephesus Christian ecclesiastics from different parts of the earth met together, consulted and legislated. But this in Chicago was a world's council in a more accurate sense. Not for purposes of legislation, it is true, but of statement of what the religions of the earth are and have done. The audiences in the Hall of Columbus, the readers of the daily press and of the coming volumes of official reports will have had such a presentation as only the scholar widely read and deeply learned has had within his reach heretofore. Valuable as the popular volumes of James Freeman Clarke, Dr. George Matheson, and other writers are, they reach a few individuals, while these presentations by actual representatives of the various systems have reached large masses of the general public.

That a larger acquaintance with this subject may be of profit to those who occupy the pulpit there can be no doubt. Such a study of religions will give them broader ideas of God's dealings with man, a fuller understanding of certain portions of Scripture, and a finer appreciation of the world's debt to Christ. This occasion will lead men's thoughts back to other important congresses of religion from the time when Job and his friends discussed the providential government of the world, and the meeting of Elijah and the priests of Baal, down to the Day of Pentecost, when every man heard them speak in his own language the "wonderful works of God." A discussion of the wonderful works of God will always bring men of serious minds close together, and the

more these things are neglected will theologians and churches and religions stand apart. And I believe that already a new impetus has come to many preachers who have followed this Parliament carefully to preach with more fervor and intelligence than ever before that all religions outside of Christianity are defective and insufficient, and that other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. "The ethnic religions can only be understood," says that clear thinker, Professor Flint,

"when viewed in relation to Christianity, and Christianity cannot fully be understood unless viewed in relation to these religions. We must know what questions the human soul has been putting to itself in various ages, lands, and circumstances, and what are the answers it has been giving to them, before we can appreciate aright the comprehensiveness and aptness of the response contained in the Gospel. Not one of the features or doctrines of Christianity will fail to appear in a brighter light and with a diviner beauty after they have been compared and contrasted with the correlative features and doctrines of other religions."

A comparison of religious faiths, if prosecuted honestly, I believe can lead to but one result, the exaltation of Him who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." An intelligent layman (Lady Somerset) discerned the importance of the Parliament for this study when she wrote to Dr. Barrows:

"The Congress of Religions is the mightiest ecumenical council the world has ever seen. Christianity has from it everything to hope; for as the plains, the table lands, the foothills, the mountain ranges all conduct alike, slowly ascending to the loftiest peak of the Himalayas, so do all views of God tend toward and culminate in the character, the life and work of Him who said, 'And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.'"

2. Attention has been called by the Parliament in an emphatic way to the fact that God has not left Himself without witness in all the earth. Many a Christian student will henceforth find in passages where he never found it before references to God's gracious

dealings with the nations, and he will approach the subject in a more sympathetic spirit. Peter's words to Cornelius will be widely pondered for their true meaning, that "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." The careers of Melchizedek, of Ruth and Rahab, and their relationship to the covenant will invite fresh study. New attention will be called to the fact that Job, the man of Uz, in whose conduct none of the ritual of the Old Testament revelation appears, was called "perfect and upright" and the servant of God.

According to St. Paul, God "left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" (Acts xiv. 17). The first chapter of the Romans was written with the purpose of showing that the heathen world is before God without excuse. "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, even His eternal power and godhead, for God hath revealed it unto them." There was a law written upon the heart of the natural man. Nor shall many a Christian layman fail to read with fresh interest the apostle's words on Mar's Hill. Pronouncing the Athenians very religious, he declared that "God had made of one all nations for to dwell upon the face of the earth, . . . that they should seek the Lord if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He be not far from every one of us."

New light will break forth from the Prologue of that Gospel to whose author (John) was applied in a pre-eminent sense the appellation "the theologian," by the early Christian centuries. There it is said that the Logos was "the true light," even *the light* "which lighteth every man coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by Him." Early Christian scholarship, following John, emphasized the manifestation of the Son of God before the incarnation among the peoples of the earth. Plato was a

Christian before Christ. "The Light shineth in darkness, and the darkness overcame it not." Gleams of light from the throne of God fell upon the conscience and heart of the nations. God spake to them—just how much, who can say? But they too are His offspring, made in His own image, and He left them not without witness. The Spirit bloweth where . . . listeth. He who makes His sun to shine upon the evil and the good had some wise purpose even when "He suffered them to walk in their own ways."

Does such a view carry with it any disparagement of the merits and glory of the incarnation? Not at all. It rather enhances them. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world, and the mercies of God before the birth at Bethlehem, as well as since, have been bound up with the activity of the Eternal Word. Does such a view conflict with the doctrine of election even in its severest form? By no means. The decree of election may with equal justice, to speak as man speaketh, include adult heathen outside the pale of Christian influence, as infants dying in infancy. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life," is the language of the Westminster divines. It is out of "God's mere free grace and love," and without prevision of their faith or good works, that men are chosen in Christ.

If Christ be only an historical Being, who came into the world eighteen hundred years ago, then His working began at that point of time. But He is more. "Before Abraham began to be, I am." His influence among the children of men does in a true sense depend upon that moment when He became incarnate, but it did not begin then. He was always in the world, and as the Light of the world, rays, now more dim and now bright as of the noonday sun, have gone out from Him unto men.

The great ethnic systems of religion are not altogether false and vicious because they are not the Christian system.

Such a conception restricts God's gracious working to the comparatively small number of the Christian generations, and breaks upon the rock of the first chapters of John and Romans and passages in the Acts. They are defective and disproportionate, and ought to give way before Christianity, which is complete and final. They also have their features of truth and disclosures of God, and in so far, if not stepping-stones to Christianity, they are in the providence of God better than atheism or esoteric pantheism. Where the sun does not shine, a lantern or a torch is better than no light whatever. In other genuine faiths there is some root and reason that is divine. To these religions may be applied words not primarily intended to represent them :

" Our little systems have their day—
They have their day and cease to be ;
They are but broken lights of Thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

8. The Parliament has called popular attention to the fact that the religious nature is inherent in man. Some, misled by teachers claiming for themselves scholarship, have been beginning to suspect that it was a product of Christianity, and that the Scriptures were a cunning device to entrap men into the notion that man was a religious being, a creature of the world to come, with power to know God. Now that idea can more easily be shown by the public religious teacher to be utterly groundless, the fabrication of philosophical sciolists. What scholars knew well all readers of the proceedings of the Parliament have tangible proof of.

Religion is an instinct, inborn like the optic faculty, and as the little baby turns its head and eye invariably toward the lighted chandelier, so the soul turns toward God. Optic nerve and religious instinct are both solecisms without the light and without God. The altars on the Nile and at Baalbek, the temples in India and China, even the lowest fetich ritual is testimony to the supernatural. To lift up hands and heart to God is according to nature. To be

atheistic is to be unnatural. It was this universal belief in God among the peoples, the *consensus gentium*, wherein Cicero found his rock of faith in God. It was in acknowledgment of this truth that Plutarch said there was no town or city where there was not some form of worship and temple. The religious faculty may exist in some men as fire in the flint stone, but it exists.

4. Another of the beneficent results of the Parliament will be in advancing the cause of religious toleration, and showing the unity of the Christian Church. Toleration has had a hard time of it in the earth. While God has tolerated evil, man has battered away at his fellow-man. It was said by Dr. Barrows, in his opening address :

" It is perfectly evident to all illuminated minds that we should cherish loving thoughts of all people and humane views of all the great and lasting religions, and that whoever would advance the cause of his own faith must discover and gratefully acknowledge the truths contained in other faiths. This Parliament is likely to prove a blessing to many Christians by marking the time when they shall cease thinking that the verities and virtues of other religions discredit the claims of Christianity or bar its progress."

Noble as these sentiments are, I do not believe that they are everywhere shared even in the Protestant Christian world. Sectarian bigotry and denominational bitterness (if such still exist) have received a rebuke through the Parliament which it will take a long while for them to recover from. The notion that the earth is to become Christian before we can recognize any grace in it and marks of the Divine approbation is past. To treat everything outside of the pale of these eighteen Christian centuries and without the bounds of the Jewish and Christian Church as diabolical and without any divinity in it at all is unscriptural, and contrary to the instincts of a common humanity and of the God and Father of us all. It would be a denial of the faith to fraternize with Buddhists and Shintoists and others as if they were on the same plane

with ourselves in the matter of religious truth and knowledge, or as if there were anything to justify the idea of religious reciprocity on equal terms. The Hindu monk Vivekananda represented a position which of course no Christian can hold. "If any one here hopes," he said, "that religious unity can come by the triumph of any one of these religions and the destruction of the others, I say to him, 'Brother, yours is an impossible hope.' Do I wish that the Christian become Hindu? God forbid. Do I wish that the Hindu or Buddhist would become Christian? God forbid." That is Hindu sentimentalism; but the Christian will become for it only the more strongly entrenched in the sentiment of St. Paul when he exclaimed, "I would to God that not only thou, but all who hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." But this positiveness of conviction of the right of Christianity to rule does not involve that there are not common human sympathies upon which we can unite, and that there are not good things in the ethnic faiths from which we may gain new intellectual and moral conviction for the things of our own. While we must be ready to give to every man who asketh a reason for the hope that is in us an answer, we should do it with "meekness and fear." The insertion of the thing signified by the Greek word *ἀλλὰ* into the feelings and conduct of Christian ages heretofore, as it has been inserted into the Revised translation (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 19), would have softened the heat and mollified the acrimony of Christian controversy. The anathemas of Tridentine and other councils would have been left out. "Not blustering and flying out into invective because the Christian has the better on it, against any man that questions him touching this hope," is the comment of Archbishop Leighton, whose gentle and tolerant spirit was a living comment of it. Perhaps if the Christian world would examine itself carefully it might find grounds for behaving better toward

these unchristian peoples in the future. It was my joy on a Sabbath evening during the Parliament to hear a missionary address from a missionary whom I know well, in whose house I spent some time in Syria, and who stands in the very front rank of devoted missionaries of his age. He spoke words of appreciation for some things in Islam from which we "could learn a lesson, and its devotees put our churches to shame." The wiser and more consecrated missionaries take this ground, and the several with whom I conversed in Chicago thought only good could come from the Parliament.

The unity of Christians was demonstrated in a striking way by the Parliament. Since the Protestant Reformation swept over Central and Western Europe there has been no such meeting together of representatives of the great branches of Christendom, nor anything comparable to it. The Greek, the Armenian, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant communions have met together in this informal way. In the remarkable address of Cardinal Gibbons, after saying that he would be wanting in his duty as a minister of the Catholic Church if he did not say that it was his desire to present the claims of the Catholic Church to the observation, and, if possible, to the acceptance of every right-minded man that would listen to him, he remarked, "Though we do not agree in matters of faith, there is one platform on which we all are united. It is the platform of charity, of humanity, and of mutual benevolence. . . . Our blessed Christ came upon this earth to break down the wall of partition that separated race from race, people from people; and as man is one people and one family, we recognize God as our common Father, and this Christ as our brother." Protestants, to say the least, could not do less than reciprocate in spirit and in truth the language in which he addressed other Christian as brethren and fellow-Christians.

The Christian soul of this age looks

toward Christian union, and sighs for Christian brotherhood and co-operation. Elements of division are untimely. The union of Christians of different names on the platform, the large presence of Catholics, the devout public prayer of the Greek archbishop cannot but be as the oil that flowed down upon Aaron's beard, and will intensify the prayer in the Christian world that all may be one who look unto Christ for salvation. A lesson not to be forgotten was given by the Armenian Professor Minaz Tcheraz, who quoted the words spoken fifteen years ago by the Supreme Patriarch of the Armenian Church to a Greek Archimandrite, "If there be no harmony between our two churches, the fault is not with our people. They are like flocks of sheep, which long for nothing more than to pasture together. It is with the shepherds who separate them, who brandish their crooks against each other, that the fault lies."

It has been declared by Joseph Cook, a constant and vigilant attendant upon the meetings, that the sublimest moments in the Parliament were those when the representatives of Buddhism, Confucianism, Brahmanism, Shintoism, joined with the representatives of Christian churches in the words of the universal prayer, "Our Father, which art in heaven." The sincerity of its use we leave to those who repeated it. The praise for its possession we give to the divine Master as a formula of religious unity and communion.

5. I believe a new impetus will come to Christian missions through the Parliament. This result will come first by the emphasis that has been put upon the unique character of Christianity. Instead of inuring to the disparagement of the Christian religion, the presentations of the ethnic systems will tend by contrast to bring out its overtopping excellence and distinguishing divinity, as foothills, if placed at its side, would bring out the superior greatness of Mont Blanc. The appropriation by Buddhists and others of the term "Father-

hood of God and brotherhood of man" could deceive none but the unwary, and shows the quiet infiltration of great Christian ideas into the thought of India, for which God ought to be praised. The address of Mozoomdar, of the Brahmo-Somaj, showed anew how Hindus, giving up their crasser beliefs, have been following Christ. Only afar off, it is true, but a certain distance. And we shall never forget what Keshub Chunder Sen, the founder of this Reformed Hinduism, said, when he declared that the crown of India belonged not to Victoria, but to Jesus Christ, and He would have it.

Of course a great deal that the representatives of the ethnic religions said will be taken with caution. Some of them, like the Hindus Dharmapala and Vivekananda, were apologists; and, without implying that they misrepresented, it is safe to say they yielded to the temptation to become pleaders, and to highly color their pictures. They spoke, so it has been said, of what those systems, in the light of Christianity, should be, rather than of what they were in the provision of their sacred books and in fact. The suttee, the perpetual widowhood of girls once married, the caste system, the thirty-three million gods and goddesses, are the dark background which is of the essence of the picture of Hinduism as presented through one or both of its two great systems. No pleading can rescue it. Regeneration from the font of Christianity alone can. Many will turn to study the life of Gautama, but from any excessive admiration there will be a rebound of faith. Christ is not superior. He stands by Himself. He is alone among the great religious teachers in His personal character, the claims He made, the elements of the kingdom He established, the boon He offered to the children of men. Not from pain as the supreme thing, but from sin He delivers; not into a Nirvana of self-forgetfulness, but into the glorious presence and companionship of

God does He, the risen and almighty Christ, lead His followers.

The impetus to Christian missions will come out of the defects made apparent of all religions other than Christianity—defects which are of their essence, and which the Gospel alone can remove by its own fulness. Mr. Webb's attempt to present Mohammedanism was rather a travesty, and yet it will do good indirectly. He could hardly be taken seriously when he adduced as one of the superiorities of Islam that under it guying on the part of the husband toward the wife was unknown. But when he ventured to assert the advantages of polygamy and the protection given to women, he was laughed at and cried down with "Shame." It was almost a supreme moment when Dr. Post, of Beirut, an honor to his country and the medical benefactor of Western Asia, rose on the same platform. And when Mr. Webb tried to retrench by declaring polygamy was not a part of the Mohammedan code, and that the murder of infidels was not commanded, Dr. Post opened his Arabic Koran and read the positive permission allowing the Mohammedan four wives and as many concubines as he chooses, and the distinct command to kill infidels. From the same platform a day or two before that other eminent educator, Dr. Washburne, of Robert College, made an address on Islam which was a masterpiece. For him who hath ears to hear no grounds will exist for parading Mohammedanism as a rival of Christianity, however much we may respect the Mohammedan's reverence for Allah and his total abstinence from alcoholic drinks.

It was hardly any wonder that Dr. Pentecost should have been stirred to controvert some of the positions of the Hindu speakers. His travels in India put him in a position to speak with authority. His references to the harlotry of Hindu priestesses, the phallus worship, and the moral rottenness of Indian society in general from top to bottom, more than counteracted the momentary

effect of any assertions suggesting an ideal state of society or religious sentiment. But Dr. Pentecost transgressed somewhat the regulations of the Parliament, which provided against all controversial heat or intent. It may be well said that the representatives of the ethnic systems seem to have presumed in this respect. But Christianity was the hostess, and could permit strokes against herself where she could not properly give them back.

The rebukes which were dealt against Christianity, which also helped to stir up Dr. Pentecost, were not undeserved by the Christian world. It is hard to endure a castigation even when it is deserved, particularly if it comes from hands not too clean. But the opium trade forced by England and the rum traffic carried on from America as well as other Christian lands are not slight iniquities. To make drunkards of heathen nations would be a crime almost inexplicable on the part of Christendom. The rebukes may do us good, but it ought to be known that Christianity is not responsible for these iniquities, and no more justifies them than the ship's management does the working of barnacles on her timbers. This episode in the Parliament should make Christian nations ashamed of themselves, and put us on our guard to be charitable toward the iniquities and polytheisms current where Christianity does not prevail, while we look at the iniquities and polytheisms current where it does nominally prevail.

The cause of missions will receive an impetus not only from the emphasis put upon the uniqueness of Christ's person and mission and the essential defects of other religions than His, but from the emphasis which has been given to the vast mistake of trying to perpetuate the denominational distinctions and nomenclatures of Protestantism in foreign lands. The best of our missionaries have been sending this word back to us. On the platform of the Parliament more than one native Christian spoke solemnly of the same

thing. To send a Christianity to Japan split up into sects is to send a rheumatic Christianity. What Chinese and Japanese Christians need is a Christian Church of China and Japan. Would that the time were near when, as Cromwell would have apportioned the missionary work in the world among four committees, there might be general missionary committees for different portions of the earth, undenominational in their constitution, who should receive the funds from all denominational boards and distribute them judiciously among the missionaries sent by all denominations, but banded together for the founding and perpetuation of the Church of Christ in India, in Japan, in Turkey, and other parts of the earth.

The outcome upon all serious Christian minds of this Parliament must be to remind us of the infinite contrast between the Christian system and the ethnic systems. The fundamental antagonism cannot be hidden by those agreements among men of every nation in the possession of a religious instinct, and a restlessness of man's spirit without God. If an insidious impression has gone forth to a popular constituency that the Parliament meant a fraternization which shall put aside fundamental differences, it will not be lasting where it has been made. And an increased sense of duty on the part of thinking Christians to carry the only Gospel of God unto men of every tribe and creed will more than counteract any such superficial impression. Vivekananda, the eloquent Hindu monk, might say that "if anybody dreams of the exclusive survival of his own religion and the destruction of the others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart." A determined and humble Christian faith will not be troubled nor turned from its duty. Christ is the Light of the world. He must be preached among all nations. It is His right to conquer, and He will conquer till all enemies are put under His feet. If it be charged that at the Parliament the distinctive and prevailing features of Christianity seem to have been at times withheld or understated, it must

be remembered that the Christian speakers were not free to turn on the search light upon the defects of the other systems. Christianity was in the place of host, and she could lose nothing by being modest and retiring for the time. Now that the Parliament is over, the Church can go on by works to demonstrate her divine mission and her ardent consecration, as she has felt she has fallen short of her resources in the past.

No one who stood thoughtfully on the grounds of the Exposition will forget the scene presented in the Court of Honor, so called. Standing near the gilded statue of Liberty and looking with her toward the west, one's eye followed the lagoon, crossed by bridges and traversed by boats, till it stopped at the graceful fountains. In the midst of the fulness of waters which they poured forth, trickling down over the white steps, was the Viking ship and her passenger, Columbia. Directly beyond the Administration Building, with a statue of Columbus looking in the direction the Viking boat was steering, even to the statue of Liberty. Turning one's back on the west and looking toward the east and the lake, one saw the beautiful colonnade on whose entablature were inscribed the names of the older and the newer States. And above the archway binding the elegant structure was written the legend, "Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free." It was the crucial spot on all the grounds for a motto, uttering, as it were, its voice out toward the statue of Liberty, the Norseman's vessel, and the great mariner, and enthroned above the States. Therein all men might read the secret of the history of our civilization and national hope. To the nations that sent their representatives from afar to Chicago and to the Parliament of Religions may it be a prophecy of the advance of the truth of God to all that still sit in the region and shadow of death, and its enlightening and subduing agency. The right use which the Christian pulpit of the land makes of the occasion will help toward its fulfilment.